Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2002-01 - 2002-02

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2002-01-01 through 2002-02-28

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 6,484

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 1

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 00:42:02 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3C3105DA.6046@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 29512
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CAM wrote:
>
> John wrote:
> > ... or the one I
> > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
> In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
LOUISIANA

2. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 00:48:59 UTC
From: f1dfr@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <a4a80311.0112311648.351ff5f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29513

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2F7121.555E7F3@IEEE.org>...
> f1dfr wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2E834E.2014983C@IEEE.org>...
> > > f1dfr wrote:
> > > > The event will be greater than the break of Berlin's wall.
> > >
> > > Such delusions of grandeur. Probably 99.97% of the population
> > > of the USA couldn't care less about amateur Morse code testing.
> >
> > The world is not only composed of the USA ...
>
> Have it your way. Guess what happens to the above percentage when
> China's population is included?

Nobody can predict something about China. Anyway the problem is not that one, it's that when the CW test will be abolished in the ITU-RR, there will be no more barrier for many hams to SPEAK on HF bands. No importance if the non-ham citizens are interested or not ...

Recently FRANCE was sentenced by the European Court of Human Rights about a right coming from the 29 July 1881 law about Press, allowing the french Minister of Interior to forbid and destroy publications in a foreign language published on the french territory. The Court considered that this absolute right was not compatible with article 10 of the European Convention about Human Rights allowing the liberty to communicate freely.

So, a wind a free communications blows in Europe ... CW will be a next target to shoot in that Court.

2002 is yet here, it's 1:41 a.m 01/01/2002, so I wish you a happy new year from FRANCE !

3. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 01:03:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231200304.03703.00000824@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29514

In article <20011230210049.05494.00004156@mb-mg.aol.com>, radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal) writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>an Advanced license by
>>itself
>>doesn't mean you passed 13 wpm, just like an Extra today doesn't mean you
>>passed 20 wpm. Medical waivers for 13 and 20 wpm code have been available
>>since
>>1990, so unless you can show that your license was issued before then,
>>there's
>>no proof of 13 wpm. Just like there's no proof of 20 wpm for my Extra unless
>>it's also known that I got it before 1990 (1970, to be exact).
>
>I disagree, Jim. While what you say is technically correct, it is most
>certainly the exception to the rule.

Well, I've been told by several VEs that in the 1990-2000 time period the rate of medical waiver applications was about 10%. Some VEs said as high as 20%. That's a LOT of exceptions!

> Would you agree that during
>pre-restructuring amateur radio licensing, at least one ham has "bought"
>his/her way past the code?

I don't know, but I DO know that the vast majority of VEs cannot be bought.

>Of course, we know this because of the reported
>VEC
>irregularities of late.

We do?

> Remember the Puerto Rico VEC fiasco of the early
>80's?

Nope.

>Heck, it could've even occurred when the FCC still did the testing. FCC
>personnel aren't infallible. (Isn't that right, Bert?)

Your point seems to be that some pre-restructuring hams may have cheated. My point is that many pre-restructuring Advanceds got their licenses without cheating and without passing 13 wpm.
>
>My point is that these scenarios are the exceptions, not the rule.

10-20% is a lot of exceptions.

>If we were
>to give the exceptions the same weight as the rule, then everyone's Tech plus
>or higher could be legitimately questioned.

Everyone's claim to 13 or 20 wpm can be legitimately questioned. In my case,
all questions are easily answered by a demonstration. Just like in August 1970.

> I remember seeing an
>advertisement
>for a one day or weekend course for hams who wished to cancel their extra
>tickets just so they could take all the required elements to grab their
>advanced ticket before 4/14/00. This was the equivalent of "downgrading" and
>was the subject of a thread here not too long ago. A bit extreme, but the
>motivation is understandable. It's the only proof of having passed a 13
>w.p.m.
>code test.

It was a goof.
>
>>Operationally, the ONLY difference between an Advanced and an Extra is
>access
>>to a few subbands. Those are where the DX is often found, 'specially the
>rare
>>ones, but if you're not a DXer it makes no difference.
>
>Some would consider this some very prime real estate.

Oh yeah - that's one of the reasons I got the big E way back then. Another was
the fact that it was cheaper for me to get the Extra than to build a 25 kHz
calibrator so I'd know where the subbands ended.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 01:25:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp86g8c.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 23:08:12 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:

>Think the case you have in mind was over in Iowa where the local farmer
>got a bit tired of people busting into the old family home to scarf
>antiques and set up a shotgun which had a non-fatal effect on one such
>looter. The looter's lawyer was smart enough to get him pled guilty to a
>misdemenor and ended up suing the farmer. Twelve dear ladies moved their
>heads up and down in response to the judges instructions and wiped out yon
>farmer.

You are correct - _Kotko v Briney_ was a 1971 Supreme Court of Iowa
case. The interesting sequel was that the looter later had to go to
bat for the farmer to keep him out of bankruptcy long enough to get
the damage award paid.

To us westerners, all states between Pensylvania and Nevada
blend into one.

Like the famous T-Shirt once sold at all three institutions said:

"University of Ohio, Iowa City, Idaho"

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 01:25:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp8762d.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29517

On 31 Dec 2001 23:03:18 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>A marriage is actually a private contract that is recorded by the
>govt. The parties involved agree to conduct their behavior in certain
>ways for as long as both of them are alive.

Maybe in some faiths but not in ours. We hold that the duration is
"..for as long as both want the marriage and its benefits to last".

There is far more religious ("canon") law about what a valid vs.
invalid divorce is than about what a valid vs. invalid marriage is,
and a serious scholar of religious law studies divorce law before
s/he studies marriage law.

We believe that marriage is not a jail.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 01:25:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp8bibe.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29516

On 31 Dec 2001 23:03:19 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>and CC&R, I believe,
>>is something to the effect of Code of Covenants and Restrictions.
>
>Close but no cookie.
>
>"Codes, Covenants and Restrictions"

Closer but still no cookie --

Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

7. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 02:14:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011231211437.07928.00002056@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29518

In article <C9A6C420A9462AC9.94974FA3AB67EA50.4645D57CB582981D@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>> Larry, go take your Viagra, dig out your Hustler magazine, and
>>>pretend that you can find a woman that would put up with you.
>>>
>>> Rick
>>
>>More insults. How charming. However, not worthy of a reply.
>
> Yet you replied.

I replied, Rick? What did I say? Oh -- I guess you thought my
"How charming" was a reply. I see. How pitiful! Now I'm sure I can
expect to be called an "idiot" again!

73 de Larry, K3LT

8. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 02:14:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011231211437.07928.00002057@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29519

In article <APQX7.316688$W8.11918421@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> On the other hand, since you have an aol account (which, to a
>> networker, is sort of like being a Novice class ham who can't even
>> remember the morse code), you ARE limited by a COU/TOS agreement that
>> specifically prohibits behavior which is harassing, offensive, or
>> violates the charter of a news group.
>>
>> Have a nice day, idiot.
>>
>> Rick
>>
>> --
>>
>> Rick Adams--KE8HH
>
>OOOOOOOOOOOOH. Eemotion. Watch it Rick, they'll heave you out of the
>faculty lounge for that. Nah, just move to the other side of the room and
>give you the sick cow stare.

Dick:

Watch it! Rick may decide to summon his two remaining brain cells
together, and call you an "idiot." Kind of like one of Kim's scathing
"ROFLMAO's." Now I know why he defends Kim so ardently -- he
doesn't have any more debating ability than she does!

73 de Larry, K3LT

9. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 02:32:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nd9Y7.318286$W8.12035304@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gp86g8c.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 23:08:12 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >Think the case you have in mind was over in Iowa where the local farmer
> >got a bit tired of people busting into the old family home to scarf
> >antiques and set up a shotgun which had a non-fatal effect on one such
> >looter. The looter's lawyer was smart enough to get him pled guilty to
a
> >misdemenor and ended up suing the farmer. Twelve dear ladies moved
their
> >heads up and down in response to the judges instructions and wiped out
yon
> >farmer.
>
> You are correct - _Kotko v Briney_ was a 1971 Supreme Court of Iowa
> case. The interesting sequel was that the looter later had to go to
> bat for the farmer to keep him out of bankruptcy long enough to get
> the damage award paid.
>
> To us westerners, all states between Pensylvania and Nevada
> blend into one.
>
> Like the famous T-Shirt once sold at all three institutions said:
>
> "University of Ohio, Iowa City, Idaho"
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

After you have done the 459 miles it takes to get 'Welcome to Wyoming'
you would be forgiven if you blended it together. Some years ago the
Game, Forestation, Parks, and Tourism Commission (no kidding) came up with
the infamous Nebraskaland, Where the West Begins slogan complete with the
traditional oxen, covered wagon, hardy pioneers etc heading into the sun.
Some of the locals had a case of the tights with the grand poobah thereof
and came up with a bumper sticker of their own.

It featured the same oxen but near death from exhaustion, a covered wagon
with four wheels going in five directions, pioneers that looked like
Snuffy Smith heading into a blazing sun with the caption: Nebraskaland,
Where the East Peters Out. Closer to the truth.

Besides most Nebraskans came on the train after a Kunte Kinte Klass ride on a steamship paid for by a railroad and were kicked off the train. The covered wagons ran only about 6 weeks a year on the Oregon trail at any given point, were rarely out of sight of each other, and the largest cause of death was being shot in the back when the idiot behind you with Grandpa's old percussion cap rifle left it in full-cock and hit a bump. Phil, you are now living among the progeny of the survivors of that bit of idiocy -- be careful!

Dick, Bionic Klutz

10. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 03:03:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231220302.03703.00000828@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29521

In article <sT6Y7.261881$3d2.12361633@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

(n2ey WROTE):

>Ever hear the term "Philadelphia lawyer"?

>Yup, a holdover from railroads, particularly the Pennsy.

The Standard Railroad of the World.

>One of the great
>problems the railroads had was financing rolling stock and keeping it from
>automatically falling into the collateral for the first-mortgage bonds so
>the grand and glorious Philadelphia Plan was developed that pioneered a
>lot of things including off balance-sheet financing. A lot of rail cars
>for a lot of years were decorated with brass plates announcing that the
>car was financed under the Philadelphia Plan by East Dinglehoofer Bank and
>Trust and not just on the Pennsy.

Still done that way for most rolling stock. Both cars and locomotives are often
not owned by the RR itself, even though they have the RR's logos on them.
>
>Railroad attorneys, including one Abraham Lincoln, were among the best
>lint-pickers, gnat-strainers, camel-swallowers, loophole pullers, and
>fly-speck finders available for a number of years but the Pennsy's ranked
>at the top of the heap.

Hence the name. PRR's Hq was always in Philadelphia. But nobody around here
said "Pennsy" or "PRR" - it was always just "The Railroad".

VCR alert: The local PBS station is going to show a new special on the PRR
mid-January. Hopefully it will make the rounds.

>Lincoln convinced a court that a low railroad
>bridge across the Mississippi was not really a hazard to navigation
>because the owners could put hinges in the smokestacks.

You mean they can't?

>He was from
>Illinois but with that performance he deserved Philadelphia.
>
PRR didn't cross the Mississippi anyway.

PRR was the first true mega-corporation, the first billion-dollar company, and
the first with widespread use of many engineering innovations (steel rails, air
brakes, Janney couplers, cab signals).

True story:

Back in the '80s the classic GG-1 electric locomotives were still running. Probably the best example of what the PRR could do. After 1968 they were painted in various awful schemes by the RRs that inherited them (Amtrak, Conrail, NJDOT). A group of railfans banded together and raised money to restore one to its former glory. GG-1 4935, the very last one built, was fixed up and painted in the original Tuscan red and gold pinstripe scheme. Old stencils that had been hidden away for almost two decades suddenly showed up in the shops so that the logos and lettering would be as they were originally.

A special train was commissioned for the "first" run of the restored 4935 originating in Washington Union Station. Vintage private car 120 was on the rear, with its classic open vestibule. Speeches were given from the rear platform of car 120 in classic whistle stop fashion.

The last speaker on that day was one Nelson Bowers, who had a major role in keeping the project moving forward through the various bureaucracies and red tape. He thanked all who had helped and concluded with the following:

"And now, after much hard work and dedication, we have one GG-1 locomotive restored to its proper condition, as God and the Pennsylvania Railroad intended".

The crowd went wild.

Then there's the story of Upton Station..

73 es HNY

Jim, N2EY

11. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 04:07:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FBaY7.208365$WW.12104426@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29522

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011231211437.07928.00002057@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<APQX7.316688$W8.11918421@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> On the other hand, since you have an aol account (which, to a
> >> networker, is sort of like being a Novice class ham who can't even
> >> remember the morse code), you ARE limited by a COU/TOS agreement that
> >> specifically prohibits behavior which is harassing, offensive, or
> >> violates the charter of a news group.
> >>
> >> Have a nice day, idiot.
> >>
> >> Rick
> >>
> >> --
> >>
> >> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> >
> >OOOOOOOOOOOOH. Eemotion. Watch it Rick, they'll heave you out of the
> >faculty lounge for that. Nah, just move to the other side of the room
and
> >give you the sick cow stare.
>
> Dick:
>
> Watch it! Rick may decide to summon his two remaining brain cells
> together, and call you an "idiot." Kind of like one of Kim's scathing
> "ROFLMAO's." Now I know why he defends Kim so ardently -- he
> doesn't have any more debating ability than she does!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, sometime when you are suffering from Terminal Boredom find
something on Myers-Briggs Personality Type and let it flow. You may have
encountered it learning to be a fixture in Human Refuse.

To oversimplify, it determines a classification on four binary scales:
a. Inner vs Outerworld Focus. I am a wierd Outerworlder but barely. E
or I
b. Information Inhalation: direct serial sensory or parallel big
picture. I am a picture thinker which is called an iNtuitive as opposed
to a Sensor.

c. Decision basis. Thinking or Feeling which actually does vary between sexes. We both tend to be strong Ts with an aversion to calling a manure pile a fertilizer storage facility.
d. And how does one go about daily existence? Plan, method, closure or open-end, casual, and adapt to anything. As a Judger or Perceiver in their nomenclature. I am a classic P

So I am an ENTP. Would not presume to guess at E or I in your case but the general population odds favor E. Suspect an S in the second, a T, and more than likely a J.

So I am an ENTP and for the nonce think you might be an ESTJ. You are more common.

Concentrate on my NP and your presumed SJ tendencies. In a job, you are the classic administrator where I am the classic theologian and neither of us is all that people-oriented nor in my case have much of a clue what it even means other than to be what in my HS days was called a Fenwick, the 'good guy' who would not complain if you pissed on his blue suede shoes. There is a big diff between a theologian and the parish priest. Diffs we have had to deal with with varying degrees of success in varying circumstances.

As it happens, EN types tend to be more common in Academe where we flunk out the SJs at an alarming rate until we get a job and get canned by the SJ people as useless overhead. Such is what makes the world spin. What is really funny is that to be say the chief engineer, we have to put on the SJ hat and be a pest to those ENs who have not yet discovered that the SJs do have a point, the money for your paycheck does have to arrive in the forseeable future. Brian Kelly got to serve this role as did I which is why we tend to cynicism about the great digital future.

A fairly small group are NFs who have a major adjustment problem in the real world and tend toward what techies call Arts and Seances. Can't say if Rick is on that path or not.

It does make for a rather interesting pattern in University design that I have seen repeated on a number of campuses. I will use Nebraska/Omaha as an example. The hard science people are in the northwest corner, the Arts and Seance people are on the East side with the teachers college in the northeast corner, the jocks are on the south, and the library, student center, admin and the business school are in the middle as a buffer zone. The Engineers, IT freaks, and technowizards are across the park learning Arabic, Mandarin, and modern Japanese. C.P. Snow's two cultures on a grand scale.

So don't get too bent, Larry. Just imagine what Rick's next faculty meeting must look like.

Dick N BK

12. Re: 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 04:09:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112312009.4ef1b4d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29523

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years for the
> radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those things you
> will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your dwelling.
>
> Dick McCollum Nï¿½BK
>
>
>
>
>
>
. . . you just HAD to do that din ya?
>
>
>
>
DIT-DIT.
>
>
>
rv

13. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 04:17:24 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_MaY7.334888$er5.7446756@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:se2Y7.317771$W8.11990974@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>
> I can see the deputy stopping a car well down on the axles with five
> irritated animals all roped up grinding down the county road at nite.
> Just what do you use for an opening line?
>snip>>

> Dick N�BK

LOL! They must've been calves, cuz I still can't see how he got 'em in
'ere> I can just see it
now; old car going down the road mashed down to the axles, bumper within
inches of the
ground. Springs broken. Tires rubbing the fenders. Maybe the deputy,
meeting this car
with "cows" in it, thought they spiked his coffee at the diner, and said to
himself, "I'm NOT
gonna say a word to anybody about this because they wouldn't believe it!"

IT is still very funny. And I believe people will try anything once.

Jerry

>

14. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 04:46:52 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Polly FQF" <Stumpjumpernr1@stumpjumpersBARF.org> wrote in message
news:a0qcu1$2ir$0@dosa.alt.net...
> If I recall, Roger Wiseman, KC8JBO, published a list of
> his enemies here not too long ago, a lengthy list indeed! So
> Wogey, how about publishing a list of your friends? Then
> again, you and I know, you have zero friends, save for the
> "companions" you have brief moments with down at O'Leary's
> Hourly Motel & Lavendar Lounge.
>
> Polly FQF
> Chief Mule Humper

Surely you jest! Roger? Friends? No way! The only friend Rogie has is his right hand which provides solace during those long, lonely nights he silently suffers through. Did not you know that this is how Rogie earned his nickname of "Thumper"?

15. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:03:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101000315.03703.00000830@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29527

In article <3c30cd1a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011231140452.27168.00000800@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >
>> >As a side note, Jim: I'll post however I choose to post, thank you very
>> >much.
>>
>> Just a suggestion to make your stuff more readable and avoid wasting
>USENET
>> resources.
>
>I know what the basis is.

So you repost the entirety of tens-of-kilobyte post just to add a two word
comment.

> It's also a waste of USENET resources if there's
>a response to a post that just wouldn't make sense to the first time reader
>and they have to go back and start looking through them all.

That's what newsreaders are for.

73 de Jim, N2EY

16. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101000316.03703.00000831@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29528

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82109.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:00 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>A question: Does the preemption cover only pay-TV antennas like the
>>pizza dish satellite receivers and terrestrial microwave services, or
>>all TV antennas like the plain old VHF-UHF log-periodics?
>
> All broadcast/video OTARDs, including plain old TV antennas.

Thanks, Phil.
>
> HOWEVER, it does not cover TV-type antennas used for any other
> purpose, such as "stealth" amateur radio transmitting antennas. The
> FCC has already closed that loophole.

Of course!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>--

17. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101000316.03703.00000832@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29529

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp80vq7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 02:01:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>In most ceremonies the people entering into the contract face each
>>other and say out loud that they have come to the contract freely and
>>unreservedly, and accept ALL its terms. They make the contract in
>>front of witnesses and get both community and legal acceptance. In
>>most ceremonies there are NO escape clauses and NO limitations.
>
> In Jewish practice, the marriage contract is in writing, it is read
> aloud at the wedding ceremony, and contains specific clauses of
> obligations of either party to the other in the event that one
> party can no longer carry out the obligations of a spouse.
>
> A "pre-nup" whose origins go back about 2200 years....
>
Makes a lotta sense. Note that in the above I wrote "most ceremonies".

Rewrite all my references to "most Christian ceremonies".

73 de Jim, N2EY

18. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101000317.03703.00000833@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29526

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82cua.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:00 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>In other words, the "couch potatoes" DO have a right to their TV,
>>because it's THEIR spectrum, and TV exists for them.
>
> Every spectrum regulation professional knows deep down that it's the
> broadcast/video companies who own that portion of the spectrum, and
> TV programming exists to fill the gaps between advertising messages.

Or pledge breaks....
>
> Hey, this is starting to sound like ba.broadcast......
>
Yup.

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

19. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101000317.03703.00000834@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29530

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp8762d.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 23:03:18 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>A marriage is actually a private contract that is recorded by the
>>govt. The parties involved agree to conduct their behavior in certain
>>ways for as long as both of them are alive.

Make that "typical Christian marriage"
>
> Maybe in some faiths but not in ours. We hold that the duration is
> "..for as long as both want the marriage and its benefits to last".

I shoulda realized that...the Christian "til death" thing is based on a single New Testament quote.
>
> There is far more religious ("canon") law about what a valid vs.
> invalid divorce is than about what a valid vs. invalid marriage is,
> and a serious scholar of religious law studies divorce law before
> s/he studies marriage law.

Makes sense.
>
> We believe that marriage is not a jail.....
>
Works for me!

But the state will grant a divorce for anyone - even those who have made a contract with no escape clauses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

20. The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:28:28 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 29531

Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?

Top 10 Users RRAP SEP 2001

[501] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 16.8%
[260] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 8.7%
[256] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.6%
[253] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 8.5%
[193] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 6.5%
[142] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 4.8%
[120] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 4.0%
[105] WA8ULX <wa8ulx@aol.com> 3.5%
[97] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 3.3%
[93] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.1%

Top 10 Users RRAP OCT 2001

[188] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 11.3%
[151] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 9.1%
[122] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 7.3%
[113] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 6.8%
[96] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
[89] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.3%
[88] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 5.3%
[75] Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com> 4.5%
[59] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.5%
[42] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 2.5%

Top 10 Users RRAP NOV 2001

[484] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 16.8%
[312] Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> 10.9%
[283] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 9.9%
[256] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 8.9%
[206] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 7.2%
[153] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 5.3%
[126] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 4.4%
[107] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 3.7%
[102] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 3.6%
[67] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 2.3%

Top 10 Users of RRAP DEC 2001

[409] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 10.7%
[352] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 9.2%
[265] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 7.0%
[257] Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> 6.7%

[194] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.1%
[180] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 4.7%
[121] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.2%
[113] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 3.0%
[98] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 2.6%
[92] KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> 2.4%

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

21. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:37:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C314AFE.A573561C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29532

Joshua Houk wrote:

>
>
> You will need to take the Technician exam if you want a General license.
> The good news is that it's a fairly easy test if you know General class
> theory - a lot of it you'll already know or can deduce just from common
> sense. I'd suggest going over the question pools or practice exams on
> the net to see how much you'll need to study.
>
> If you don't want to take everything right away, you can take the
> General exam and the code exam at the next session and assuming you pass
> those you have credit for those elements for 365 days, and as long as
> you pass your Technician exam by then you'll get your General ticket.
> The bad news is, of course, that you won't get a license at the first
> session.

I don't think the VEs will let you take the General written without
having successfully done the Tech first.

When you do attend a test session, take all the tests. It doesn't
cost more, and who knows, you might just pass them all. AFAIK,
they don't have "unsuccessful completion of exam" certificates.

22. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:43:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <U%bY7.262204$3d2.12389712@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:_MaY7.334888$er5.7446756@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>
> Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:se2Y7.317771$W8.11990974@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> >
> > I can see the deputy stopping a car well down on the axles with five
> > irritated animals all roped up grinding down the county road at nite.
> > Just what do you use for an opening line?
> >snip>>
>
> > Dick N�BK
>
> LOL! They must've been calves, cuz I still can't see how he got 'em in
> 'ere> I can just see it
> now; old car going down the road mashed down to the axles, bumper
within
> inches of the
> ground. Springs broken. Tires rubbing the fenders. Maybe the deputy,
> meeting this car
> with "cows" in it, thought they spiked his coffee at the diner, and said
to
> himself, "I'm NOT
> gonna say a word to anybody about this because they wouldn't believe
it!"
>
> IT is still very funny. And I believe people will try anything once.
>
>
> Jerry

It isn't that bad, Jerry. Say something like 250-400 max for each heifer in a six passenger car and they did not bring any luggage. Probably made one or two ride in the trunk.

What amazes me is the amount of racket he had to have made getting them in. Who needs the phone, just open the window at the county jail. Can't believe the deputy wasn't there watching for most of it.

But with the meth freaks and their well-known paranoia a deputy is well-advised to pick his spots for any kind of bust.

23. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 05:48:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <q4cY7.262210$3d2.12390808@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29534

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02...
>
> Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
>

Somehow, Louie, I don't think this is the beginning of a beautiful
friendship.

24. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 06:04:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C3144B2.33780750@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29535

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <C9A6C420A9462AC9.94974FA3AB67EA50.4645D57CB582981D@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >>> Larry, go take your Viagra, dig out your Hustler magazine, and
> > >>>pretend that you can find a woman that would put up with you.
> > >>>
> > >>> Rick
> > >>
> > >>More insults. How charming. However, not worthy of a reply.
> > >
> > > Yet you replied.
> >
> > I replied, Rick? What did I say? Oh -- I guess you thought my
> > "How charming" was a reply. I see. How pitiful! Now I'm sure I can
> > expect to be called an "idiot" again!

By an idiot, yet. How charming!

25. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 06:35:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112312235.42fec17b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29536

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20011231140453.27168.00000802@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> In article <y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the garage
> >between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish, and
> >relieve on your flathead.
>
>
OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB block
with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing in
a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter Phase
II. Yahoo!
>
>
The little 30s 135in^3 flatheads did their thing pretty well too. Did
a cupple of those in a screamin' nitro-powered 12 foot hydroplane. I
still have the damned valve spring tool ya need to work on 'em.
>
>
Personally I refused to grow up and moved to Mopar hemis a bit later.
There ain't NOTHIN' like the throaty growl of CUBES Mon. Or the
torque. 450 inches of bofum 'em with six Webber sidedraft carbs in my
2-dr. '56 Plymouth Savoy stealth grannymobile fer instance.
Punched-out DeSoto block, the pots came out of a wrecked Aston-Martin.
'Vettes = LUNCH. Could pass everything on the road 'cept gas stations
and tire stores.
>
>
My Geo Metro gets 35mpg, 75,000 miles on a set of tires, can't pass
the average skateboarder and tends to stall when I fire up the 2m rig.
>
>
Shit happens.
>
>
>>Life moves on.
>
>
Shaddup.
>
>
> Actually you can do the ARC-5 thing but it'll cost ya.

>
>
Yeah, fer Chrissake Richard DON'T bring up ARC-5s else Lenny's
embalmer will let him out to play with the bloody computer again and
we'll ALL pay.
>
>
>
> Don't get Kelly & me
> started about small engine work.
>
>
Remind me sometime to tellya abt the assorted Kelly & Micollis Inc.
Field Day fiascos, the Abbot & Costello of EPA . . . especially The
Year Of HIS Tailgate Special genset . . not that I don't make my own
"contributions" to the act of course. The question at this point is
whether the nocode who runs the neighborhood FD operation will let us
try again this year.
>
>
>
> >And our choice is pretty simple, do we stay a part of the program or spend
> >our time at QCWA luncheons?
>
>
Buncha frigging lame noclue newbies . . the HCWA Bingo & Coupon
Clippers is where it's AT.
>
>
>
> Our part in the program is largely that of
> >the old male elephants they move with the younger herds to maintain some
> >sense of decorum and order, take names, kick butts, provide some support
> >when the young bucks realize they just did something dumb, and generally
> >play the classic Grandpa which like sergeanting is a lost art. Oh well.
>
>
Just this afternoon so help me: 15 transmissions land on the dock
which are supposed to mate with the bellhousing of a 900Hp Cat diesel
engine in a big piece of construction equipment. Something did not
look right. I counted the holes in bolt pattern. Shoulda been 16 for
that engine. There were 12 holes in all in all the wrong places.
Dragged the kid who dunnit out to the dock and asked him (a) if he
could still count when he ran outta fingers and (b) if he knew which
sides of a drawing were up and down. "Jeez Mr. Kelly you sound just
like my dad!"
>
>
> Been there, done that, still here. Yer preachin' to the choir.
> >

> >Still wonder if Brittany's are real.
>
>
> awcumon, as fake as a $3 bill.
>
>
I'd sure as hell like to find out but both of my grandsons are 'WAY
ahead of me in the line.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
G'nite & Happy New Year. My computer clock kicked over at midnite,
gawd that was exciting.
>
>
w3rv

26. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 07:27:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112312327.69bce152@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29537

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...

>
> predeliction for taking his themes from opera overtures did a western with
> a pretty dumb hero who used a .45 caliber shotgun and was constantly
> bailed out by his faithful Indian companion
>
>
.45 shotgun? Nah, it wuz the Willaim Tell Overture and Hisself's .45
Colt hawgleg which spit silver bullets in the name of law, order and
justice. Check out Alex Kunzel conducting the Cincinatti Pops version
of the overture and if ya listen real close ya can hear a muted "Hi,
Yo Silver! at the end of the track.
>
>
>
>who it might be argued called
> him 'dumbshit' at every opportunity
>
>
Tonto (Jay Silverheels) eventually got his revenge though and I'm sure
you've heard this before but halfheimers being what it is at "our"
age, etc.

>
>
>
>
The Lone Ranger & Tonto found themselves surrounded by hostile
Indians. The Lone Ranger sez "I think we're in a lot of trouble
Kimosabe." Tonto sez "whatta mean "WE" white man?
>
>
I guess it was maybe sometime in the mid-late sixties at a new year's
eve bash, buncha young couples, the usual. The name of the game was to
name the song. Comes my turn I picked eight young sweeties out of the
crowd and lined 'em up in a row. First one facing forward, next one
facing backward, next one facing backward in a specific order, etc.
Eventually they gave up, "OK Kelly, so what's the tune?" "It's the
William Tell Overture, the themesong of the Lone Ranger, titty rump
titty rump titty rump rump rump."
>
>
>

Some years ago one of the banks around here did a parody and aired a
TV commercial based on the "Lone Arranger." Funny as hell but the kids
din have a clue.
>
>
>
> and another where the Mountie's dog
> was the star and sold great shitpots of KennelRation. Hey man, you gotta
> believe.
>
>
Sergeant Preston of the Yukon and his mutt King . .
>
>
And the dumbest of all mutts Lassie . . .
>
>
I really do need to get back on the air dammit.
>
>
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK
>
>
w3rv

27. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 08:09:00 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <w8eY7.208543$WW.12120003@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29538

I don't know how they do it today. When I obtained my first tickets (novice, general, extra in 1962, 64, and 66), you had to pass the code tests before you took the written tests (at the FCC). Later, after I dropped my tickets around 1981 or 1982 and then took my tests in 1993, I took the novice, technician and was either in the middle of the technician or general written exam when we were asked if anyone wanted element 1-C. So, I took the exam papers with me and took the 20 WPM code test and then went back for the rest of the written exams. Is any order necessary today?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10112312348540.3647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001, Howard Johnson wrote:
> >I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
> >for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
> >(next testing period that I can attend).
> >
> >My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
> >first then a General written or just the General?
>
> In order to get a license, you will have to take the Technician written as well
> (and to get the general class license, 5wpm code too).
>

28. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 09:37:31 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AEA2EFD8F5776B5A.B1307447EC92E18D.D607FD904548D98B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29539

On 31 Dec 2001 02:01:03 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>"love, honor, and cherish"
>"in good times and bad"
>"in sickness and in health"
>"for richer or poorer"
>"til death us do part"

They clearly state and repeat the terms up front. How often do you see the CC&Rs posted on the front door of an available house, or clearly defined in the realtor's flyer?

When my YL and I moved into our current apartment, we had to hound the management to get an actual copy of the restrictions; the sheet we were supposed to sign referred to the rulebook and a few strange exceptions, but didn't include any specifics. According to its text, posession of a cell phone or cordless phone in the apartment would be grounds for eviction, but on examination of the actual rules, it was found that only antennas actually anchored in place, or extending beyond our apartment are restricted. Therefore, all my antennas are technically stored, since they can easily be picked up and moved.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

29. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 09:41:13 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29540

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:36:15 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>They're not. And, if you don't like the marriage you're in, get a divorce.
>If you don't like neighborhoods with whatever CCRs you can't agree with,
>then don't move in.

That's reasonable....provided they don't weasel something in through
vague language, or hidden references to another document that you
never get to see until after you've signed.

>Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
>environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
>wishing to be married. It's that simple.

Moving out is a hell of a price to pay for something one was given no
notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
know.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

30. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 09:46:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <52A288A27D913EBC.8AB20C4A2E998B29.75009D44359B7EFF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29541

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:19:13 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

>>So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to have
>>your cake and eat it, too.
>
> No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
> doing continuous maintenance on an older home.

Then fix it right the first time.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

31. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 09:51:07 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <75E9E8A449CF3A9B.8CA522D068AEA257.3584421CE865F7D7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29542

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:54:14 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses! Tell them dirty joke *every*
>time they show up at your door. Really. It'll take 'em once or twice, but
>they'll get lost.

Answer the door naked. If it doesn't work the first time, try asking
your local butcher for some particularly identifiable parts, and have
one with you next time.

>Still haven't figured out what keeps the Baptists away. I did yell at one
>who showed up dressed like a clown offering to take my two children to
>Sunday School and they even got a free goldfish for going...buhruther...I
>asked her if God had approved the clown suit. She still came back a few
>times, but we were living in the commune--I mean apartment at the time. No
>property ownership means they can do whatever they want.

I got them kicked off the property several times at my old place.
After management had raised hell with the $cientologists jumping the
gate to put their flyers on all the cars and doors, letting any other
group proselytize would have gotten them in some legal hot water.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

32. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 09:52:06 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <5795A3BEEDABD7CB.B3096C2C3D2A487F.B01F322FE3BB20DE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29543

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:54:14 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Still haven't figured out what keeps the Baptists away. I did yell at one
>who showed up dressed like a clown offering to take my two children to
>Sunday School and they even got a free goldfish for going.

Call the cops and report some pervert posing as a clown, trying to get
you to send your kids off with them.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

33. Re: New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:02:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A1E894B8A8F1FC02.96B41B03E199594B.34D539342DD742CE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29544

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 22:37:59 GMT, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:

>Here's a new topic for all!
>
>Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the
>quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.

Depends on who you're asking. While I like the idea of having a stack
of full logbooks, I'd generally prefer one interesting 20-minute QSO
to a couple dozen swap-calls-and-reports-and-move-on contacts. That's
why I find the IRLP so darn interesting.

Now, for playing with a QRP rig and seeing what it'll do, I can find
out more from 20 minutes of callsign-and-RST than from chatting with
one guy, but then, I could find it out from more interesting QSOs with
all those stations too, it would just take longer. I'm 25, and the
licenses are good for ten years each, so I don't see a lot of reason
to get in a rush outside of contesting or the occasional
barely-above-the-noise contact where exchanging much more would be a
hassle.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

34. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:07:12 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <45BC4A9A0D5A30D9.DF54ED5817F8B46C.F511960C9A406949@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29545

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 04:15:57 -0000, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote:

>Instead, they basically tell us to "go eat cake", go for a ride in
>your car, or go down to the club station. Uhhhhhhhh, is there
>a club station near you which can be shared by all the amateurs
>in your community?

I'm not even sure any of the clubs anywhere near me even have a fixed station. Most don't own any real estate whatsoever, and if they have anything resembling a station, it's a van or trailer with no permanent home.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

35. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:16:07 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4FC7CFF42958BA79.0B468E54B97BF96C.47790CC5C5C13D3F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 15:35:51 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>John wrote:
>> ... or the one I
>> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
>> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
>In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?

Texas, if it's after dark and you don't have another readily available
means of stopping them.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

36. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:22:47 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D6CB2546DFA7D087.798CB5E8B4441F3F.3A04387373958D95@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:04:46 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
>limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.

TX Penal Code
9.42. Deadly Force to Protect Property
A person is justified in using deadly force against another to
protect land or tangible, movable property:
(1) if he would be justified in using force against the other
under Section 9.41; and
(2) when and to the degree he reasonably believes the deadly
force is immediately necessary:
(A) to prevent the other's imminent commission of arson,
burglary, robbery, aggravated robbery, theft during the nighttime, or
criminal mischief during the nighttime; or
(B) to prevent the other who is fleeing immediately after
committing burglary, robbery, aggravated robbery, or theft during the
nighttime from escaping with the property; and
(3) he reasonably believes that:
(A) the land or property cannot be protected or recovered by any
other means; or
(B) the use of force other than deadly force to protect or
recover the land or property would expose the actor or another to a
substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury.

Going hand to hand against someone trying to rob you is considered too
dangerous, and given the rarity of recovering stolen property, that
rarely enters the picture except in cases of something that's just too
obvious for them to get far with it. (The only case that comes to
mind under that exception is the guy who had his 10ft tall fiberglass
cow on a trailer stolen repeatedly - it was always recovered within 48
hours...where in the hell would they hide it, and what could they do
with it that wouldn't result in being seen?)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

37. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:27:05 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <8380336C9DB490F9.3E36E455A5C43AB8.0380C9BAA26EA5F5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 18:36:08 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>The article had to do with the increase in amateur
>rustling
<SNIP>

Someone's stealing hams? How much could you possibly get for one?
Can I trade two Techs and a Novice for a General?

:)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

38. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:33:12 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A887CDB817BDAE6D.0CDA5DF3E137B9B6.1D454785E1645914@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29549
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:56:36 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>There was a case in South Texas that was ruled a suicide. A guy allegedly
>shot himself in the back seven times with a semiautomatic rifle.

Not too uncommon if the person was one of the local Sheriff's least
favorite customers. IIRC, one guy was determined to have run himself
through an industrial chipper-shredder.

The only real evidence in favor of that determination was the marks on
the inside of the chute from when he tried to pull himself out,
showing that he was definitely alive when he went in.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

39. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 10:36:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <B32C689320EBBBB3.298E5DCF4F327624.14C11683213126AD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 22:39:06 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

>On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 01:40:58 GMT, JR wrote:
>
>>> There are LOTS of cases in almost every state that hold that
>>> deadly force is not justified in a property-only crime.
>>
>>Shoot to kill then drag him inside and put a weapon in his hand.
>
> But the forensic guys and gals can see through that, too.

The small-town sheriff who knows damn well that Bubba did half the
breakins in town, but couldn't prove it is going to assume that you
butchered a deer on the front lawn earlier.

Hell, in the right small towns, he'll bring a throwdown weapon just in
case you forgot.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

40. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:13:23 UTC
From: Torbj&#65533;rn Morka <tmorka@online.no>
Message-ID: <4JhY7.15276$KQ3.200045@news1.oke.nextra.no>
Source record: 29551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Ed Cregger" <nm2k@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:u2m8vs8ka1b06e@corp.supernews.com...
> They can have it. Ten meters was trashed years ago.
>
> Ed Cregger
> nm2k@adoublerl.net
>

WHAT ???

Sorry, but are you an amateur ?

I thought seriously allmost every "ham" sticked their soul for every bit
they could use/get of the spectrum ?

Hmm...

73de
LC3RBT, Torbjorn.

41. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:17:52 UTC
From: Torbj&#65533;rn Morka <tmorka@online.no>
Message-ID: <hNhY7.15279$KQ3.200044@news1.oke.nextra.no>
Source record: 29552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F30AC.6EF20444@IEEE.org...
> Twistedhed wrote:
> > We are treated like 2nd class citizens.
>
> Would you like for a homeless person to start living in
> the back seat of your vehicle?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

As i can interpet this statement, every cb'er who uses frequencies NOT used
by ham's, are to be concidered as "hoboes" ?

Shit, you should have a BIG cactus shuffed up behind !!

T.

42. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:37:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C31AD96.DEA37149@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29553

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C30C224.BB48E409@earthlink.net...

> >
> > Moving is often not an option.
> > If I'd lived in such a neighborhood when I was first licensed at age 14,
> > I'd have to have run away from home in order to move out of the
> > neighborhood. I couldn't have talked my parents into moving since the
> > church would never have understood why Dad moved out of the rectory.
> >
>
> There's lots of restrictions on kids and we are all usually bound by
> decisions our parents make. What's your point?

Maybe it would be easier for you if you read what you wrote and THEN
read what I wrote. My point was and is that your suggestion to move is
often not an option at all. Many folks can't do much about where they
live. If someone becomes interested in amateur radio and finds that
there are prohibitions on any type of antenna, it would present a huge
obstacle to the enjoyment of amateur radio.

> >
> > If you can't reasonably do what you want with land which you have
> > purchased, it really isn't your land.
> >
>
> Well, it truly isn't your land anyway, because the government can use
> "eminent domain" if they choose to.

Kim, that simply does not take place often. If it does take place, you
have to be paid for the taking of your land. Often a landowner is paid
far more than he or she paid for the property. CC&R's are not put in
place by government.

Dave K8MN

43. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:39:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C31AE02.F638E823@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29554

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> I know apartment owners whose logs will
> rival even the best of antenna farms.

Manure.

Dave K8MN

44. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:44:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C31AF3F.6AC8EA2C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29555

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C30C2CC.15408267@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner we
> wish
> > > it is a certain inalienable right.
> >
> > I don't like the pukey green color of your house. I hate those pink
> > plastic flamingos along your driveway and your maple leaves blow in my
> > yard. Your cheap, plastic lawn furniture is an eyesore. Hey, are you
> > going to keep that Winnebago there?

> Do you have a point, Dave?

Let me suggest once again that you take the time to read what YOU wrote
and THEN read what I wrote. It may save us both a lot of time.

If a neighbor objects to an antenna or supporting structure, that is
pretty much too bad. I may not like the neighbor's paint, lawn
furniture, landscaping, Winnebago or decorative items. He did not
obtain them for my enjoyment. I certainly don't put up an antenna or
refrain from doing so for the neighbor's convenience.

Dave K8MN

45. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 12:47:49 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0sb4c$s28$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29556

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:q4cY7.262210$3d2.12390808@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02...
> >
> > Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
> >
>
> Somehow, Louie, I don't think this is the beginning of a beautiful
> friendship.

<SPOILER>
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
Kevin Spacey's character is Keyzer Soze.

73 Corry K4DOH
--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

April Llewellyn wrote in hsv.general: "I love you, unclaimed mysteries
person. =o) Well, not really, since I have no clue who you are, but GOD,
sarcasm! So refreshin! (^__^)"

46. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 13:07:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C31B49B.54459E84@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29557

f1dfr wrote:

> Nobody can predict something about China. Anyway the problem is not
> that one, it's that when the CW test will be abolished in the ITU-RR,
> there will be no more barrier for many hams to SPEAK on HF bands. No
> importance if the non-ham citizens are interested or not ...
>
> Recently FRANCE was sentenced by the European Court of Human Rights
> about a right coming from the 29 July 1881 law about Press, allowing
> the french Minister of Interior to forbid and destroy publications in
> a foreign language published on the french territory. The Court
> considered that this absolute right was not compatible with article 10
> of the European Convention about Human Rights allowing the liberty to
> communicate freely.
>
> So, a wind a free communications blows in Europe ... CW will be a next
> target to shoot in that Court.

Among my long lasting memories of 6m operation from West Africa will be the FD stations from France appearing on my CW operating frequency, inquiring on SSB, "Coo Air Zed?". My French is rusty so at first I thought they were simply asking, "Who is calling me?". It was obvious that no one was calling them. I corrected my translation to mean, "What is that funny beeping noise?".

"Speak on HF bands" will soon become the same as speaking on the VHF bands for the poor pathetic victims of this Euro-slavery. There is certainly *some kind of wind* blowing in Europe.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

47. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 13:28:35 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C31B971.39096A0@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> Can I trade two Techs and a Novice for a General?

I'll give you a couple of lifer techs, no charge!

48. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 13:48:49 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0selq01o79@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29559

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net...
> >Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
> >environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
> >wishing to be married. It's that simple.
>
> Moving out is a hell of a price to pay for something one was given no
> notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
> new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
> know.

Neither is a divorce. That's why that comparison was made.

49. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 13:56:36 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0sf3701ol4@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29560

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:75E9E8A449CF3A9B.8CA522D068AEA257.3584421CE865F7D7@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:54:14 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses! Tell them dirty joke
every
> >time they show up at your door. Really. It'll take 'em once or twice,
but
> >they'll get lost.
>
> Answer the door naked. If it doesn't work the first time, try asking
> your local butcher for some particularly identifiable parts, and have
> one with you next time.

My house is "L" shaped, so I can look out of a window and see who is at the
front door without them knowing. I've often cranked up the stereo and not
answered the door, just to see their reaction.

50. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 13:59:44 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0sgp3hcup@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flame,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Surely you jest!

That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's been
spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.

51. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 14:04:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0sfit01p52@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29561

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02...
>
> Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
>

He must have. All I've noticed is that I've moved up one notch each month. I probably fell behind for December, because some of the discussions have been beaten beyond recognition, and aren't worth responding to.

52. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 14:30:26 UTC
From: BARF HQ <Herbie@BARFHQvirginislands.org>
Message-ID: <a0sh45$i1m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29563

Meaningless statistics from the brain of an even more
meaningless person with absolutely no life!

53. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 15:07:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101100718.05154.00000741@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29564

In article <3C3182EF.31F8077D@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
writes:

>If you sign the deed restriction, and you are agreeing to abide by
>those restrictions when you sign, then you haven't a leg to stand
>on. Don't sign if you do not want to abide by them.

Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and who
owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at the
county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask
for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
reference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

54. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 15:07:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101100718.05154.00000740@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29565

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82k1b.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:02 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
>>>the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
>>
>>Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable".
>
> Auto repair is not an activity regulated and protected by the
> Federal government. Ham radio is.
>
Right you are! Since the states regulate auto inspection, registration, etc.,
the states should exempt personal repair of autos, not the feds.

TNX es 73 de Jim, N2EY

55. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 15:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101100719.05154.00000742@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29566

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp8bibe.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 23:03:19 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>and CC&R, I believe,
>>>is something to the effect of Code of Covenants and Restrictions.
>>
>>Close but no cookie.
>>
>>"Codes, Covenants and Restrictions"
>
> Closer but still no cookie --
>
> Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions
>
DOH!!!!!

Thanks, Phil.

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

56. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 15:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101100719.05154.00000743@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29568

In article <52A288A27D913EBC.8AB20C4A2E998B29.75009D44359B7EFF@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:19:13 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
>wrote:
>
>>>So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to have
>>>your cake and eat it, too.
>>
>> No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
>> doing continuous maintenance on an older home.
>
>Then fix it right the first time.

You never lived in an older (pre WW2) house, didja, Joe? Most of them were designed back when labor was cheap. They tend to need lots of painting and other time-consuming maintenance. Doing even minor jobs becomes a big deal because nothing in them is predictable or standard. Often you find serious code violations and unsafe conditions that have to be fixed NOW. Supplies for old houses are often made of unobtanium.

If "they don't make 'em like that anymore" there's usually a very good reason!

73 de Jim, N2EY

57. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 15:07:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101100720.05154.00000744@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29567

In article <AEA2EFD8F5776B5A.B1307447EC92E18D.D607FD904548D98B@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2001 02:01:03 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>"love, honor, and cherish"
>>"in good times and bad"
>>"in sickness and in health"
>>"for richer or poorer"
>>"til death us do part"
>
>They clearly state and repeat the terms up front. How often do you
>see the CC&Rs posted on the front door of an available house, or
>clearly defined in the realtor's flyer?

Exactly. How often do you even see mention that they exist? Mention "CC&R" to
many homeowners and they have NO idea what you are talking about.
>
>When my YL and I moved into our current apartment, we had to hound the
>management to get an actual copy of the restrictions; the sheet we
>were supposed to sign referred to the rulebook and a few strange
>exceptions, but didn't include any specifics.

I had to specifically request them, and it turned out that there was a page and
a half of fine-print boilerplate deed restrictions applied to all of the houses
around here. Which houses were all built between 1949 and 1951. Nothing against
the kinds of antennas I want to put up, so no big deal. But I can't have a
garden shed with a poured foundation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

58. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:07:05 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <g4m33uoanq8uiofn1ovhejg1m04c3m0d65@4ax.com>
Source record: 29569

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 15:18:54 -0600, Howard Johnson
<hjohnson5700@home.net> wrote:

>I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
>for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
>(next testing period that I can attend).
>
>My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
>first then a General written or just the General?
>
>==========
>
>Yours truly,
>
>Howard Johnson
>
>*** Spam Filter in place... change 5700 to 57 for correct reply address! ***
>
>==========

To get the General license, you have to pass both the Technician and
General written exams as well as the 5 WPM CW test. You'll be
expected to pass the Technician written exam BEFORE you are allowed to
take the General written exam...

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

59. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:15:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e20c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29570

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231160312.09102.00000875@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >
> >While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil,
and
> >the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for
their
> >little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they
wish--within
> >the law--on it (in my opinion).
>
> Then you are against covenants and restrictions, because they are not laws
but
> contracts.
>

Hmmm, I don't know that I am "against" them altogether. I support any kind of sensible expectation. For instance, if a CCR stated that I wasn't allowed to keep pigs or chickens (as mine does) and, if I am not planning on keeping pigs or chickens--or if it wouldn't seem reasonable to keep pigs or chickens (middle of town), then I can go along with that. I think that is reasonable to expect from people who move into homes in the middle of town, or who move into homes without benefit of a good, long distance between them. But, CCRs that restrict such things as fences or fence-types, etc., I do have a problem with. I think a fence of any type should be able to be put up--regardless of how someone else thinks it looks.

> >
> >I don't think a law prohibiting them from
> >doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
> >Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to help
> >every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.
>
> So it's OK for a neighbor to make noise, a stink and a mess working on
their
> OWN car, but it's not OK for them to spend ten minutes helping out a
friend or
> neighbor?
>

Accidents happen and I think most people are aware of that and can yield. However, for a neighbor to plan on having a friend over for the benefit of using their driveway and garage to help the friend with repairs? No.

>
> By that logic, if you showed up at a friend's house with a minor problem
> (busted hose or belt, dead battery) your friend can't help you out - even

> though he's in the middle of changing engines on his own car in the
driveway.
> >

I think I just addressed that by recognizing that accidents happen.

> >
> >I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece
of
> >property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he
> >keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for
me
> >to have to deal with it.
>
> WHY is it "unfair for you to have to deal with it"? What do you have to
"deal
> with"?
>

I have to deal with driving past the unsightly mess, the noise he generates
at night (running generators for power equipment), and I am certain there is
major runoff from his property through mine, of things that shouldn't be in
the soil.

>
> And if they are all HIS cars, what right have YOU to tell him what he can
do
> with them?
>
> You wrote, above:
>
> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be
able to
> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it (in my opinion). "
>

I have a good feeling that it is *not* within the law to have a scrapyard
and/or run a commercial business on land not zoned for commercial.

> >
> >I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
> >think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets
the
> >same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far
more
> >than one or two CCRs.
>
> How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched the
deed to

> his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living there, his may
be
> just as unrestricted.
>

No, but I imagine the county will be able to tell me.

> >
> > I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact
> >my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things lying
> >around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
> >stuff, and growing.
>
> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be
able to
> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it. "
>
> Is there a law against having a lot of old cars where you live?
>

Don't know. Hope so.

>
> >I think CCRs are generally a cheap way out to protect us from the creeps
of
> >the world.
>
> In part. There are also safety and "good neighbor" issues, like noise and
> upkeep requirements. In some communities the proximity of properties makes
> aesthetic issues important.
>

That's why I used the term "generally" above. There are other reasons, but
one of those is to protect "us" from having to deal with each other.

>
> > We've become
> >"afraid" to deal with our neighbor and ask them that they be reasonable.
On
> >the other side, we've become intolerant of dealing with situations we
don't
> >seem to be able to control in any other way but through a court system.
> >Pitiful.
>
> What's pitiful is that some people have not developed the idea that they
are
> responsible to the community to take care of their properties in a
reasonable
> way.
>

Well, my idea of what a piece of property should look like may be different. I don't think it is reasonable for my neighbor down the street to have his scrapyard. If you live here, you may think differently. I also think it's pretty dumb for a city to worry about grass that is over a certain height. I like the look of tall grass. Yeah, it's a fire hazard, but let's pick apart how many other fire hazards that go un-cited by cities.

> >
> >I will go to the county about my neighbor. If they deem he is
> >doing nothing wrong, or if they choose to do nothing about it, I must
then
> >live with the fact that he's there and he's going to have his junkyard.
> >That's all there is to it.
>
> And you'll have to "deal with it"
>

I think I've said that. I either ignore it, move, or stew about it as long as I live here. Guess which one I think is a healthier attitude for me to take?

> >
> >I think everyone needs to chill and quit trying to tell everyone else how
to
> >live and how they must use their property. The day someone wants to
share
> >the expenses of my property and home is the day they'll have a say in
what I
> >do with it--*if* I want them sharing.
>
> Then what right do you have to go to the county about what your neighbor
is
> doing with the old cars? You're not "chilling" - you're telling him how to
live
> and how he must use his property, and getting the govt. to do the job of
> confronting him.
>

Well, that's a good point. To everything there are probably exceptions. Actually, Jim, I am not telling him how to live. I am requesting from the county that they tell me what the limitations are. Then, I will either choose to live within their definition, or I will ask my neighbor to. I have said from the beginning of this that people need to live "within the law" on their property.

>
> Suppose the county says "We know - he's technically in violation of a few
> things. But someone must file a formal complaint before we can take any
> action". Will you file the complaint?
>

Heck, probably not. I'll just go down the street and let him know that he is violating the laws and expectations of agreements for this area, and ask

that he consider that while he makes his noise and dirties up his yard. This particular issue is not worth much more than that for me. Now, if he started having fires; or, even better: let's say my insurance company shows up and says that because of our proximity to him they are going to have to raise our insurance rate. That's a good one. What do I do? I go down the road and ask him if he wants to pay the extra insurance, or if he wants to voluntarily keep that from happening, or if he wants a citation from the county. I don't plan on moving.

> >>
> >> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In
> >many
> >> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist.
> >While
> >> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.
>
> >CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to find
> >them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long
ago
> >and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my
> >blood to boiling.
>
> Kim, by that statement, you obviously don't know what CC&R or HOA stand
for.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Why do you say that?

Kim W5TIT

60. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:19:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e2d5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29571

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231180316.01870.00000683@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c30d097_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Then, I don't know that you have a problem such as Jim/N2EY fights.
>
> Who says I have a problem or a fight? My interest in restrictions is their
> effect on the ARS and its future. At this stage of my life I don't want a
tower
> - another thing to maintain.
>
> >Neither
> >do I. We've got a 70' foot tower, a 40' pushup, a 20' pushup, and a 50'
> >pushup pole. We've yet to put the 30' tower up, as I got the 50' pushup
for
> >$20 and am happy with it.
>
> Do you have any antennas, or just towers and poles? ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

We've got an ATV antenna, a dual-band VHF/UHF antenna, and mounts for a dipole (don't ask me for what bands, it's my husband's), and an Alpha Delta DXCC on the 70' tower. We've got some kind of HF yagi to go up on top to replace our ruined 10M quad, but haven't ever put it up yet.

On the 20' pushup is a Antron. On the other two pushup poles is UHF/VHF, actually one is decommisioned.

Cliff (my husband) has every intention of building a skyloop to play with. It's been one of his ham projects for a few years now, ... LOL

Kim W5TIT

61. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:24:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e413_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29574

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:36:15 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >They're not. And, if you don't like the marriage you're in, get a
divorce.
> >If you don't like neighborhoods with whatever CCRs you can't agree with,
> >then don't move in.
>
> That's reasonable....provided they don't weasel something in through
> vague language, or hidden references to another document that you
> never get to see until after you've signed.
>
> >Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
> >environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
> >wishing to be married. It's that simple.
>
> Moving out is a hell of a price to pay for something one was given no
> notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
> new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
> know.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

As Jim said, a CCR is a different animal because it can be stealthy.
However, in a HOA situation, as I noted above, that *should* be known about
prior to move-in. Right? I mean, I've never had to deal with a HOA
situation, so I don't know--I presume one is knowledgeable of an HOA in a
neighborhood prior to move-in, aren't they? I have heard folks talking on
the radio about HOAs being implemented after move-in. That would be
rough...time to build leadership skills to the hilt on that one, and take
the lead in a very sublime neighborhood contract--if any at all.

Kim W5TIT

62. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:28:09 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201010828.2a0db2fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29572

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Dawgone, Hans, I do believe you're cornfuses poor ol' Cec.

A couple of observations:

Observation #1) Every ham enjoys Federal protection of their
right to erect a TV antenna. Haven't heard any hams protesting
that protection. Several hams here have protested the idea of
extending that same protection to amateur antennas.

Observation #2) Protest or support of the idea is split right
down "party lines" here on rrap.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

63. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:28:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e4e9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29575

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:75E9E8A449CF3A9B.8CA522D068AEA257.3584421CE865F7D7@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:54:14 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses! Tell them dirty joke
every
> >time they show up at your door. Really. It'll take 'em once or twice,
but
> >they'll get lost.
>
> Answer the door naked. If it doesn't work the first time, try asking
> your local butcher for some particularly identifiable parts, and have
> one with you next time.
>

heh heh heh. Joe, I assure you if I answered the door naked, nothing more
would be needed to keep someone away :^)

> >
> >Still haven't figured out what keeps the Baptists away. I did yell at
one
> >who showed up dressed like a clown offering to take my two children to
> >Sunday School and they even got a free goldfish for going...buhruther...I
> >asked her if God had approved the clown suit. She still came back a few
> >times, but we were living in the commune--I mean apartment at the time.
No
> >property ownership means they can do whatever they want.
>
> I got them kicked off the property several times at my old place.
> After management had raised hell with the $cientologists jumping the
> gate to put their flyers on all the cars and doors, letting any other
> group proselytize would have gotten them in some legal hot water.
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

Wow, never been approached by Scientologists...they must be getting
desperate, too. ;)

Kim W5TIT

64. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:32:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C31D7B8.EE1808B4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29573

Dave Heil wrote:

> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > rival even the best of antenna farms.
>
> Manure.

She doesn't have a clue, and will never have. She doesn't *want* a clue, and in fact wouldn't recognize one if it slapped her upside the head.

65. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:32:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e5ee_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:4FC7CFF42958BA79.0B468E54B97BF96C.47790CC5C5C13D3F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 15:35:51 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >John wrote:
> >> ... or the one I
> >> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
WALK
> >> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> >
> >In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
>
> Texas, if it's after dark and you don't have another readily available
> means of stopping them.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

Is it that, Joe, or is that it is legal to shoot only if you are under
threat of being harmed? I am not sure it is legal to shoot to keep someone
from getting away...?

Kim W5TIT

66. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:40:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e7a2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29577

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C31AD96.DEA37149@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C30C224.BB48E409@earthlink.net...
>
> > > >
> > > Moving is often not an option.
> > > If I'd lived in such a neighborhood when I was first licensed at age
14,
> > > I'd have to have run away from home in order to move out of the
> > > neighborhood. I couldn't have talked my parents into moving since the
> > > church would never have understood why Dad moved out of the rectory.
> > >
> >
> > There's lots of restrictions on kids and we are all usually bound by
> > decisions our parents make. What's your point?
>
> Maybe it would be easier for you if you read what you wrote and THEN
> read what I wrote. My point was and is that your suggestion to move is
> often not an option at all. Many folks can't do much about where they
> live. If someone becomes interested in amateur radio and finds that
> there are prohibitions on any type of antenna, it would present a huge
> obstacle to the enjoyment of amateur radio.
>

Dave, could you *try* to have comments without the insults? My point
exactly. And, if you get interested in ham radio after you've moved into a
neighborhood or if you're kid gets interested, and there are restrictions
prohibiting the erection of antennas, then you either have to make the
decision to move or deal with what ramifications there are. There's all
kinds of what ifs to be dealt in situations, Dave. How many in life should
we accommodate?

> > >
> > > If you can't reasonably do what you want with land which you have
> > > purchased, it really isn't your land.
> > >
> >
> > Well, it truly isn't your land anyway, because the government can use
> > "eminent domain" if they choose to.
>
> Kim, that simply does not take place often. If it does take place, you
> have to be paid for the taking of your land. Often a landowner is paid

> far more than he or she paid for the property. CC&R's are not put in
> place by government.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

That it can happen at all is enough.

Kim W5TIT

67. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:40:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e7cd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29578

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C31AE02.F638E823@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > rival even the best of antenna farms.
>
> Manure.
>
> Dave K8MN

Is that the silver-spooned man's way of saying bullshit, Dave?

Kim W5TIT

68. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:42:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e838$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29579

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C31AF3F.6AC8EA2C@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C30C2CC.15408267@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner
we
> > wish
> > > > it is a certain inalienable right.
> > >
> > > I don't like the pukey green color of your house. I hate those pink
> > > plastic flamingos along your driveway and your maple leaves blow in my
> > > yard. Your cheap, plastic lawn furniture is an eyesore. Hey, are you
> > > going to keep that Winnebago there?
>
> > Do you have a point, Dave?
>
> Let me suggest once again that you take the time to read what YOU wrote
> and THEN read what I wrote. It may save us both a lot of time.
>
> If a neighbor objects to an antenna or supporting structure, that is
> pretty much too bad. I may not like the neighbor's paint, lawn
> furniture, landscaping, Winnebago or decorative items. He did not
> obtain them for my enjoyment. I certainly don't put up an antenna or
> refrain from doing so for the neighbor's convenience.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I *think* the debate here is for people who *cannot* put up antennas or
refrain from doing so, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

69. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:44:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e8a9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29580

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a0sf3701ol4@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> > On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:54:14 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses! Tell them dirty joke
> *every*
> > >time they show up at your door. Really. It'll take 'em once or twice,
> but
> > >they'll get lost.
> >
> > Answer the door naked. If it doesn't work the first time, try asking
> > your local butcher for some particularly identifiable parts, and have
> > one with you next time.
>
> My house is "L" shaped, so I can look out of a window and see who is at
the
> front door without them knowing. I've often cranked up the stereo and not
> answered the door, just to see their reaction.
>
>

Hmmmm, be sure you get some Moms Mabley to turn up real loud...LOL

Kim W5TIT

70. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:46:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e929$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29581

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020101100718.05154.00000741@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3C3182EF.31F8077D@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
> writes:
>
> >If you sign the deed restriction, and you are agreeing to abide by
> >those restrictions when you sign, then you haven't a leg to stand
> >on. Don't sign if you do not want to abide by them.
>
> Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
> signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and
who
> owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at
the
> county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to
ask
> for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
> reference.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Any business transaction a person enters into should be revered as a screw
up front. Then, you don't get screwed from behind.

Kim W5TIT

71. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:47:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31e96d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29582

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020101100719.05154.00000742@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp8bibe.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
> >On 31 Dec 2001 23:03:19 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>>and CC&R, I believe,
> >>>is something to the effect of Code of Covenants and Restrictions.
> >>
> >>Close but no cookie.
> >>
> >>"Codes, Covenants and Restrictions"
> >
> > Closer but still no cookie --
> >
> > Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions
> >
> DOH!!!!!
>
> Thanks, Phil.
>
> 73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Yeah, something like that... :p

Kim W5TIT

72. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 16:51:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c31ea36_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29583

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020101100720.05154.00000744@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article
<AEA2EFD8F5776B5A.B1307447EC92E18D.D607FD904548D98B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:
>
> >On 31 Dec 2001 02:01:03 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>"love, honor, and cherish"
> >>"in good times and bad"
> >>"in sickness and in health"
> >>"for richer or poorer"
> >>"til death us do part"
> >
> >They clearly state and repeat the terms up front. How often do you
> >see the CC&Rs posted on the front door of an available house, or
> >clearly defined in the realtor's flyer?
>
> Exactly. How often do you even see mention that they exist? Mention "CC&R"
to
> many homeowners and they have NO idea what you are talking about.
> >

So? Not my problem if someone enters into such a serious amount of money
spending contract and doesn't know all the rules. I know that sounds cold,
but I'll ask you the same question I asked Dave. There are all kinds of
what-ifs that enter into life situations. How many accommodations should be
anticipated and prepared for? I didn't know when I got my truck on lease
that I was going to have to increase my insurance, because I didn't read far
enough into the contract. What line do I get in?

> >
> >When my YL and I moved into our current apartment, we had to hound the
> >management to get an actual copy of the restrictions; the sheet we
> >were supposed to sign referred to the rulebook and a few strange
> >exceptions, but didn't include any specifics.
>
> I had to specifically request them, and it turned out that there was a
page and
> a half of fine-print boilerplate deed restrictions applied to all of the
houses
> around here. Which houses were all built between 1949 and 1951. Nothing
against
> the kinds of antennas I want to put up, so no big deal. But I can't have a
> garden shed with a poured foundation.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Kim W5TIT

73. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 17:01:24 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net>
Message-ID: <3C31EB64.96435651@blackhole.net>
Source record: 29584

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
> news:3C309F4C.284AE08C@blackhole.net...
> >
> > Last night (12-30-2001), I heard a radio station, WWCR, on 52.040,050
> > MHz. It was fairly clear, and at first I was delighted, as it's the
> > first thing I've ever heard on 6 meters on my 756pro. (I live in a
> > valley and have only a single 120 foot dipole as an antenna, tuned by an
> > AH4 automatic tuner).
> > The signal seemed to really be on that frequency, because retuning the
> > antenna tuner to other bands diminished the signal strength. The
> > material being broadcast was information about short-wave listening- a
> > rebroadcast of 'Popular Communications' and some Voice of America
> > short-wave reports.
> > I consulted the web and found out that WWCR is a religious broadcaster
> > located in Tennessee (I live in Imperial, MO, just south of St. Louis.)
> > They had a list of times and frequencies, and I listened at all of them
> > to see if I found the same material. Most of the frequencies had
> > religious propaganda on them, but one, 3.210 MHz, had a duplicate of
> > what I heard on 6 meters. I notice that 52.040050 isn't an exact
> > multiple of 3.210. It is close to an exact multiple of one of their
> > other frequencies- 7.435 MHz * 6.999334... = 52.04... but that frequency
> > had the religious propaganda- not the same program as that appearing on
> > 6 meters.
> > Has anyone an idea about how a signal at 3.210 could get translated up
> > to 6 meters with no appearance of other modulation?
> >
> > --
> > john
>
> Sounds like a receiver spur to me. Or some kind of product from your six
> meter receiver being blasted by Channel 2 pix carrier at 55.25. Don't
> know where 2 is these days physically and Imperial covers a multitude of
> sins as well as geography but 55.25 less 52+ comes out to 3.21 or so.

That makes sense. Thanks.

> Say hi to any remaining buzzards on 25/85 for me.

How did you come up with those numbers?

--
john

74. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 17:27:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <RjmY7.318900$W8.12087039@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29585

"John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
news:3C31EB64.96435651@blackhole.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C309F4C.284AE08C@blackhole.net...
> > >
> > > Last night (12-30-2001), I heard a radio station, WWCR, on
52.040,050
> > > MHz. It was fairly clear, and at first I was delighted, as it's the
> > > first thing I've ever heard on 6 meters on my 756pro. (I live in a
> > > valley and have only a single 120 foot dipole as an antenna, tuned
by an
> > > AH4 automatic tuner).
> > > The signal seemed to really be on that frequency, because retuning
the
> > > antenna tuner to other bands diminished the signal strength. The
> > > material being broadcast was information about short-wave listening-
a
> > > rebroadcast of 'Popular Communications' and some Voice of America
> > > short-wave reports.
> > > I consulted the web and found out that WWCR is a religious
broadcaster
> > > located in Tennessee (I live in Imperial, MO, just south of St.
Louis.)
> > > They had a list of times and frequencies, and I listened at all of
them
> > > to see if I found the same material. Most of the frequencies had
> > > religious propaganda on them, but one, 3.210 MHz, had a duplicate of
> > > what I heard on 6 meters. I notice that 52.040050 isn't an exact
> > > multiple of 3.210. It is close to an exact multiple of one of their
> > > other frequencies- 7.435 MHz * 6.999334... = 52.04... but that
frequency
> > > had the religious propaganda- not the same program as that appearing
on
> > > 6 meters.
> > > Has anyone an idea about how a signal at 3.210 could get translated
up
> > > to 6 meters with no appearance of other modulation?
> > >
> > > --
> > > john
> >
> > Sounds like a receiver spur to me. Or some kind of product from your

six
> > meter receiver being blasted by Channel 2 pix carrier at 55.25. Don't
> > know where 2 is these days physically and Imperial covers a multitude
of
> > sins as well as geography but 55.25 less 52+ comes out to 3.21 or so.
>
> That makes sense. Thanks.
>
> > Say hi to any remaining buzzards on 25/85 for me.
>
> How did you come up with those numbers?
>
> --
> john

Kind of assumed you might be an Amateur. Two meter repeaters are on 600 kHz separation so it is shorthand for 146.25 in, 146.85 out. This is Suburban Radio Club's machine where I hung my hat in my St. Louis days. I lived off Telegraph Rd south of 255 so I know about the Great Reavis Barracks Road r.f. site. For some reason, Channel 2 always was a pain in the drain.

Dick

75. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:10:58 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <SYmY7.20400$5v1.534019269@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29586
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey Joe,
I think Richard & Jerry have the answers
concerning missing bovine.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message (The only
case that comes to
> mind under that exception is the guy who had his 10ft tall fiberglass
> cow on a trailer stolen repeatedly - it was always recovered within 48
> hours...where in the hell would they hide it, and what could they do
> with it that wouldn't result in being seen?)
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

76. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:16:50 UTC
From: Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C31FD12.399273C4@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 29587

K0HB wrote:
>
> Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
> [snip]

Isn't this kind of endeavor similar to keeping track of how many times
your co-workers use the rest room?

77. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:34:17 UTC
From: dalej2@mac.com
Message-ID: <dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 29588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.

78. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:44:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320377.1F42D054@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29589

N2EY wrote:
> Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
> signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and who
> owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at the
> county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask
> for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
> reference.

When I bought my present house and asked for a copy of the deed restrictions
the real estate agent had no idea where they were located. After a few days,
he mailed them to me. Just about the only things prohibited are live stock
and mobile homes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

79. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:48:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320462.939C1F70@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29590

N2EY wrote:
> No, I only infer what you imply. Often you deny what you imply.

Oh, you infer infinitely more than I imply, Jim. I have a narrow
focus by nature. You are determined to teach me a broad focus.
Won't work.

> Maybe the devil makes you do it.

You are the one doing the devil's inference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

80. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:51:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320544.1E3ED48E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29591

```
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> They clearly state and repeat the terms up front. How often do you
> see the CC&Rs posted on the front door of an available house, or
> clearly defined in the realtor's flyer?

caveat emptor
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

81. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:54:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3205EF.110431D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29592

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Don't ask me my opinion *most* (sorry Phil) lawyers.

Phil is a sorry lawyer????? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

82. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 18:58:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3206BB.D1CBA6E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29593

N2EY wrote:
> Like many porcine species - cute and cuddly when they're little, ugly and
> disagreeable when they get older.

Speaking of which, did you see those pig-like beasts on Discovery
Channel's "Walking With Prehistoric Beasts". For awhile, they
ruled the roost.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

83. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:00:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320742.3569EECF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29594

N2EY wrote:
> You never lived in an older (pre WW2) house, didja, Joe?

I did, in 1938. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

84. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:05:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C32085C.5C3D8291@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29595

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses!

My "cure" is to ask them to prove that the supernatural
exists. Out of all of supernatural "existence" seems that
just one little bit of proof could be produced.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

85. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:10:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320998.EFA508BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29596

Phil Kane wrote:
> We believe that marriage is not a jail.....

"Love and marriage is an institution,
We don't like living in an institution."

- Homer and Jethro

--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

86. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:14:19 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3C320A8B.6EC3@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 29599

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C3182EF.31F8077D@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
> writes:
>
> >If you sign the deed restriction, and you are agreeing to abide by
> >those restrictions when you sign, then you haven't a leg to stand
> >on. Don't sign if you do not want to abide by them.
>
> Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
> signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and who
> owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at the
> county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask
> for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
> reference.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
Suggestion:

When you make an offer to purchase on a piece of property, place a
clause in the agreement or offer to purchase which basically states that
there are no restrictions
or Deed Restrictions which prohibit antennas and if there are, then the
offer
is automatically void. This allows the deal to be killed before you get
into a
bad situation. Usually, the closing attorney or the more than likely,
The Real
Estate Agent will want to make sure before proceeding, that is, get you
a copy
of the CC&Rs out of the Courthouse. Always use the escape clause to
prevent
finding yourself with an unusable property.

Martin N5PZJ
Louisiana Real Estate Agent
Velma Duet Realty
Civil Law Notary

87. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:15:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29598

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > rival even the best of antenna farms.
>
> Manure.

It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

88. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:17:17 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <d3221ad2ca2f5fe4d38e2597475e3351.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29597

Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee wrote

> Isn't this kind of endeavor similar to keeping track of how many times
> your co-workers use the rest room?

I saw the numbers on the Mailgate.org site, and thought they'd
be interesting to the group. I assume that they are automagically
calculated, as opposed to someone making tick marks on a cell
wall. (Now that sounds like a delicious punishment for someone
like Lloyd.)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

89. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:17:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320B57.1A14C8BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29600

Phil Kane wrote:
> HOWEVER, it does not cover TV-type antennas used for any other
> purpose, such as "stealth" amateur radio transmitting antennas. The
> FCC has already closed that loophole.

How would they ever know?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

90. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:20:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320BF8.3D9A8D2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29601

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
> >restriction part before I signed the contract.

> You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the deed.

Mine was an HOA agreement, initialed by me and two officers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

91. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:21:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320C55.B5FB0536@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29602

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:50:24 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
> >restriction part before I signed the contract.
>
> You can do that with a sales contract. You cannot do that with an
> easement without the agreement of the dominant holder (the person to
> whom the easement is granted) and you cannot do that with a CC&R
> without the agreement of every other owner in the development
> affected by the restriction.

It was an HOA agreement initialed by me and two officers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

92. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:25:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320D30.CC2F854D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29603

K0HB wrote:
> Observation #1) Every ham enjoys Federal protection of their
> right to erect a TV antenna. Haven't heard any hams protesting
> that protection.

You probably didn't notice, but I objected. Exactly what part
of the Constitution gives the feds the rights to interfere
with private contracts in private neighborhoods within a state?
Please be specific.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

93. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:29:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C320E0D.45133067@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Torbjï¿½rn Morka" wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > Would you like for a homeless person to start living in
> > the back seat of your vehicle?
>
> As i can interpet this statement, every cb'er who uses frequencies NOT used
> by ham's, are to be concidered as "hoboes" ?
>
> Shit, you should have a BIG cactus shuffed up behind !!

All the real men around this part of Texas use cactus
to wipe with when we run out of corncobs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

94. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:42:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0t3bj0j7r@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29607

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3206BB.D1CBA6E9@IEEE.org...
> Speaking of which, did you see those pig-like beasts on Discovery
> Channel's "Walking With Prehistoric Beasts". For awhile, they
> ruled the roost.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

They still rule today, only now we refer to them as "congress".

95. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:50:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3212F9.2951794B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> Going hand to hand against someone trying to rob you is considered too
> dangerous, and given the rarity of recovering stolen property, that
> rarely enters the picture ...

If someone is stealing a bicycle that your kid left in the open
front yard, you would be well advised to think twice before
shooting the perp in the back as he pedaled away.

However, if someone has broken into your home, you could
rationally justify a fear of bodily injury or death.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

96. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:52:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0t3ul0k9f@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29611

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c31e838$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > If a neighbor objects to an antenna or supporting structure, that is
> > pretty much too bad. I may not like the neighbor's paint, lawn
> > furniture, landscaping, Winnebago or decorative items. He did not
> > obtain them for my enjoyment. I certainly don't put up an antenna or
> > refrain from doing so for the neighbor's convenience.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I *think* the debate here is for people who *cannot* put up antennas or
> refrain from doing so, Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Actually, the debate, as originally started by Larry, was a paranoid rant about the FCC selling off the amateur radio spectrum. He thinks that the ruling means the beginning of the end for amateur radio. Notice that he's been conveniently absent from the debate since making the original post.

97. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 19:58:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3214FC.F92ABF3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 15:35:51 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >John wrote:
> >> ... or the one I
> >> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> >> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> >>
> >In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
>
> Texas, if it's after dark and you don't have another readily available
> means of stopping them.

I have a Texas concealed carry permit. We were taught that using
deadly force on someone in a publicly accessible driveway where
only property is involved can cause more civil problems than
the property is worth. Even if it is a justifiable act under
criminal law, civil law may have a different take on it. The
cost of defending oneself in civil court may cost more than
the property is worth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

98. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:06:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3216BA.5997B186@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29608

K0HB wrote:
> Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?

I tried day trading.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

99. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:14:26 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C32B368.76EE8126@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29609
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CAM wrote:
>
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> >
> > On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 15:35:51 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >John wrote:
> > >> ... or the one I
> > >> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> > >> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> > >
> > >In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> >
> > Texas, if it's after dark and you don't have another readily available
> > means of stopping them.
>
> I have a Texas concealed carry permit. We were taught that using
> deadly force on someone in a publicly accessible driveway where
> only property is involved can cause more civil problems than
> the property is worth. Even if it is a justifiable act under
> criminal law, civil law may have a different take on it. The
> cost of defending oneself in civil court may cost more than
> the property is worth.

Any bastard sorry enough to be a thief needs to be shot.

100. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:17:56 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C32B43A.3CAF3C8B@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flame,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Surely you jest!
>
> That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's been
> spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.

"t time"? Were they playing golf, woger?

101. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:21:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C321A30.52898FBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29612
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:
> Any bastard sorry enough to be a thief needs to be shot.

The Code of the West is still pretty strong down here in Texas.
Shooting a retreating perp in the back is still frowned upon.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

102. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:22:45 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a0t5qh$j70$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 29620

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C3216BA.5997B186@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> > Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
>
> I tried day trading.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

What did you trade Monday for?
Something good I hope, anything's better than a Monday!
--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

103. About 10m repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:28:15 UTC
From: IW0GLC Ham Radio <iw0glcABBASSOLOSPAM@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <a0t62i$motu4$1@ID-83686.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 29613

Hi all! I'm an Italian "young" amateur radio (21y.o.) and I'd like some
informations about repeaters in that HF band: which are their frequencies
and their "shift" (more or less how many kHz). Are they all in USA or in
other Countries too?
Thank you very much for your replies

'73 and happy 2002 de
IW0GLC op. David from
JN61FU, Rome

104. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:36:31 UTC
From: Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 29614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Surely you jest!
> >
> > That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's been
> > spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.
>
> "t time"? Were they playing golf, woger?

It is an "in" abbreviation for tea time. Woger looks forward to tea
time with his friends each day, because it is a time when they can
relax, hold their pinkies high, and discuss the hair styles of their
other friends who were stupid enough not to show up for tea.

He thinks that law enforcement people also engage in such activities,
even though the rest of us know that only CW operators and ARRL officers
are similarly inclined.

105. REPOST: Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:36:31 UTC
From: Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <5$--$$-$-%%-_%$-$$@news.noc.cabal.int>
Source record: 29798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Surely you jest!
> >
> > That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's been
> > spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.
>
> "t time"? Were they playing golf, woger?

It is an "in" abbreviation for tea time. Woger looks forward to tea
time with his friends each day, because it is a time when they can
relax, hold their pinkies high, and discuss the hair styles of their
other friends who were stupid enough not to show up for tea.

He thinks that law enforcement people also engage in such activities,
even though the rest of us know that only CW operators and ARRL officers
are similarly inclined.

========= WAS CANCELLED BY =======:
Path: news.uni-stuttgart.de!uni-erlangen.de!newsfeeds.belnet.be!news.belnet.be!newsfeed.me
dia.kyoto-u.ac.jp!newsfeed.mesh.ad.jp!osa.uu.net!sac.uu.net!lax.uu.net!news.navix.net!u.n.
a.c.4.n.c.3.l.l.e.r
From: Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Newsgroups: news.admin.censorship,alt.test,alt.flame
Subject: cmsg cancel <3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com>
Control: cancel <3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2002 02:43:14 GMT
Organization: Navix Internet Subscribers
Lines: 2
Message-ID: <cancel.3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 166.102.15.34
X-Trace: iac5.navix.net 1009942468 18640 166.102.15.34 (2 Jan 2002 03:34:28 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: abuse@navix.net
NNTP-Posting-Date: 2 Jan 2002 03:34:28 GMT
X-No-Archive: yes
Comment: Dude, where's my NewsAgent?
Xref: news.uni-stuttgart.de control:40273934

autocancel

106. Re: About 10m repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 20:58:13 UTC
From: mailfrmpa@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101155813.22263.00000063@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 29615

>informations about repeaters in that HF band: which are their frequencies
>and their "shift" (more or less how many kHz)

Those that I know of are all 100KHz, xmit low. Some commonly heard ones here are 29.520 in, 29.620 out; 29.530 in, 29.630 out; 29.540 in, 29.640 out; 29.550 in, 29.640 out. See the pattern?

>Are they all in USA or in
>other Countries too?

From my QTH in Colorado I have not heard any European repeaters, but I do regularly hear the Carribean.

73,
K0MB

107. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 21:16:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201012115190.5272-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29616

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>Joshua Houk wrote:
>> You will need to take the Technician exam if you want a General license.
>> The good news is that it's a fairly easy test if you know General class
>> theory - a lot of it you'll already know or can deduce just from common
>> sense. I'd suggest going over the question pools or practice exams on
>> the net to see how much you'll need to study.
>>
>> If you don't want to take everything right away, you can take the
>> General exam and the code exam at the next session and assuming you pass
>> those you have credit for those elements for 365 days, and as long as
>> you pass your Technician exam by then you'll get your General ticket.
>> The bad news is, of course, that you won't get a license at the first
>> session.
>
>I don't think the VEs will let you take the General written without
>having successfully done the Tech first.

Some groups may allow it, but obviously for element credit only. However, due to the fee structure of some VEC's, taking the General test first then filling in the Technician element may require two testing fees EVEN IF taken at the same session. Taking the elements in the normal order doesn't have that effect.

108. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 21:22:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201012118050.5272-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29617

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002, JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>I don't know how they do it today. When I obtained my first tickets
>(novice, general, extra in 1962, 64, and 66), you had to pass the code tests
>before you took the written tests (at the FCC). Later, after I dropped my
>tickets around 1981 or 1982 and then took my tests in 1993, I took the
>novice, technician and was either in the middle of the technician or general
>written exam when we were asked if anyone wanted element 1-C. So, I took
>the exam papers with me and took the 20 WPM code test and then went back for
>the rest of the written exams. Is any order necessary today?

There is no order on which of the code vs. written tests is taken first.
However, there is generally an order as to the written tests themselves (and
back when there were multiple code elements, an order to them as well).

You didn't say if you temporarily surrendered your written test materials
during the code test, but IF you DIDN'T and tried to pull a stunt like that
with the VE team I test with, your written test would have been graded "as is"
at the time of the code test.

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10112312348540.3647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001, Howard Johnson wrote:
>> >I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
>> >for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
>> >(next testing period that I can attend).
>> >
>> >My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
>> >first then a General written or just the General?
>>
>> In order to get a license, you will have to take the Technician written as
>> well (and to get the general class license, 5wpm code too).

109. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 21:46:57 UTC
From: gm7jds <gm7jds@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <L7qY7.24209$Zg2.2542345@news11-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 29618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

28mhz for cb use,"oh look theres a flying pig"please dont put thing on here
that are not fact,this is total rubbish.

regards to all
"Torbj&#65533;rn Morka" <tmorka@online.no> wrote in message
news:4JhY7.15276$KQ3.200045@news1.oke.nextra.no...
>
> "Ed Cregger" <nm2k@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:u2m8vs8ka1b06e@corp.supernews.com...
> > They can have it. Ten meters was trashed years ago.
> >
> > Ed Cregger
> > nm2k@adoublerl.net
> >
>
> WHAT ???
>
> Sorry, but are you an amateur ?
>
> I thought seriously allmost every "ham" sticked their soul for every bit
> they could use/get of the spectrum ?
>
> Hmm...
>
> 73de
> LC3RBT, Torbjorn.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.306 / Virus Database: 166 - Release Date: 04/12/2001

110. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 21:50:31 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Y6qY7.128397$BX4.8171604@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Yeah,

And if the perp comes in while I am at home, and I hear him, he'll get his butt filled with
12 ga buckshot! One less "poor ole criminal" for the liberals to force me to keep up in
prison.

Jerry

JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2F0A14.8BA83AA5@mailcity.net...
> snip>
There are others who choose to operate outside the law with a
clear conscience. When one of these robs your house, you may get
upset, but too damn bad.

111. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:05:57 UTC
From: jerkin gherkins <iorniferiness@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9pqY7.6239$%C1.612224@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a0qnhdip1@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Polly FQF" <Stumpjumpernr1@stumpjumpersBARF.org> wrote in message
> news:a0qcu1$2ir$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > If I recall, [Lay off the heroin and you might be able to]
>
>
> Hey Polly, how's it feel to get FIRED from SEARS for stealing store
> merchandise?
> How's it feel to live with the fact you drove your own daughter to suicide?
> HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!

Is that why Polly the Shitting 14313 Parrot was
such a hatefull, vindictative old cur when he
was still on the radio? Had to be somethin.
No wonder he hanged out with billyjerk.

112. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:12:09 UTC
From: len@w8rc.org
Message-ID: <a9f19d53.0201011412.102851f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

dalej2@mac.com wrote in message news:<dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>...
> Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.
Guys, there is alawless element out there and nothing in this thread
can control it. Let the FCC deal with it and read about the fines
given out. Enough said.
Len

113. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:19:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C3235F0.89DFA245@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29623

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece of
> property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he
> keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for me
> to have to deal with it. I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
> think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets the
> same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far more
> than one or two CCRs. I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact
> my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things lying
> around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
> stuff, and growing.

Watch out Kim, Larry and the other guys might make up an SAT test
style analogy:

Kim's call is to ham radio as Kim's neighbor's junkyard is to Kim's
neighborhood.

:-)

114. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:28:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C32381D.CEF084FB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29624

Dave Heil wrote:

> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > rival even the best of antenna farms.
>
> Manure.
>

She said "owners", not "renters". :-)

115. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:39:52 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0tf4olqe7@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flame,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Repeater jammer who'd steal equipment at hamfests
"JizzswallowingRecepticle" <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C32B43A.3CAF3C8B@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Surely you jest!
> >
> > That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's
been
> > spending days and weeks at a time with, involuntarily.
>
> "t time"?

And they could use your oddly shaped cranium for a tee.

> Were they playing golf, woger?

So you really did jam the repeaters with music, huh?

116. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:41:30 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0tf4qlqe8@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Stagger Milhaus Romain 'child raper' Fentworth Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com...
> JR wrote:
> >
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > > news:a0rfi5lrf0@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > Surely you jest!
> > >
> > > That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department he's
been
> > > spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.
> >
> > "t time"? Were they playing golf, woger?
>
> It is an [Faggot Lee's admission he couldn't pass the morse code test
noted]

Faggot Lee usually concentrates on fucking little kids up the ass, don't
you, CONVICT?

117. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:42:13 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0tf4rlqe9@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"jerkin gherkins" <iorniferiness@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9pqY7.6239$%C1.612224@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a0qnhdip1@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "Polly FQF" <Stumpjumpernr1@stumpjumpersBARF.org> wrote in message
> > news:a0qcu1$2ir$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > If I recall, [Lay off the heroin and you might be able to]
> >
> >
> > Hey Polly, how's it feel to get FIRED from SEARS for stealing store
> > merchandise?
> > How's it feel to live with the fact you drove your own daughter to
suicide?
> > HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
>
> Is that why Polly the Shitting 14313 Parrot was
> such a hatefull, vindictative old cur when he
> was still on the radio? Had to be somethin.
> No wonder he hanged out with billyjerk.

He'll die of his diabetes soon, hopefully so will Faggot Lee.

118. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:44:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C323BC7.6C671128@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29625

f1dfr wrote:

>
>
> Recently FRANCE was sentenced by the European Court of Human Rights
> about a right coming from the 29 July 1881 law about Press, allowing
> the french Minister of Interior to forbid and destroy publications in
> a foreign language published on the french territory. The Court
> considered that this absolute right was not compatible with article 10
> of the European Convention about Human Rights allowing the liberty to
> communicate freely.
>
> So, a wind of (ed) free communications blows in Europe ... CW will be a next
> target to shoot in that Court.

I'd think that "freedom of the press", aka in the USA as the "1st
amendment", is a lot more important than if a morse code test
is needed or not for getting a ham license. Who cares if someone
publishes a paper in Afghanastanian? You don't have to buy a copy...

119. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 22:59:06 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> are there any mods available for frs radios; power output

Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.

Scott

120. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:09:18 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <p_qY7.14882$_K.1767420@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 29626

Kim-W5TIT wrote in message <3c31e20c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011231160312.09102.00000875@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> >
>> >While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil,
>and
>> >the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for
>their
>> >little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they
>wish--within
>> >the law--on it (in my opinion).
>>
>> Then you are against covenants and restrictions, because they are not
laws
>but
>> contracts.
>>
>
>Hmmm, I don't know that I am "against" them altogether. I support any kind
>of sensible expectation. For instance, if a CCR stated that I wasn't
>allowed to keep pigs or chickens (as mine does) and, if I am not planning
on
>keeping pigs or chickens--or if it wouldn't seem reasonable to keep pigs or
>chickens (middle of town), then I can go along with that. I think that is
>reasonable to expect from people who move into homes in the middle of town,
>or who move into homes without benefit of a good, long distance between
>them. But, CCRs that restrict such things as fences or fence-types, etc.,
I
>do have a problem with. I think a fence of any type should be able to be
>put up--regardless of how someone else thinks it looks.
>
>> >
>> >I don't think a law prohibiting them from
>> >doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
>> >Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to
help
>> >every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.
>>
>> So it's OK for a neighbor to make noise, a stink and a mess working on
>their
>> OWN car, but it's not OK for them to spend ten minutes helping out a
>friend or
>> neighbor?
>>

>
>Accidents happen and I think most people are aware of that and can yield.
>However, for a neighbor to plan on having a friend over for the benefit of
>using their driveway and garage to help the friend with repairs? No.
>
>>
>> By that logic, if you showed up at a friend's house with a minor problem
>> (busted hose or belt, dead battery) your friend can't help you out - even
>
>> though he's in the middle of changing engines on his own car in the
>driveway.
>> >
>
>I think I just addressed that by recognizing that accidents happen.
>
>> >
>> >I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece
>of
>> >property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and
he
>> >keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for
>me
>> >to have to deal with it.
>>
>> WHY is it "unfair for you to have to deal with it"? What do you have to
>"deal
>> with"?
>>
>
>I have to deal with driving past the unsightly mess, the noise he generates
>at night (running generators for power equipment), and I am certain there
is
>major runoff from his property through mine, of things that shouldn't be in
>the soil.
>
>>
>> And if they are all HIS cars, what right have YOU to tell him what he can
>do
>> with them?
>>
>> You wrote, above:
>>
>> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be
>able to
>> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it (in my opinion). "
>>
>
>I have a good feeling that it is *not* within the law to have a scrapyard
>and/or run a commercial business on land not zoned for commercial.
>

>> >
>> >I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
>> >think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets
>the
>> >same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far
>more
>> >than one or two CCRs.
>>
>> How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched the
>deed to
>> his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living there, his may
>be
>> just as unrestricted.
>>
>
>No, but I imagine the county will be able to tell me.
>
>> >
>> > I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact
>> >my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things
lying
>> >around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
>> >stuff, and growing.
>>
>> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be
>able to
>> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it. "
>>
>> Is there a law against having a lot of old cars where you live?
>>
>
>Don't know. Hope so.
>
>>
>> >I think CCRs are generally a cheap way out to protect us from the creeps
>of
>> >the world.
>>
>> In part. There are also safety and "good neighbor" issues, like noise and
>> upkeep requirements. In some communities the proximity of properties
makes
>> aesthetic issues important.
>>
>
>That's why I used the term "generally" above. There are other reasons, but
>one of those is to protect "us" from having to deal with each other.
>
>>
>> > We've become
>> >"afraid" to deal with our neighbor and ask them that they be reasonable.

>On
>> >the other side, we've become intolerant of dealing with situations we
>don't
>> >seem to be able to control in any other way but through a court system.
>> >Pitiful.
>>
>> What's pitiful is that some people have not developed the idea that they
>are
>> responsible to the community to take care of their properties in a
>reasonable
>> way.
>>
>
>Well, my idea of what a piece of property should look like may be
different.
>I don't think it is reasonable for my neighbor down the street to have his
>scrapyard. If you live here, you may think differently. I also think it's
>pretty dumb for a city to worry about grass that is over a certain height.
>I like the look of tall grass. Yeah, it's a fire hazard, but let's pick
>apart how many other fire hazards that go un-cited by cities.
>
>> >
>> >I will go to the county about my neighbor. If they deem he is
>> >doing nothing wrong, or if they choose to do nothing about it, I must
>then
>> >live with the fact that he's there and he's going to have his junkyard.
>> >That's all there is to it.
>>
>> And you'll have to "deal with it"
>>
>
>I think I've said that. I either ignore it, move, or stew about it as long
>as I live here. Guess which one I think is a healthier attitude for me to
>take?
>
>> >
>> >I think everyone needs to chill and quit trying to tell everyone else
how
>to
>> >live and how they must use their property. The day someone wants to
>share
>> >the expenses of my property and home is the day they'll have a say in
>what I
>> >do with it--*if* I want them sharing.
>>
>> Then what right do you have to go to the county about what your neighbor
>is
>> doing with the old cars? You're not "chilling" - you're telling him how
to
>live

>> and how he must use his property, and getting the govt. to do the job of
>> confronting him.
>>
>
>Well, that's a good point. To everything there are probably exceptions.
>Actually, Jim, I am not telling him how to live. I am requesting from the
>county that they tell me what the limitations are. Then, I will either
>choose to live within their definition, or I will ask my neighbor to. I
>have said from the beginning of this that people need to live "within the
>law" on their property.
>
>>
>> Suppose the county says "We know - he's technically in violation of a few
>> things. But someone must file a formal complaint before we can take any
>> action". Will you file the complaint?
>>
>
>Heck, probably not. I'll just go down the street and let him know that he
>is violating the laws and expectations of agreements for this area, and ask
>that he consider that while he makes his noise and dirties up his yard.
>This particular issue is not worth much more than that for me. Now, if he
>started having fires; or, even better: let's say my insurance company shows
>up and says that because of our proximity to him they are going to have to
>raise our insurance rate. That's a good one. What do I do? I go down the
>road and ask him if he wants to pay the extra insurance, or if he wants to
>voluntarily keep that from happening, or if he wants a citation from the
>county. I don't plan on moving.
>
>> >>
>> >> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature.
In
>> >many
>> >> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even
exist.
>> >While
>> >> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.
>>
>> >CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to
find
>> >them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long
>ago
>> >and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my
>> >blood to boiling.
>>
>> Kim, by that statement, you obviously don't know what CC&R or HOA stand
>for.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>

>Why do you say that?
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>

I had some fool tell me that I couldn't do this or that on my property a while back, I tried to be polite to him, and to work with him be he insisted on being a real PITA. So I made a point, legally, my property is zoned as farmland, and since the town I live in has grown to include my property, they asked me if I wanted to be rezoned, and I delined for just this reason, as farmland I am not under as strict zoning laws. So my neighbor who wouldn't calm down, he got a real reason to complain, and there wasn't a thing he could do about it from a legal stand as I was within the law.

This applies to a friend of mine in Napoleon Oh. he is legally blind, and his only true joy in life is his radio shack. He moved into a trailer park where thye have a rule that says no visible antennas. Of course he signed the contract w/o consulting us or a lawyer, and when he realized what he did he was upset. But we figured out how to get him back on the air, or so we thought. We built him a shed to store his bicycle and lawnmower in, and we put an underground conduit from the trailer to the shed to run the coax through, and placed a small simple groundplane in his shed. it wasn't outside OR visible. His neghbor decided to file a complaint with the owner, and they tried to force him to remove it. He called me, I got a friend of mine who is a lawyer and we contacted his trailer park owner and told them they would be in violation of their own rules, as the antenna in question was inside and not visible, and that we would be happy to bring equipment to assure he was not causing interferrence. At the same time I contacted his neighbor, and told them that if they complained anymore, that he would in turn file a formal complaint about them parking their cars in his parking spaces for days at a time.
Thus the problem ended.

If you do not like what I do with my property,don't look. As long as I am not doing anything illegal (drugs, prostitution,ect.) it is none of your business.

Been there done that won the fight, one fool came onto my property to see if my car I was rebuilding had valid tags, he was trying to get me into trouble, it had legal tags and he went to jail for trespassing.

Keith Hosman

121. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:15:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9rln0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29631

On 01 Jan 2002 03:03:02 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Back in the '80s the classic GG-1 electric locomotives were still running.
>Probably the best example of what the PRR could do. After 1968 they were
>painted in various awful schemes by the RRs that inherited them (Amtrak,
>Conrail, NJDOT).

One of my favorite photos is the one that I took of the power
swap at Harrisburg (PA) in 1974 where the diesels were cut off
the Broadway and the black-painted G (Amtrak 910, ex-PRR 4910)
was backed on for its run to NY.

It wasn't the first time I rode behind a G (I "commuted"
between NY and Washington several times in the mid-1950s and in
the late 1970s) but it was the most memorable.

The slight-of-hand trick that they do in Philly today with the
train running backwards from NY pulled by an AEM-7 comes nowheres
near that.

>"And now, after much hard work and dedication, we have one GG-1 locomotive
>restored to its proper condition, as God and the Pennsylvania Railroad
>intended".

Amen, brother. I grew up near the Long Island RR yards in East New
York (Brooklyn) and saw LOTS of electric power bustling around. The
G is a holy object.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Scrappy New Year to all

122. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:15:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9rrf1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29634

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 03:46:15 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>>>So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to have
>>>your cake and eat it, too.
>>
>> No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
>> doing continuous maintenance on an older home.
>
>Then fix it right the first time.

Always do - then something else goes wrong.

Been there, done that,.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

123. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:15:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9sh92.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29632

On 01 Jan 2002 05:03:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>But the state will grant a divorce for anyone - even those who have made a
>contract with no escape clauses.

The joys of a pluralistic society. The "contract" does not bind the
civil authorities' actions.

I could not get a religious divorce until the civil divorce was
final.

OTOH, my brother in Tel Aviv, where there is no civil marriage or
divorce, went through innumerable hoops to get a religious divorce
to which he was clearly entitled, and a year and a half later when
he wanted to remarry he could not get a civil marriage license in
the US because the religious divorce court in Israel was still
dragging its feet (not enough "grease" on the wheels, it seems).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

124. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:16:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9tiv4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29633

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 04:07:12 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 04:15:57 -0000, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote:
>
>>Instead, they basically tell us to "go eat cake", go for a ride in
>>your car, or go down to the club station. Uhhhhhhhh, is there
>>a club station near you which can be shared by all the amateurs
>>in your community?
>
>I'm not even sure any of the clubs anywhere near me even have a fixed
>station. Most don't own any real estate whatsoever, and if they have
>anything resembling a station, it's a van or trailer with no permanent
>home.

Whichever legal assistant wrote that Order must have been reading
the transcript of the second trial of _Hotz v Rich_ where Judge Hahn
(San Mateo County, CA Superior Court) told Jimmy Rich that he could
use a 2-meter hand-held to relay emergency traffic to some other ham
in a neighboring city where they didn't care about antenna support
structures disturbing the "quiet enjoyment" of a "you must follow
the [unreasonable] rules because I say so" neighbor who could not
even see the 75 foot tower from her home.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

125. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:16:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9t403.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29635

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 12:37:38 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Kim, that simply does not take place often. If it does take place, you
>have to be paid for the taking of your land. Often a landowner is paid
>far more than he or she paid for the property.

But far less than he could get for selling the property in a
competitive market.

>CC&R's are not put in place by government.

But they are enforced by state courts. In _Hotz v Rich_, an amateur
antenna case in California during the early 90s, we argued that such
entanglement invoked the provisions of PRB-1 as "state action". The
trial court bought that, but the California Court of Appeal for
District One (San Francisco) did not although another (non-antenna)
case in the Fourth District (Los Angeles) had accepted that argument.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

126. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:34:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3246f7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29637

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C31D7B8.EE1808B4@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> >
> > Manure.
>
> She doesn't have a clue, and will never have. She doesn't *want* a
> clue, and in fact wouldn't recognize one if it slapped her upside the
> head.
>

Hey, Dick! C'mon and join us up here at this intellectual level--you'll
make it someday!

Kim W5TIT

127. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:37:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3247c3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29638

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> >
> > Manure.
>
> It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!

Kim W5TIT

128. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:39:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c324846$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29639

```
"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a0t3ul0k9f@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c31e838$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > If a neighbor objects to an antenna or supporting structure, that is
> > > pretty much too bad. I may not like the neighbor's paint, lawn
> > > furniture, landscaping, Winnebago or decorative items. He did not
> > > obtain them for my enjoyment. I certainly don't put up an antenna or
> > > refrain from doing so for the neighbor's convenience.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > I *think* the debate here is for people who *cannot* put up antennas or
> > refrain from doing so, Dave.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Actually, the debate, as originally started by Larry, was a paranoid rant
> about the FCC selling off the amateur radio spectrum. He thinks that the
> ruling means the beginning of the end for amateur radio. Notice that he's
> been conveniently absent from the debate since making the original post.
>

ROFLMAO...you're right! Yeah, Larry's been happily predicting the end of
the ARS for the whole time I've been participating in this newsgroup--OK,
not the whole time; most of it.

Kim W5TIT
```

129. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:39:48 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8NrY7.209305$WW.12186833@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29636

I honestly don't recall if they held on to the exam papers at that time or what (they probably did, but that was in 1993 and I don't recall). I did not take 1a or 1b - I simply took 1c. I do recall taking both the amateur extra and the commercial telegraph on the same day in 1966 at the FCC in Buffalo. Frankly, although I had to drive 60 miles to the FCC office, I preferred it. There were no questions then as to whether someone had passed the test, failed the test, or simply cheated.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10201012118050.5272-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 1 Jan 2002, JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> >I don't know how they do it today. When I obtained my first tickets
> >(novice, general, extra in 1962, 64, and 66), you had to pass the code
tests
> >before you took the written tests (at the FCC). Later, after I dropped
my
> >tickets around 1981 or 1982 and then took my tests in 1993, I took the
> >novice, technician and was either in the middle of the technician or
general
> >written exam when we were asked if anyone wanted element 1-C. So, I took
> >the exam papers with me and took the 20 WPM code test and then went back
for
> >the rest of the written exams. Is any order necessary today?
>
> There is no order on which of the code vs. written tests is taken first.
> However, there is generally an order as to the written tests themselves
(and
> back when there were multiple code elements, an order to them as well).
>
> You didn't say if you temporarily surrendered your written test materials
> during the code test, but IF you DIDN'T and tried to pull a stunt like
that
> with the VE team I test with, your written test would have been graded "as
is"
> at the time of the code test.
>
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10112312348540.3647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001, Howard Johnson wrote:
> >> >I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
> >> >for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
> >> >(next testing period that I can attend).

> >> >
> >> >My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
> >> >first then a General written or just the General?
> >>
> >> In order to get a license, you will have to take the Technician written
as
> >> well (and to get the general class license, 5wpm code too).
>

130. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:40:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c324879$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29640

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C3235F0.89DFA245@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece
of
> > property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and
he
> > keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for
me
> > to have to deal with it. I have no problem with it, *except* that I
don't
> > think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets
the
> > same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far
more
> > than one or two CCRs. I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to
contact
> > my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things
lying
> > around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
> > stuff, and growing.
>
> Watch out Kim, Larry and the other guys might make up an SAT test
> style analogy:
>
> Kim's call is to ham radio as Kim's neighbor's junkyard is to Kim's
> neighborhood.
>
> :-)
>

LOL....

Kim W5TIT

131. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-01 23:40:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c324893_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29641

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C32381D.CEF084FB@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> >
> > Manure.
> >
>
> She said "owners", not "renters". :-)
>

I meant renters, though...heh heh

Kim W5TIT

132. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:06:29 UTC
From: Gary - KJ6Q <davison7@gte.net>
Message-ID: <9asY7.249$lY6.114450@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 29642
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

ANYONE thinking the FCC IS, or is LIKELY to do anything with any serious degree of dedication and
aggressiveness to "control" or in ANY way address the issue of CB lawlessness is living in a

DREAM WORLD!

The likes of Riley Hollingsworth are doing precious LITTLE in the direction of "CB crackdown" - and
about all you see at best, is perhaps one such FCC case per month - and THAT only occurs if the FCC
is taken by the hand and forcibly LED to the offender by a Ham or government/commercial interest who
has already done all the footwork FOR the FCC...

--
Gary - KJ6Q
****
Two things we'll never see:
1. Perpetual motion...
2. A liberal Democrat complaining
about "Too much government"
"Len Nathanson" <len@w8rc.org> wrote in message
news:a9f19d53.0201011412.102851f8@posting.google.com...
> dalej2@mac.com wrote in message
news:<dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>...
> > Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.
> Guys, there is alawless element out there and nothing in this thread
> can control it. Let the FCC deal with it and read about the fines
> given out. Enough said.
> Len

133. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:10:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C324FFD.A20401AF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott Unit-69 wrote:

>
> Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.

Get a ham license. Then you can (legally) run up to around a kilowatt
on thousands of channels.

134. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:13:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_gsY7.209339$WW.12191637@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Without seeing the original, Bozo*Flush is tired of this dude and just
makes him disappear, I suspect you responded to a forgery.

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C324FFD.A20401AF@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Scott Unit-69 wrote:
>
> >
> > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
>
> Get a ham license. Then you can (legally) run up to around a kilowatt
> on thousands of channels.
>

135. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:35:30 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0tkji0ire@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29650

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c3247c3_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
>
> Kim W5TIT

I know of at least two hams who lived in an area that had antenna
restrictions. A dipole in the attic is all one used to get his WAS. It took
a couple of years, but he did it.

136. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:35:37 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0201011635.421fdfb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Shrimp Biskit" <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote in message
news:<20011231094809.181$V9@news.newsreader.com>...
> "One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in
> message news:3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net...
> > On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> > <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
> >
> > >Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
> >
> >
> > like they'd take the time to do that....
> >
> > if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> > just for someone saying they would get real
>
> For your sake you had better hope so, just because you wanted to sound like
> a tough guy to impress your rec.radio.cb friends.So if Riley does show up at
> your QTH your gonna kill him right thats what it sounds like to me If your
> gonna bust a cap in his ass what end result woul you be looking for. Ever
> heard of Chris Marquis?

well shrimp dick......it was you who provoked him.....and it was
you....who are trying to lead him on now....haven't you got something
else to do..???? just drop it shrimp dick , ...ok??? i mean, we all
know that you and voobner both have your very own personal autographed
kneepads from your little buddy..rh,.....given to you, because you two
chumps do such good hummers.....get out of dodge shrimp dick.....this
town ain't big enough for both of us.......

137. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:49:16 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <gOsY7.20744$DG2.637591733@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'd say you're correct. The real
Scott will show up, while the phony
will disappear.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:_gsY7.209339$WW.12191637@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Without seeing the original, Bozo*Flush is tired of this dude and just
> makes him disappear, I suspect you responded to a forgery.
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C324FFD.A20401AF@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > Scott Unit-69 wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
> >
> > Get a ham license. Then you can (legally) run up to around a kilowatt
> > on thousands of channels.
> >
>
>

138. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 00:52:08 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20020101195251.815$UM@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 29648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0201011635.421fdfb6@posting.google.com...
>
> well shrimp dick......it was you who provoked him.....and it was
> you....who are trying to lead him on now....haven't you got something
> else to do..???? just drop it shrimp dick , ...ok??? i mean, we all
> know that you and voobner both have your very own personal autographed
> kneepads from your little buddy..rh,.....given to you, because you two
> chumps do such good hummers.....get out of dodge shrimp dick.....this
> town ain't big enough for both of us.......

I didn't provoke him at all how could I provoke him to say he wants to shot
riley dead.. huh jonsie?
If I provoked him i would expect him to want to shoot the biskit...if he
shoots you it will be shooting the shit... come on come on ...no doubt about
it ... ice cold shrimp is out .....

139. dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:00:32 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <CCsY7.14894$_K.1769026@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 29646

from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can talk on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the radio. Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns it over to the unlicensed person?
The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang with him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.

Keith Hosman

140. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:02:37 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <N_sY7.319766$W8.12130781@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29649

Absolutely legal. As long as the control operator is present, someone else can have at it. I believe you could do the calling - just as long as the control operator (licensed) is present. Interestingly enough, a codeless tech can apparently use a 10 meter port on linked repeaters. We have such a system here in Rochester, NY, and I've yakked with Australia with it. A lot of DX comes in at times. The codeless tech is responsible for his signal (say at 2 meters - I use one of the 440 ports myself, but there are ports on 6 meters, 2 meters, 220, and 440 as well as the 10 meter port). The control operator of the repeater system (including the 10 meter port) is responsible for the signal at 10 meters (where the codeless tech can't operate directly).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
"WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message news:CCsY7.14894$_K.1769026@cletus.bright.net...
> from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can talk
> on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the radio.
> Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns it
> over to the unlicensed person?
> The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang with
> him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.
>
>
> Keith Hosman
>
>

141. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:16:50 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201011716.281fd818@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output

I am dead serious about this, I want to know too. The ham in the CB
newsgroup are always telling us not to try power on FRS. I think they
are jealous of what we have achieved on CB! Clipped limiters! Echo
mikes! VFOs to slide onto ham freqs! 60 KW mobiles! I bet we can do
the same or better with FRS given a bit of time.

142. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:32:45 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201011732.1f8d82c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

len@w8rc.org (Len Nathanson) wrote in message
news:<a9f19d53.0201011412.102851f8@posting.google.com>...
> dalej2@mac.com wrote in message
news:<dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>...
> > Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.
> Guys, there is alawless element out there and nothing in this thread
> can control it. Let the FCC deal with it and read about the fines
> given out. Enough said.
> Len

CBers aren't on 28 mhz. Your eyes are getting heavy. There is no 10
meter bootlegger problem. You are getting sleepy. Hams should mind
their own business. You are getting very sleepy. There are no
truckers on 28.085. You are in a deep deep sleep.....

143. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:35:46 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C1380CF94534E8B9.D4F56C927F46E1F4.9BF10C5AD20B7C79@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29653

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002 08:48:49 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>news:0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net...
>> >Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
>> >environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
>> >wishing to be married. It's that simple.
>>
>> Moving out is a hell of a price to pay for something one was given no
>> notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
>> new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
>> know.
>
>Neither is a divorce. That's why that comparison was made.

Divorces can be had fairly cheaply and easily if both parties can
agree on ownership of common property.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

144. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:49:09 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <BE8A570A800C8721.60BD884FBE01B7B3.F448398249AAB1D7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29659

On 01 Jan 2002 15:07:19 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>You never lived in an older (pre WW2) house, didja, Joe? Most of them were
>designed back when labor was cheap. They tend to need lots of painting and
>other time-consuming maintenance. Doing even minor jobs becomes a big deal
>because nothing in them is predictable or standard. Often you find serious code
>violations and unsafe conditions that have to be fixed NOW. Supplies for old
>houses are often made of unobtanium.

Actually, I did. It's like owning an old car; you don't just change
out the part that happens to be broken at the moment, you go over it
with a fine-tooth comb and find all the problems. If you replace all
the wiring in one shot, it's a hell of a lot cheaper than doing one
outlet at a time. Same goes for plumbing, floor joists, roofing, and
doors. You don't just sit around waiting for something to break, you
overhaul the whole system as soon as you find a problem.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

145. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:54:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa5l89.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29654

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 12:44:07 -0600, CAM wrote:

>When I bought my present house and asked for a copy of the deed
>restrictions the real estate agent had no idea where they were
>located. After a few days, he mailed them to me. Just about the only
>things prohibited are live stock and mobile homes.

When I bought my second house in California in 1977 (a private sale that did not involve real-estate agents on either side) I spent several hours at the County Recorder's office to verify that no CC&Rs attached to the property, a tract home built in 1960.

As a further note, a title search, required to obtain title insurance, will turn up easements and CC&Rs and they will be listed in the property description.

The home we were selling was built for us in 1968 in the same general neighborhood and had CC&Rs. The one relative to antennas stated: "No radio or TV aerials of an unsightly nature shall be erected". I asked my mentor in radio tower litigation, the late Ed Peck, K6AN, what that meant and he said: "It means that you can put up a triband beam if you so desire".

That's been my attitude ever since.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

146. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:54:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa4nx8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29656

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002 10:15:33 -0600, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>> How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched
>> the deed to his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living
>> there, his may be just as unrestricted.

>No, but I imagine the county will be able to tell me.

The county planning and code enforcement folks can tell you "over
the counter" what the property is zoned for or if there are any
ordinances regulating the activity but they cannot - and should not
- tell you if there are any CC&Rs or easements attached.

That info is usually found at the County Recorder's office (which is
in essence a nig library) but you have to do the reaearch yourself or
hire someone to do it for you.

Even after you find the information "the county" won't interpret it
for you nor enforce it for you. You would have to institute a suit
in court to force compilance with a deed easement or CC&R limitation.

IF you have standing to do so. If not - you're out of luck.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

147. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:54:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa61va.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29657

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:17:43 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>> HOWEVER, it does not cover TV-type antennas used for any other
>> purpose, such as "stealth" amateur radio transmitting antennas. The
>> FCC has already closed that loophole.
>
>How would they ever know?

We went through this before.....

If they have a real hardcore and deep pocket to get you, they can
hire a radio engineering srrvice with df capability to prove that
the radio signals were coming from that antenna. The FCC will not
go to bat for you in that case.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

148. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:54:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6hlb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29655

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:20:24 -0600, CAM wrote:

>> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
>> >restriction part before I signed the contract.
>
>> You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the deed.
>
>Mine was an HOA agreement, initialed by me and two officers.

You're home free as long as the HOA By-Laws gave the officers the
power to grant such a waiver.

If not, and (in California) if it wasn't done as a result of a
resolution adopted at an open meeting, the officers are open to a
lawsuit brought by any other member of the Association voiding the
waiver.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

149. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:54:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6n9c.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29658

On 01 Jan 2002 15:07:18 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
>signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and who
>owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at the
>county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask
>for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
>reference.

If they are incorporated by reference they are legally part of the
deed. Same thing with contracts and wills that incorporate "external"
documents by reference.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

150. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 01:58:50 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <41C2283D7D7B90BF.164F1AB31ADFFA70.C384A5752A49ACCE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29661

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 23:15:53 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

>>Then fix it right the first time.
>
> Always do - then something else goes wrong.

Fixing it right also means looking around for other possible problems
that the current issue might indicate.

There are five basic systems in most houses; electrical, phone,
water/sewage, foundation and structure. (Structure and foundation
being somewhat linked, of course. Depending on the house, there may
be other systems as well.) If you find a problem somewhere in a
system, you should look at the entire system, and repair or replace as
needed to prevent further problems. If an outlet catches fire, you
should start at the service entrance, and check all the wiring, not
just replace the old worn out wiring to that outlet. If your doors
don't close right, you should look at the entire structure to
determine if you need to replace a joist or two, or if the foundation
is settling and should be shored up.

Restore a house the way you would restore a 1965 Stingray, and you'll
save yourself a lot of effort in the long run.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

151. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:06:16 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C628EDEC7FD973AC.A35BF596A61C11AE.48BA03A6A1875A72@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:50:17 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>> Going hand to hand against someone trying to rob you is considered too
>> dangerous, and given the rarity of recovering stolen property, that
>> rarely enters the picture ...
>
>If someone is stealing a bicycle that your kid left in the open
>front yard, you would be well advised to think twice before
>shooting the perp in the back as he pedaled away.
>
>However, if someone has broken into your home, you could
>rationally justify a fear of bodily injury or death.

You don't have to. That's why the law here allows deadly force if the
shooter reasonably believes that "the land or property cannot be
protected or recovered by any other means."

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

152. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:08:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <302D658EE376371C.81F6CD3E06F69EA9.C22C3EDFD250DB28@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002 10:32:39 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Is it that, Joe, or is that it is legal to shoot only if you are under
>threat of being harmed? I am not sure it is legal to shoot to keep someone
>from getting away...?

Penal Code 9.42
(B) to prevent the other who is fleeing immediately after
committing burglary, robbery, aggravated robbery, or theft during the
nighttime from escaping with the property; and

If they're getting away with your property, and you reasonably
believe you won't be getting it back unless you stop them now.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

153. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:11:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201011811.58ce9492@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29660

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gp9tiv4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...

>
> Whichever legal assistant wrote that Order must have been reading
> the transcript of the second trial of _Hotz v Rich_ where Judge Hahn
> (San Mateo County, CA Superior Court)
>
How did a state court court get into telling anybody they could or
could not use a radio??
>
>
>told Jimmy Rich that he could
> use a 2-meter hand-held to relay emergency traffic to some other ham
> in a neighboring city where they didn't care about antenna support
> structures disturbing the "quiet enjoyment" of a "you must follow
> the [unreasonable] rules because I say so" neighbor who could not
> even see the 75 foot tower from her home.
>
>
Counselor is it not true that the Comms Act of '34 gives anybody
premptive rights to use any radio at his/her disposal to get life &
death traffic thru to the authorities? Say ya have a snipped 2m mobile
rig in the car which can hit the neighborhood gendarmerie dispatch
station on 155.whatever. Ya come up on bodies bleeding all over the
highway and ya jump on 155.xxx and holler for help. Izzat something
which is gonna raise Riley's hackles? The way I sse it if it wuz me
I'd do it in a wink as part of my responsibilities as a licensed radio
operator and citizen and the devil take hindmost. And screw the broad
who can't even see the tower AND Part 97, seeya in court if ya don't
like it. FEDERAL court.
>
>
w3rv

154. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:13:38 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <588D9EFDDEBAF7C3.23430B8FE5FE6A71.CE5AD3C4A112BDA2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:58:52 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I have a Texas concealed carry permit. We were taught that using
>deadly force on someone in a publicly accessible driveway where
>only property is involved can cause more civil problems than
>the property is worth. Even if it is a justifiable act under
>criminal law, civil law may have a different take on it. The
>cost of defending oneself in civil court may cost more than
>the property is worth.

Depends on the situation, and having a cousin trying to make a name
for herself in civil law can cut the costs a *lot*.

Make it even a little easier by keeping an extra gun in the car, so
you can tell the cops that he had access to a gun after he broke into
the car.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

155. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:14:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <V1uY7.319897$W8.12139312@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29662

"WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
news:CCsY7.14894$_K.1769026@cletus.bright.net...
> from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can
talk
> on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the
radio.
> Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns
it
> over to the unlicensed person?
> The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang
with
> him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.
>
>
> Keith Hosman
>
>

All that is required is that he be in a position to turn you off if you violate the rules and therefore in a position to monitor you. You can masquerade as long as his bladder holds out.

You will encounter in Element 3 rules on 'third party' - and you is one - communication under the international agreements. In general, these boil down to observing the rules of the most restrictive country -- a British ham could not participate in the QSO with you on the rig because they do not allow third party communication, and never run a phone patch in pigeon Swahili unless you speak it and it has to be with a country we have an agreement with. Within the US we don't sweat third party a whole lot; protecting Ma Bell never ranked really high on the FCCs priority list.

Dick N BK

156. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:22:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
>
> Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
>
>
No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
>
>
> Scott
>
w3rv

157. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:24:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> >
> > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
> >
> >
> No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> >
> >
> > Scott
> >
> w3rv

The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
well-known public urinal.

158. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:27:15 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7euY7.209474$WW.12205012@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29668
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yep, and he sure is getting real active. Almost time to send him to the
recycle bin.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > >
> > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
> > >
> > >
> > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> > >
> > >
> > > Scott
> > >
> > > w3rv
>
> The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
> well-known public urinal.
>
>

159. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:32:41 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <djuY7.209482$WW.12206753@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29669

True today when international calls are cheap. When I was in the Navy stationed on Guam Island, things were different. It was $4.00 per minute with a 3 minute minimum. This was in 1968 dollars on a sailor's pay (entry level as a recruit was something like $93.00 per month in 1967 as I recall). Those phone patches were a LOT more important back then. Reversing the charges from California or Arizona to New York was substantially cheaper than four bucks a minute! Barry Goldwater handled a bunch of patches back then.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:V1uY7.319897$W8.12139312@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
> news:CCsY7.14894$_K.1769026@cletus.bright.net...
> > from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can
> talk
> > on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the
> radio.
> > Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns
> it
> > over to the unlicensed person?
> > The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang
> with
> > him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.
> >
> >
> > Keith Hosman
> >
> >
>
> All that is required is that he be in a position to turn you off if you
> violate the rules and therefore in a position to monitor you. You can
> masquerade as long as his bladder holds out.
>
> You will encounter in Element 3 rules on 'third party' - and you is one -
> communication under the international agreements. In general, these boil
> down to observing the rules of the most restrictive country -- a British
> ham could not participate in the QSO with you on the rig because they do
> not allow third party communication, and never run a phone patch in pigeon
> Swahili unless you speak it and it has to be with a country we have an
> agreement with. Within the US we don't sweat third party a whole lot;

> protecting Ma Bell never ranked really high on the FCCs priority list.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>
>
>

160. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:34:30 UTC
From: inigo@montoya.net
Message-ID: <3c35717e.5604859@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>> are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
>
>Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.

Get a license, get GMRS.

161. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:44:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3273ff_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29671

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228143934.10110.00001463@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3c2c89da_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> (at least 10 times...)
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> >> which are far more popular?
> >
> >Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
> >voice privileges as well ...
>
> But you proposed giving them ONLY "modern digital modes" (without
specifying
> which modes fit that description". No mention of analog voice modes
at all.

I was referring to your proposal to give them CW privs ...
IN THE LOWER PARTS OF THE HF BANDS ... I asked
"Why not allow them modern digital modes as well (in those
sub-bands)?" THEN I observed that there also isn't a logical,
valid reason (other than S25.5, which will go away in 2003)
to not give them voice privs as well ...)
of the entry class license would be much wider.

> Your statements about "modern digital modes" seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or,
> more accurately, arm-twisting) people to use those modes by limiting
the
> majority of their HF frequency privileges to those modes.

I didn't suggest "limiting the majority of their HF frequency
privileges
to those (digital) modes" ... I merely observed that ALL you had
proposed to give them were expanded CW sub-bands when the
majority don't WANT to use CW.

73,
```

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDJz7pe+N6+q84HiEQKWlACgwCY3bCPut7FRAWzs1uwqmD1ijZUAoLgc
CJGefxYbBuaM00aVtE3BFU4S
=l4iR
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

162. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:44:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201011844.6876f48e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:<a0ojj3$a0d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>...

>
> As soon as I can get my copy up to the 5wpm requirement.
> I'm listening to the ARRL code practice files off the Internet
> and I'll go for my test as soon as I can copy the 7.5 wpm
> files, that way I'll know for _SURE_ I can do the 5 wpm test.
> --
>
Good show, the winds are beneath your wings.
>
>
If you have or have access to a half-decent HF reciever you might
consider copying "real cw" code practice off the airwaves. The ARRL
station w1aw broadcasts code practice sessions nightly and it's a
helluva lot of fun. Plus it would give you experience with real radio
operations. The Internet is fine but it ain't the real thing, if you
can copy 7.5wpm solid off the air you'll kick the crap outta the VE
code test grinning from ear-to-ear.
>
>
Dial into the following link for the specifics.
>
>
http://www.arrl.org/w1aw.html
>
>
> '73' From KB9TMP
>
w3rv

163. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 02:54:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tsq1cco1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29673

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230220311.06877.00000826@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a0o5gsajr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >The exam is the means to determine the qualification.
> >For 20wpm,, the qualification was to have the ability
> >to recieve at 20 wpm...as determined by passing a
> >test which was the actual requirement.
>
> I had to send and receive at 20 wpm.

I did that for Novice in the 50's but only had
receiev in the 90s. Times change and no one
has ever shown that if you can receive at X you couldn't
send at X also.
<SNIP>

> >> But none of this answers the original question: What is so special
about
> >> 3524 kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?
> >
> >It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".
>
> BINGO!!!!
>
> The idea is that the system "rewards" the passing of additional tests by
giving
> out additional privileges, even though the additional tests do NOT contain
> material that is "necessary" to use the new privileges. In other words,
hams
> are rewarded for "jumping through the hoop" of Element 4.

That will always be the case when additional privileges
are associated with "higher" license grades.

> >> >> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says
that
> >> >> license test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating
> >> >> the necessary qualifications.
> >> >
> >> >And that's what it is per my comments above.
>
> But now you say "It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".".
And

> you are absolutely correct, Bill. It's about incentives and rewards, not
> showing necessary qualifications.

I agree. Where we differ is when the reward is
inconsistent with the requirements.

> >> Why is Element 4 "necessary"? Because the FCC says so?
> >
> >See my comment above...the test is the means to ascertain
> >an individual's knowledge.
>
> Yup - even though the knowledge was shown to be adequate on a lower-level
test.

Not sure I agree, but I see where you are going with this (I think).

> >> >> Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though
> >> >> their size and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.
> >> >
> >> >The number of questions doesn't change the scope and
> >> >or difficulty of learning the knowledge needed
> >> >to pass.
> >>
> >> Sure it does.
> >
> >Let's make this simple.... I give you 200 words
> >to learn the spelling of. You have NO knowledge
> >of which words will be on a test. You still need
> >to learn them all regardless of the test being
> >25 or 50 of the words picked at random.
> >Same applies to all types of testing.
>
> Nope.
>
> The amateur writtens are not a spelling test. The questions are not simply
> chosen at random, and are not unrelated.

The questions, within subject areas, ARE at random. The anaolgy
holds for 5, 10 or 50 questions.

> >> A simple basic test to get started, a more involved test for more
> >> privs, and a fairly comprehensive test for full privileges.
> >> And make the privileges match the testing level.
> >
> >How does that differ from Tech/General/Extra today?
>
> 1) Tech today is a big step for newcomers who do not have technical
> backgrounds. They get way too much VHF/UHF, and if they pass 5 wpm
> code get way too little HF/MF

But the number of hams that have been starting out via the Tech
has been significant since the majority of new hams since the

intro of the "nocode" tech have, in fact, taken the tech route.

> 2) General today is "about right" except the written test is mostly regs
and
> not technical enough

So you'd leave it alone or change it?

> 3) The privileges earned do not match the knowledge tested closely enough

I actually agree with that statement.

> 4) There is no experience requirement

Nor has there been for about 50 years...at least to the extent
additional privileges were involved with the higher
license being saught after.

> 5) VE qualification should be a separate issue

I totally agree on that.

> 6) Current system is a patchwork quilt of a system dating back
> more than 50 years.

Agree also as you have laid out. I think, however,
the "problem" becomes one of WHAT privileges
should be coupled to what requirements. I have
always felt that 1500 watts power was uncalled for
for just a tech license once the written test was no
longer the equal to the General.

> >> The big problem lots of ham have with the current system is that the
> >> privileges don't match the testing.
> >
> >Then what alignment would you like for privileges
> >vs license (I can't find your prior post on those
> >details...so maybe repubishing would help me
> >understand your position.) I have some thoughts
> >on those lines also...perhaps we are in closer agreement
> >than we think.
>
> See end of this post.

<SNIP>

> Here's a revised and cleaned-up version of myu earlier post, with some
> suggestions by Rich Plourde incorporated. Remember that this is more of a
> "thought experiment" than a finished job. The names of the proposed
license
> classes were chosen to avoid confusion with the existing classes.
> How about this:
>
> Right now:

> 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone General
> HF/MF bands, 160-10. (They haven't been tested on other modes for HF)

No objection on that.

> 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or online
> procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions.

I have no objection to that...BUT I wonder how many
haven't already done so. I'd bet almost everyone that
has even a passing continued interest in ham radio and
was still a pre-87 tech has already "upgraded" at a VE
session. I know everyone that participated on the local
Morris County RACES repeater has done so. The word
went out very quickly.

> 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
amateur
> allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200 worldwide
exclusive
> amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in Region 2 and 7000-7100
> everywhere else. 7000-7300 worldwide exclusive amateur would be
wonderful.

That's a goal of WRC 2003 already.

> 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and analog
> voice/image modes.

I see no reason to segregate digital from CW. How much of a "slice" would
each get in your solution?

> After S25.5 is gone:
> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names
if you
> don't like them)

I'd like Basic/General/Extra... But it isn't anything I'd loose
sleep over.

> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
class.
> (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode only).

How would that differ from item 4 above.

> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures,
and
> safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff, main purpose is
to
> keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF
> and 25 watts or so
> on VHF/UHF (determined by RF exposure limits). Modes are CW, analog
> voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data modes like packet.

Basics
> cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or be club trustees.
> Basics get all
> VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the
entry
> level. Test content matches privileges granted.
>
> 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF
exposure
> stuff with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates get
300-400 watts
> watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after
qualification (see
> below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates
get all
> VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum.
> Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.

I see no reason for the one year requirement at this point.

> 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
regs to cover
> expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except
that
> Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full license
requires
> at least one year (preferably two years) as an Intermediate.

I see NO difference between Intermediate and Full. Did you leave out a
higher
power allowance (e.g. 1500 watts)?

> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.

Agree.

> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
six-character
> calls,
> and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls.

I have no care at all about that. My K2UNK will
be my call until my key goes silent.

> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to
> Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.

Good, I fully agree.

> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals
and
> Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.

I'd have no problem...BUT I can hear the complaints
already from the "high power" operators of Tech,
general and Advanced suddenly loosing their power punch.

> 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade,
> but their time in existing classes counts.

OK (except I don't see a need for any delay between basic
and Intermediate.

> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a
21st
> century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to
reach
> full privileges. And the testing matches the priviliges granted.

Not a bad approach.

> The power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Perhaps current hams
would be
> allowed to use the existing power levels so nobody loses privileges.

If the "current" hams get "grandfathered" into the high
power allowed aspect, then they have no incentive
(especially the Generals and Advanced)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

164. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:02:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tt8btkv1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29674

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231140453.27168.00000802@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the garage
> >between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish, and
> >relieve on your flathead. Life moves on.
>
> Actually you can do the ARC-5 thing but it'll cost ya. Don't get Kelly &
me
> started about small engine work.

Those flatheads weren't exactly "small engines" compared to
today's crop of 4 and 6's which are found in most cars now.

> >And our choice is pretty simple, do we stay a part of the program or
spend
> >our time at QCWA luncheons? Our part in the program is largely that of
> >the old male elephants they move with the younger herds to maintain some
> >sense of decorum and order, take names, kick butts, provide some support
> >when the young bucks realize they just did something dumb, and generally
> >play the classic Grandpa which like sergeanting is a lost art. Oh well.
>
> Been there, done that, still here. Yer preachin' to the choir.

Yup, Yup Yup!

> >
> >Still wonder if Brittany's are real.
>
> awcumon, as fake as a $3 bill.

ROTFLMAO!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

165. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:06:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tthh$ta3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29676

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0112312235.42fec17b@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011231140453.27168.00000802@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > In article
<y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >
> > >Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the garage
> > >between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish, and
> > >relieve on your flathead.
> >
> >
> OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB block
> with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing in
> a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
> done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter Phase
> II. Yahoo!

OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

166. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:07:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020101220703.04115.00000763@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29675

In article <d22b54c3.0112312327.69bce152@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>The Lone Ranger & Tonto found themselves surrounded by hostile
>Indians. The Lone Ranger sez "I think we're in a lot of trouble
>Kimosabe." Tonto sez "whatta mean "WE" white man?

HAW - a classic!

I recall from somewhere that while "Tonto" is Spanish for "foolish one" or some such, "Kimosabe" could be interpreted as "know it all". Not a compliment.

>> and another where the Mountie's dog
>> was the star and sold great

[quantities]

>> of KennelRation. Hey man, you gotta
>> believe.
>>
Yea, verily. Also Sky King and the Nabisco logo flying into the upper left corner of the screen.

>Sergeant Preston of the Yukon and his mutt King . .

"Wonder Dog"?
>>
>And the dumbest of all mutts Lassie . . .

Which role was actually played by several doggies, all of them male.

>I really do need to get back on the air dammit.

Just don't wipe out a doe on 202 near Dilworthtown like I just did. Odyssey's outa commission for a while.

73 de Jim, N2EY

167. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:09:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpaak0e.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29678

On 1 Jan 2002 18:11:37 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> Whichever legal assistant wrote that Order must have been reading
>> the transcript of the second trial of _Hotz v Rich_ where Judge Hahn
>> (San Mateo County, CA Superior Court)
>>
>How did a state court court get into telling anybody they could or
>could not use a radio??

The issue was that the CC&Rs attaching to the house restricted amateur antennas to "below the eave line" which we were claiming was unreasonable, Jimmy being one of the more prominent amateurs who handled H&W traffic in and out of the area during the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake.

In spite of a good case put on by a trial team consisting of two litigation lawyers, two commmunications lawyers, a full professor of radio engineering at Stanford University, the head of communications for the Western Region of the American Red Cross, and the Assistant County Assessor, all active hams and all working pro bono, Da Judge just didn't like the concept of a 75 foot tower, which the "CC&R Sheriff" lead complainant couldn't even see from her house.

He didn't order Jimmy to use 2-meters or forbid him from working HF. He just stated his uninformed and off-base opinion on one way for Jimmy to do his thing while still being hobbled by the restriction.

Jimmy got sick of the whole thing, sold the tower, and had another heart attack shortly after.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

168. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:09:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpaaryf.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29677

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 19:49:09 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>>You never lived in an older (pre WW2) house, didja, Joe? Most of them were
>>designed back when labor was cheap. They tend to need lots of painting and
>>other time-consuming maintenance. Doing even minor jobs becomes a big deal
>>because nothing in them is predictable or standard. Often you find serious code
>>violations and unsafe conditions that have to be fixed NOW. Supplies for old
>>houses are often made of unobtanium.
>
>Actually, I did. It's like owning an old car; you don't just change
>out the part that happens to be broken at the moment, you go over it
>with a fine-tooth comb and find all the problems. If you replace all
>the wiring in one shot, it's a hell of a lot cheaper than doing one
>outlet at a time. Same goes for plumbing, floor joists, roofing, and
>doors. You don't just sit around waiting for something to break, you
>overhaul the whole system as soon as you find a problem.

And who replaces the green stuff that seems to hemorrhage from your
savings with no end in sight?

Been there, doing it.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

169. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:11:10 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <iTuY7.20769$6d4.676895907@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sorry to say Brian,
You got hooked by our resident forging troll.
The real Scott Unit 69 goes by Upplus@Hotmail.com
Not this one with the extra "S".
Please note that you can complain about this
to hotmail, here is an e-mail I received yesterday
concerning these posts:

Hello S3Buell,

Thank you for writing to MSN Hotmail.

I have checked the account that you have reported and found out that it has
been forged. The individual is forging a Hotmail address suggesting that
the message is associated with Hotmail.

We have actively pursued legal action against many of these spammers who
are forging addresses using the Hotmail domain and would like to thank you
for taking the time to forward the message you received to our Abuse Team.
Should you receive any other unsolicited e-mail with the Hotmail domain name
in either the header information or the body of the message, please forward
it to abuse@hotmail.com so that we can investigate each instance.

We encourage you to visit the following links to learn more about spam,
forged message headers, and how to complain about e-mail abuse.

The Anti-Spam HOWTO:
http://www.cauce.org
http://www.bluemarble.net/~scotty/forgery.html

So if this does bother you, you can do what is
described above, if not , life goes on.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> >
> > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
> >
> >
> No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> >
> >
> > Scott
> >
> w3rv

170. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:11:10 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <iTuY7.20770$te4.676979807@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

File him now, don't delay. Your
newsreader and you will be a lot happier in
the long run.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:7euY7.209474$WW.12205012@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Yep, and he sure is getting real active. Almost time to send him to the
> recycle bin.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> > news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> > news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > > >
> > > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more
channels.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at

> > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Scott
> > > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
> > well-known public urinal.
> >
> >
>
>

171. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:22:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tudtucn1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29681

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <a0o6kp$264$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd
> >> be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for
> >> you in the 50's.
> >
> >Actually, I see it easier today than in the 50s.
> >My first station cost about $150 to set up (that's
> >1957 dollars) for which I had to work over
> >150 hours to earn. Today there are 2m
> >HTs and mobiles that can be had for little more
> >than $150 and that teen can be on the air.
>
> Apples and oranges comparison, though. While a lot of fun and useful in
its
> way, the ham with only a $150 HT has very limited options. Except during
rare
> band openings, his/her available QSOs are limited to very local simplex
> contacts and the repeaters that can be reached (very limited).
>
> Back in the late '60s I built a station based on surplus ARC-5 units.
80/40 CW
> only, 50 watts or so. Cost less than $50 including key and 'phones. With
it I
> could reliably work practically any similarly-equipped ham within a
thousand
> miles. Unreliably I could work anywhere in the world. Plus a lot more -
because
> I had a decent antenna. Nothing fancy, just the classic inverted L random
wire
> out to the crabapple tree.
> >
> >> So it's fine for you to have freedom from such
> >> unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor
> >> involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I
> >> gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.
> >
> >The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
> >other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
> >can enjoy:
> >- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in

> >the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
>
> Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or
windshield
> wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared
> driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10
minute
> repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing his spark
plugs!!!)

Odds are by time anyone complained, the "tail light bulb"
or windscreen wiper would be changed...BUT, there are
indeed, condo/homeowner CC&Rs that prohibit such
things as changing the oil and/or doing anything
that resembles auto repair (changing brake shoes, spark
plugs, etc.) in your driveway. NOTE-I mean YOUR driveway,
not one that is shared.

> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
> >of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
>
> I think you mean "changing the ....". Again, if the changes are
reasonable.
> Being forced to repaint one's house in the same color forever is
unreasonable.
> Having a list of approved colors and color combinations for the homeowner
to
> choose from is reasonable.

You are correct as to what I intende to mean...BUT that choice
may also be limited to avoid having two homes with the same
color immediately next to each other.

> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?
>
> Depends on the pets and other regulations concerning pets, like noise
> ordinances governing barking. No pets means no goldfish or hamsters, btw.

True, the point is that there are many different aspects to CC&Rs.

> My township has a serious leash law - a dog found loose can cost its owner
a
> BIG fine (up to $1000). Everybody who owns a dog has an invisible fence
and
> good leashes.
> >
> >Just some thoughts.
>
> The key to all this is "reasonable". Sweeping prohibitions of common
at-home
> activities are not reasonable. Same with restrictions that make such
activities

> impractical or extremely limited.

But they do exist and are enforced. Many "senior" communities prohibit children living with grandparents...and the owners can not sell except to a person or couple over 55.

> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In many
> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist. While
> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.

IF you write the contract demanding FULL disclosure then your attorney had better look for them AND the attorney for the selling party had better make sure there aren't any being hidden. Such CC&Rs MUST be on record either with the deed and/or via some form of association rules/regs.

What can happen, is over time, the original "association" simply ceases to function if there are no common grounds that need to be cared for by the collective responsibility of the homeowners in the subdivision. That could even happen where common grounds are voluntarily turned over to the municipal (i.e. city) for ownership and care. If there is no association, the ability to enforce CC&Rs becomes difficult and must be taken on as a neighbor against neighbor effort.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

172. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:34:23 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3dvY7.320002$W8.12148826@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29682

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a0tthh$ta3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0112312235.42fec17b@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20011231140453.27168.00000802@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > > In article
> <y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the
garage
> > > >between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish,
and
> > > >relieve on your flathead.
> > >
> > >
> > OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB block
> > with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing in
> > a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
> > done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter Phase
> > II. Yahoo!
>
> OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

The Amish as I understand it generally are allowed to raise hell in their late teens and the parentage hope to hell they come to their senses and return in one piece to carry on.

A '50 Lincoln was the height of coolth in my early teens followed by a 49 Mercury. One of the latter got into a bumper clanger which did not do any body damage but about 412 pounds of lead fell into the street from the nose-and-deck job. Looked like it been attacked by metal moths and the owner did not look real happy.

A flathead as I recall was about 3.8 liters, the size of my Mopar screaming banshee. Wasn't all that big.

I learned hi-speed driving in an Austin-Healy 100-4 based on a tractor engine as were the 240Z and TRseries. There was an exhaust note that might as well have been wired directly to the old gonads. Understeer right up there with a garbage truck but golly that was fun. One of the oddities of driving in Nebraska is that the section roads often have a jog in them to get lined up with the survey on the next range. I happened to go into a 35 mph corner at something well in excess of that, went into a farm lot with its entry right where an escape route should have been, thru a shed fortunately with both doors open, turned around in his yard, went back thru the shed and on my way and didn't do more than scare a few chickens; almost got me going to church again.

Dick N&#65533;BK

173. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:38:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tvdfkrp1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29683

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c3084d1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com...
> > >
> > > >The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
> > > >other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
> > > >can enjoy:
> > > >- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
> > > >the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
> > >
> > > Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or
> > > wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared
> > > driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10
> > > minute repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing
> > > his spark plugs!!!)
> >
> > While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil, and
> > the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for
> their
> > little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they
> wish--within
> > the law--on it (in my opinion). I don't think a law prohibiting them from
> > doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
> > Note that I said *their* vehicle.

Yet many properties with CC&Rs have exactly that type of
prohibition. One fairly well publicized case a few years back
involved a subdivision with CC&Rs that prohibited parking trucks
in the driveway overnight (cars were OK). When one neighbor
bought a new pick-up truck, the legal conflict that followed
eventually got national media attention.

I have done just about everything you can to a vehicle
in my driveway (including removing and rebilding the
engine) because there are no CC&Rs on my home.

> I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece
> of
> > property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he
> > keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for
> me
> > to have to deal with it. I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
> > think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets the
> > same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far

more
> than one or two CCRs. I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to
contact
> my county authorities about it.

If he is ONLY breaking CC&R rules, the county won't
care. If he is violating county zoning, land use and/or property
maintenance laws, then the county could step in. there
is a difference. CC&Rs are a strictly CIVIL matter between
two private entities (i.e. a homeowner and a homeowner association,
or between two homeowneres) whereas the other is a government
action (i.e. the county) against the individual property
owner.

<SNIP>

> > One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In
> > many localities it requires serious research to discover if they even
exist.
> > While some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not
universal.
>
> CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to find
> them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long
ago
> and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my
> blood to boiling.

CC&Rs are the rules that HOAs enforce. The two generally coexist.
An HOA is created by the developer when the subdivision is built.
In rare cases, a group of existing homeowners could form their
own HOA, but they could NOT force those that didn't want to
join to do so, nor could they impose their rules on homes that
they don't have participation from the homeowner.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

174. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:42:53 UTC
From: john <w9jcm@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <1lvY7.221$94.8407@newsfeed.intelenet.net>
Source record: 29685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

yes and i bet you are falling asleep at the wheel trucker boy
"Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a2cf6f35.0201011732.1f8d82c@posting.google.com...
> len@w8rc.org (Len Nathanson) wrote in message
news:<a9f19d53.0201011412.102851f8@posting.google.com>...
> > dalej2@mac.com wrote in message
news:<dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>...
> > > Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.
> > Guys, there is alawless element out there and nothing in this thread
> > can control it. Let the FCC deal with it and read about the fines
> > given out. Enough said.
> > Len
>
> CBers aren't on 28 mhz. Your eyes are getting heavy. There is no 10
> meter bootlegger problem. You are getting sleepy. Hams should mind
> their own business. You are getting very sleepy. There are no
> truckers on 28.085. You are in a deep deep sleep.....

175. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:44:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0tvud$5ka$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29684

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020101100718.05154.00000741@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3C3182EF.31F8077D@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
> writes:
>
> >If you sign the deed restriction, and you are agreeing to abide by
> >those restrictions when you sign, then you haven't a leg to stand
> >on. Don't sign if you do not want to abide by them.
>
> Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
> signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and
who
> owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at
the
> county seat.

Which is what YOUR attorney should be pointing out
and researching for you...IF s/he is a competent
attorney.

>If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask
> for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
> reference.

True...AND, the real estate agent should also be well aware
of such things. If I were looking for a new home today, I'd
be sure the contract with the real estate agent stated clearly
I MUST be informed of ANY/ALL such CC&Rs or the
deal is off.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

176. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:55:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0u0dfqje1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29686

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c31e20c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011231160312.09102.00000875@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > >
> > > >While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil,
> and
> > > >the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for
> their
> > > >little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they
> wish--within
> > > >the law--on it (in my opinion).
> > >
> > > Then you are against covenants and restrictions, because they are not
laws
> but
> > > contracts.
> > >
>
> Hmmm, I don't know that I am "against" them altogether. I support any
kind
> of sensible expectation. For instance, if a CCR stated that I wasn't
> allowed to keep pigs or chickens (as mine does) and, if I am not planning
on
> keeping pigs or chickens--or if it wouldn't seem reasonable to keep pigs
or
> chickens (middle of town), then I can go along with that. I think that is
> reasonable to expect from people who move into homes in the middle of
town,
> or who move into homes without benefit of a good, long distance between
> them. But, CCRs that restrict such things as fences or fence-types, etc.,
I
> do have a problem with. I think a fence of any type should be able to be
> put up--regardless of how someone else thinks it looks.
>
> > > >
> > > >I don't think a law prohibiting them from
> > > >doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
> > > >Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to
help
> > > >every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.
> > >
> > > So it's OK for a neighbor to make noise, a stink and a mess working on
> their

> > OWN car, but it's not OK for them to spend ten minutes helping out a
> friend or
> > neighbor?
> >
>
> Accidents happen and I think most people are aware of that and can yield.
> However, for a neighbor to plan on having a friend over for the benefit of
> using their driveway and garage to help the friend with repairs? No.

Don't move next to me or any other antique car lover
cause you won't be a happy camper knowing me and
my friends absolutely love working on our cars together.

<SNIP>

> > WHY is it "unfair for you to have to deal with it"? What do you have to
> > "deal with"?
>
> I have to deal with driving past the unsightly mess, the noise he
generates
> at night (running generators for power equipment), and I am certain there
is
> major runoff from his property through mine, of things that shouldn't be
in
> the soil.

1. - One person's mess is anothers beauty..
2. - Noise at night can probably be a noise or nuisance violation (city
or county law)
3. - Runoff, if any, could be environmental...BUT you need
to prove it.

> > How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched th
> > deed to his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living there,
> > his may be just as unrestricted.
>
> No, but I imagine the county will be able to tell me.

You'll probably need to file a complaint. As to CC&Rs, the
county doesn't care, they (the county) don't enforce CC&Rs.
the county enforces laws (land use, ordinances, etc.)

<SNIP>
> Well, that's a good point. To everything there are probably exceptions.
> Actually, Jim, I am not telling him how to live. I am requesting from the
> county that they tell me what the limitations are.

The county will only deal with the law...NOT with CC&R
for you.

> Then, I will either
> choose to live within their definition, or I will ask my neighbor to. I
> have said from the beginning of this that people need to live "within the

> law" on their property.

> > Suppose the county says "We know - he's technically in violation of a
few
> > things. But someone must file a formal complaint before we can take any
> > action". Will you file the complaint?
> >
>
> Heck, probably not. I'll just go down the street and let him know that he
> is violating the laws and expectations of agreements for this area, and
ask
> that he consider that while he makes his noise and dirties up his yard.
> This particular issue is not worth much more than that for me. Now, if he
> started having fires; or, even better: let's say my insurance company
shows
> up and says that because of our proximity to him they are going to have to
> raise our insurance rate. That's a good one. What do I do? I go down
the
> road and ask him if he wants to pay the extra insurance, or if he wants to
> voluntarily keep that from happening, or if he wants a citation from the
> county. I don't plan on moving.
>
> > >>
> > >> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature.
In
> > >many
> > >> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even
exist.
> > >While
> > >> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.
> >
> > >CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to
find
> > >them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented
long
> ago
> > >and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets
my
> > >blood to boiling.
> >
> > Kim, by that statement, you obviously don't know what CC&R or HOA stand
> for.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Why do you say that?

See my comments above and in several other posts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

177. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 03:59:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0u0taptn1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29687

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpa4nx8.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Tue, 1 Jan 2002 10:15:33 -0600, Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >> How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched
> >> the deed to his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living
> >> there, his may be just as unrestricted.
>
> >No, but I imagine the county will be able to tell me.
>
> The county planning and code enforcement folks can tell you "over
> the counter" what the property is zoned for or if there are any
> ordinances regulating the activity but they cannot - and should not
> - tell you if there are any CC&Rs or easements attached.
>
> That info is usually found at the County Recorder's office (which is
> in essence a nig library) but you have to do the reaearch yourself or
> hire someone to do it for you.
>
> Even after you find the information "the county" won't interpret it
> for you nor enforce it for you. You would have to institute a suit
> in court to force compilance with a deed easement or CC&R limitation.
>
> IF you have standing to do so. If not - you're out of luck.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil,
Thanks for underscoring exactly the points I have
also been stating.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

178. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 04:06:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0u10n$g8h$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29688

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:36:15 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >They're not. And, if you don't like the marriage you're in, get a
divorce.
> >If you don't like neighborhoods with whatever CCRs you can't agree with,
> >then don't move in.
>
> That's reasonable....provided they don't weasel something in through
> vague language, or hidden references to another document that you
> never get to see until after you've signed.

The ONLY reason you or anyone else didn't see it (CC&Rs)
before you signed is because you didn't look for it. They are
NOT hidden from anyone that knows enough to (1) ask for
them and (2) demand them of their real estate agent as
well as their title search company.

> >Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
> >environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
> >wishing to be married. It's that simple.
>
> Moving out is a hell of a price to pay for something one was given no
> notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
> new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
> know.

Same comment as above.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

179. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 04:09:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0u17egfa1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29689

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c31e413_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> As Jim said, a CCR is a different animal because it can be stealthy.
> However, in a HOA situation, as I noted above, that *should* be known
about
> prior to move-in. Right? I mean, I've never had to deal with a HOA
> situation, so I don't know--I presume one is knowledgeable of an HOA in a
> neighborhood prior to move-in, aren't they? I have heard folks talking on
> the radio about HOAs being implemented after move-in. That would be
> rough...time to build leadership skills to the hilt on that one, and take
> the lead in a very sublime neighborhood contract--if any at all.

If you live in a home that has no CC&Rs today and their is no
HOA, you can NOT be forced to become a part of an HOA just
because some other residents want to start one. I don't know what
you've heard on the radio, but un;ess your deed expressly allows
for creation of an HOA, then you have nothing to worry about...as
Phil Kane has aptly stated in another post.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

180. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 04:13:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0u1dklfe1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29690

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231080250.03703.00000804@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <a0o75k$70q$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >It is actually totally American as no one is "forced" to move in
> >and accept the CC&Rs. The ability to own a home and
> >be a ham has many options that allow for choice...UNLESS
> >the person absolutely wants to live in a certain subdivision.
> >The choice is yours.
> >
> Sorry, but in many areas that's simply not the case. Often there is NO
choice
> of unrestricted property, particularly where most of the homes have been
built
> in the past 20-30 years.
>
> My current house is over 50 years old and has over a page and a half of
> fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing directly about antennas, though.

And how often, if at all, are the specifics enforced. I bet there
is more than one home in your neighborhood with a garden
shed on a poured foundation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

181. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 04:53:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201012053.3adafe1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > >
> > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more channels.
> > >
> > >
> > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> > >
> > >
> > > Scott
> > >
> > > w3rv
>
> The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
> well-known public urinal.
>
>
Shit. I oughta known.

182. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 04:55:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3292B3.7039EF62@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> That's why the law here allows deadly force if the
> shooter reasonably believes that "the land or property cannot be
> protected or recovered by any other means."

That law gets you off the hook for criminal charges but does
not protect you from a civil lawsuit where you have the burden
of proving your innocence.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

183. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 05:11:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C32969B.55D17274@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >However, if someone has broken into your home, you could
> >rationally justify a fear of bodily injury or death.
>
> You don't have to. That's why the law here allows deadly force if the
> shooter reasonably believes that "the land or property cannot be
> protected or recovered by any other means."

Here's a quote from "The Texas Gun Owner's Guide" by Korwin & Lockwood.

"Some experts feel that use of deadly force in a property crime, which doesn't involve a threat to life or limb, would be difficult or even impossible to defend in court. Shooting an escaping thief in the back creates a risky legal defense. Many of the precedent-setting cases are old and may not reflect the current state of jurisprudence. Some Supreme Court decisions suggest that the use of deadly force in property-only crimes, or to stop a criminal who is fleeing once the crime has ended, may not be justifiable. Civil liability is not necessarily removed by being cleared of criminal charges."

"These and other factors make reliance on this law quite risky and not recommended."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

184. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 05:35:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C328F48.B8370295@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29694

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
> > Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
>
> I tried day trading.

Lose your ASSets?

185. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 06:22:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201012222.1750dd5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29695

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a0tthh$ta3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...

> > >
> > OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB block
> > with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing in
> > a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
> > done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter Phase
> > II. Yahoo!
>
> OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
>
>
YESSSSSS! You were in The Program. Futzing grilles was big.
>
>
However Continental kits were not a very big thing herabouts until the
Chebby gloms made them avaiable as options for the Tri-Fives. Along
with skirts and powerpaks . . .
>
>
Ask a kid today what "skirts" are. Blank look. Pop quiz: What 2002
model car sports skirts?
>
>
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
w3rv

186. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 06:27:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <YKxY7.320243$W8.12166241@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29696

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201012222.1750dd5f@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a0tthh$ta3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
>
> > > >
> > > OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB
block
> > > with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing
in
> > > a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
> > > done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter
Phase
> > > II. Yahoo!
> >
> > OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> > My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> > added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> > kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> > and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
> >
> >
> YESSSSSS! You were in The Program. Futzing grilles was big.
> >
> >
> However Continental kits were not a very big thing herabouts until the
> Chebby gloms made them avaiable as options for the Tri-Fives. Along
> with skirts and powerpaks . . .
> >
> >
> Ask a kid today what "skirts" are. Blank look. Pop quiz: What 2002
> model car sports skirts?
> >
> >
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> w3rv

Damfino but do you remember Cruiser Skirts?

187. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 06:57:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C32AF59.FC1DA46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29697

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
> > >
> > I tried day trading.
>
> Lose your ASSets?

Nope, I made money but being glued to the terminal for six
hours a day is not my cup of tea. Also it is very frustrating
when the DATEK server goes down while I'm trying to sell
and the stock price is tumbling.

I enjoy teaching in the GED program better than day trading.
During slow times, I can access my news server from work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

188. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 11:35:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C32F046.C67E823@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29698

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> >
> > Manure.
>
> It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.

I see--and he used the field for planting trees, then cut up the trees
for logs. Now go back to sleep.

Dave K8MN

189. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 11:41:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C32F187.A8D9AF36@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29699

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C31AF3F.6AC8EA2C@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C30C2CC.15408267@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner
> we
> > > wish
> > > > > it is a certain inalienable right.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't like the pukey green color of your house. I hate those pink
> > > > plastic flamingos along your driveway and your maple leaves blow in my
> > > > yard. Your cheap, plastic lawn furniture is an eyesore. Hey, are you
> > > > going to keep that Winnebago there?
> >
> > > Do you have a point, Dave?
> >
> > Let me suggest once again that you take the time to read what YOU wrote
> > and THEN read what I wrote. It may save us both a lot of time.
> >
> > If a neighbor objects to an antenna or supporting structure, that is
> > pretty much too bad. I may not like the neighbor's paint, lawn
> > furniture, landscaping, Winnebago or decorative items. He did not
> > obtain them for my enjoyment. I certainly don't put up an antenna or
> > refrain from doing so for the neighbor's convenience.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I *think* the debate here is for people who *cannot* put up antennas or
> refrain from doing so, Dave.

Look out, Kim! That was a low-flying concept that just went over your
head.

Dave K8MN

190. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 11:48:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C32F332.D5A5DD67@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29700

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > >
> > > Manure.
> >
> > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!

...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.

Dave K8MN
```

191. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 12:27:39 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C32FCA8.A165CC4C@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

What's even funnier is that you responded to a forge.

I don't post from google, and I won't start a message cross-posted.
Notice my IP address and organization. Now that you know what a
genuine message from me looks like, you can ignore the ones that aren't.

john wrote:
>
> yes and i bet you are falling asleep at the wheel trucker boy
> "Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:a2cf6f35.0201011732.1f8d82c@posting.google.com...
> > len@w8rc.org (Len Nathanson) wrote in message
> news:<a9f19d53.0201011412.102851f8@posting.google.com>...
> > > dalej2@mac.com wrote in message
> news:<dalej2-9B1222.12350001012002@zeus.rdc-kc.rr.com>...
> > > > Lets make em all hams then they'll have to play by our rules.
> > > Guys, there is alawless element out there and nothing in this thread
> > > can control it. Let the FCC deal with it and read about the fines
> > > given out. Enough said.
> > > Len
> >
> > CBers aren't on 28 mhz. Your eyes are getting heavy. There is no 10
> > meter bootlegger problem. You are getting sleepy. Hams should mind
> > their own business. You are getting very sleepy. There are no
> > truckers on 28.085. You are in a deep deep sleep.........

192. Re: Roger Wiseman's ISP and Employer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 13:03:42 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0v55pojr0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29707
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.flamenet,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Wimpy Twatty" <Wogey@LittleGnomeBoy.com> wrote in message
news:a0tu1v$c83$0@pita.alt.net...

Poor gimpy dwarf thing......from your picture, you look like you have quite
the Heinz 57 background. Does your crack 'ho mommy even know which john is
your father?

> "Bill Wallace" <billwallace2002a@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:4ee80222.0201010228.18a31b99@posting.google.com...
> > Many of you may recall that Roger Wiseman used to use the email
> > address crow@ovnet.com. Doing a thorough search of his past postings
> > indicates that he has used that email address for quite some time.
> > Doing a domain search on ovnet.com indicates that ovnet.com is
> > registered to American Heuristics Corporation in Triadelphia, WV.
> > Triadelphia, WV happens to be a nearby town close to Wheeling, WV.
> > What concerned parties may do is to give the good folks a call at
> > American Heuristics Corporation a phone call and ask if Wiseman is an
> > employee. Also, you may want to talk to him directly if he happens to
> > be still employed there. That or perhaps talk to the human resources
> > director regarding inappropriate usage of computing resources. The
> > contact information is below. Also, it is probable that KC8JBO/Roger
> > Wiseman is currently using internet access via ovis.net or
> > mountain.net. In the past Wiseman has used ovis.net however his
> > alleged work postings come via access from mountain.net.
> >
> > American Heuristics Corporation
> > RD 1 Box 500
> > Two Millennium Centre
> > Triadelphia, WV 26059
> > 304-547-4201 (voice)
> > 304-547-4203 (fax)
> >
> > Ovnet.com traces back to IP address 198.77.25.33 as well as the
> > following information
> >
> > American Heuristics Corporation
> > 2 Millennium Centre
> > Triadelphia, WV 26059
> > US
> >
> > Domain Name: OVNET.COM
> >
> > Administrative Contact:

> > Network Admin MountainNet sysadmin@MOUNTAIN.NET
> > NewNet, LLC DBA MountainNet
> > 2816 Cranberry Square
> > Morgantown, WV 26508-9289
> > US
> > Phone- 304-594-9075
> > Fax- 304-594-9088
> > Technical Contact:
> > Network Admin MountainNet sysadmin@MOUNTAIN.NET
> > NewNet, LLC DBA MountainNet
> > 2816 Cranberry Square
> > Morgantown, WV 26508-9289
> > US
> > Phone- 304-594-9075
> > Fax- 304-594-9088
> >
> > Record updated on 2001-07-15 18:31:15.
> > Record created on 1994-08-31.
> > Record expires on 2002-08-30.
> > Database last updated on 2001-12-31 20:32:25 EST.
> >
> > Also, you may contact the good people at ovis.net including Anthony
> > Lemons. Registrant:
> > Ohio Valley Internet Service
> > 1816 7th Street
> > Moundsville, WV 26041
> > US
> >
> > Domain Name: OVIS.NET
> >
> > Sponsoring Reseller; for Technical Support
> > with respect to this domain contact:
> > Ohio Valley Internet Service, alemons@ovis.net
> > 304-843-5090
> >
> > Administrative Contact:
> > Lemons, Anthony alemons@ovis.net
> > 1816 7th Street
> > Moundsville, WV 26041
> > US
> > 304-843-5090
> >
> > Technical Contact:
> > Lemons, Anthony alemons@ovis.net
> > 1816 7th Street
> > Moundsville, WV 26041
> > US
> > 304-843-5090
> >
> > Billing Contact:

> > Lemons, Anthony alemons@ovis.net
> > 1816 7th Street
> > Moundsville, WV 26041
> > US
> > 304-843-5090
> >
> >
> > Record last updated on 10-Dec-2001.
> > Record expires on 05-Apr-2002.
> > Record Created on 04-Apr-1997.
> >
> > Domain servers in listed order:
> > NS1.OVIS.NET 207.0.147.2
> > NS3.CW.NET 204.70.25.234
>
> That little pointy-headed Gnome

While the bald-headed , oblong craniumed nutsack slurper Llllardasssssss Llllloyd is prepearing for a night of nuytsack slurping and burglaries.

>KC8JBO, Roger Wiseman,
> has gone to bed finally. Anyone else notice the way he posts
> at 8 a.m., then his final posts are at 5 p.m. ?

Anyone notice how this ANONYMOUS COWARD posts late at niught? Must be because he's a homosexual that detests women and is a member of the band of the hand.

193. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 13:06:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020102080653.01446.00000836@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29704

In article <3c3273ff_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
>> >> which are far more popular?
>> >
>> >Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
>> >voice privileges as well ...
>>
>> But you proposed giving them ONLY "modern digital modes" (without
>specifying
>> which modes fit that description". No mention of analog voice modes
>at all.
>
>I was referring to your proposal to give them CW privs ...
>IN THE LOWER PARTS OF THE HF BANDS ... I asked
>"Why not allow them modern digital modes as well (in those
>sub-bands)?"

I don't recall you writing "(in those subbands)", just the part about "modern
digital modes". With no specification as to what those modes are.

> THEN I observed that there also isn't a logical,
>valid reason (other than S25.5, which will go away in 2003)
>to not give them voice privs as well ...)

Only AFTER I specifically asked about such voice modes.

>of the entry class license would be much wider.

Have you seen the ideas for "Basic/Intermediate/Full" licenses, posted in this
thread at least twice?

It is interesting to note that your signature line about NCI talks about the
future and survival of amateur radio in the 21st century, yet I see no
comprehensive plan for what US ham radio licensing should be like in a
post-S25.5 era. I've seen a few general comments with a heavy bias against what
hams actually do today ("No setasides for legacy modes!" "50 year old SSB
technology") but a detailed plan? Nope. Zip. Nada.

If S25.5 is gonna disappear in less than 2 years, the time to think about what
will happen afterwards is now. What's needed is a detailed plan that will get
widespread support from hams and which doesn't cost the FCC too much work, yet
sets the stage for the growth and future of the ARS. The UK is doing it - but I
don't agree with some of their ideas. Without a plan, folks like N0MHS and W5YI

may get their way and we'll have a US version of the "Foundation" license.
>
>> Your statements about "modern digital modes" seems aimed at
>"encouraging" (or,
>> more accurately, arm-twisting) people to use those modes by limiting
>the
>> majority of their HF frequency privileges to those modes.
>
>I didn't suggest "limiting the majority of their HF frequency
>privileges
>to those (digital) modes" ...

Yes, you did. That would be the effect if you don't include voice modes. You only talked about analog voice modes after I asked about them.

>I merely observed that ALL you had
>proposed to give them were expanded CW sub-bands

Not me. Mr. Plourde, Mr. Speroni and some others. I expanded on the idea.

>when the
>majority don't WANT to use CW.

How do you know that? Have you interviewed them in an unbiased way?

If one looks at actual mode usage by amateurs, the majority don't want to use "modern digital modes", either. They want analog voice (FM, SSB). In a "free market of modes", FM dominates VHF/UHF and SSB dominates HF/MF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

194. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 13:06:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020102080653.01446.00000837@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29705

In article <a0u1dklfe1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote:)

>> My current house is over 50 years old and has over a page and a half of
>> fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing directly about antennas, though.
>
>And how often, if at all, are the specifics enforced.

I don't see a single violation in my neighborhood. I looked closely, too,
because if they existed they'd be a big help if I ever wanted out of a
restriction.

>I bet there
>is more than one home in your neighborhood with a garden
>shed on a poured foundation.
>
Nope. Not one. Zip. Zero.

People put pressure-treated timbers on the ground, then put the garden shed on
that. It's not "permanent" and therefore not a "foundation" and the shed is
therefore not a "structure". Radio and TV antennas attached to the house and
trees are OK if they can be removed, the house restored to its previous
condition, and if they do not have their own "foundations". Thus no
freestanding towers but the house can look like a porcupine.

73 de Jim, N2EY

195. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 13:06:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020102080654.01446.00000838@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29703

In article <C1380CF94534E8B9.D4F56C927F46E1F4.9BF10C5AD20B7C79@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>>news:0CD5F544EA52D1DF.19CF76EE8DC99D1B.E890938D84266AE7@lp.airnews.net...
>>> >Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the
>>> >environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer
>>> >wishing to be married. It's that simple.
>>>
>>> Moving out is a

[very high]

>>> price to pay for something one was given no
>>> notice of prior to moving in. Finding, financing, and moving into a
>>> new house isn't like buying a different brand of toilet paper, you
>>> know.
>>
>>Neither is a divorce. That's why that comparison was made.
>
>Divorces can be had fairly cheaply and easily if both parties can
>agree on ownership of common property.
>
In some states, yes. The same is true of CC&Rs - if all parties involved agree
on how to change them, it's often no big deal. How often do ya think THAT
happens?

But if one party doesn't agree, it can turn into a long and costly legal
battle. There may not be much joint property left to distribute.

Point is, most Christians get married "til death us do part", so for them
getting a divorce involves getting the state to preempt provisions of a private
contract. Getting out of an anti-antenna CC&R restriction is asking the FCC
(the feds) to preempt provisions of a private contract. Same thing in different
clothing. And there are precedents for both situations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

196. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 13:07:13 UTC
From: smoolb@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020102080713.01446.00000839@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29702

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6n9c.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 01 Jan 2002 15:07:18 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not >>signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and who >>owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at the >>county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to ask >>for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by >>reference.
>
> If they are incorporated by reference they are legally part of the
> deed.

Of course. But the buyer may not get a copy of the referenced document unless specifically asked for. Or they may not get a copy until closing. How many people are going to walk away from a closing because of a CC&R discovered at the last minute?

> Same thing with contracts and wills that incorporate "external"
> documents by reference.
>
Yup.

Point is ya gotta read everything twice and also retain the services of a competent real estate attorney.

Here in the PA area, local station WWDB used to be all talk. One of the rare high points of that swamp was a show by one Russ Miller, devoted entirely to real-estate subjects from minor repairs and maintenance to legal matters like these. Properly disclaimered, of course. But very useful.

73 de Jim, N2EY

197. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 14:14:56 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lr563u00ihhruloipouo56bnnnar7gvo5v@4ax.com>
Source record: 29706

On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 01:02:37 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
<j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Absolutely legal. As long as the control operator is present, someone else
>can have at it. I believe you could do the calling - just as long as the
>control operator (licensed) is present. Interestingly enough, a codeless
>tech can apparently use a 10 meter port on linked repeaters. We have such a
>system here in Rochester, NY, and I've yakked with Australia with it. A lot
>of DX comes in at times. The codeless tech is responsible for his signal
>(say at 2 meters - I use one of the 440 ports myself, but there are ports on
>6 meters, 2 meters, 220, and 440 as well as the 10 meter port). The control
>operator of the repeater system (including the 10 meter port) is responsible
>for the signal at 10 meters (where the codeless tech can't operate
>directly).
>
>73 from Rochester, NY

While you are correct in that a Technician operator can legally use
the remote base feature of a VHF repeater to utilize HF operations,
technically, there must be a control operator on duty for the 2 meter
repeater - someone who is responsible for ensuring that the repeater's
remote base operation is done in adherance with the class of the
repeater's licensee - or that of the control operator. It can get
pretty complicated... Suffice it to say that there has to be someone
available who is capable of "pulling the plug" (even if done remotely)
whenever the remote base feature is turned on. Of course, technically
there must be a control operator available on all repeaters at all
times the repeater is available, but we know THAT doesn't always turn
out to be the case...

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

198. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 14:15:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0v4is0tsj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29708

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a0tvdfkrp1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> Yet many properties with CC&Rs have exactly that type of
> prohibition. One fairly well publicized case a few years back
> involved a subdivision with CC&Rs that prohibited parking trucks
> in the driveway overnight (cars were OK). When one neighbor
> bought a new pick-up truck, the legal conflict that followed
> eventually got national media attention.

I remember this incident. It was in the Chicago area, and the guy had
something like 20 citations that he wasn't going to pay. How did things
finally turn out?

199. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 14:23:52 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0v52o0vau@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29710

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020102080653.01446.00000837@mb-cs.aol.com...
> People put pressure-treated timbers on the ground, then put the garden
shed on
> that. It's not "permanent" and therefore not a "foundation" and the shed
is
> therefore not a "structure". Radio and TV antennas attached to the house
and
> trees are OK if they can be removed, the house restored to its previous
> condition, and if they do not have their own "foundations". Thus no
> freestanding towers but the house can look like a porcupine.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That reminds me of a ham who had his shack in his attic. He had a hole in the roof through which a mast went. He had a steering wheel mounted on the bottom of the mast with which he pointed his beam. I don't know how he prevented leaks when it rained.

200. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 14:37:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C331B45.3ABB851F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29709

SMOOLB wrote:
> How many
> people are going to walk away from a closing because of a CC&R discovered at
> the last minute?

One, for sure.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

201. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 15:11:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C33233C.DA0B1353@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29711

Krell wrote:
> That reminds me of a ham who had his shack in his attic. He had a hole in
> the roof through which a mast went. He had a steering wheel mounted on the
> bottom of the mast with which he pointed his beam. I don't know how he
> prevented leaks when it rained.

Maybe he just lived in Phoenix. :-) I once saw a similar installation.
A waterproof external sleeve attached to the mast and fitted over an
internal sleeve that went through the roof and was waterproofed at
the roof interface.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

202. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 15:28:47 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net>
Message-ID: <3C33272F.F8A100F5@blackhole.net>
Source record: 29712

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
> news:3C31EB64.96435651@blackhole.net...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > >
> > > "John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C309F4C.284AE08C@blackhole.net...
> > > >
> > > > Last night (12-30-2001), I heard a radio station, WWCR, on
> 52.040,050
> > > > MHz. It was fairly clear, and at first I was delighted, as it's the
> > > > first thing I've ever heard on 6 meters on my 756pro. (I live in a
> > > > valley and have only a single 120 foot dipole as an antenna, tuned
> by an
> > > > AH4 automatic tuner).
> > > > The signal seemed to really be on that frequency, because retuning
> the
> > > > antenna tuner to other bands diminished the signal strength. The
> > > > material being broadcast was information about short-wave listening-
> a
> > > > rebroadcast of 'Popular Communications' and some Voice of America
> > > > short-wave reports.
> > > > I consulted the web and found out that WWCR is a religious
> broadcaster
> > > > located in Tennessee ( I live in Imperial, MO, just south of St.
> Louis.)
> > > > They had a list of times and frequencies, and I listened at all of
> them
> > > > to see if I found the same material. Most of the frequencies had
> > > > religious propaganda on them, but one, 3.210 MHz, had a duplicate of
> > > > what I heard on 6 meters. I notice that 52.040050 isn't an exact
> > > > multiple of 3.210. It is close to an exact multiple of one of their
> > > > other frequencies- 7.435 MHz * 6.999334... = 52.04... but that
> frequency
> > > > had the religious propaganda- not the same program as that appearing
> on
> > > > 6 meters.
> > > > Has anyone an idea about how a signal at 3.210 could get translated
> up
> > > > to 6 meters with no appearance of other modulation?
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > john
```

> > >
> > > Sounds like a receiver spur to me. Or some kind of product from your
> six
> > > meter receiver being blasted by Channel 2 pix carrier at 55.25. Don't
> > > know where 2 is these days physically and Imperial covers a multitude
> of
> > > sins as well as geography but 55.25 less 52+ comes out to 3.21 or so.
> >
> > That makes sense. Thanks.
> >
> > > Say hi to any remaining buzzards on 25/85 for me.
> >
> > How did you come up with those numbers?
> >
> > --
> > john
>
> Kind of assumed you might be an Amateur. Two meter repeaters are on 600
> kHz separation so it is shorthand for 146.25 in, 146.85 out. This is
> Suburban Radio Club's machine where I hung my hat in my St. Louis days. I
> lived off Telegraph Rd south of 255 so I know about the Great Reavis
> Barracks Road r.f. site. For some reason, Channel 2 always was a pain in
> the drain.

I am, but only since February of... last year, and I don't have any
two-meter equipment. I thought you were referring to other spurs from
channel two. What is the G.R.B.R. rf site?
I've heard that interference again, and I think you must be right about
channel two. It's not real clear, but there's a sort of undercurrent of
buzzing that could be picture modulation. When I throw in 6db of
attenuation, it cuts the spur out completely.

--
john

203. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 17:34:08 UTC
From: Howard Johnson <hjohnson5700@home.net>
Message-ID: <q2h63ukuu88krasgd49ot2cdle93cfpkfm@4ax.com>
Source record: 29713

Thanks for all the replies. I just wanted to make sure to prepare for
the right tests and not get caught with any surprises on test day.

- Howard

On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 16:07:05 GMT, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote:

>On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 15:18:54 -0600, Howard Johnson
><hjohnson5700@home.net> wrote:
>
>>I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
>>for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
>>(next testing period that I can attend).
>>
>>My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
>>first then a General written or just the General?
>>
>>==
>>
>>Yours truly,
>>
>>Howard Johnson
>>
>>*** Spam Filter in place... change 5700 to 57 for correct reply address! ***
>>
>>==
>
>To get the General license, you have to pass both the Technician and
>General written exams as well as the 5 WPM CW test. You'll be
>expected to pass the Technician written exam BEFORE you are allowed to
>take the General written exam...
>
>
>Raymond Sirois AB2HR
>SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
>607-733-5745
>telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

==

Yours truly,

Howard Johnson

*** Spam Filter in place... change 5700 to 57 for correct reply address! ***

==

204. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 18:01:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201021001.62ac51eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29714

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<41C2283D7D7B90BF.164F1AB31ADFFA70.C384A5752A49ACCE@lp.airnews.net>...
> On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 23:15:53 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> >>Then fix it right the first time.
> >
> > Always do - then something else goes wrong.
>
> Fixing it right also means looking around for other possible problems
> that the current issue might indicate.

Agreed - but most people's resources are not infinite.
>
> There are five basic systems in most houses; electrical, phone,
> water/sewage, foundation and structure. (Structure and foundation
> being somewhat linked, of course. Depending on the house, there may
> be other systems as well.)

Most houses have HVAC, too.

> If you find a problem somewhere in a
> system, you should look at the entire system, and repair or replace as
> needed to prevent further problems. If an outlet catches fire, you
> should start at the service entrance, and check all the wiring, not
> just replace the old worn out wiring to that outlet.

Nice idea, particularly if you have an actual fire. But in many cases
that's not what happens - the problems are more on the order of "fuse
blows when you run the coffee perc and the toaster oven at the same
time".

> If your doors
> don't close right, you should look at the entire structure to
> determine if you need to replace a joist or two, or if the foundation
> is settling and should be shored up.

Priorities, my friend, priorities.

> Restore a house the way you would restore a 1965 Stingray, and you'll
> save yourself a lot of effort in the long run.

Ah - but would you try to use the '65 'Ray for your ONLY car while
restoring it?Or would you have another car for the practical stuff and
fix up the classic
as a second car?

I agree that the ideal way to deal with an older home is to do the "This Old House/Hometime" treatment, where you simply do what needs to be done all at once. A guy up the street from me is doing just that - he bought the last beat-up house in the neighborhood and is fixing it up. It'll be great when he's done.

Trouble is, the fixer-upper has to have the time and resources in big chunks, AND often has to live somewhere else while the job is going on. That's a LOT of resources all at once.

Add to this two-career families and kids and pretty soon it's a no-go for most folks. The "little boxes made of ticky-tacky" are popular for just this sort of reason.

Even after the work is done, the maintenance issues remain unless you do major upgrades. Older houses tended to have lots of woodwork inside and out, which means lots of painting and repainting. Plaster/lath walls are more of a headache than drywall, etc.

End result is that older homes, if they even exist in the area, are not always a realistic solution. I lived in a 1923 house for 20-1/2 years and grew up in an even older one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

205. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 18:40:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C33473C.A8281E7A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29715

```
Dave Heil wrote:

> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > >
> > > > Manure.
> > >
> > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
>
> ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
>

Do as I did and dump her into Bozoflushmode and just pull the handle...
```

206. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 19:18:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C335CE3.DC052798@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29716

Krell wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020102080653.01446.00000837@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > People put pressure-treated timbers on the ground, then put the garden
> shed on
> > that. It's not "permanent" and therefore not a "foundation" and the shed
> is
> > therefore not a "structure". Radio and TV antennas attached to the house
> and
> > trees are OK if they can be removed, the house restored to its previous
> > condition, and if they do not have their own "foundations". Thus no
> > freestanding towers but the house can look like a porcupine.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> That reminds me of a ham who had his shack in his attic. He had a hole in
> the roof through which a mast went. He had a steering wheel mounted on the
> bottom of the mast with which he pointed his beam. I don't know how he
> prevented leaks when it rained.

Harry Habig K8ANV (SK) of Cincinnati was the inventor of the delta loop antenna. Harry lived in the same house on Beldare Avenue where he was born early in the century. He cut a hole in the roof and had a three inch mast running through it. On top was a 20m three element delta loop. The attic end was rigged to a geared down washing machine motor. The whole shebang turned about two r.p.m. The entire house seemed to shudder when it stopped. Harry had a built up block on the roof side with a bearing mounted on it. The outdoor side had the rubber end of a common toilet plunger as a rain boot.

Modern ops often use the a CV joint boot from a front wheel drive automobile as a weather boot.

Dave K8MN

207. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 19:25:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C335E72.4EDDB0CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29717

N2EY wrote:

> I agree that the ideal way to deal with an older home is to do the
> "This Old House/Hometime" treatment, where you simply do what needs to
> be done all at once. A guy up the street from me is doing just that -
> he bought the last beat-up house in the neighborhood and is fixing it
> up. It'll be great when he's done.
>
> Trouble is, the fixer-upper has to have the time and resources in big
> chunks, AND often has to live somewhere else while the job is going
> on. That's a LOT of resources all at once.
>
> Add to this two-career families and kids and pretty soon it's a no-go
> for most folks. The "little boxes made of ticky-tacky" are popular for
> just this sort of reason.
>
> Even after the work is done, the maintenance issues remain unless you
> do major upgrades. Older houses tended to have lots of woodwork inside
> and out, which means lots of painting and repainting. Plaster/lath
> walls are more of a headache than drywall, etc.
>
> End result is that older homes, if they even exist in the area, are
> not always a realistic solution. I lived in a 1923 house for 20-1/2
> years and grew up in an even older one.

We dedicated almost all of our vacation time over eight years to working on this place. The main part of the house is a log cabin blacksmith shop from the mid-1840s. The big addition wasn't put on until 1976. You should have seen the heating/cooling contractor who was installing the furnace and central air when he found that he'd have to go through a log wall to access the kitchen. He really did not want to fit that piece of ducting. My neighbor came up the hill with some long drill bits, a Sawzall and a small electric chain saw. We had the opening for the ductwork cut in about ten minutes.

I love the place *now*. If I had it all to do again, I'd not have bought a house which I would have to rebuild myself. The antenna farm is, however, worth it.

Dave K8MN

208. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 19:30:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C335FC2.EEFF37EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29718

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > >
> > > > > Manure.
> > > >
> > > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> > > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> > > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
> >
> > ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
> >
>
> Do as I did and dump her into Bozoflushmode and just pull the handle...

I can't leave now, Dick. I want to find out how this serial with the
let-them-go-mobile and QRP apartment ops trouncing the big guns turns
out. It is starting to remind me of the guy I met at a local club
meeting who was a self-described DXer. He regaled me with tales of his
Antron antenna at thirty some feet and his Magnum 250 amp--a 250 watter
which *he had modified* to run 1500w output. I'm guessing the
modifications required an outboard chassis bigger than the orginal amp.

Dave K8MN
```

209. Re: K5BLB was on 14.313!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 19:59:22 UTC
From: kaptan ghoul <aardvark@uemi.edu>
Message-ID: <uEJY7.16347$yi.1672572@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29719
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Firebottle" <Herbie@KV4FZliveson.net> wrote in message news:a0vlns$693$0@pita.alt.net...
> "The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
> <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:6e7463c441e8a5d951ad602ae5fa286a@spamfreenews.com...
> > I swear to God he was on 14.313 just now!
> >
>
> Hell, the whole dam BARF/SJ crowd is back in form on
> 14313 & 3894.5 Big Al is back on 3894.5 drinking it up and
> screaming for people to rock 'n roll. Once all of Al's idiots show
> up, all they can talk about is Porkbutt! It shows you how limited
> they are in intelligence, Porkbutt hasn't even been on the air for
> two years.

Yup! Yup! Yup!!

I think ole KA4MUJ (sk) was right when he said these people had "a disease".
Can't get it out of their system. It's all they LIVE FOR which means we have much
more radio fun to look forward to. I still miss the Mike and Judy show however.
When Raincoat Charlie would get in there and talk about "4x D-Cell vibrators"
and such, it was like live comedy theater you'd pay $35.00 a seat for downtown
right out of your speaker for free. It can only get better in 2002. When NR5T and
EVE get in there it's a 3-ring RF circus. So all you SWL's get tune in to 14.313 USB
for some daytime and weekend radio fun.

210. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 20:03:49 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201022003330.6970-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29720

On Tue, 1 Jan 2002, WebDoc REACT Unit #602 wrote:
>from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can talk
>on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the radio.
>Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns it
>over to the unlicensed person?
>The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang with
>him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.

The licensed person does NOT "turn it over" to the unlicensed person. The
licensee must remain in control. This is called "third-party traffic."

211. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 20:09:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201022006340.6970-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29721

On Wed, 2 Jan 2002, AB2HR wrote:
>On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 01:02:37 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
><j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>>Absolutely legal. As long as the control operator is present, someone else
>>can have at it. I believe you could do the calling - just as long as the
>>control operator (licensed) is present. Interestingly enough, a codeless
>>tech can apparently use a 10 meter port on linked repeaters. We have such a
>>system here in Rochester, NY, and I've yakked with Australia with it. A lot
>>of DX comes in at times. The codeless tech is responsible for his signal
>>(say at 2 meters - I use one of the 440 ports myself, but there are ports on
>>6 meters, 2 meters, 220, and 440 as well as the 10 meter port). The control
>>operator of the repeater system (including the 10 meter port) is responsible
>>for the signal at 10 meters (where the codeless tech can't operate
>>directly).
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>
>While you are correct in that a Technician operator can legally use
>the remote base feature of a VHF repeater to utilize HF operations,
>technically, there must be a control operator on duty for the 2 meter
>repeater - someone who is responsible for ensuring that the repeater's
>remote base operation is done in adherance with the class of the
>repeater's licensee - or that of the control operator. It can get
>pretty complicated... Suffice it to say that there has to be someone
>available who is capable of "pulling the plug" (even if done remotely)
>whenever the remote base feature is turned on. Of course, technically
>there must be a control operator available on all repeaters at all
>times the repeater is available, but we know THAT doesn't always turn
>out to be the case...

Not quite: Correct that in addition to the no-code technician licensee coming into the repeater/remote base on VHF that there must be a control operator for the repeater itself, you are incorrect that the reason for the control operator is to ensure operation with the repeater trustee's license class privileges. It's the CONTROL OPERATOR's privileges that are in use, not the trustee's. The no-coder is effectively a "third party" on the control op's license on the HF side of the transmission. The repeater trustee's license class is not relevant here.

212. Re: Open Letter to Mr. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 20:35:36 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C336F18.73EF2DDC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29722

Mr. Hollingsworth's Reply:

> I'm not handling this case.
> It's in the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
> and the order was on the FCC web site.

So it wasn't his call.
I've asked to whome I should address the question.

D.S.

213. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:20:00 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <526e11ea9a85e40d54dab9159628b2ea.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29723

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote

> I know of at least two hams who lived in an area that had antenna
> restrictions. A dipole in the attic is all one used to get his WAS. It took
> a couple of years, but he did it.

A *couple of years* to work WAS??????????

I think that just reinforces how idiotic this FCC ruling is.

On a November Saturday this last fall, I worked WAS and all
Canadian provinces in less than 6 hours. And that would
not be considered a "great feat" among most big station
owners. I'm a "Joe Tribander and wires" on a city lot.
A "big gun" station would likely have done it in half that
time.

A *couple of years*?????? What more evidence do we need that
CC&R-crippled federally licensed Amateur Radio Service stations
need some federal protection -- at least as much as TV-watching-
couch-potatoes already enjoy from the FCC.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

214. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:32:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C337C52.7321FE15@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott Unich-69 wrote:

>
>
> I am dead serious about this, I want to know too. The ham in the CB
> newsgroup are always telling us not to try power on FRS. I think they
> are jealous of what we have achieved on CB! Clipped limiters! Echo
> mikes! VFOs to slide onto ham freqs! 60 KW mobiles! I bet we can do
> the same or better with FRS given a bit of time.

Troll. You suckered me once (as someone pointed out).
At the risk of being suckered again:
Anyway, if you know how to do this stuff, you can
study to pass the ham writtens. Clipped limiters are not
a feature with SSB or AM, but work fine for FM after
filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.

215. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:33:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C337C94.C7450A45@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What and miss the fun of getting into flame wars? :-)

\"Landshark\" wrote:

> File him now, don't delay. Your
> newsreader and you will be a lot happier in
> the long run.
>
> Landshark
>
> --
> Please note that any post that is from
> S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
> is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
> be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
> been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
> time now. If you want to send a complaint,
> forward each message complete with headers
> to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
> groups-abuse@google.com
> Beware of George WA3MO^
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:7euY7.209474$WW.12205012@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Yep, and he sure is getting real active. Almost time to send him to the
> > recycle bin.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > > > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> > > news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more
> channels.

> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses and
> > > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> > > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz bands.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Scott
> > > > >
> > > > w3rv
> > >
> > > The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
> > > well-known public urinal.
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

216. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:57:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201021357.7cea7ded@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29726

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>...

> Top 10 Users RRAP SEP 2001

Hans,

Is that by number of posts or total bytes posted?

73 de Jim, N2EY

217. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:57:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C33825F.17CDB058@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29727

Suppose I put a diplexer (that the right term for a passive circuit
that routes different segments of the spectra to different devices)
so a TV set gets fed the VHF spectra, and an HF rig gets
1.8 to 30MHz. Thus the TV antenna *is* a TV antenna, but
also has a secondary use. Of course the diplexer will have to
keep the HF linear out of the TV tuner....

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:17:43 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >> HOWEVER, it does not cover TV-type antennas used for any other
> >> purpose, such as "stealth" amateur radio transmitting antennas. The
> >> FCC has already closed that loophole.
> >>
> >How would they ever know?
>
> We went through this before.....
>
> If they have a real hardcore and deep pocket to get you, they can
> hire a radio engineering srrvice with df capability to prove that
> the radio signals were coming from that antenna. The FCC will not
> go to bat for you in that case.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

218. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 21:59:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpbi9zi.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29728

On Wed, 2 Jan 2002 09:15:27 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> Yet many properties with CC&Rs have exactly that type of
>> prohibition. One fairly well publicized case a few years back
>> involved a subdivision with CC&Rs that prohibited parking trucks
>> in the driveway overnight (cars were OK). When one neighbor
>> bought a new pick-up truck, the legal conflict that followed
>> eventually got national media attention.
>
>I remember this incident. It was in the Chicago area, and the guy had
>something like 20 citations that he wasn't going to pay. How did things
>finally turn out?

There was a case in San Diego, CA about a half dozen years ago or
so where the CC&Rs prohibited parking "trucks" in the condo garage,
and the court held that the fairly-new pick-up with a good-looking
camper shell, no advertising, and with passenger vehicle license
plates, used as a family vehicle, was not what was intended to be
prohibited by the term "truck".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

219. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 22:06:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C338449.11BE1617@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29729

>
>
> I am, but only since February of... last year, and I don't have any
> two-meter equipment. I thought you were referring to other spurs from
> channel two. What is the G.R.B.R. rf site?
> I've heard that interference again, and I think you must be right about
> channel two. It's not real clear, but there's a sort of undercurrent of
> buzzing that could be picture modulation. When I throw in 6db of
> attenuation, it cuts the spur out completely.
>

That might indicate that the spur is happening in the front end
of your radio. A trap at channel 2's video carrier in the antenna feedline
should then help. Doesn't have to be a deep trap, 6dB ought to do it.

220. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 22:25:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3388C2.4DA2F7B1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29730

N2EY wrote:
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>...
>
> > Top 10 Users RRAP SEP 2001
>
> Is that by number of posts or total bytes posted?

Good point. I don't use as many bytes as you. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

221. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 22:31:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7TLY7.210586$WW.12302010@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29731

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201021357.7cea7ded@posting.google.com...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>...
>
> > Top 10 Users RRAP SEP 2001
>
> Hans,
>
> Is that by number of posts or total bytes posted?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, you bucking for number one???

222. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 22:39:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C338C1F.341F47C7@uci.edu>
Source record: 29732

CAM wrote:
> I drove a pickup with 200,000
> miles on it so I could possess those two acres.

Well, that, and cash-in some stock options. ;-)

223. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 22:49:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C338E7B.1A7590C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29733

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I drove a pickup with 200,000
> > miles on it so I could possess those two acres.
>
> Well, that, and cash-in some stock options. ;-)

Actually, I bought the two acres before any of my options
matured.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

224. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:07:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpbtyeq.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29734

On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 16:57:51 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>Suppose I put a diplexer (that the right term for a passive circuit
>that routes different segments of the spectra to different devices)
>so a TV set gets fed the VHF spectra, and an HF rig gets
>1.8 to 30MHz. Thus the TV antenna *is* a TV antenna, but
>also has a secondary use. Of course the diplexer will have to
>keep the HF linear out of the TV tuner....

Using it for a non-protected purpose will negate the preemption even
if simultaneously used for a protected purpose. That question came
up in connection with an interactive video system where the set-top
box sends signals back to the program source.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

225. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpbubxr.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29735

On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 09:28:47 -0600, John O'Flaherty wrote:

>I've heard that interference again, and I think you must be right about
>channel two. It's not real clear, but there's a sort of undercurrent of
>buzzing that could be picture modulation. When I throw in 6db of
>attenuation, it cuts the spur out completely.

Conclusive evidence that the mixing is in your front end, not a
transmitter spur.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Retired IX Chaser

226. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:12:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c339529_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29736

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpaaryf.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 19:49:09 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>
> >>You never lived in an older (pre WW2) house, didja, Joe? Most of them
were
> >>designed back when labor was cheap. They tend to need lots of painting
and
> >>other time-consuming maintenance. Doing even minor jobs becomes a big
deal
> >>because nothing in them is predictable or standard. Often you find
serious code
> >>violations and unsafe conditions that have to be fixed NOW. Supplies for
old
> >>houses are often made of unobtanium.
> >
> >Actually, I did. It's like owning an old car; you don't just change
> >out the part that happens to be broken at the moment, you go over it
> >with a fine-tooth comb and find all the problems. If you replace all
> >the wiring in one shot, it's a hell of a lot cheaper than doing one
> >outlet at a time. Same goes for plumbing, floor joists, roofing, and
> >doors. You don't just sit around waiting for something to break, you
> >overhaul the whole system as soon as you find a problem.
>
> And who replaces the green stuff that seems to hemorrhage from your
> savings with no end in sight?
>
> Been there, doing it.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Hey Phil! Write a book, take the entire project as a tax deduction? It's
an idea, and I know you could do it...

Kim W5TIT

227. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:16:02 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3395fa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29737

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a0u17egfa1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c31e413_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > As Jim said, a CCR is a different animal because it can be stealthy.
> > However, in a HOA situation, as I noted above, that *should* be known
> about
> > prior to move-in. Right? I mean, I've never had to deal with a HOA
> > situation, so I don't know--I presume one is knowledgeable of an HOA in
> a
> > neighborhood prior to move-in, aren't they? I have heard folks talking
> on
> > the radio about HOAs being implemented after move-in. That would be
> > rough...time to build leadership skills to the hilt on that one, and
> take
> > the lead in a very sublime neighborhood contract--if any at all.
>
> If you live in a home that has no CC&Rs today and their is no
> HOA, you can NOT be forced to become a part of an HOA just
> because some other residents want to start one. I don't know what
> you've heard on the radio, but un;ess your deed expressly allows
> for creation of an HOA, then you have nothing to worry about...as
> Phil Kane has aptly stated in another post.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Wow! Now that's good news. Thanks, Bill!

Kim W5TIT

228. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:20:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c339719_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29740

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C32F332.D5A5DD67@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > >
> > > > Manure.
> > > >
> > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
>
> ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
>
> Dave K8MN

OK, so am I the *only* one who's heard people talking of this?

Kim W5TIT

229. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:23:35 UTC
From: For Dickie <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3397c0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29742

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C33473C.A8281E7A@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > >
> > > > > Manure.
> > > >
> > > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated
a
> > > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard
people
> > > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
> >
> > ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
> >
>
> Do as I did and dump her into Bozoflushmode and just pull the handle...
>

heh heh, told you that you couldn't handle the truth.

Kim W5TIT
```

230. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:25:23 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <DFMY7.321598$W8.12239911@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29738

Agreed with both responses to my response. We all know what happened in California (the 'NUT' repeater). Obviously, we should be aware of the regulations. Both responses were correct. The best rule may be 'if in doubt - DON'T'.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10201022006340.6970-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 2 Jan 2002, AB2HR wrote:
> >On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 01:02:37 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
> ><j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >>Absolutely legal. As long as the control operator is present, someone else
> >>can have at it. I believe you could do the calling - just as long as the
> >>control operator (licensed) is present. Interestingly enough, a codeless
> >>tech can apparently use a 10 meter port on linked repeaters. We have such a
> >>system here in Rochester, NY, and I've yakked with Australia with it. A lot
> >>of DX comes in at times. The codeless tech is responsible for his signal
> >>(say at 2 meters - I use one of the 440 ports myself, but there are ports on
> >>6 meters, 2 meters, 220, and 440 as well as the 10 meter port). The control
> >>operator of the repeater system (including the 10 meter port) is responsible
> >>for the signal at 10 meters (where the codeless tech can't operate
> >>directly).
> >>
> >>73 from Rochester, NY
> >
> >While you are correct in that a Technician operator can legally use
> >the remote base feature of a VHF repeater to utilize HF operations,
> >technically, there must be a control operator on duty for the 2 meter
> >repeater - someone who is responsible for ensuring that the repeater's
> >remote base operation is done in adherance with the class of the
> >repeater's licensee - or that of the control operator. It can get
> >pretty complicated... Suffice it to say that there has to be someone
> >available who is capable of "pulling the plug" (even if done remotely)
> >whenever the remote base feature is turned on. Of course, technically

> >there must be a control operator available on all repeaters at all
> >times the repeater is available, but we know THAT doesn't always turn
> >out to be the case...
>
> Not quite: Correct that in addition to the no-code technician licensee
coming
> into the repeater/remote base on VHF that there must be a control operator
for
> the repeater itself, you are incorrect that the reason for the control
operator
> is to ensure operation with the repeater trustee's license class
privileges.
> It's the CONTROL OPERATOR's privileges that are in use, not the trustee's.
The
> no-coder is effectively a "third party" on the control op's license on the
HF
> side of the transmission. The repeater trustee's license class is not
relevant
> here.
>

231. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:26:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c339870_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29743

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:526e11ea9a85e40d54dab9159628b2ea.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > I know of at least two hams who lived in an area that had antenna
> > restrictions. A dipole in the attic is all one used to get his WAS. It
took
> > a couple of years, but he did it.
>
> A *couple of years* to work WAS??????????
>
> I think that just reinforces how idiotic this FCC ruling is.
>
> On a November Saturday this last fall, I worked WAS and all
> Canadian provinces in less than 6 hours. And that would
> not be considered a "great feat" among most big station
> owners. I'm a "Joe Tribander and wires" on a city lot.
> A "big gun" station would likely have done it in half that
> time.
>
> A *couple of years*?????? What more evidence do we need that
> CC&R-crippled federally licensed Amateur Radio Service stations
> need some federal protection -- at least as much as TV-watching-
> couch-potatoes already enjoy from the FCC.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans, with all due respect, perhaps it would behoove you to find out how
much time was spent on the air. Maybe this person only got on the radio a
few minutes at a time, eh?

Kim W5TIT

232. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:26:59 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7HMY7.321600$W8.12240783@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You make an interesting point. I removed a few from my kill file for exactly the reason you mention. Kinda like watching 'the 3 stooges' reruns (except that it changes daily).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3C337C94.C7450A45@ix.netcom.com...
> What and miss the fun of getting into flame wars? :-)
>
> \"Landshark\" wrote:
>
> > File him now, don't delay. Your
> > newsreader and you will be a lot happier in
> > the long run.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> > --
> > Please note that any post that is from
> > S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
> > is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
> > be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
> > been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
> > time now. If you want to send a complaint,
> > forward each message complete with headers
> > to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
> > groups-abuse@google.com
> > Beware of George WA3MO^
> >
> > "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:7euY7.209474$WW.12205012@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Yep, and he sure is getting real active. Almost time to send him to the
> > > recycle bin.
> > >
> > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim AA2QA
> > >
> > >
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > >

> > > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > > > > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> > > > news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more
> > channels.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses
and
> > > > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels" at
> > > > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz
bands.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Scott
> > > > > >
> > > > > w3rv
> > > >
> > > > The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings, a
> > > > well-known public urinal.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>

233. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:29:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c339918$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29744

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F706A.860FD61E@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I am an Amateur Extra Class licensee in good standing, ...
>
> Not with everyone, Larry. Some of us consider you to be a
> despicable ham who is guilty of harassment.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh, here's the one with the four elipses ;)

Kim W5TIT

234. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:31:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C33983C.6A7AAD09@uci.edu>
Source record: 29741

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I drove a pickup with 200,000
> > > miles on it so I could possess those two acres.
> > >
> > Well, that, and cash-in some stock options. ;-)
>
> Actually, I bought the two acres before any of my options
> matured.

Is there a ham station on the two acres?
```

235. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-02 23:38:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C339A0D.2DB537A8@uci.edu>
Source record: 29745

```
CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > Cecil said:
> >
> > > I suspect it would be unconstitutional for the federal government to
> > > interfere with willingly signed CC&R contracts.
> >
> > You suspect wrong. The federal government (FCC) issued a preemption voiding
> > CC&Rs which prohibit visual entertainment (TV) antennas.
>
> Where in the Constitution are the feds granted that power? Does that power
> apply to non-commercial items?

The power to regulate commerce would not seem to apply to non-commercial
items. That's probably why a congressional mandate is cited as a
requirement.
```

236. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:11:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu>
Source record: 29746

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Hans, with all due respect, perhaps it would behoove you to find out how
> much time was spent on the air. Maybe this person only got on the radio a
> few minutes at a time, eh?
>
> Kim W5TIT

By the same token, Kim, it might behoove you to get on the air and compare a QRP rig on an attic dipole with Henry 4K Ultra into a 4 element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest - in order to get a better feel for what these fellas are trying to say to you.

237. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:15:29 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C33A28E.7E0C137D@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29747
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Scott Unich-69 wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > I am dead serious about this, I want to know too. The ham in the CB
> > newsgroup are always telling us not to try power on FRS. I think they
> > are jealous of what we have achieved on CB! Clipped limiters! Echo
> > mikes! VFOs to slide onto ham freqs! 60 KW mobiles! I bet we can do
> > the same or better with FRS given a bit of time.
>
> Troll. You suckered me once (as someone pointed out).
> At the risk of being suckered again:
> Anyway, if you know how to do this stuff, you can
> study to pass the ham writtens. Clipped limiters are not
> a feature with SSB or AM, but work fine for FM after
> filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.

Well Mr., HAMburger, you got suckered by a forging troll again.

Not that this message does NOT say groups.google.com in the
organization, and that my IP address does NOT come back to AOL.

So now that you've seen a real message from me, you can stuff
that echo mike up your ham ticket. I have had enough ham snootiness
to last a lifetime, and at this point will never get a ham ticket
and I will persuade others to stay away. Remember, you are only one
ham, but if you are the first one that a non ham sees, you are what
the non ham expects from all other hams. Thanks for putting the ham
fraternity back into perspective for me.

238. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:18:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a10881nmn1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29748

"SMOOLB" <smoolb@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020102080713.01446.00000839@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6n9c.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
> >On 01 Jan 2002 15:07:18 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>Ah, but here's the rub: In many situations the deed restrictions are not
> >>signed. In my case, the deed itself describes the specific property and
who
> >>owns it, then refers (in fine print) to another document that is kept at
the
> >>county seat. If you want to see the actual deed restrictions you have to
ask
> >>for them ahead of time - they are NOT part of the deed itself, except by
> >>reference.
> >
> > If they are incorporated by reference they are legally part of the
> > deed.
>
> Of course.
> But the buyer may not get a copy of the referenced document unless
> specifically asked for.

Why wouldn't you ask for it?

> Or they may not get a copy until closing.

If you ask for it and they won't give it to you until
closing then shame on you and your
attorney for accepting such a position.

> How many
> people are going to walk away from a closing because of a CC&R discovered
at
> the last minute?

IF you protected yourself in the "contract" then I'd bet more than
a few. Smart people get the details BEFORE they get
that deep into a purchase.

> > Same thing with contracts and wills that incorporate "external"
> > documents by reference.
> >
> Yup.
>

> Point is ya gotta read everything twice and also retain the services of a
> competent real estate attorney.

Anyone that spends the amount of money it takes to buy
a home and doesn't use an attorney is (IMHO)
nuts.

> Here in the PA area, local station WWDB used to be all talk. One of the
rare
> high points of that swamp was a show by one Russ Miller, devoted entirely
to
> real-estate subjects from minor repairs and maintenance to legal matters
like
> these. Properly disclaimered, of course. But very useful.

I sometimes listen to a consumer advocate on WABC NYC and
I am amazed at the stupid things and predicaments people get
themselves into regarding real estate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

239. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:28:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <4BNY7.321670$W8.12246101@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29749
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:3C33A28E.7E0C137D@hotSPAMmail.com...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > Scott Unich-69 wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I am dead serious about this, I want to know too. The ham in the CB
> > > > newsgroup are always telling us not to try power on FRS. I think
they
> > > > are jealous of what we have achieved on CB! Clipped limiters! Echo
> > > > mikes! VFOs to slide onto ham freqs! 60 KW mobiles! I bet we can do
> > > > the same or better with FRS given a bit of time.
> > >
> > > Troll. You suckered me once (as someone pointed out).
> > > At the risk of being suckered again:
> > > Anyway, if you know how to do this stuff, you can
> > > study to pass the ham writtens. Clipped limiters are not
> > > a feature with SSB or AM, but work fine for FM after
> > > filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.
> >
> > Well Mr., HAMburger, you got suckered by a forging troll again.
> >
> > Not that this message does NOT say groups.google.com in the
> > organization, and that my IP address does NOT come back to AOL.
> >
> > So now that you've seen a real message from me, you can stuff
> > that echo mike up your ham ticket. I have had enough ham snootiness
> > to last a lifetime, and at this point will never get a ham ticket
> > and I will persuade others to stay away. Remember, you are only one
> > ham, but if you are the first one that a non ham sees, you are what
> > the non ham expects from all other hams. Thanks for putting the ham
> > fraternity back into perspective for me.

240. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:38:34 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!

I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately, I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm glad I'm not him...

241. Forge Check Instructions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:42:23 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C33A8DD.CF7FB077@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29751
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Look for this string is a message from me:
NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.9.144.161

If it's not from this IP, it's not me. This IP may
change when Comcast takes over from @Home. Cable is
still faster, cheaper, and more reliable then DSL.
```

242. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:46:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C33A9CB.3DF8E088@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29752

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C32F332.D5A5DD67@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > >
> > > > > Manure.
> > > >
> > > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually stated a
> > > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard people
> > > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
> >
> > ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> OK, so am I the *only* one who's heard people talking of this?

Probably not. You just seem to be the only one who actually bought into
it.

Dave K8MN
```

243. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 00:58:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <h1OY7.321731$W8.12250466@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!
>
> I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message
> attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be
> me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I
> didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to
> let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have
> a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately,
> I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm
> glad I'm not him...

244. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:01:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a10af702pvg@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C337C52.7321FE15@ix.netcom.com...
> filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.

Yah but they sound so kewl, d00d!

245. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:02:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C33ADA7.783EA5DF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29754

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
> Is there a ham station on the two acres?

Not any more. KG7BK used to be there.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

246. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:07:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020102200701.06877.00000901@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 29755

In article <526e11ea9a85e40d54dab9159628b2ea.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> writes:

>"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> I know of at least two hams who lived in an area that had antenna
>> restrictions. A dipole in the attic is all one used to get his WAS. It took
>> a couple of years, but he did it.
>
>A *couple of years* to work WAS??????????

Different folks have different standards for what constitutes "good results", Hans.
>
>I think that just reinforces how idiotic this FCC ruling is.

Yup!
>
>On a November Saturday this last fall, I worked WAS and all
>Canadian provinces in less than 6 hours. And that would
>not be considered a "great feat" among most big station
>owners. I'm a "Joe Tribander and wires" on a city lot.
>A "big gun" station would likely have done it in half that
>time.

On that same November Saturday I worked 48 states and 6 Canadian provinces in a little less than 13 hours of half-trying. The states I missed were Wyoming and Alabama, and I missed them because I never heard them. Hawaii and Alaska are the most difficult states from here in EPA, but they were worked with a little trying. I'm sure if I applied myself a bit more I could have done a WAS.

The setup here consisted of a QRP transceiver adjusted to 5 watts output and a homebrew coax-fed inverted V with the apex at 35 feet or so and the ends at maybe 15 feet. This antenna uses coax-cable traps to permit direct operation on 80 and 40 meters, and a homebrew tuner permitted operation on the other bands.

This was my first serious WAS attempt with this QRP rig, and I'm still learning how to get the most out of it.

>A *couple of years*?????? What more evidence do we need that
>CC&R-crippled federally licensed Amateur Radio Service stations
>need some federal protection -- at least as much as TV-watching-
>couch-potatoes already enjoy from the FCC.

EXACTLY!

73 de Jim, N2EY

247. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:08:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a10app02qrn@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29761

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:526e11ea9a85e40d54dab9159628b2ea.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > I know of at least two hams who lived in an area that had antenna
> > restrictions. A dipole in the attic is all one used to get his WAS. It
took
> > a couple of years, but he did it.
>
> A *couple of years* to work WAS??????????
>
> I think that just reinforces how idiotic this FCC ruling is.

Did it ever occur to you that Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island are tough
states to get?

248. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:10:57 UTC
From: "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski>
Message-ID: <BcOY7.350889$5A3.133377274@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick you are like the boy who cried wolf, every post you claim are forged
some are from the original poster are you drinking again, or did you forget
how to set up Mad Boris Flush.

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:h1OY7.321731$W8.12250466@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)
>
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> news:3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > >
> > > Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!
> >
> > I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message
> > attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be
> > me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I
> > didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to
> > let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have
> > a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately,
> > I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm
> > glad I'm not him...
>
>

249. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:12:16 UTC
From: "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski>
Message-ID: <QdOY7.350894$5A3.133378665@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

James I don't blame you otherwise all you get to see are posts from the hypocrites of rec.radio.cb's.

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:7HMY7.321600$W8.12240783@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> You make an interesting point. I removed a few from my kill file for
> exactly the reason you mention. Kinda like watching 'the 3 stooges' reruns
> (except that it changes daily).
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C337C94.C7450A45@ix.netcom.com...
> > What and miss the fun of getting into flame wars? :-)
> >
> > \"Landshark\" wrote:
> >
> > > File him now, don't delay. Your
> > > newsreader and you will be a lot happier in
> > > the long run.
> > >
> > > Landshark
> > >
> > > --
> > > Please note that any post that is from
> > > S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
> > > is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
> > > be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
> > > been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
> > > time now. If you want to send a complaint,
> > > forward each message complete with headers
> > > to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
> > > groups-abuse@google.com
> > > Beware of George WA3MO^
> > >
> > > "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:7euY7.209474$WW.12205012@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Yep, and he sure is getting real active. Almost time to send him to
> the
> > > > recycle bin.

> > > >
> > > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > Jim AA2QA
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:SbuY7.319920$W8.12140346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:d22b54c3.0201011822.360d9f6f@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
> > > > > news:<a2cf6f35.0201011459.565b4e29@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > erehwon <erehwon@erehwon.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:<md043ug4v9cau3jjh5fl34lo0h6a0v2du7@4ax.com>...
> > > > > > > > are there any mods available for frs radios; power output
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yes I would like to know too how to get more watts and more
> > > channels.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No problem. Just get Amateur Radio Operator and Station licenses
> and
> > > > > > ya have something approaching an infinite number of "channels"
at
> > > > > > power outputs up to 1.5 Kilowatts from 1.8Mhz to the gigahertz
> bands.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Scott
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > w3rv
> > > > > >
> > > > > The Mad Forger strikes again, Brian. Note Google in the routings,
a
> > > > > well-known public urinal.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > >
>
>

250. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:23:31 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C33B280.3014BD73@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)

It's hard to turn in a ticket I never had. No 3 series call for me.
I might be in grid FM29, but no N3xxx or Wx3xxx call for me.

251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:31:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201021731.31f59a3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29760

> > >
> > Ask a kid today what "skirts" are. Blank look. Pop quiz: What 2002
> > model car sports skirts?
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > >
> > w3rv
>
> Damfino but do you remember Cruiser Skirts?
>
>
The gas/electric hybrid Honda Insight
>
>
http://www.honda.ca/models/insight.asp
>
>
Dim recollection. Very dim. I think "cruiser skirts" were skirts that
stretched from the real wheel wells to the rear bumper. Looked best on
chopped 'n channelled '49 - '51 Mercs.
>
>
w3rv

252. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:35:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020102203523.07928.00002240@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29762

In article <Y6qY7.128397$BX4.8171604@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>
>Yeah,
>
>And if the perp comes in while I am at home, and I hear him, he'll get his
>butt filled with
>12 ga buckshot! One less "poor ole criminal" for the liberals to force me
>to keep up in
>prison.
>
>Jerry

What a maroon! You'd probably end up in jail, getting your butt filled up with something you didn't plan on!

73 de Larry, K3LT

253. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:35:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020102203524.07928.00002241@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29763

In article <CCsY7.14894$_K.1769026@cletus.bright.net>, "WebDoc REACT Unit #602"
<arcweb@bnnorth.net> writes:

>
>from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can talk
>on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the radio.
>Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns it
>over to the unlicensed person?
>The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang with
>him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.
>
>
>Keith Hosman

Keith:

This is called Third Party operation. The licensed person is acting
as the control operator for the station, and is responsible for its
proper operation...including what you say. You can actually operate
the transceiver -- push the buttons, turn the dials, and do all the
talking -- including giving your friend's call sign. He just has to be
present and keep you from doing anything wrong -- like operating
in a manner which exceeds his privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

254. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:35:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020102203524.07928.00002242@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29764

In article <a0t3ul0k9f@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Actually, the debate, as originally started by Larry, was a paranoid rant
>about the FCC selling off the amateur radio spectrum. He thinks that the
>ruling means the beginning of the end for amateur radio. Notice that he's
>been conveniently absent from the debate since making the original post.

Krell:

I didn't say that the only meaning of the FCC's ruling was an imminent
spectrum sell-off. However, the FCC obviously doesn't see any need to
protect a radio amateur's right to establish an effective station on his
own property -- on their own initiative. They'll do it if Congress
forces them to, but somehow, I think that's a bill that would have a very
hard time getting to the floor, much less passing. This whole thing
circles back to the fact that amateur radio doesn't have much of an
economic impact -- at least, not enough to overcome it's nuisance
value to those who don't understand us.

73 de Larry, K3LT

255. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 01:35:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020102203525.07928.00002243@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 29765

In article <3C3235F0.89DFA245@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Watch out Kim, Larry and the other guys might make up an SAT test
>style analogy:
>
>Kim's call is to ham radio as Kim's neighbor's junkyard is to Kim's
>neighborhood.

Bob:

So Kim lives in a no-class, redneck neighborhood. There's a lot of that going on here in Delaware, which is one reason why I've been reluctant to buy property. I could end up with a nice house planted next door to somebody who buys a piece of ground, plants a trailer on it, and lets their teen-aged kids run around on 4-wheel ATV's. I have a couple of friends who've had their property rendered virtually unmarketable based on what's going on next door. The only way out of that scenario is to live in a development where the CC&R's tell you not only how many times an hour you can sneeze, but which hand you have to hold the Kleenex in. All I want is a 48-foot tower, a 4-element multi-band Yagi, with a 4-element 6-meter Yagi, and a couple of dipoles. There's nothing "unsightly" about that, compared to what you'll find on virtually every "county" road in this state. Certainly nothing that would reduce the value of adjacent properties. I just hope Kim likes the property she's on now, because if she's living next door to a junkyard, all she'll ever be able to get for her property is a hard time!

73 de Larry, K3LT

256. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:02:18 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <KYOY7.677$fe1.50997@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29766

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201021731.31f59a3e@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > Ask a kid today what "skirts" are. Blank look. Pop quiz: What 2002
> > > model car sports skirts?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Damfino but do you remember Cruiser Skirts?
> >
> >
> The gas/electric hybrid Honda Insight
> >
> >
> http://www.honda.ca/models/insight.asp
> >
> >
> Dim recollection. Very dim. I think "cruiser skirts" were skirts that
> stretched from the real wheel wells to the rear bumper. Looked best on
> chopped 'n channelled '49 - '51 Mercs.
> >
> >
> w3rv

Yup, originally came from the Mercury Turnpike Cruiser, hence the name.
That was the one with the rear power window slanting in rather than out.

Don't see too many Insights in the Marvelous Midlands.

NBK

257. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:11:36 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <s5PY7.693$fe1.52315@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Syntax Voobsie, it's called syntax

"middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski> wrote in message
news:BcOY7.350889$5A3.133377274@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> Dick you are like the boy who cried wolf, every post you claim are
forged
> some are from the original poster are you drinking again, or did you
forget
> how to set up Mad Boris Flush.
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:h1OY7.321731$W8.12250466@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)
> >
> > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com...
> > > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!
> > >
> > > I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message
> > > attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be
> > > me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I
> > > didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to
> > > let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have
> > > a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately,
> > > I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm
> > > glad I'm not him...
> >
> >
>
>

258. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:23:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c33c1e8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29768

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Hans, with all due respect, perhaps it would behoove you to find out how
> > much time was spent on the air. Maybe this person only got on the radio
a
> > few minutes at a time, eh?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> By the same token, Kim, it might behoove you to get on the air and
> compare a QRP rig on an attic dipole with Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest - in order to get a
> better feel for what these fellas are trying to say to you.

Jim: I fully understand the difference between station set-ups. I also fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a Wilson 1000 magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday and talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii. I missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas. I haven't done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out and a horizontally polarized beam--and no stupid remarks about having to point the beam in the right direction (not from you, Jim, but from others).

I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation that we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack up some pretty amazing log files. I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4 element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most of the time. I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time. I am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work, and diligence one must have to do it with QRP. Big watts make the trip easy.

Kim W5TIT

259. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:26:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c33c282_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29771

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C33A9CB.3DF8E088@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C32F332.D5A5DD67@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Manure.
> > > > > >
> > > > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > > > --
> > > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > > >
> > > > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually
stated a
> > > > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard
people
> > > > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
> > >
> > > ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > OK, so am I the *only* one who's heard people talking of this?
>
> Probably not. You just seem to be the only one who actually bought into
> it.
>
> Dave K8MN

I didn't see, and still don't, any reason not to. Are you insulted, Dave,
by the fact it can be done? Or, you just don't believe it can be done? I
just don't quite understand your refusal to believe that it can be done.
```

Kim W5TIT

260. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:33:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wpPY7.706$fe1.54771@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29770
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What is one more frustrated Channel Master more or less'

"middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski> wrote in message
news:KpPY7.351200$5A3.133454624@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> Dick, I appreciate the flattery, but I think voobsie is in Ohio and I am
a 5
> hour ride from there. But thanks for wondering.
>
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:s5PY7.693$fe1.52315@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Syntax Voobsie, it's called syntax
> >
> > "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski> wrote in message
> > news:BcOY7.350889$5A3.133377274@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > > Dick you are like the boy who cried wolf, every post you claim are
> > forged
> > > some are from the original poster are you drinking again, or did you
> > forget
> > > how to set up Mad Boris Flush.
> > >
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:h1OY7.321731$W8.12250466@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)
> > > >
> > > > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com...
> > > > > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message
> > > > > attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be
> > > > > me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I
> > > > > didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to
> > > > > let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have
> > > > > a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately,
> > > > > I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm
> > > > > glad I'm not him...
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

> >
> >
>
>

261. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:33:14 UTC
From: "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski>
Message-ID: <KpPY7.351200$5A3.133454624@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Dick, I appreciate the flattery, but I think voobsie is in Ohio and I am a 5
hour ride from there. But thanks for wondering.

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:s5PY7.693$fe1.52315@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Syntax Voobsie, it's called syntax
>
> "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski> wrote in message
> news:BcOY7.350889$5A3.133377274@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > Dick you are like the boy who cried wolf, every post you claim are
> forged
> > some are from the original poster are you drinking again, or did you
> forget
> > how to set up Mad Boris Flush.
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:h1OY7.321731$W8.12250466@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > When are you turning in your ticket, Scott(?)
> > >
> > > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3C33A7F7.7E80464A@hotSPAMmail.com...
> > > > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Also Phoney!!!!!!!!!!
> > > >
> > > > I'm as phoney as you are! Look a little closer at the message
> > > > attributes. I sit back and laugh at the poor attempts to be
> > > > me, with poor spelling, punctuation and other things that I
> > > > didn't say. I watch the hambos take the bait. I just had to
> > > > let that one hambo know his actions can cause others to have
> > > > a poor view of amateur radio. I haven't posted much lately,
> > > > I have too much fun gathering the evidence for Hotmail. I'm
> > > > glad I'm not him...
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> >
>
>
```

262. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:36:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c33c559_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29773

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020102203525.07928.00002243@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3C3235F0.89DFA245@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Watch out Kim, Larry and the other guys might make up an SAT test
> >style analogy:
> >
> >Kim's call is to ham radio as Kim's neighbor's junkyard is to Kim's
> >neighborhood.
>
> Bob:
>
> So Kim lives in a no-class, redneck neighborhood. There's a lot of that
> going on here in Delaware, which is one reason why I've been reluctant
> to buy property. I could end up with a nice house planted next door
> to somebody who buys a piece of ground, plants a trailer on it, and
> lets their teen-aged kids run around on 4-wheel ATV's. I have a
> couple of friends who've had their property rendered virtually
> unmarketable based on what's going on next door. The only way
> out of that scenario is to live in a development where the CC&R's tell
> you not only how many times an hour you can sneeze, but which
> hand you have to hold the Kleenex in. All I want is a 48-foot tower,
> a 4-element multi-band Yagi, with a 4-element 6-meter Yagi, and a
> couple of dipoles. There's nothing "unsightly" about that, compared
> to what you'll find on virtually every "county" road in this state.
> Certainly nothing that would reduce the value of adjacent properties.
> I just hope Kim likes the property she's on now, because if she's
> living next door to a junkyard, all she'll ever be able to get for her
> property is a hard time!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yes, we do like where we live, Larry. My husband and I did not buy our
first land as an investment. I moved enough with my dad in the military all
my kid life. This will be home until, well, until whenever. There is a
chance I'd leave it if something happens to my husband. I'd be just as
happy then in an apartment watching the maintenance men do the outside work
and having them repair whatever inside that I can't. And I can repair a
lot.

This land will come up for development, as the rich folks who move to the
country and like living on top of each other are just over the hill from us

now. Can't wait 'til they see the junkyard...heh heh

Kim W5TIT

263. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:38:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c33c55a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29774

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a10af702pvg@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C337C52.7321FE15@ix.netcom.com...
> > filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.
>
> Yah but they sound so kewl, d00d!
>
>

Tuned just right, and echo mic beats the heck out of the power limitations on CB... tuned just right means where there is no echo, just ever so slight reverberation.

Kim W5TIT

264. Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 02:39:25 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201021839.16426d89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29772
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

wavelengthzero@aol.com (The Dude) wrote:
>Try using CB channels 1-40 during the day for convoy
>communications or other kinds of actual use. Worthless,
>between the 7 pounds of Noise caused by the idiots
>running thousands of watts to talk to themselves
>etc.. The freeband actually is the place to be, but
>Its getting worrysome some ass was tying up 27.555 with
>Music, anyhow anyone actually Use CB 1-40 for anything?
>how was the freeband when the solar cycle was down? was all
>DX dead??? anyhow this freeband is cool, with
>a little Icom radio I talk around the world using a
>102inch whip.

Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
Truckers are leading the way....

Scott, Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay

--
NOTE that someone is forging me using "upplus@hotmailNOSPAM.com". Pay
not attention to this idiot. My posts always come from
"uppluss@hotmail.com".

265. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 03:00:54 UTC
From: "rich@work" <richf69@megahits.com>
Message-ID: <u37i5lg2141cb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 29775
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

let me make myself perfectly clear. STOP POSTING THIS SHIT---NO ONE WANTS TO READ ABOUT YOU BITCHING AND WHINING LIKE A GIRL. IF YOU WANT TO BE A DICK PLEASE BE A DICK ANYWHERE ELSE BUT ALT.2600

rich@work

266. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 04:07:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a10lan015lt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29778

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020102203524.07928.00002242@mb-fi.aol.com...
> I didn't say that the only meaning of the FCC's ruling was an imminent
> spectrum sell-off. However, the FCC obviously doesn't see any need to
> protect a radio amateur's right to establish an effective station on his
> own property -- on their own initiative. They'll do it if Congress
> forces them to, but somehow, I think that's a bill that would have a very
> hard time getting to the floor, much less passing. This whole thing
> circles back to the fact that amateur radio doesn't have much of an
> economic impact -- at least, not enough to overcome it's nuisance
> value to those who don't understand us.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it takes to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what is necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary or hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they can still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.

267. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 04:16:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a10m00sme1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29776

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpbi9zi.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Wed, 2 Jan 2002 09:15:27 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> Yet many properties with CC&Rs have exactly that type of
> >> prohibition. One fairly well publicized case a few years back
> >> involved a subdivision with CC&Rs that prohibited parking trucks
> >> in the driveway overnight (cars were OK). When one neighbor
> >> bought a new pick-up truck, the legal conflict that followed
> >> eventually got national media attention.
> >
> >I remember this incident. It was in the Chicago area, and the guy had
> >something like 20 citations that he wasn't going to pay. How did things
> >finally turn out?
>
> There was a case in San Diego, CA about a half dozen years ago or
> so where the CC&Rs prohibited parking "trucks" in the condo garage,
> and the court held that the fairly-new pick-up with a good-looking
> camper shell, no advertising, and with passenger vehicle license
> plates, used as a family vehicle, was not what was intended to be
> prohibited by the term "truck".

My last recollection (in the Chicago area case)
was that the homeowner had lost. Maybe someone
else has a better memory.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

268. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 04:33:36 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AaRY7.322023$W8.12274178@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29777
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nice forge. Lotsa luck on 28.000 on up.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a2cf6f35.0201021839.16426d89@posting.google.com...
> wavelengthzero@aol.com (The Dude) wrote:
> >Try using CB channels 1-40 during the day for convoy
> >communications or other kinds of actual use. Worthless,
> >between the 7 pounds of Noise caused by the idiots
> >running thousands of watts to talk to themselves
> >etc.. The freeband actually is the place to be, but
> >Its getting worrysome some ass was tying up 27.555 with
> >Music, anyhow anyone actually Use CB 1-40 for anything?
> >how was the freeband when the solar cycle was down? was all
> >DX dead??? anyhow this freeband is cool, with
> >a little Icom radio I talk around the world using a
> >102inch whip.
>
> Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> Truckers are leading the way....
>
> Scott, Unit-69
> Chesapeake Bay
>
> --
> NOTE that someone is forging me using "upplus@hotmailNOSPAM.com". Pay
> not attention to this idiot. My posts always come from
> "uppluss@hotmail.com".

269. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 04:40:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpc8dct.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29779

On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 15:38:53 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:

>> Where in the Constitution are the feds granted that power? Does that power
>> apply to non-commercial items?
>
>The power to regulate commerce would not seem to apply to non-commercial
>items. That's probably why a congressional mandate is cited as a
>requirement.

It's long established law that all communiucations are interstate in
nature, and that The Congress has the power to make legislation
affecting any communications and to delegate that power to the FCC
under the commerce clause. What the layman sees as "non-commercial"
use of radio is in fact interstate commerce.

The Congressional mandate on the OTARDs was done to make it crystal
clear that the FCC was to exercise pre-emption over CC&Rs. The FCC
didn't do it on their own - it was in the era of Reed Hundt who
didn't blow his nose without White House or Congressional mandate.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

270. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 05:09:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C33E77C.CFBAFFE0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29780

```
W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C33A9CB.3DF8E088@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C32F332.D5A5DD67@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C320AC3.205C842B@IEEE.org...
> > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I know apartment owners whose logs will
> > > > > > > > rival even the best of antenna farms.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Manure.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It's true, Dave. I knew an apartment owner ham in Tucson who
> > > > > > rented the adjacent vacant field for his antenna farm.
> > > > > > --
> > > > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > > > >
> > > > > Nah, I'm not talking "lucky" apartment owners. And, I actually
> stated a
> > > > > mistruth. I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have heard
> people
> > > > > talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!
> > > > >
> > > > ...and it just keeps getting deeper and deeper.
> > > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > OK, so am I the *only* one who's heard people talking of this?
> >
> Probably not. You just seem to be the only one who actually bought into
> > it.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I didn't see, and still don't, any reason not to. Are you insulted, Dave,
```

> by the fact it can be done? Or, you just don't believe it can be done? I
> just don't quite understand your refusal to believe that it can be done.

Your original statement: "I know apartment owners whose logs will
rival even the best of antenna farms."

From there we went to: "I don't *know* the hams of which I speak, I have
heard people talking to them on the air. Many are also QRP operators!"

No Kim, I not only don't believe that the logs of apartment owners whose
logs rival even the best of antenna farms, I'm quite sure that your
statement is false.

While I do believe that you have heard them having QSOs of some sort on
the air, I refuse to accept that apartment dwelling QRPers are a match
for the "best of antenna farms"

It is true that those with inadequate antennas and who run low power
made it into my logs from some of my African operations. It is not
nearly so much how well they did as it is that the big dogs had their
time, made their QSOs and went off to find new prey. It also has to do
with my patience in pulling a puny signal out of the noise. Please note
that these apartment dwelling QRPers can get into some fairly rare logs
on the upper bands. When it comes to 160, 80 and 40m, they aren't even
in the game.

Dave K8MN

271. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 05:24:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C33EB1C.92E23C90@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29781
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott (Unich-69)" wrote:

>
>
> Well Mr., HAMburger, you got suckered by a forging troll again.

Naw, just playing the game.

>
>
> Not that this message does NOT say groups.google.com in the
> organization, and that my IP address does NOT come back to AOL.

As if turdtwister is more credible...., or hotmail for that matter.

>
>
> So now that you've seen a real message from me, you can stuff
> that echo mike up your ham ticket. I have had enough ham snootiness
> to last a lifetime, and at this point will never get a ham ticket
> and I will persuade others to stay away. Remember, you are only one
> ham, but if you are the first one that a non ham sees, you are what
> the non ham expects from all other hams. Thanks for putting the ham
> fraternity back into perspective for me.

I operate legally, you freebanders are still illegal. Beyond that, I'm
not gonna be snooty.

272. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 05:35:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C33E0CD.A7BF28C1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29782

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Tue, 1 Jan 2002, WebDoc REACT Unit #602 wrote:
> >from studying for my license I understand that an unlicensed person can talk
> >on the air with the licensed person being at the control point of the radio.
> >Just how does that work? the licensed person does the calling then turns it
> >over to the unlicensed person?
> >The reason I am asking, I have a friend who has invited me over to hang with
> >him in his shack, and said that I could talk on his rig.
>
> The licensed person does NOT "turn it over" to the unlicensed person. The
> licensee must remain in control. This is called "third-party traffic."

Chill out, D. Of course you can 'turn it over' to a third party and let him run the rig while you sit back and watch. And do nothing, so long as he doesn't screw up.

273. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 06:14:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C33EA00.99F29ECC@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29783

Krell wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020102203524.07928.00002242@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > I didn't say that the only meaning of the FCC's ruling was an imminent
> > spectrum sell-off. However, the FCC obviously doesn't see any need to
> > protect a radio amateur's right to establish an effective station on his
> > own property -- on their own initiative. They'll do it if Congress
> > forces them to, but somehow, I think that's a bill that would have a very
> > hard time getting to the floor, much less passing. This whole thing
> > circles back to the fact that amateur radio doesn't have much of an
> > economic impact -- at least, not enough to overcome it's nuisance
> > value to those who don't understand us.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it takes
> to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
> right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what is
> necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary or
> hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they can
> still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.

Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with all wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional transmission lines of any type may be installed".

274. Re: SILTRONICS 550 AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 07:34:20 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201022334.2f253f0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29784
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DOUBLE_22@HOTMAIL.COM (2-DUCES) wrote in message
news:<98b51405.0201021914.57f22e6c@posting.google.com>...
> SILTRONICS 550 BASE AMP WITH 1-8950 DRIVING 4-8950 IN GREAT SHAPE
> WITH THE MANUAL 325.00 SHIPPED

Cool

275. Re: MACO 75 AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 07:34:48 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201022334.256db1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DOUBLE_22@HOTMAIL.COM (2-DUCES) wrote in message
news:<98b51405.0201021910.2218f9eb@posting.google.com>...
> MACO 75-BASE AMP IN GREAT SHAPE 150.00 SHIPPED

Neat

276. Re: GALAXY 1000 BASE AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 07:35:34 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201022335.30b34254@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DOUBLE_22@HOTMAIL.COM (2-DUCES) wrote in message
news:<98b51405.0201021907.31a91549@posting.google.com>...
> GALAXY 1000 BASE AMP IN EXCELLENT CONDITION TUBES ARE LIKE NEW 425.00 SHIPPED
> CAN EMAIL A PIC

Cool.

277. Re: BASE AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 07:36:57 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201022336.51ffbb0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DOUBLE_22@HOTMAIL.COM (2-DUCES) wrote in message
news:<98b51405.0201021909.44413206@posting.google.com>...
> I HAVE A 3-PILL BASE AMP WITH A 25 AMP P-SUPPLY BUILT IN 275.00 SHIPPED

neato

278. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 08:34:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <YHUY7.1044$fe1.89671@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29788

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C33EB1C.92E23C90@ix.netcom.com...
>
> > the non ham expects from all other hams. Thanks for putting the ham
> > fraternity back into perspective for me.
>
> I operate legally, you freebanders are still illegal. Beyond that, I'm
> not gonna be snooty.
>

Oddly enough, Bob, the perp on this is an old Extra.

279. Re: About 10m repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 11:57:11 UTC
From: IW0GLC Ham Radio <iw0glcABBASSOLOSPAM@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <a11gsb$noda6$1@ID-83686.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 29789

"MailfrmPA" wrote:
> Those that I know of are all 100KHz, xmit low. Some commonly heard ones
here
> are 29.520 in, 29.620 out; 29.530 in, 29.630 out; 29.540 in, 29.640 out;
29.550
> in, 29.640 out. See the pattern?

Yes. Thank you!
> >Are they all in USA or in
> >other Countries too?
>
> From my QTH in Colorado I have not heard any European repeaters, but I do
> regularly hear the Carribean.

Interesting...
Many thanks for informations!

'73 de
IW0GLC op. David from
JN61FU, Rome

280. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 13:07:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103080721.02371.00000823@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29793

In article <aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?

Great question, Ryan.

Here are some of mine (in no particular order):

- Get workshop and station properly set up and in order.
- Fix up antenna system with better materials, new coax, etc.
- Add some options and mods to K2 #2084
- Build kit or homebrew 100 W amp for same
- Sell off about 50% of ham radio parts/material inventory (that's a BIG job!)
- Set new personal best scores on FD, SS, and other contests.
- Attend a local hamfest or two
- Get BMI (body mass index) under 23 so I'm in better physical shape for all of
the above

Will they all get done by December 31 2002? We'll see!

73 de Jim, N2EY

281. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 13:07:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103080722.02371.00000825@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29790

In article <3C320D30.CC2F854D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>K0HB wrote:
>> Observation #1) Every ham enjoys Federal protection of their
>> right to erect a TV antenna. Haven't heard any hams protesting
>> that protection.
>
>You probably didn't notice, but I objected. Exactly what part
>of the Constitution gives the feds the rights to interfere
>with private contracts in private neighborhoods within a state?
>Please be specific.

The rights to regulate interstate commerce. Radio is interstate commerce, and has been recognized as such since the early days of broadcasting. "Commerce" doesn't just mean commercial stations but all radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

282. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 13:07:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103080722.02371.00000824@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29791

In article <3C3388C2.4DA2F7B1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> Is that by number of posts or total bytes posted?
>
>Good point. I don't use as many bytes as you. :-)

You don't say anyhting serious,either ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

283. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 13:07:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103080725.02371.00000827@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29792

In article <a0tsq1cco1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >The exam is the means to determine the qualification.
>> >For 20wpm,, the qualification was to have the ability
>> >to recieve at 20 wpm...as determined by passing a
>> >test which was the actual requirement.
>>
>> I had to send and receive at 20 wpm.
>
>I did that for Novice in the 50's but only had
>receiev in the 90s.

I think you mean you had to send and receive at 5 wpm for the Novice......;-)

>Times change and no one
>has ever shown that if you can receive at X you couldn't
>send at X also.
><SNIP>

It's been shown many times. When you hear a licensed amateur with a terrible
fist, it's clear that the person passed the receiving test but can't send worth
a hoot. FCC just didn;t want to be bothered by sending tests, plus they require
subjective judgement and an examiner who knows da code. End of story.

>> >> But none of this answers the original question: What is so special
>about
>> >> 3524 kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?
>> >
>> >It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".
>>
>> BINGO!!!!
>>
>> The idea is that the system "rewards" the passing of additional tests by
>giving
>> out additional privileges, even though the additional tests do NOT contain
>> material that is "necessary" to use the new privileges. In other words,
>hams
>> are rewarded for "jumping through the hoop" of Element 4.
>
>That will always be the case when additional privileges
>are associated with "higher" license grades.

If yer talkin' about subbands as "incentives", that's right.
>
>> >> >> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says

>that
>> >> >> license test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating
>> >> >> the necessary qualifications.
>> >> >
>> >> >And that's what it is per my comments above.
>>
>> But now you say "It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".".
>And
>> you are absolutely correct, Bill. It's about incentives and rewards, not
>> showing necessary qualifications.
>
>I agree. Where we differ is when the reward is
>inconsistent with the requirements.

The point is that making a person pass additional technical tests to use
subbands is even more of an example of "jumping through hoops" as the code
tests were claimed to be. Yet Grand Poobah Carl supports 'em. In other words,
it's OK to make hams jump through technical test hoops to get more privs.
>
>> >> Why is Element 4 "necessary"? Because the FCC says so?
>> >
>> >See my comment above...the test is the means to ascertain
>> >an individual's knowledge.
>>
>> Yup - even though the knowledge was shown to be adequate on a lower-level
>test.
>
>Not sure I agree, but I see where you are going with this (I think).

Simply pointing to inconsistencies.

>> >> A simple basic test to get started, a more involved test for more
>> >> privs, and a fairly comprehensive test for full privileges.
>> >> And make the privileges match the testing level.
>> >
>> >How does that differ from Tech/General/Extra today?
>>
>> 1) Tech today is a big step for newcomers who do not have technical
>> backgrounds. They get way too much VHF/UHF, and if they pass 5 wpm
>> code get way too little HF/MF
>
>But the number of hams that have been starting out via the Tech
>has been significant since the majority of new hams since the
>intro of the "nocode" tech have, in fact, taken the tech route.

The Tech took over as the entry level long before 1991. A major reason is 2
meters.

The point is that the number of new hams hasn't grown with the population since
the 1970s.
>
>> 2) General today is "about right" except the written test is mostly regs

>and
>> not technical enough
>
>So you'd leave it alone or change it?

Change it somewhat. But that's a detail.
>
>> 3) The privileges earned do not match the knowledge tested closely enough
>
>I actually agree with that statement.

You begin to see my point, then.
>
>> 4) There is no experience requirement
>
>Nor has there been for about 50 years...at least to the extent
>additional privileges were involved with the higher
>license being saught after.

Not true. Until the early 1970s the Extra required 2 years as a General or
higher before they'd lket you near the test. Then it was one year, then zip.
>
>> 5) VE qualification should be a separate issue
>
>I totally agree on that.
>
>> 6) Current system is a patchwork quilt of a system dating back
>> more than 50 years.
>
>Agree also as you have laid out. I think, however,
>the "problem" becomes one of WHAT privileges
>should be coupled to what requirements. I have
>always felt that 1500 watts power was uncalled for
>for just a tech license once the written test was no
>longer the equal to the General.

Which is a result of simply patching the old system.
>
>> Here's a revised and cleaned-up version of myu earlier post, with some
>> suggestions by Rich Plourde incorporated. Remember that this is more of a
>> "thought experiment" than a finished job. The names of the proposed
>license
>> classes were chosen to avoid confusion with the existing classes.
>> How about this:
>>
>> Right now:
>> 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone General
>> HF/MF bands, 160-10. (They haven't been tested on other modes for HF)
>
>No objection on that.
>

>> 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or online
>> procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions.
>
>I have no objection to that...BUT I wonder how many
>haven't already done so. I'd bet almost everyone that
>has even a passing continued interest in ham radio and
>was still a pre-87 tech has already "upgraded" at a VE
>session. I know everyone that participated on the local
>Morris County RACES repeater has done so. The word
>went out very quickly.

It may become a moot point as the number of Tech Pluses continues to decline.
>
>> 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
>amateur
>> allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200 worldwide
>exclusive
>> amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in Region 2 and 7000-7100
>> everywhere else. 7000-7300 worldwide exclusive amateur would be
>wonderful.
>
>That's a goal of WRC 2003 already.

We'll see what happens. Main point is that sharing creates a mess.
>
>> 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and analog
>> voice/image modes.
>
>I see no reason to segregate digital from CW.

I do.

> How much of a "slice" would
>each get in your solution?

Depends on usage and the band. I figure 2/3 CW, 1/3 digital to start. Maybe
60/40.
>
>> After S25.5 is gone:
>> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names
>if you
>> don't like them)
>
>I'd like Basic/General/Extra... But it isn't anything I'd loose
>sleep over.

Names don't really matter.
>
>> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
>class.
>> (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode only).
>

>How would that differ from item 4 above.

It doesn't.
>
>> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures,
>and
>> safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff, main purpose is
>to
>> keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF
>> and 25 watts or so
>> on VHF/UHF (determined by RF exposure limits). Modes are CW, analog
>> voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data modes like packet.
>Basics
>> cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or be club trustees.
>> Basics get all
>> VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the
>entry
>> level. Test content matches privileges granted.
>>
>> 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
>regs,
>> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF
>exposure
>> stuff with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates get
>300-400 watts
>> watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after
>qualification (see
>> below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates
>get all
>> VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum.
>> Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.
>
>I see no reason for the one year requirement at this point.

Experience - stuff that isn't learned from books.
>
>> 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
>> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
>regs to cover
>> expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except
>that
>> Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full license
>requires
>> at least one year (preferably two years) as an Intermediate.
>
>I see NO difference between Intermediate and Full.

Intermediates don't have all subbands and don't have 1500 W

> Did you leave out a
>higher

>power allowance (e.g. 1500 watts)?
>
That's what "Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc." means.

>> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
>
>Agree.
>
>> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
>six-character
>> calls,
>> and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls.
>
>I have no care at all about that. My K2UNK will
>be my call until my key goes silent.

That's a 5 character call. You would not have to change it. If there are any
1x2 non-extras left, they'd be grandfathered.
>
>> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to
>> Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.
>
>Good, I fully agree.
>
>> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals
>and
>> Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.
>
>I'd have no problem...BUT I can hear the complaints
>already from the "high power" operators of Tech,
>general and Advanced suddenly loosing their power punch.

Maybe they'd be grandfathered to high power the same way "Techs with HF" can
operate HF.
>
>> 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade,
>> but their time in existing classes counts.
>
>OK (except I don't see a need for any delay between basic
>and Intermediate.
>
>> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a
>21st
>> century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to
>reach
>> full privileges. And the testing matches the priviliges granted.
>
>Not a bad approach.

Thanks.
>

>> The power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Perhaps current hams
>would be
>> allowed to use the existing power levels so nobody loses privileges.
>
>If the "current" hams get "grandfathered" into the high
>power allowed aspect, then they have no incentive
>(especially the Generals and Advanced)

Subbands!

73 de Jim, N2EY

284. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 13:54:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103085410.10674.00001784@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29794

>Subject: Re: The Usual Suspects!
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/1/2002 2:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C3216BA.5997B186@IEEE.org>

>I tried day trading.

Must not have been very good at it...you're back!

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

285. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 14:23:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a11pe801a3s@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29796

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C33EA00.99F29ECC@townsqr.com...
> > It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it
takes
> > to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
> > right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what
is
> > necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary
or
> > hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they
can
> > still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.
>
> Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with
all
> wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> transmission lines of any type may be installed".

If you're serious about having a station your way, and you don't like the
rules, move.

286. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 14:38:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C346CD5.6F137D37@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29795

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> >I tried day trading.
>
> Must not have been very good at it...you're back!

I made $1000 in one month. That's about $17 an hour.
It wasn't worth the hassle.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

287. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 15:20:55 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0201030720.26524950@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29797

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20011230210103.09102.00000860@mb-ct.aol.com>...

> The point is that we are guaranteed certain freedoms in the use of our
> vehicles. Limitations are imposed only to protect the safety of others.

No one is guarenteed *any* freedom in the use of an automobile. Well,
maybe one: you're allowed to use your automobile on private land that
you own (subject to CC&Rs, of course :-).

Ownership of an automobile doesn't signify the right to use it. In fact,
the federal government has little or nothing to do with who has the right
to drive automobiles -- that's left up to the states.

The old saying goes that driving is a priviledge, not a right. And it's a
right that is not guarenteed and one that can be taken away at a moment's
notice. Other uses of an automobile are governed in different ways, but
none are, I believe, guarenteed.

Sean.

288. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 16:50:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a121subqj1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 29799

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpc8dct.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Wed, 02 Jan 2002 15:38:53 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >The power to regulate commerce would not seem to apply to non-commercial
> >items. That's probably why a congressional mandate is cited as a
> >requirement.

> It's long established law that all communiucations are interstate in
> nature, and that The Congress has the power to make legislation
> affecting any communications and to delegate that power to the FCC
> under the commerce clause. What the layman sees as "non-commercial"
> use of radio is in fact interstate commerce.

Interstate, undoubtedly. With regard to 'commerce' and the Amateur Service,
the FCC's opinion would seem to be at odds with yours.

> The Congressional mandate on the OTARDs was done to make it crystal
> clear that the FCC was to exercise pre-emption over CC&Rs. The FCC
> didn't do it on their own - it was in the era of Reed Hundt who
> didn't blow his nose without White House or Congressional mandate.

Reed Hundt's departure seems not to have made much difference in this
regard. He who has the gold still makes the rules.

73 de ac6xg

289. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 16:56:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a122abbui1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 29800

Good to see Len absent from the list in 3 out of 4. Sorry to see my name in the top ten however. Must have been arguing about the civil war or something.

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:uWvBwRokBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02...
>
> Hey, Cecil, did you take a vacation in October?
>
>
> Top 10 Users RRAP SEP 2001
>
> [501] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 16.8%
> [260] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 8.7%
> [256] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.6%
> [253] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 8.5%
> [193] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 6.5%
> [142] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 4.8%
> [120] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 4.0%
> [105] WA8ULX <wa8ulx@aol.com> 3.5%
> [97] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 3.3%
> [93] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.1%
>
>
> Top 10 Users RRAP OCT 2001
>
> [188] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 11.3%
> [151] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 9.1%
> [122] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 7.3%
> [113] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 6.8%
> [96] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
> [89] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.3%
> [88] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 5.3%
> [75] Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com> 4.5%
> [59] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.5%
> [42] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 2.5%
>
>
> Top 10 Users RRAP NOV 2001
>
> [484] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 16.8%
> [312] Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> 10.9%
> [283] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 9.9%
> [256] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 8.9%

> [206] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 7.2%
> [153] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 5.3%
> [126] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 4.4%
> [107] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 3.7%
> [102] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 3.6%
> [67] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 2.3%
>
>
>
> Top 10 Users of RRAP DEC 2001
>
> [409] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 10.7%
> [352] Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> 9.2%
> [265] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 7.0%
> [257] Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> 6.7%
> [194] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.1%
> [180] Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> 4.7%
> [121] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.2%
> [113] Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> 3.0%
> [98] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 2.6%
> [92] KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> 2.4%
>
> --
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

290. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 17:01:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201030901.7648c15e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29851

> > > OhYeah . . ain't nothing like the sweet music a blueprinted 59AB block
> > > with a pair of Stromberg 97s and a pair of glaspaks can still sing in
> > > a nosed & decked '51 Fowd convert . . pitter-patter. Hell, we even
> > > done some pore "deprived" Amish chicks with those. Pitter-patter Phase
> > > II. Yahoo!
> >
> > OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> > My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> > added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> > kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> > and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> The Amish as I understand it generally are allowed to raise hell in their
> late teens and the parentage hope to hell they come to their senses and
> return in one piece to carry on.
>
>
That's the reality Dick but in the minds of us '50s city kids well
east of their neighborhood like myself they were held in awe as
stalwarts of purity and steadfastness to their lofty principles as
scewball as those were by our measures. They were not at all known
then for any loosy-goosey behavior especially by the pubescents
amongst them.
>
>
As we usually did on Friday nites us Aldan Borough Ugly Five
hellraisers piled into Tommy Mau's bleating & popping red '51 Ford
convertible and off we went to The Well, a weekly high-school level
dance held at the Irish-American Club in Terminal Square. Major
big-burg rail & bus transit hub, kids from everywhere lookin' for
action.
>
>
So one nite four broads showed up which we'd never seen before. They
were huddled in a corner looking kinda confused and outta place but
man they had bods to kill for, they were stumbling around on 4" spikes
and they smelled like and were painted like Saturday nite Paris ladies
of the night . . "OK guys, we got fair prey here, it's time to FEED.
Tally-ho . . !"

>
>
I landed on the dark-haired but otherwise Kim Novak lookalike. I quickly noticed a buncha oddities abt her. She talked kinda funny for one, had a bit of an accent and twisted her nouns & verbs here & there. Couldn't quite figger it although I'd heard it before. She didn't know the music or cool dancing and she had a helluva time with the spikes. I finally told her to kick the damned things off, I pitched my penny loafers and we danced all night barefoot. No way anybody could get a 0.005" shim between us toes to noses. For hours. Whew. Talk abt a rigid digit generator.
>
>
I asked her where she wuz from but she pointedly and coyly deflected the question several times, drove me nuts. Eventually I got me a hunch. I'd had a wood shop teacher name of Edgar Strykker from upstate who taught me some bits and pieces of Up County Dutch. I tossed a few of those at her and she didn't even notice I'd shifted languages. That was the end of her game. Holyshit, an Amish girl fer chrissake! Culture shock, could not believe it. Kept it to myself.
>
>
When the lights came up at midnite she looked me in the eye and and purred something like "You know where I'm from and what I am . . " Dumbass Walt Kramer asks if "we" can take them home which was the mandatory maneuver after a dance back then. Visions of getting laid in the back seat, yeah, sure, of course. I'm biting my tongue and giggling to myself, this is gonna be one helluva trip.
>
>
Vince Castle din participate, he wuz hot on a local redhead name of Corrine and they bailed out on a Media trolley and went on to have five kids. So it got down to Tom The Wheel, the other Brian in the group, Kramer and myself and the four Amish broads. 'Cept I was the only one who knew they were Amish.
>
>
"Can you drop us off in Birdsboro?" "WHAT the HELL is a Birdsboro and where izzit?? asketh The Wheelman. "'Bout 50 miles away out the PA turnpike dumbo." sayeth me. I'd been there earlier at the Boy Scout camp outside Birdsboro. Off we went, one of my more memorable drives in the country . . Eight-pack of scrambled hormones in a '51 Ford convert bumping along on it's aft axle for an hour and a half. Nope, she wuz not packing falsies, they wuz real .38s.
>
>
We crested a hill on the far side of Birdsboro 'way out in the middle of nowhere at 2 AM or so. "Let us off here!" Huh? OK . . Poof, they were off down the hill and disappeared into the darkness. Got me another hunch. There was a barn at the bottom of the hill under the only street light within a couple miles. "Hey Mau, shut the frigging

engine off, kill the lights, coast halfway down the hill, park it and
shaddup."
>
>
Maybe twenty minutes later four very proper Amish girls popped outta
the barn complete with their ankle-length gray skirts, starched white
bonnets & aprons and big sewing baskets. They trundled off again,
right outta the tourist guides and never to be seen again. Yeah,
they'd told their parents they'd gotten together for an Amish "sewing
bee" that Friday nite allrighty . . More like a zipper-yanking bee
with some "English" bad boyz from the city.
>
>
Lotta illusions died that nite.
>
>
Roll forward maybe forty years later and I'm in a family restaraunt
sorta joint in Intercourse PA for lunch doing a legenadry Up Country
meatloaf. In those parts an open seat at a table is an invitation to
sit. An elderly Amish farmer did. I related the whole tale and he's
grinning from ear to ear. "You people have always had a hard time
understanding that there is no such thing as a 16 year old Amish
virgin, ain't?"
>
>
> A '50 Lincoln was the height of coolth in my early teens followed by a 49
> Mercury.
>.
Don't particularly remember the Lincolns except that those
self-propelled barges needed Coast Guard nummers on their bows,
fuhgeddit. The Zephyrs were kinda cool though. The Mercs were where it
wuz AT in that group.
>
>
> One of the latter got into a bumper clanger which did not do any
> body damage but about 412 pounds of lead fell into the street from the
> nose-and-deck job. Looked like it been attacked by metal moths and the
> owner did not look real happy.
>
> A flathead as I recall was about 3.8 liters, the size of my Mopar
> screaming banshee. Wasn't all that big.
>
There were flatheads and there were flatheads. The original was a
135in^3 (2.2 Liter) mill which I think first showed up in the '32
A-Bones, 60Hp or something like that. The '50s versions were 289s (4.7
Liters) which kicked out around 100Hp. Don't skewer me too hard, it's
been a LONG time. My 440 in^3 Mopar beast on the other hand wuz an
ovehead valve 7.2 Liter abomination. They're all now non-discussions,
today it's in the computer chips, revs and o'head cams, no comparison
wrt the lame cubes/Hp ratios of yesteryear.

>
> I learned hi-speed driving in an Austin-Healy 100-4 based on a tractor
> engine as were the 240Z and TRseries.
>
>
Imports. No fair.
>
>
> There was an exhaust note that
> might as well have been wired directly to the old gonads.
>
>
If it ain't a V-8 noise I doan wanna hear abt it. With a few notable
exceptions. Back in my airborne daze I got close up and friendly with
mills like the 1,500 Hp Allison V-12s in P-51s and the thundering
round-engine Pratts in the assorted Naval birds. Man, when the stick
'n pedal jocks firewall those suckers for takeoff even today ya get
RELIGION, to hell with just the gonads coming to attention.
>
>
> Understeer
> right up there with a garbage truck but golly that was fun. One of the
> oddities of driving in Nebraska is that the section roads often have a jog
> in them to get lined up with the survey on the next range.
>
>
Sounds like yer surveyors get too much into yer corn . .
>
>
> I happened to
> go into a 35 mph corner at something well in excess of that, went into a
> farm lot with its entry right where an escape route should have been, thru
> a shed fortunately with both doors open, turned around in his yard, went
> back thru the shed and on my way and didn't do more than scare a few
> chickens; almost got me going to church again.
>
>
Jeeesus! Yeah, I think most of us got hardcore reality checks one way
or another. Mine came the midnite I was "doing" a guy and his brand
new 'Vette side by side on West Chester Pike. I wuz a length ahead in
second doing maybe 70 when all of a sudden there was a huge bang and a
shower of fireworks on his part. I got off the pedal and he did
beaucoup 360s past me sparks everywhere. His whole drivetrain was
scattered all over the Pike, I think I ran over his driveshaft. He
finally came to rest INSIDE a freaking Laundromat. Plowed right thru
the front window & the line of washers. He got out and looked OK so I
got the hell outta Broomall real quick like. Went home and diddled the
Vibroplex on 80 and rethought my whole life.
>
>

>
> Dick Nï¿½BK
>
>
w3rv

291. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 17:22:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201030922.421c4dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29852

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 1, 2002:

Novice - 40,155 (decrease of 9,174)
Tech - 234,319 (increase of 28,925)
Tech Plus - 85,438 (decrease of 43,422)
General - 138,657 (increase of 25,980)
Advanced - 86,546 (decrease of 13,236)
Extra - 97,995 (increase of 19,245)
Total - 683,110 (increase of 8,318)

73 de Jim, N2EY

292. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 17:22:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a123sr$co7$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 29854

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6hlb.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:20:24 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
> >> >restriction part before I signed the contract.
> >
> >> You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the deed.
> >
> >Mine was an HOA agreement, initialed by me and two officers.
>
> You're home free as long as the HOA By-Laws gave the officers the
> power to grant such a waiver.
>
> If not, and (in California) if it wasn't done as a result of a
> resolution adopted at an open meeting, the officers are open to a
> lawsuit brought by any other member of the Association voiding the
> waiver.

Right. Lining-out a restriction is about as effective an exemption as
refusing to sign a citation for a moving violation. Changing home owners
restrictions usually require a 2/3rds vote of the homeowners. And it's
nearly impossible to get that many homeowners to even return a
self-addressed stamped envelope with a check mark on it.

293. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 17:24:46 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a12478$n6pe6$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 29853

I realize the original post was a troll, but this was a GREAT reply, it was exactly what I was thinking.

By the way, the Ham Bands are "free" too, the FCC doesn't charge me a dime to use them. All I have to do is take a test. And while some places charge to take the tests, our club (BARC, Birmingham Amateur Radio Club, http://www.w4cue.com) underwrites the cost, so you can walk into one of the test sessions and take any test for free.

And I get to operate without worrying about the FCC looking over my shoulder, or worrying I'll get caught! Heh.

73,

Robert / N4IXT

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message news:95bu2u8msof02mvqjtp165ol6sn6krlh86@4ax.com...
> On 30 Dec 2001 00:24:18 -0800, twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
> (Twistedhed) wrote:
>
> >I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> >this
> >group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> >frequencies
> >from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> >think.
>
> Hmmm, are you licensed operators, operating under the
> authorization of the government of your country of residence with
> active participation in public service, public safety and emergency
> response? Do you have a call sign issued to you by your operating
> authority, thereby providing an easily verified method of identifying
> the originator of transmissions from your station? No, I think the
> only thing you have in common with hams is that you know how to key up
> a mike and speak into it.
>
> >We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> >conditions.
> >We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> >technical
> >issues as well or better.
>
> No, you are illegal operators with a knowledge of propagation
> and skip conditions. You are criminals with high-ticket tools with
> which you engage in your criminal activities.

>
> >However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> >is
> >rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> >should
> >not be.
>
> The attitude hams have toward you is the same as hams would
> have toward any other criminal. You are not treated as 2nd class
> citizens any more than the drunk driver, the shoplifter or chronic
> speeder in our neighborhood. You are treated with every bit of
> respect that you deserve, criminal.
>
> >We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> >do.
>
> And those rights are the right to study for a license and to
> operate according to the law - or face criminal action and the disdain
> of those who prefer to obey the law and operate within the law. You
> seem to think that you deserve a free ride, all the rights and
> privileges of ham operating, but none of the responsibilities.
>
> >For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> >is
> >a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> >is
> >that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> >talk with
> >him before you condemn him.
>
> Oh, I've talked to plenty of them... I've also talked to
> criminals of every other type as well. There seems to be a common
> thread running through each of them, the belief that the rules apply
> to others, not to them.
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

294. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 17:37:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201030937.256d3789@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29855

"Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message news:<3c33c1e8_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.

Maybe. You ever worked HF/MF on an amateur band lower than 25 MHz?

> I also
> fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a Wilson 1000
> magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday and
> talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii. I
> missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas.

Obviously on 10 meters when the band was wide open at the peak of the
sunspot cycle. You got a log of that operation?

> I haven't
> done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out and a
> horizontally polarized beam

How do you get 300 watts out of an FT-890?
>
> I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation that
> we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack up
> some pretty amazing log files.

This has been known for a while. Back in the '20s 8GZ/W8GZ, Loren
Windom, worked Australia from Ohio using a fraction of a watt of power
output. Using a one-tube transmitter and a simple receiver.

"Amazing" is in the mind of the beholder.

> I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most of
> the time.

No, it can do better ALL of the time.

> I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.

Yup. But 25 watts isn't QRP. It's more than an S-unit above QRP.

> I
> am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work, and
> diligence one must have to do it with QRP.

Much of which is on the other end of the QSO.

> Big watts make the trip easy.

Only with a decent antenna, which is the whole point. Given a choice between the legal limit into a limited antenna and QRP into a good antenna, I'll take antenna over power any day.

In a few years or less the sunspots will be gone and the bands above 10 MHz will be usable for skywave propagation only during the day - if then. At night there will be times when even 40 meters is almost useless.

73 de Jim, N2EY

(yes, 8GZ was THAT WIndom)

295. Re: About 10m repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 18:35:21 UTC
From: John Hypes <johnhypes@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <da893ukn5t57ne9v7l3sl2ll1h387obcps@4ax.com>
Source record: 29856

Hi,,

We have Va3RPT here in Ontario, Canada. 29.620.000Mhz.
WE / I hear FL stations all the time up here.

I have your call K0MB so i'll heep an ear out for you.

Ve3hsc ((Scott))

On 01 Jan 2002 20:58:13 GMT, mailfrmpa@aol.com (MailfrmPA) wrote:

>>informations about repeaters in that HF band: which are their frequencies
>>and their "shift" (more or less how many kHz)
>
>Those that I know of are all 100KHz, xmit low. Some commonly heard ones here
>are 29.520 in, 29.620 out; 29.530 in, 29.630 out; 29.540 in, 29.640 out; 29.550
>in, 29.640 out. See the pattern?
>
>>Are they all in USA or in
>>other Countries too?
>
>From my QTH in Colorado I have not heard any European repeaters, but I do
>regularly hear the Carribean.
>
>73,
>K0MB

296. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 18:57:46 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a12d0n$h5a$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"rich@work" <richf69@megahits.com> wrote in message
news:u37i5lg2141cb9@corp.supernews.com...
> let me make myself perfectly clear. STOP POSTING THIS SHIT---NO ONE WANTS
> TO READ ABOUT YOU BITCHING AND WHINING LIKE A GIRL. IF YOU WANT TO BE A
> DICK PLEASE BE A DICK ANYWHERE ELSE BUT ALT.2600
>
> rich@work

Go..fuck...yourself...

297. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 19:06:23 UTC
From: Little Woger <BigMarie@WogerISgay.com>
Message-ID: <a12a1c$95k$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29857
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a0tf4q$lqe$8@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Stagger Milhaus Romain 'child raper' Fentworth Lee"
> <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:3C321DCF.1B5E593C@houston-hunks.com...
> > JR wrote:
> > >
> > > KC8JBO wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > > > news:a0rfi5$lrf$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Surely you jest!
> > > >
> > > That's right "arf arf!"'s only friends are the police department
he's
> been
> > > > spending days and weeks at a t time with, involuntarily.
> > >
> > "t time"? Were they playing golf, woger?
> >
> > It is an [Faggot Lee's admission he couldn't pass the morse code test
> noted]
>
> Faggot Lee usually concentrates on fucking little kids up the ass, don't
> you, CONVICT?
>
Well Roger, looks like you've made yet more enemies in
alt.2600 You started flaming their group for no reason. Cool!
Now you can add them to your looooong list of enemies. Have
you played peek-a-boo through Big Marie's curtains lately?
```

298. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 19:20:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpdd70z.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29858

On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with all
>wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
>transmission lines of any type may be installed".

That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to refer
to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

299. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 19:20:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpddl70.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29860

On Thu, 3 Jan 2002 08:50:02 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:

>> It's long established law that all communiucations are interstate in
>> nature, and that The Congress has the power to make legislation
>> affecting any communications and to delegate that power to the FCC
>> under the commerce clause. What the layman sees as "non-commercial"
>> use of radio is in fact interstate commerce.
>
>Interstate, undoubtedly. With regard to 'commerce' and the Amateur Service,
>the FCC's opinion would seem to be at odds with yours.

I learned "my opinion" while at the FCC....."interstate commerce"
is a term of art in regulatory law and includes situatins where
value does not change hands.

>> The Congressional mandate on the OTARDs was done to make it crystal
>> clear that the FCC was to exercise pre-emption over CC&Rs. The FCC
>> didn't do it on their own - it was in the era of Reed Hundt who
>> didn't blow his nose without White House or Congressional mandate.
>
>Reed Hundt's departure seems not to have made much difference in this
>regard. He who has the gold still makes the rules.

You betcha. His predecessors, Madman Mark and Charlie Ferris, were
from some other planet as well.

The last decent chairman we had was Dick Wiley in the 1970s.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

300. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 19:20:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpddrm1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29859

On Thu, 3 Jan 2002 09:23:38 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with all
>> wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
>> transmission lines of any type may be installed".
>
>If you're serious about having a station your way, and you don't like the
>rules, move.

Or get the rules changed. Court suits are one legitimate way of
getting them changed. but the burden is on you to show why they
should be changed.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

301. Re: Open Letter to Mr. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 19:28:16 UTC
From: kamasoupa@aol.com
Message-ID: <632c4b71.0201031128.1400d7b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29861

David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F7BBE.5EAFC23A@ix.netcom.com>...
> Open letter to Mr. Hollingsworth.
>
> Re: Kevin Mitnick (N6NHG)
>
> Dear Mr. Hollingsworth,
>
> A wise person once said-
> "If I stand idly by as injustice is done,
> then my hands, too,
> are stained with that injustice."
>
> A lot of people in the ham community
> see revoking Mr. Mitnick's license as an unjust over-reaction.
> It's not like he was on 14.313 thumbing his nose at everyone.
> I could name current licensees with criminal records that make
> Mr. Mitnick look like a gilded saint. But then, they didn't
> make the national news. Uncle can get more headlines beating up
> a celebrity then by whacking a real criminal.
> I wonder about the morality of "making an example"
> of someone who has paid their debt.
>
> Mr. Mitnick did his time and, as far as we know,
> has been straight since. More then a few believe
> that someone in Justice ordered someone else
> to slap the boy, just for the sake of petty vengeance.
>
> We're concerned.
> If one person is treated unjustly,
> what about when it's *our* turn?
> But we're not the ones "on the ground" in this case;
> we must rely on those empowered with the public trust
> to show us the justice of such matters.
> What do *you* say about it?
> You are respected in the community.
> Your words carry weight with us.
> If there is justification for continuing to kick this man
> after he's served his sentence,
> surely it can stand the test of public disclosure.
>
> We just want know our hands are clean.
>
> Sincerely, David S.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

What a joke! Kevin Mitnick chooses to post this message on his website, http://www.kevinmitnick.com -- even though everybody who talks on the repeater in the Malibu Hills knows that N6NHJ is a known liar and thief. NHJ is a gun toting looney who recently tried to burn his ham radio license at a local Orange County, Calif restaurant. NHJ is the biggest snitch in ham radio history, something Kevin Mitnick use to believe was worst than being a *bin Laden* follower. NHJ snitched out ham Richard Burton. NHJ violates every Part 97 section. NHJ violates every ham radio code of ethics. NHJ has no honor...& cannot be trusted. NJH is backing Kevin Mitnick. What does that say about Mitnick's morals and ethics???

As John Markoff recently said about Mitnick, "The guy doesn't know when to stop. He has used up his 15 minutes of fame and is working on the next 45!" Aren't you all bored with Mitnick's shit. He now has another Mitnick Defense Fund. He plans to *social engineer* money out of the poor amateur radio hams so that he doesn't have to pay a cent of his own money for attorney fees. Mitnick is a cheap little creep who was so bad that he got fired from his radio show and dropped months ago from several writing jobs. Kevin, we all know your ghost writers have covered your ass for years. You can't write worth shit. Why don't we ask Jack Biello how many writing assignments he wrote for you.

The FCC may be taking a hard stand against you, and you may have paid some very heavy dues by serving more prison time than you deserved...but, the world needs to know what a whiney back stabbing bastard you are. You have been back on ham radio begging for remotes, begging for funds for your FCC Mitnick Defense Fund, and begging for attention which you don't deserve.

GET A LIFE, MITNICK! PAY BACK YOUR GRANDMOTHER FOR ALL THOSE THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS SHE GAVE YOU FOR PHONE CALLS WHILE YOU WERE IN PRISON FOR 5 YEARS. You took all her retirement money and squandered it on Prison Phone Time. It's time for you to growup!
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

302. Re: Open Letter to Mr. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 20:00:11 UTC
From: kamasoupa@aol.com
Message-ID: <632c4b71.0201031200.b2251bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29863

David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F7BBE.5EAFC23A@ix.netcom.com>...
> Open letter to Mr. Hollingsworth.
>
> Re: Kevin Mitnick (N6NHG)
>
> Dear Mr. Hollingsworth,
>
> A wise person once said-
> "If I stand idly by as injustice is done,
> then my hands, too,
> are stained with that injustice."
>
> A lot of people in the ham community
> see revoking Mr. Mitnick's license as an unjust over-reaction.
> It's not like he was on 14.313 thumbing his nose at everyone.
> I could name current licensees with criminal records that make
> Mr. Mitnick look like a gilded saint. But then, they didn't
> make the national news. Uncle can get more headlines beating up
> a celebrity then by whacking a real criminal.
> I wonder about the morality of "making an example"
> of someone who has paid their debt.
>
> Mr. Mitnick did his time and, as far as we know,
> has been straight since. More then a few believe
> that someone in Justice ordered someone else
> to slap the boy, just for the sake of petty vengeance.
>
> We're concerned.
> If one person is treated unjustly,
> what about when it's *our* turn?
> But we're not the ones "on the ground" in this case;
> we must rely on those empowered with the public trust
> to show us the justice of such matters.
> What do *you* say about it?
> You are respected in the community.
> Your words carry weight with us.
> If there is justification for continuing to kick this man
> after he's served his sentence,
> surely it can stand the test of public disclosure.
>
> We just want know our hands are clean.
>
> Sincerely, David S.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Slight typo on that callsign...snitch KC6NHJ
Hams like NHJ are backers of Mitnick. Anyone with half a brain will
sit back and watch Network Hacking Genius Mitnick go down at the hands
of the FCC. Couldn't happen to a more deserving ham!
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

303. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 20:01:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103150114.10639.00002074@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29864

>Subject: Re: The Usual Suspects!
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/3/2002 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C346CD5.6F137D37@IEEE.org>

>I made $1000 in one month. That's about $17 an hour.
>It wasn't worth the hassle.

Still less than I earn. And without the risk.

73

Steve, K4YZ

304. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 20:02:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103150228.10639.00002075@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 29865

>Subject: Re: The Usual Suspects!
>From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>Date: 1/3/2002 10:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a122abbui1@news.service.uci.edu>

>Good to see (CENSORED) absent from the list in 3 out of 4.

ARE YOU NUTS...?!?!?

Shhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh!

=)

73
Steve, K4YZ

305. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 21:09:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu>
Source record: 29866

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...

> > By the same token, Kim, it might behoove you to get on the air and
> > compare a QRP rig on an attic dipole with Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest - in order to get a
> > better feel for what these fellas are trying to say to you.

> Jim: I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.

A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.

306. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 21:19:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201031319.33ebc764@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29867

"Kim-wrote:..
> "N2EY" wrote:

> > >> I'm surprised that he didn't reply that the new licensee should raise
> his
> > >> code speed to 40 WPM so that he could be considered a real ham despite
> the
> > >> new regs.
>
> > >He can't. He can't do that fast...LOL
> > >
> > I can.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > "It ain't braggin' if ya really done it" - Babe Ruth
>
> Yeah, but you're far from the inhuamness of a Larry Roll, Jim.

All depends whose standards of "huamness" we use, Kim ;-)

> Oh, and I
> happen to know of a gal here who has an ARRL certificate for 45 wpm.

Cool.

> Ever worked KF9AS?

Nope. Not that I know of, anyway.

Speed is but one measure of code skill. I know folks who can zip along
at incredible speed - as long as the signal is in the clear. Others
are not nearly so fast but they can dig a signal out of the mud that
most folks can't even hear. Then there's the ability to put it on
paper, the ability to operate in tough circumstances, the ability to
keep track of what's going on, etc. Contesting and traffic handling
develop those skills. I've got a list around here somewhere....

Coupla FDs ago I had a 13 year old Extra show up in the CW tent. He'd
been an Extra a few years but wasn't a contest op - not that FD is
much of a contest, anyway. He could read 25 per easily but I hadda
coach him on what to send and when, how to keep the log, that sorta
stuff. After a half hour he was getting the idea. Give him a coupla
years and contests and he'll be pretty good. Reminded me of myself
about 30 Field Days ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

307. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 21:19:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C34CAE3.B88D08B@uci.edu>
Source record: 29868

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 3 Jan 2002 08:50:02 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >Interstate, undoubtedly. With regard to 'commerce' and the Amateur Service,
> >the FCC's opinion would seem to be at odds with yours.

> I learned "my opinion" while at the FCC....."interstate commerce"
> is a term of art in regulatory law and includes situatins where
> value does not change hands.

Can you cite an example where conducting amateur communications was
considered a form interstate commerce? If it is considered as such,
then the latest ruling would seem a non-uniform application of the law.

308. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 21:27:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201031327.796cd43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29869

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020101220703.04115.00000763@mb-fy.aol.com>...

> I recall from somewhere that while "Tonto" is Spanish for "foolish one" or some
> such, "Kimosabe" could be interpreted as "know it all". Not a compliment.

Could be, there was all kindsa word games on the airwaves back then.
Imagine how far the Amos 'n Andy show would fly today.

> >>
> Yea, verily. Also Sky King and the Nabisco logo flying into the upper left
> corner of the screen.

Screen? What screen? We're talking RADIO days, the screen wuz in yer
head!

> Just don't wipe out a doe on 202 near Dilworthtown like I just did. Odyssey's
> outa commission for a while.

That stinks. They seem to prefer Hondas, my eldest daughter nailed two
of 'em at the same time on the Pike in Edgemont with her Civic. Did
$1,100 worth of damage when the 1500GL was $5k. It gets worse a bit
north, New Hampshire loses an average of five citizens a year in
collisions with their 2,000 moose. Meese?

We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

309. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 21:28:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201031328.e7f2549@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29870

Addendum to previous list:

N2EY wrote:

> Here are some of mine (in no particular order):
>
> - Get workshop and station properly set up and in order.
> - Fix up antenna system with better materials, new coax, etc.
> - Add some options and mods to K2 #2084
> - Build kit or homebrew 100 W amp for same
> - Sell off about 50% of ham radio parts/material inventory (that's a BIG job!)
> - Set new personal best scores on FD, SS, and other contests.
> - Attend a local hamfest or two
> - Get BMI (body mass index) under 23 so I'm in better physical shape
> for all of the above

- Get touchtyping skill up to 60-70 wpm or better
- Get dedicated shack computer

> Will they all get done by December 31 2002? We'll see!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Anybody else?

310. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 22:28:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C34DB13.888A8A25@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29871

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> This is called Third Party operation. The licensed person is acting
> as the control operator for the station, and is responsible for its
> proper operation...including what you say.

Like no dirty word or business (pecuniary) messages. That
"no business" rule is actually there to protect the ham bands
from being taken over by companies wanting to avoid
phone bills. Also some countries don't like 3rd party
comms. Oddly enough, the bad ol' USSR didn't mind,
but England did.

> You can actually operate
> the transceiver -- push the buttons, turn the dials, and do all the
> talking -- including giving your friend's call sign. He just has to be
> present and keep you from doing anything wrong -- like operating
> in a manner which exceeds his privileges.

Being present in a bed sleeping doesn't count. The FCC said as
much when ex KF4FZ(sp) operated 3rd party from another
ham's station.

311. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 22:43:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C34DE87.38169698@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29872

>
> I think you mean you had to send and receive at 5 wpm for the Novice......;-)
>
> >Times change and no one
> >has ever shown that if you can receive at X you couldn't
> >send at X also.
> ><SNIP>
>
> It's been shown many times. When you hear a licensed amateur with a terrible
> fist, it's clear that the person passed the receiving test but can't send worth
> a hoot. FCC just didn;t want to be bothered by sending tests, plus they require
> subjective judgement and an examiner who knows da code. End of story.

Back in 1976 I had to send using their straight key at the old FCC office
in NYC. And the examiner was a black woman, not your stereotype
person you would have imagined. She knew the code.

>
>
> >> >> But none of this answers the original question: What is so special
> >about
> >> >> 3524 kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?
> >> >
> >> >It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".
> >>
> >> BINGO!!!!
> The point is that making a person pass additional technical tests to use
> subbands is even more of an example of "jumping through hoops" as the code
> tests were claimed to be. Yet Grand Poobah Carl supports 'em. In other words,
> it's OK to make hams jump through technical test hoops to get more privs.
>

> I think, however,
> >the "problem" becomes one of WHAT privileges
> >should be coupled to what requirements. I have
> >always felt that 1500 watts power was uncalled for
> >for just a tech license once the written test was no
> >longer the equal to the General.

A lot of what privs to allow to what level of license has to
do with what is easily enforceable. What frequency you
are on is easily observed at a remote FCC field site. How
much power is not so easily identifyable. Are you using a
kilowatt into a vertical, or 100W into a beam that happens to
be pointed their way? The FCC guy has to pay you an

inspecting visit. That costs a lot more than just sitting
at a desk playing with a radio dial.

312. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 22:48:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C34DFA6.DD6836B9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29873

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
>
> OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
>

And I had a 72 Ford Pinto in 1979. Much less fun
to drive. That is, when it did function....

I do hear that hot rodders like Pintos for their
spacious engine compartments and small size
of the overall car. They put muscle engines in
'em.

313. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 22:52:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C34E09E.B0D7E913@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29874

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
> is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.

Just make sure that those BIG cats realize that humans taste bad.
And that deer are much more yummy.

314. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-03 23:51:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C34EE8B.184224EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29875

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation that
> we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack up
> some pretty amazing log files.

Under certain circumstances QRP can work around the world. QRP doesn't
do very well on 160, 80 or 40m when it comes to working DX. The amazing
logs would come after toiling in the QRP vineyards for a number of years
or after you install the phenomenal antenna farm for use with your QRP
rig. Otherwise, the only time a visiting ham might find your log amazing
is when he remarks, "Amazing--you've been on the air for five years and
you're still on your first log book!".

I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most of
> the time. I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.

I just came from an early evening CW pileup on 40m. The DX was
A61AJ and the calling horde must have numbered over a hundred stations
in the U.S. alone. QRP rigs don't break piles like that anytime.
If the propagation gods smile and if you have a decent antenna at decent
height, you'd have A61AJ in your amazing log....but only after the big
cats are finished with their feeding.

> I
> am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work, and
> diligence one must have to do it with QRP. Big watts make the trip easy.

"Big watts" might make it easy but I'd rather have a hundred watts into
a couple of elements at 75 feet on 40m than have the legal limit going
to a dipole at 30 feet. Some of the guys with "big watts" and big
antennas are also hard working, patient and diligent. Their efforts are
directed toward building and maintaining their stations rather than
sitting in line to work a rare one.

Dave K8MN

315. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 00:05:55 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C34F1D0.3D55DE79@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29876
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"middlefinnger4@home.moc" wrote:
>
> Early January Returns
>
> Top 10 Users
>
> [43] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 11.5%
> [40] Scott Unit-69 <uppluss@hotmail.com> 10.7%
> [24] Frank Gilliland <sparky@cet.com> 6.4%
> [22] \"Landshark\ <Landshark@TheLandshark.com> 5.9%
> [15] JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> 4.0%
> [14] Moparholic <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> 3.7%
> [14] SD SpecialDelivery Jones <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> 3.7%
> [11] Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> 2.9%
> [9] Scott (Unit-69) <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> 2.4%
> [9] middlefinnger4@home.moc <middlefinger4@home.comski> 2.4%

I like the way my forges make me the un-number 2.

Please keep up the good work. You are amusing my lawyer.
(I think it's just the dollar signs in his eyes...)

upplus (with ONE "S") at hotmail dot com @ 24.9.144.161.
Any other IP is fake. Don't feed the trolls.

316. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 00:17:45 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020103191745.14755.00003076@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 29877

>>What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?
>
>Great question, Ryan.
>
>Here are some of mine (in no particular order):

Ditto! :-)

- Develop a good fist, then...
- Crank up the speed
- Scratch build a 3 el. 10m Yagi
- Scratch build a 4 or 6 el. 2m quad
- Erect a Carolina Windom 80
- Erect a 10 - 80 doublet
- Set-up a nicely "organized" shack
- Get XYL to take Technician exam (Easy, she already wants to.)
- Get XYL to take element 1 (Not-so-easy, "it all sounds the same.")
- Join an ARC.
- Join FISTS
- ARRL 20-wpm Code Proficiency Certificate
- Add radar endorsement to GROL

Phew, I'm "tuckered" already...but I'll get 'em done. ;-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

317. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 00:19:06 UTC
From: wavelengthzero@aol.com
Message-ID: <8b6cfc98.0201031619.26653dfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> > crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> > messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> > gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> > Truckers are leading the way....
> >
> > Scott, Unit-69
> > Chesapeake Bay
> >
> > --
> > NOTE that someone is forging me using "upplus@hotmailNOSPAM.com". Pay
> > not attention to this idiot. My posts always come from
> > "uppluss@hotmail.com".

hehe pretty soon we are going to be transmitting on the 30Mhz band.
but seriously you cant move on up past 27.990, I dont want to mess
with the Ham Radio Users, so this is the last stand. no where else to
go.

318. Re: Spark Transmitter on CB????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 00:21:00 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201031621.1535965d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 2 Jan 2002 16:06:23 -0500, "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
wrote:
> >I think what your actually after is an ARC Transmitter and not a spark gap
> >transmitter. The difference is in order to transmit a AM modulated signal
> >you need a carrier. The spark gap does not support that but an arc
> >transmitter does and is fundamentally different. The carrier is generated
> >in the arc LC combination which is continuously produced and coupled to a
> >tuned LC circuit. The ARC is then modulated to produce AM. Very high
> >voltages and power are required thus making this design not only dangerous
> >but impractical by today's standards.

OK I read more about it at
http://c2.com/~ward/morse/lecture.html

It says there you can make a spark transmitter with a neon sign
transformer. I might try it. The part I don't understand is why it is
illegal. If someone is hearing me on top of their communications isn't
it their fault? They are the ones with the weak radio if they can't
get over me.

Scott, Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay

319. Re: dumb question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 00:31:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpdt1w2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29880

On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 17:28:35 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>Being present in a bed sleeping doesn't count. The FCC said as
>much when ex KF4FZ(sp) operated 3rd party from another
>ham's station.

And there is a caveat that someone who had his/her license revoked,
suspended, or refused-renewal cannot operate a station even under
the "supervision" of a licensed control operator.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

320. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 01:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103200732.01870.00000774@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29881

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> I recall from somewhere that while "Tonto" is Spanish for "foolish one" or
>some
>> such, "Kimosabe" could be interpreted as "know it all". Not a compliment.

>Could be, there was all kindsa word games on the airwaves back then.

Oh yeah, they got away wid moidah.

>Imagine how far the Amos 'n Andy show would fly today.

They actually had white actors for the radio version!

>> Yea, verily. Also Sky King and the Nabisco logo flying into the upper left
>> corner of the screen.
>>
>Screen? What screen? We're talking RADIO days, the screen wuz in yer
>head!

I'm not THAT old!

>> Just don't wipe out a doe on 202 near Dilworthtown like I just did.
Odyssey's
>> outa commission for a while.
>>
>That stinks. They seem to prefer Hondas, my eldest daughter nailed two
>of 'em at the same time on the Pike in Edgemont with her Civic. Did
>$1,100 worth of damage when the 1500GL was $5k.

Right across from the Dilworthtown Inn. The body shop has it now, I pay the
deductible, insurance does the rest.

> It gets worse a bit
>north, New Hampshire loses an average of five citizens a year in
>collisions with their 2,000 moose. Meese?

Moose.

>We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
>is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.

Nah. All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more doe
licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.

The dern things are basically big cute vermin. Rats with antlers. No natural
enemies except two-legged and rubber-tired ones. The folks who get all upset

about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end of winter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

321. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 01:40:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201031740.71449000@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29882

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C34DFA6.DD6836B9@ix.netcom.com>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > OK, now you're really tugging on my nostalgia cord.
> > My first car was a 50 Ford conv which had glaspaks. I
> > added a set of dual 97s on the engine, added a contenental
> > kit on the rear, dropped a 51 hood on it, 49 ford grill trim
> > and a aftermarket grill trim filler piece. Tubular grill......
> >
>
> And I had a 72 Ford Pinto in 1979. Much less fun
> to drive. That is, when it did function....
>
>
Right up there near the top of the list of the worst ten cars ever.
>
>
>
> I do hear that hot rodders like Pintos for their
> spacious engine compartments and small size
> of the overall car. They put muscle engines in
> 'em.
>
>
Sure, there isn't any METAL in the damned things so when ya strip 'em
out they're very light with big engine compartments and make good
"surrounds" for what are called "funny cars." The equally terrible
Vegas are another one and for all the same reasons.
>
>
w3rv

322. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 01:51:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103205147.01870.00000780@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29884

In article <20011226000315.00833.00000845@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> Section 308(b) of the Communications Avt specifically charges the
>> Commission to make a detrmination of wherher any applicant or
>> licensee possesses the moral character to become or remain a
>> licensee.
>
> (1) Why wasn't this done at the time he was first convicted?

What good would it do to take away his license while he's in the pokey?

> If it had
>occured then, no one would have thought twice about it...

So if they yanked his license then, he'd be off the air now.

>But NOW it's just
>vengence. Vengence and justice are not necessarily synonymous.

The issue is renewal of the license.
>
> (2) WHO in the FCC has ANY qualifications to make a determination on
>morality? The bureaucrats and lawyers...?!?! HA!!

Not "morality" but "character".

>>Did you read the entire jistory of this case? This wasn't the first
>> time.....and may not be his last, either.
>
> Yes, I know about his "jistory". I also know that there has never been
>any allegation of misdeed as far as his Amateur license is concerned.

So where should the line be drawn? If he violates comm law but not Amateur Radio regs, he keeps his license? The law doesn't work like that.

>>>He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.

He's on probation. He'll go right back to jail if he violates it. He has NOT paid the price.
>>
>> He is totally unrepentent.
>
> So...Mr FCC Lawyer...Unless they drop to thier knees, wallowing in tears,
>begging you to forgive them and "pretty pretty please don't take my license".
>they are unworthy of submitting to your (or your successors) whims?

> A bit Napoleonic, aren't you?

All it takes is "Gee, I'm sorry, I made a mistake. Learned my lesson. Won't happen again."

Has he done that?

>>The FCC is doing what the law requires to yank this guy's privileges
>> to operate a radio.
>
> Was the FCC REQUESTED to revoke his license? If so, WHY? Has he
>perpetrated a NEW act against the law?

It's their JOB to enforce this stuff.

Seems to me that the real problem is that the FCC has been awful lenient for way too long. Now that Riley & Co. are trying to tighten things up, there are all sorts of complaints.

73 de Jim, N2EY

323. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 01:51:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103205147.01870.00000779@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29885

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gp9rln0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>One of my favorite photos is the one that I took of the power
> swap at Harrisburg (PA) in 1974 where the diesels were cut off
> the Broadway and the black-painted G (Amtrak 910, ex-PRR 4910)
> was backed on for its run to NY.

Last time I was there they had a brunswick-green GG-1 on display at the station.

The original plan was to extend the wire to Pittsburg and eventually to Chicago - the end of the PRR system. WW2 ended that idea.
>
> It wasn't the first time I rode behind a G (I "commuted"
> between NY and Washington several times in the mid-1950s and in
> the late 1970s) but it was the most memorable.

Ayup.
>
> The slight-of-hand trick that they do in Philly today with the
> train running backwards from NY pulled by an AEM-7 comes nowheres
> near that.

Sadly. Electric loco operation is mostly limited to the Corridor now. Some of the commuter agencies bought AEM-7 types and matching cars because they cost less than an equal number of seats in MUs.
>
>>"And now, after much hard work and dedication, we have one GG-1 locomotive
>>restored to its proper condition, as God and the Pennsylvania Railroad
>>intended".
>
> Amen, brother.

Yea, verily. I don;t know how many survive. Only one P-5 survives - a boxcab in St. Louis, of all places.

> I grew up near the Long Island RR yards in East New
> York (Brooklyn) and saw LOTS of electric power bustling around. The
> G is a holy object.

The Sunnyside complex is amazing. Much of it has both third rail and overhead catenary.

The real hero of US RR electrification is the old New Haven. They pioneered high voltage AC when everyone else thought low voltage DC. The GG-1 is similar to an earlier NHRR design - EP-3, I think.

Most of the freight lines that were electrified have had the wire taken down. In some cases the cat poles are gone too. Sad.

The real villain in the electrification story is the tax man. Most people don't realize that RRs pay enormous property taxes. And anything they do to improve the property raises the taxes. The cost savings of electrification can be nullified by increased taxes from every burg a line passes through. Add to this the ROI that is expected, and it's a losing game. Oddly enough, nobody expects competing rights-of-way to make an ROI.

73 de Jim, N2EY

324. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 01:51:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020103205148.01870.00000781@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29883

In article <20011225234315.00833.00000842@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>He had due process. He was convicted by a court (presumedly a trial by
>>jury).
>
> Granted. Now, please tell me WHERE in American law it is written that
>we
>keep ON punishing someone AFTER the sentence meted out by the court has been
>fulfilled?

Mr. M is out on probation. His sentence has NOT been fulfilled.
>
> This action to cancel his license has absolutely NOTHING to do with any
>misconduct as an Amateur licensee, and as far as I can remember, he never
>used
>his Amateur license in any of his previous misdeeds.

That's true. But he DID violate communications law - repeatedly. He has several convictions of comm law violations, not just one.

Although his license ran out in 1999, he is being allowed to operate until a decision is reached. There will be a hearing and other legal proceedings. The FCC did not "yank his license" - they are deciding whether it should be renewed.

The story is on the arrl website. Get the facts - all of them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

325. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:07:17 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C350E55.A5FAB738@uci.edu>
Source record: 29886

N2EY wrote:
> Although his license ran out in 1999, he is being allowed to operate until a
> decision is reached. There will be a hearing and other legal proceedings. The
> FCC did not "yank his license" - they are deciding whether it should be
> renewed.
>
> The story is on the arrl website. Get the facts - all of them.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I've heard him a few times on the W6NUT repeater (and on KFI). Seems to
me he's been watching his P's and Q's.

ac6xg

326. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:11:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C350296.8293505A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29887

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with all
> >wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> >transmission lines of any type may be installed".
>
> That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to refer
> to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.
>
>

But of course could easily be interpreted by anyone knowledable to mean exactly what it says.

327. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:15:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201031815.545a69ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29888

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C34E09E.B0D7E913@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
> > is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.
>
> Just make sure that those BIG cats realize that humans taste bad.
> And that deer are much more yummy.
>
>
The moms who live with the things in Idaho have 30-.06s hung over
their kitchen doors and know how to keep their kids from becoming some
cat's lunch. But here in the I-95 corridor fuhgeddit, the yuppy broads
around here would go apeshit ballistic if a big cat wandered by and
don't even bring up GUNS fer chrissake.
>
>
We have at least one big cat around here which made a helluva media
stir maybe four years ago when the Wilmington Delaware PD made a
complete ass of itself trying to nail the thing. Sent SWAT teams out
with night vision gear, imported a $1,000/day Great White Hunter from
Idaho, whatta bloody hoot. They never even came close and he/she fell
off the media radar screen. The thing is still surfing the Brandywine
River area, once in awhile folk run into the gutted leftovers from one
of it's meals.
>
>
Big cats don't like people. People stand upright which the cats
interpret as being a combat mode. As long as they're not starving they
avoid combat scenes. No healthy big cat around here could possibly be
starving so the likelihood of getting tangled up with one is very
remote. But don't kneel down to tie the laces of yer sneakers when yer
out in the woods along the Brandywine at night . .
>
>
w3rv

328. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:27:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020103212753.19213.00002193@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 29889

In article <6FQX7.316668$W8.11919805@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>You have left out the biggest single influence on whatever literary style
>I might possess, Tom McCahill who invented auto testing about 1949 for
>Mechanix Illustrated. I regularly use one of his lines -- whipping Granny
>down to the pool hall. He had a thing about Pontiacs, particularly the
>50s versions where Chief Pontiac on the hood actually lit up (note they
>have done goofy things like that to this day) so old guys could sight on
>it at 110 ft/sec on the Santa Monica Freeway. And the description of a 58
>model as having a trunk that would hold 17 dead giraffes and a catcher's
>mitt.

Dick:

Wow -- did you ever bring back great memories of my ute -- reading
all the car test articles and editorials by Tom McCahill! I was trying
to remember his name a few weeks ago, but couldn't dredge it up.
What brought it to mind was watching an episode of Motor Trend TV
on TNN, and hearing how Csaba Csere's name is really pronounced
by Jim Scouten! It's something like "Chubba Serie." Tom McCahill
had a writing style that brought a smile to my face with each and
every article, and I purchased at least one car based on his road
test results and personal opinion. I also liked the way he would
toss in comments on everything else from shotguns to shaving
soap. Mechanix Illustrated was a great old mag, and Tom McCahill
was a great writer!

73 de Larry, K3LT

329. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:37:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a134i0$hd4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29890

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020103080725.02371.00000827@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <a0tsq1cco1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
<SNIP>
> >But the number of hams that have been starting out via the Tech
> >has been significant since the majority of new hams since the
> >intro of the "nocode" tech have, in fact, taken the tech route.
>
> The Tech took over as the entry level long before 1991.
> A major reason is 2 meters.
>
> The point is that the number of new hams hasn't grown with the
> population since the 1970s.

What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
compared to today? The population has not been growing
anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)

<SNIP>
> >> 4) There is no experience requirement
> >
> >Nor has there been for about 50 years...at least to the extent
> >additional privileges were involved with the higher
> >license being saught after.
>
> Not true. Until the early 1970s the Extra required 2 years as a General or
> higher before they'd lket you near the test. Then it was one year, then
zip.

But being an Extra from (about) 1951 to 1967 did NOT garner
any additional privileges...hence no incentive. Given the
intro of incentive licensing (and special privileges for Extra),
what lead to the FCC dropping the 2 yr experience requirement
after continuing it for the 3 yrs between 67-70?

Did the ARRL petition for the change?

FCC unilateral action?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

330. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:40:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a134vm$5iv$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29891

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020103080722.02371.00000825@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3C320D30.CC2F854D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> Observation #1) Every ham enjoys Federal protection of their
> >> right to erect a TV antenna. Haven't heard any hams protesting
> >> that protection.
> > >
> > >You probably didn't notice, but I objected. Exactly what part
> > >of the Constitution gives the feds the rights to interfere
> > >with private contracts in private neighborhoods within a state?
> > >Please be specific.
> >
> > The rights to regulate interstate commerce. Radio is interstate commerce,
and
> > has been recognized as such since the early days of broadcasting.
"Commerce"
> > doesn't just mean commercial stations but all radio.

Yet cities, counties and states can and do regulate interstate commerce in
the cases where companies engaged in interstate commerce must
comply with state and local building codes, tax laws, employment
practices, etc.

Just something else to chew on.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

331. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:43:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a134ubies1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29892

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a123sr$co7$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6hlb.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> > On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:20:24 -0600, CAM wrote:
> >
> > >> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
> > >> >restriction part before I signed the contract.
> > >
> > >> You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the deed.
> > >
> > >Mine was an HOA agreement, initialed by me and two officers.
> >
> > You're home free as long as the HOA By-Laws gave the officers the
> > power to grant such a waiver.
> >
> > If not, and (in California) if it wasn't done as a result of a
> > resolution adopted at an open meeting, the officers are open to a
> > lawsuit brought by any other member of the Association voiding the
> > waiver.
>
> Right. Lining-out a restriction is about as effective an exemption as
> refusing to sign a citation for a moving violation. Changing home owners
> restrictions usually require a 2/3rds vote of the homeowners. And it's
> nearly impossible to get that many homeowners to even return a
> self-addressed stamped envelope with a check mark on it.

It really depends on the individual HOA. The rules governing
how each operates and/or makes changes can be
very different from one to another.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

332. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:47:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1354k$j5u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29893

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C33EA00.99F29ECC@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20020102203524.07928.00002242@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > > I didn't say that the only meaning of the FCC's ruling was an imminent
> > > spectrum sell-off. However, the FCC obviously doesn't see any need to
> > > protect a radio amateur's right to establish an effective station on
his
> > > own property -- on their own initiative. They'll do it if Congress
> > > forces them to, but somehow, I think that's a bill that would have a
very
> > > hard time getting to the floor, much less passing. This whole thing
> > > circles back to the fact that amateur radio doesn't have much of an
> > > economic impact -- at least, not enough to overcome it's nuisance
> > > value to those who don't understand us.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it
takes
> > to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
> > right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what
is
> > necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary
or
> > hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they
can
> > still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.
>
> Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with
all
> wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> transmission lines of any type may be installed".

A hidden indoor antenna wouldn't constitute a "transmission line."
Indeed, it would seem that the FCC preemption for TV/Satellite
reception would mandate allowing a transmission line from the
TV antenna or SAT dish to the inside of the home.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

333. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:48:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1357n$2s4$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29894

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpddrm1.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 3 Jan 2002 09:23:38 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with all
> >> wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> >> transmission lines of any type may be installed".
> > >
> > >If you're serious about having a station your way, and you don't like the
> > >rules, move.
>
> Or get the rules changed. Court suits are one legitimate way of
> getting them changed. but the burden is on you to show why they
> should be changed.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Has there been much/any success in that route regarding ham antennas?
Existing cases/case law, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

334. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:51:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a135cp$gr4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29895

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C350296.8293505A@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision
with all
> > >wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> > >transmission lines of any type may be installed".
> >
> > That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to refer
> > to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.
> >
> >
>
> But of course could easily be interpreted by anyone knowledable to mean
exactly
> what it says.

Carried to that degree, it could also prohibit having additional
electrical wiring done in or about the home. I think, however,
the idea of a transmission line is fairly common to mean external
power lines or cable lines.

I'd go with Phil on that one.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

335. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 02:58:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c351baf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29896

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201030937.256d3789@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message news:<3c33c1e8_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.
>
> Maybe. You ever worked HF/MF on an amateur band lower than 25 MHz?
>

Nope.

> >
> > I also
> > fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a Wilson
1000
> > magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday and
> > talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii. I
> > missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas.
>
> Obviously on 10 meters when the band was wide open at the peak of the
> sunspot cycle. You got a log of that operation?
>

Nope. Don't write a thing down when I'm mobile and I'm not really all that
inclined to do it stationary either. I've never had QSL cards yet...save
the quick put together ones my husband and I made and sent here locally for
our first night of operation on 10M.

> >
> > I haven't
> > done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out and a
> > horizontally polarized beam
>
> How do you get 300 watts out of an FT-890?
>

Well, you could with an amp, but he's just clarified for me that it does 100
watts, not 300.

> >
> > I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation
that
> > we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack
up
> > some pretty amazing log files.
>
> This has been known for a while. Back in the '20s 8GZ/W8GZ, Loren

> Windom, worked Australia from Ohio using a fraction of a watt of power
> output. Using a one-tube transmitter and a simple receiver.
>
> "Amazing" is in the mind of the beholder.
>
> > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most
of
> > the time.
>
> No, it can do better ALL of the time.
>

Really?

> >
> > I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
>
> Yup. But 25 watts isn't QRP. It's more than an S-unit above QRP.
>

Where'd you get 25 watts from? It's my understanding that 5 or less is QRP.

> >
> > I
> > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work,
and
> > diligence one must have to do it with QRP.
>
> Much of which is on the other end of the QSO.
>
> > Big watts make the trip easy.
>
> Only with a decent antenna, which is the whole point. Given a choice
> between the legal limit into a limited antenna and QRP into a good
> antenna, I'll take antenna over power any day.
>

Yep. Probably why a good QRP station does well.

>
> In a few years or less the sunspots will be gone and the bands above
> 10 MHz will be usable for skywave propagation only during the day - if
> then. At night there will be times when even 40 meters is almost
> useless.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> (yes, 8GZ was THAT WIndom)

336. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:00:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29897

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
>
> > > By the same token, Kim, it might behoove you to get on the air and
> > > compare a QRP rig on an attic dipole with Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest - in order to get
a
> > > better feel for what these fellas are trying to say to you.
>
> > Jim: I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.
>
> A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.

Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
understand? OKAY.

Kim W5TIT

337. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:05:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c351d51_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29899

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C34EE8B.184224EB@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation
that
> > we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack
up
> > some pretty amazing log files.
>
> Under certain circumstances QRP can work around the world. QRP doesn't
> do very well on 160, 80 or 40m when it comes to working DX. The amazing
> logs would come after toiling in the QRP vineyards for a number of years
> or after you install the phenomenal antenna farm for use with your QRP
> rig. Otherwise, the only time a visiting ham might find your log amazing
> is when he remarks, "Amazing--you've been on the air for five years and
> you're still on your first log book!".
>

I am not a QRPer, so you wouldn't find anything in my log book. In fact,
you won't find a log book here at all.

>
> I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most
of
> > the time. I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
>
> I just came from an early evening CW pileup on 40m. The DX was
> A61AJ and the calling horde must have numbered over a hundred stations
> in the U.S. alone. QRP rigs don't break piles like that anytime.
> If the propagation gods smile and if you have a decent antenna at decent
> height, you'd have A61AJ in your amazing log....but only after the big
> cats are finished with their feeding.
>

You know? Isn't CW also done in QRP? I'll get ahold of some of the QRPers
down here and see if they can shed some light on this discussion of how much
distance and how often QRP can be of any substance on the bands.

I didn't say I have an amazing log. I don't have a log at all...not into that.

> >
> > I
> > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work, and
> > diligence one must have to do it with QRP. Big watts make the trip easy.
>
> "Big watts" might make it easy but I'd rather have a hundred watts into
> a couple of elements at 75 feet on 40m than have the legal limit going
> to a dipole at 30 feet. Some of the guys with "big watts" and big
> antennas are also hard working, patient and diligent. Their efforts are
> directed toward building and maintaining their stations rather than
> sitting in line to work a rare one.
>
> Dave K8MN

To each his own, Dave. I'll see if I can get ahold of some of the QRPers down here. It's big around this area, I know that. The guys are always talking about the new rigs they are building.

Kim W5TIT

338. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:09:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C351047.4D6D0650@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29898

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C350296.8293505A@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision
> with all
> > > >wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> > > >transmission lines of any type may be installed".
> > >
> > > That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to refer
> > > to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > But of course could easily be interpreted by anyone knowledable to mean
> exactly
> > what it says.
>
> Carried to that degree, it could also prohibit having additional
> electrical wiring done in or about the home. I think, however,
> the idea of a transmission line is fairly common to mean external
> power lines or cable lines.
>
> I'd go with Phil on that one.

So you really think that the nitpickers so common in HOA's would let you get
away with such a loose interpretation when they find out what *any*
transmission line is? I sure wouldn't buy a house on such shakey a basis.

339. No More Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:11:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c351eab_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29801

Well, it didn't last until March... But it was fun while it lasted...

Kim W5TIT

340. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:16:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a136rj$6iv$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29900

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C351047.4D6D0650@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C350296.8293505A@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > > > On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision
> > with all
> > > > > >wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no
additional
> > > > > >transmission lines of any type may be installed".
> > > > >
> > > > > That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to
refer
> > > > > to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > But of course could easily be interpreted by anyone knowledable to
mean
> > exactly
> > > > what it says.
> > >
> > Carried to that degree, it could also prohibit having additional
> > electrical wiring done in or about the home. I think, however,
> > the idea of a transmission line is fairly common to mean external
> > power lines or cable lines.
> >
> > I'd go with Phil on that one.
>
> So you really think that the nitpickers so common in HOA's would let you
get
> away with such a loose interpretation when they find out what *any*
> transmission line is? I sure wouldn't buy a house on such shakey a basis.
```

Just my comments, I wouldn't probably buy one on that basis either.
Odds are the rules barring transmission lines also
probably have another specific section that bar antennas anyway.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

341. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:48:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a138j60pab@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29804

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020103205147.01870.00000780@mb-fz.aol.com...

> >
> > (2) WHO in the FCC has ANY qualifications to make a determination on
> >morality? The bureaucrats and lawyers...?!?! HA!!
>
> Not "morality" but "character".

Well, Mitnick is certainly a character.

342. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 03:52:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a138q60pkn@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29805

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C350296.8293505A@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Thu, 03 Jan 2002 06:14:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision
with all
> > >wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> > >transmission lines of any type may be installed".
> >
> > That's a common restriction, but it is usually interpreted to refer
> > to public utilities, of which ham radio is not.
> >
> >
>
> But of course could easily be interpreted by anyone knowledable to mean
exactly
> what it says.

Define "installed." I doubt a temporary setup fits the definition.

343. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 04:03:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpe25l3.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29802

On Thu, 3 Jan 2002 21:48:52 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> Or get the rules changed. Court suits are one legitimate way of
>> getting them changed. but the burden is on you to show why they
>> should be changed.
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>Has there been much/any success in that route regarding ham antennas?
>Existing cases/case law, etc.

Getting rules changed - none that I know of. Getting exemptions
from the rules - very few.

In California the burden of showing that the restriction or HOA rule
is unreasonable falls on the party wanting such a ruling. Before
1994 the HOA had the burden of showing that the rule was reasonable.

That's why we lost _Hotz v Rich_ on retrial - the standard changed
between the remand by the Court of Appeal and the retrial.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

344. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 04:03:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpe2k14.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29803

On Fri, 04 Jan 2002 03:09:56 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> So you really think that the nitpickers so common in HOA's would let
>you get away with such a loose interpretation when they find out what
>*any* transmission line is? I sure wouldn't buy a house on such shakey
>a basis.

We turned one down just because of that and because it wasn't
as close to public transportation - the other "must have" on
our shopping list - as the one we finally bought.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

345. Re: Roger In Drag?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 04:30:34 UTC
From: Hyannis Lloyd EXQ <EXQasshole@LivesWithHisMommy.org>
Message-ID: <a13b3o$g5q$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29806
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.flamenet,alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a12d9h$i57$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Senator Ted" <Liar@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> news:a10bd7$s37$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Look! It's
>
> Oh, look it's Twatty Campbell's crack-whore mommy.

Why Roger, that is a very cute outfit you are wearing!
What does Big Marie think of it?

346. Re: The Usual Suspects!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 04:47:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3533DF.8B5DBBCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29807

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: The Usual Suspects!
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 1/3/2002 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C346CD5.6F137D37@IEEE.org>
>
> >I made $1000 in one month. That's about $17 an hour.
> >It wasn't worth the hassle.
>
> Still less than I earn. And without the risk.

Still, not a bad return on $5000 risked.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

347. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 04:57:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C353645.AC499B24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29808

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C34EE8B.184224EB@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through experimentation
> that
> > > we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can rack
> up
> > > some pretty amazing log files.
> > >
> > Under certain circumstances QRP can work around the world. QRP doesn't
> > do very well on 160, 80 or 40m when it comes to working DX. The amazing
> > logs would come after toiling in the QRP vineyards for a number of years
> > or after you install the phenomenal antenna farm for use with your QRP
> > rig. Otherwise, the only time a visiting ham might find your log amazing
> > is when he remarks, "Amazing--you've been on the air for five years and
> > you're still on your first log book!".
> >
>
> I am not a QRPer, so you wouldn't find anything in my log book. In fact,
> you won't find a log book here at all.

That's pretty much what I would have guessed.

> >
> > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most
> of
> > > the time. I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
> >
> > I just came from an early evening CW pileup on 40m. The DX was
> > A61AJ and the calling horde must have numbered over a hundred stations
> > in the U.S. alone. QRP rigs don't break piles like that anytime.
> > If the propagation gods smile and if you have a decent antenna at decent
> > height, you'd have A61AJ in your amazing log....but only after the big
> > cats are finished with their feeding.
> >
>
> You know? Isn't CW also done in QRP? I'll get ahold of some of the QRPers

> down here and see if they can shed some light on this discussion of how much
> distance and how often QRP can be of any substance on the bands.

Yeah, I'm sure one of the guys with a QRP rig and a G5RV at 25 feet will
be in invalueable source of accurate information for you.
>
> I didn't say I have an amazing log. I don't have a log at all...not into
> that.

Most hams are "into it".

> > >
> > > I
> > > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work,
> and
> > > diligence one must have to do it with QRP. Big watts make the trip
> easy.
> >
> > "Big watts" might make it easy but I'd rather have a hundred watts into
> > a couple of elements at 75 feet on 40m than have the legal limit going
> > to a dipole at 30 feet. Some of the guys with "big watts" and big
> > antennas are also hard working, patient and diligent. Their efforts are
> > directed toward building and maintaining their stations rather than
> > sitting in line to work a rare one.

> To each his own, Dave. I'll see if I can get ahold of some of the QRPers
> down here. It's big around this area, I know that. The guys are always
> talking about the new rigs they are building.

As you say, Kim, to each his own. There may actually be a few guys
there who are as "into" poor antennas as they are QRP rigs.
One can buy a T-shirt which sums it up pretty well: "Life is too short
for QRP".

Dave K8MN

348. Oh Happy Day!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 05:11:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OPaZ7.2647$fe1.185837@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29809

The Cornhuskers nee Bugeaters (really) got their plow cleaned by a Miami team no one including the Oregon Ducks was going to come close to. The mass suicide is scheduled for 10 AM to give the Clampetts in Pasadena time to catch the red eye.

Having coached the game, I don't like to see any team beaten like that but maybe now we can get to the reality that we run a classy, first-rate athletic program at a classless 5th rate state university. I know it is the purpose of state universities to ease the pain of living in the state and the function of the athletic program to entertain the taxpayers just as the high-school teams do. But Big Red fever is just plain ridiculous. Much prefer to watch Nebroma play Division 2, and beat the team that won the Div2 playoffs.

If your state hires a good football coach, put a contract out on him asapy for the benefit of your sanity.

Dick N&#65533;BK

349. Re: Spark Transmitter on CB????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 05:12:05 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <iRaZ7.38467$Ad5.3757548@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 29810
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You're at fault if your generating strong harmonics on a wide spread. If a person's radio is tuned to say 4Mhz and you build a sparkgap or arc transmitter with an intended frequency of 2Mhz but because your signal is full of strong harmonics then the radio tuined at 4Mhz regardless of filtering and cost, will pick up that harmonic and receive your interference. It's great there are laws and standards that prevent anyone from building a transmitter that transmits anywhere they please. All equipment that emits RF energy must be tested to get approval. The exception is with homebrew amateur radio gear but this gear must be designed so it does not cause any undue interference.
You can read about this on the FCC site or many other sites on the web.

The only time you would not be at fault is if you are tranmitting on your intended frequency (leagally licensed to do so) and the harmonics created a so low as to not cause interference. The if a radio has a poor frontend and they pick up your strong CLEAN signal then it's the fault of the other persons poor receiver or TV or whatever.

Scott Unit-69 <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:a2cf6f35.0201031621.1535965d@posting.google.com...
> On Wed, 2 Jan 2002 16:06:23 -0500, "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
> wrote:
> > >I think what your actually after is an ARC Transmitter and not a spark gap
> > >transmitter. The difference is in order to transmit a AM modulated signal
> > >you need a carrier. The spark gap does not support that but an arc
> > >transmitter does and is fundamentally different. The carrier is generated
> > >in the arc LC combination which is continuously produced and coupled to a
> > >tuned LC circuit. The ARC is then modulated to produce AM. Very high
> > >voltages and power are required thus making this design not only dangerous
> > >but impractical by today's standards.
>
> OK I read more about it at
> http://c2.com/~ward/morse/lecture.html
>
> It says there you can make a spark transmitter with a neon sign
> transformer. I might try it. The part I don't understand is why it is
> illegal. If someone is hearing me on top of their communications isn't
> it their fault? They are the ones with the weak radio if they can't
> get over me.

>
> Scott, Unit-69
> Chesapeake Bay

350. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 06:00:33 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <5ybZ7.22315$TI6.1311753433@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LMAO! I was thinking the same thing.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20020103222539.084$SH@newsreader.com...
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote:
> > "middlefinnger4@home.moc" wrote:
> > >
> > > Early January Returns
> > >
> > > Top 10 Users
> > >
> > > [43] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 11.5%
> > > [40] Scott Unit-69 <uppluss@hotmail.com> 10.7%
> > > [24] Frank Gilliland <sparky@cet.com> 6.4%
> > > [22] \"Landshark\ <Landshark@TheLandshark.com> 5.9%
> > > [15] JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> 4.0%
> > > [14] Moparholic <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> 3.7%
> > > [14] SD SpecialDelivery Jones <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com>
> > > 3.7% [11] Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> 2.9%
> > > [9] Scott (Unit-69) <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> 2.4%
> > > [9] middlefinnger4@home.moc <middlefinger4@home.comski> 2.4%
> >
> > I like the way my forges make me the un-number 2.
> >
> > Please keep up the good work. You are amusing my lawyer.
> > (I think it's just the dollar signs in his eyes...)
> >
> > upplus (with ONE "S") at hotmail dot com @ 24.9.144.161.
> > Any other IP is fake. Don't feed the trolls.
> >

> Math doesn't add up,or is the rest spam?
>
> Did it count ALL of George's names and addy's,including AOL?
>
> Didn't think so.
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

351. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 06:45:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C354F93.9559EB90@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29812

Brian Kelly wrote:

> >
> >
> > And I had a 72 Ford Pinto in 1979. Much less fun
> > to drive. That is, when it did function....
> >
> >
> Right up there near the top of the list of the worst ten cars ever.
> >

There was the time my brother had a Vega, and I had the Pinto.
My brother takes a girl on a date at the movies. Movie ends,
his car won't start. He calls me, I come rescue him in my Pinto.
We must have looked like a family of losers, as he didn't date her
again. :-)

352. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 06:50:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C3550D3.A09C4613@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29813

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
>
> Has there been much/any success in that route regarding ham antennas?
> Existing cases/case law, etc.

Not sure how revalent or successful, but a ham in River Edge NJ
sued all the members of the town consul when they did an antenna
ordinance. They all quit to avoid the suit. I don't know enough law
to know if that would work or make sense.

353. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 08:41:43 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201040041.333c8d0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29814
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C34F1D0.3D55DE79@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> "middlefinnger4@home.moc" wrote:
> >
> > Early January Returns
> >
> > Top Whining Cry Babies
> >
> > [1] Scott (Unit-69) <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> 100%
>
>
>
> Please keep up the good work. You are amusing my lawyer.
> (I think it's just the dollar signs in his eyes...)

Well you oughtta hear what MY lawyer says. He says (and I quote):

"That guy using the email so close to yours is intentionally
impersonating you and we are collecting evidence to act on it in the
very near future. Chances are very good we can make him stop using
that address"

> upplus (with ONE "S") at hotmail dot com @ 24.9.144.161.
> Any other IP is fake. Don't feed the trolls.

No, sorry. Uppluss with TWO s's is the ONLY true Scott Unit-69
address.

354. Re: Roger In Drag?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 12:58:00 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a14e0hbra0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29817
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.flamenet,alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hyannis Lloyd EXQ" <EXQasshole@LivesWithHisMommy.org> wrote in message
news:a13b3o$g5q$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a12d9h$i57$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Senator Ted" <Liar@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
> > news:a10bd7$s37$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > Look! It's
> >
> > Oh, look it's Twatty Campbell's crack-whore mommy.
>
>
> Why Roger, [Projection]

Now, Twatty, you'll have to continue to see that big black man, I doubt your parents want anything to do with you now that you've told them you are an AIDS carrier. That IS why you're so angry with your parents, isn't it? Or is it because they shuffled you from foster home to foster home because of all the domestic violence?

355. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 13:07:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020104080748.27168.00000874@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29815

" Kim" writes:

>> > I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.

(N2EY wrote):

>> Maybe. You ever worked HF/MF on an amateur band lower than 25 MHz?

>Nope.

K8MN, AC6XG, K0HB, myself and others have done so. It's a bit hard to accept claims of "fully understand the difference between station set-ups" from someone who equates "HF" with only those frequencies near 10 meters.

>> > I also
>> > fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a Wilson
>1000
>> > magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday and
>> > talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii. I
>> > missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas.

>> Obviously on 10 meters when the band was wide open at the peak of the
>> sunspot cycle.

It occurs to me that I am ASSUMING your operation was on 10 meters. Maybe it wasn't.

>> You got a log of that operation?

>Nope.

Then your memory may not be accurate. See below.

> Don't write a thing down when I'm mobile and I'm not really all that
>inclined to do it stationary either. I've never had QSL cards yet...save
>the quick put together ones my husband and I made and sent here locally for
>our first night of operation on 10M.

Then don't expect folks to accept your claim of a near-WAS under those conditions.

>> > I haven't
>> > done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out and a
>> > horizontally polarized beam
>>
>> How do you get 300 watts out of an FT-890?

>Well, you could with an amp,

Then it's the amplifier that's putting out 300 watts, not the FT-890

> but he's just clarified for me that it does 100 watts, not 300.

See how unreliable one's memory can be? Perhaps you worked 47 states that day in '96 - or maybe it was 37, or 27, or 17. Hard to know for sure without a permanent record.

>> > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
>> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better most
>of
>> > the time.
>>
>> No, it can do better ALL of the time.

>Really?

Yeah, really. Ask K8MN - he not only works DX, he knows what is to BE DX. Real DX.

>> > I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
>>
>> Yup. But 25 watts isn't QRP. It's more than an S-unit above QRP.

>Where'd you get 25 watts from?

You mentioned your results with 25 watts.

> It's my understanding that 5 or less is QRP.

Right. Been there, done that. Since 1967. My first rig was 6V6GT on 80 meters - 5 watts out on a good day. Not on a par with the Novice gallon folks by a long shot.

>> > I
>> > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard work,
>and
>> > diligence one must have to do it with QRP.
>>
>> Much of which is on the other end of the QSO.
>>
>> > Big watts make the trip easy.
>>
>> Only with a decent antenna, which is the whole point. Given a choice
>> between the legal limit into a limited antenna and QRP into a good
>> antenna, I'll take antenna over power any day.

>Yep.

Which means that having effective antennas is essential to having an effective ham station. That's what Larry and others
are about in this thread.

>Probably why a good QRP station does well.

What constitutes "doing well" depends on experience and accomplishment. On Field Day, using a 100 watt rig and dipole at 50 feet, I can typically average 30 QSOs per hour and peak at 60 QSOs during a really good hour on 80. 40 or 20 CW. To many hams that is simply amazing performance (i.e., "doing well") but to any real contester it's not even in the game. And I don't claim that it is.

Look at the contest-winning and section-winning scores in QST or the ARRL website. That's the standard to use.

73 de Jim, N2EY

356. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 13:36:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29816

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

> What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> compared to today? The population has not been growing
> anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)

All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more accurate
figures:

US population:

1970 - 203 million
1980 - 227 million
1990 - 249 million
2000 - 281 million

US hams:

1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
1980 - 350,000
1990 -
2000 - 680,000
>
> <SNIP>
> > >> 4) There is no experience requirement
> > >
> > >Nor has there been for about 50 years...at least to the extent
> > >additional privileges were involved with the higher
> > >license being saught after.
> >
> > Not true. Until the early 1970s the Extra required 2 years as a General or
> > higher before they'd lket you near the test. Then it was one year, then
> zip.
>
> But being an Extra from (about) 1951 to 1967 did NOT garner
> any additional privileges...hence no incentive.

The exact dates were February 1953 to November 1968. Result was only a
few thousand Extras existed before 1967.

> Given the
> intro of incentive licensing (and special privileges for Extra),
> what lead to the FCC dropping the 2 yr experience requirement
> after continuing it for the 3 yrs between 67-70?

Requirement went to 1 year in 1973 and zero in 1976.
>

> Did the ARRL petition for the change?

I don't think so.
>
> FCC unilateral action?

I seem to recall it that way, but I could be mistaken.

73 de Jim, N2EY

357. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 15:40:25 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <zXjZ7.171796$BX4.9810887@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29818

"N2EY" wrote in part ...

> Speed is but one measure of code skill. I know folks who can zip along
> at incredible speed - as long as the signal is in the clear. Others
> are not nearly so fast but they can dig a signal out of the mud that
> most folks can't even hear. Then there's the ability to put it on
> paper, the ability to operate in tough circumstances, the ability to
> keep track of what's going on, etc. Contesting and traffic handling
> develop those skills. I've got a list around here somewhere....

Couldn't have said it better. Speed doesn't mean squiddly, if you can't put it on paper at the receiving end. What Jim has described above are the qualifications the ARRL is looking for in A-1 Operators. I am proud to be a member of that group. This award transcends CW and is equally relevant to SSB and digital modes. If you are a member of the ARRL A-1 Operator Club, try and nominate at least one new member this year. Here's the link to learn more about the A-1 Operator Club. (note: You don't need to be a member of the ARRL to receive this award)

www.arrl.org/awards/a1-op/a1v11.html

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

358. Re: Oh Happy Day!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 16:11:53 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C35D448.9C3DEF57@psu.edu>
Source record: 29819

Ain't that the truf! I don't really have anything against Nebraska,
well maybe a little, but they were NOT the team that should have been
playing Miami. So the BCS treated the nation to a really boring game on
account of their stupid system. I didn't watch much of it, but tuned
back in the forth quarter in time to listen to the announcers pathetic
shilling for the BCS. About all thay could come up with was some
nonsense about being good for different conferences.

The best part of the game was watching the BCS take a nationwide and
well deserved spanking.

- mike -

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> The Cornhuskers nee Bugeaters (really) got their plow cleaned by a Miami
> team no one including the Oregon Ducks was going to come close to. The
> mass suicide is scheduled for 10 AM to give the Clampetts in Pasadena time
> to catch the red eye.

359. Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 16:31:49 UTC
From: Ralph Williams <CaliforniaCarDealer@juno.com>
Message-ID: <a14lcu$mo0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Check this out. That perpetual boil on the ass of ham radio
and the FCC is keeping his latest rent-a-dxQTH scam alive!
Just waiting for the next sucker.

www.dxholiday.com/na/kp2.htm

Without a doubt, KV4FZ has got to be the all time scam
artist ever to key a ham radio mic. Got to hand it to him,
even his BARF organization is coming back to life on
14313 and 3894.5

Ralph

360. Re: Oh Happy Day!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 17:19:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rulZ7.214460$WW.12504981@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29821

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C35D448.9C3DEF57@psu.edu...
> Ain't that the truf! I don't really have anything against Nebraska,
> well maybe a little, but they were NOT the team that should have been
> playing Miami. So the BCS treated the nation to a really boring game on
> account of their stupid system. I didn't watch much of it, but tuned
> back in the forth quarter in time to listen to the announcers pathetic
> shilling for the BCS. About all thay could come up with was some
> nonsense about being good for different conferences.
>
> The best part of the game was watching the BCS take a nationwide and
> well deserved spanking.
>
> - mike -

My viewpoint is that of a native Nebraskan a bit tired of Go Big Red as the Clampetts drool on their shoes.

It is interesting to note that the Division 2 playoff winner also did not win its conference, North Dakota won the playoffs but was second in the North Central Conference. So plugging that loophole won't help a lot. The problem the BCS had is to find someone to sacrifice to Miami. So when it was all said and done, who you played determined the sacrificial lamb and that is not entirely a bad idea in the long run of things.

Oregon, who the hell knows? Their schedule did them in. Colorado was a classic case of coaching getting you to the playoffs but talent being required to win them. It falls off pretty quickly from there. You do not coach speed and Miami has quick running out its ears.

And a lot depends on when and where. Do you only look at the last part of the season to get the best show in the bowl games? For that matter, do you select teams that bring money? There is no formula that will not produce the occasional stupidity.

Dick NBK

361. Re: Oh Happy Day!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 17:47:18 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C35EAA6.8884E3E3@psu.edu>
Source record: 29823

My position on the whole college football/bowl situation is that we return to the so called "bad old days" where you played a good season, and you went to a bowl. The better teams went to the bigger bowls, you know the drill.

The whole issue of playoffs is not a good one, from the fans perspective. Fans that follow the team will probably have to make a choice which playoff game they go to. The first games would probably be lightly attended, but that means that some people who would have gone to a bowl game would now stay home (keeping their money with them) and of course the loser team isn't sending any fans to the next level.

People try to compare it to basketball, where they do have a successful playoff system, but of course, thay have a lot more games, and during the week, not just Saturdays.

I say let the students be students, and not force them to entertain us any more than we already do. After all, thats what it is supposed to be about.

- mike -

Richard McCollum wrote:

> My viewpoint is that of a native Nebraskan a bit tired of Go Big Red as
> the Clampetts drool on their shoes.
>
> It is interesting to note that the Division 2 playoff winner also did not
> win its conference, North Dakota won the playoffs but was second in the
> North Central Conference. So plugging that loophole won't help a lot. The
> problem the BCS had is to find someone to sacrifice to Miami. So when it
> was all said and done, who you played determined the sacrificial lamb and
> that is not entirely a bad idea in the long run of things.

362. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 17:52:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020104125213.10698.00003123@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29824

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/3/2002 7:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020103205148.01870.00000781@mb-fz.aol.com>

>Mr. M is out on probation. His sentence has NOT been fulfilled.

True. But is he otherwise complying with the terms of his probation? Has he violated ANY law that we know of?

So far, by his handling of the on-going license matter, it would appear as though he's doing things by the book...

>That's true. But he DID violate communications law - repeatedly. He has
>several
>convictions of comm law violations, not just one

Again true. But I reitereate my question about his conduct SINCE his sentencing and incarceration, including his probationary program.

>Although his license ran out in 1999, he is being allowed to operate until a
>decision is reached. There will be a hearing and other legal proceedings. The
>FCC did not "yank his license" - they are deciding whether it should be
>renewed.

And again...how has he conducted himself ON-THE-AIR? Failure to ID? QRM'ing nets? Broadcasting?

So far and since before 1999, it seems he's been doing it lawfully. No one has cited anything otherwise.

If he relapses, sure...Bust him hard! He's had his "rehabilitation" and reasonable second chance, ie: probation.

Otherwise, I thought this was supposed to be how it worked! Someone screws up...We "punish" them via the courts, and then we return them to society to be a "productive member".

But where is the enticement to "go straight" if we keep ON punishing after-the-fact?

>The story is on the arrl website. Get the facts - all of them.

I did...And from other sites too. He was a screw up. But is he today?

73
Steve, K4YZ

363. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 17:54:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 29822

W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
>
> Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> understand? OKAY.

Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
station shows a lack of understanding of radio.

364. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 17:58:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a14q2q$n74$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 29825

```
Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a134ub$ies$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a123sr$co7$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpa6hlb.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> > > On Tue, 01 Jan 2002 13:20:24 -0600, CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > >> >When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
> > > >> >restriction part before I signed the contract.
> > > >
> > > >> You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the
deed.
> > > >
> > > >When was an HOA agreement, initialed by me and two officers.
> > >
> > > You're home free as long as the HOA By-Laws gave the officers the
> > > power to grant such a waiver.
> > >
> > > If not, and (in California) if it wasn't done as a result of a
> > > resolution adopted at an open meeting, the officers are open to a
> > > lawsuit brought by any other member of the Association voiding the
> > > waiver.
> >
> > Right. Lining-out a restriction is about as effective an exemption as
> > refusing to sign a citation for a moving violation. Changing home
owners
> > restrictions usually require a 2/3rds vote of the homeowners. And it's
> > nearly impossible to get that many homeowners to even return a
> > self-addressed stamped envelope with a check mark on it.
>
> It really depends on the individual HOA. The rules governing
> how each operates and/or makes changes can be
> very different from one to another.

Yes, thanks for that Bill. The people in homeowners associations are not
all that different from one to the next however. Point being that it is
next to impossible to change CC&R's - particularly the antenna portions
thereof.
```

365. Re: Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 18:01:16 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3c35eae0.42079567@basic.bs.webusenet.com>
Source record: 29826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx

On Fri, 4 Jan 2002 11:31:49 -0500, "Ralph Williams"
<CaliforniaCarDealer@juno.com> wrote:

> Check this out. That perpetual boil on the ass of ham radio
>and the FCC is keeping his latest rent-a-dxQTH scam alive!
>Just waiting for the next sucker.
>

Ralph, I don't think KV4FZ invented the rent-a-shack idea.
Seems like a whole bunch of people been doing that for
some time.....

Are you suggesting that we should require a license to
offer a shack for rental ?

73, Jim KH2D

366. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 18:08:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020104130800.10698.00003125@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29827

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/3/2002 7:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020103205147.01870.00000780@mb-fz.aol.com>

>What good would it do to take away his license while he's in the pokey?

What good does it do to take it now? He's been on probation for a while
and doing what he's supposed to do.

>So if they yanked his license then, he'd be off the air now.

Yes. And the action THEN would have been seen as part of the original
snetence and punishment.

To take his license NOW, while he's doing those things to reassimilate
into society, doesn't make sense.

>The issue is renewal of the license.

If not for his conviction, he would have otherwise been renewed. His
conduct under Part 97 has never been at issue. As far as I recall, it never
was before, either.

>Not "morality" but "character".

Point taken, but my question remains the same. Who in the FCC has been
appointed Character Police?

THAT was addressed in his conviction and subsequent "rehabilitation". He
was released on probation because he demonstrated certain conduct while
incarcerated, and has, as far as anyone can see, fulfilled the expectations of
the courts.

>So where should the line be drawn? If he violates comm law but not Amateur
>Radio regs, he keeps his license? The law doesn't work like that.

Why not? No one says the FCC HAS to pull (or refuse to renew) his
license.

I still contend that the FCC would benefit far more by saying "We'll let
him keep his license while he behaves..." rather than slam him for something he
did unrelated to his Amateur license.

That's an awfully big carrot...or at least it would be to ME, if I were in
his shoes.

>He's on probation. He'll go right back to jail if he violates it. He has NOT
>paid the price.

But he's complying with the terms of the sentence and his probation, is he not? His Amatuer Radio license was neer part and parcel of his conviction, was it?

>All it takes is "Gee, I'm sorry, I made a mistake. Learned my lesson. Won't
>happen again."
>
>Has he done that?

Does the law specify where he MUST? Isn't that tantamount to surrendering his Fifth Amendment rights if he did?

>>Was the FCC REQUESTED to revoke his license? If so, WHY? Has he
>>perpetrated a NEW act against the law?
>
>It's their JOB to enforce this stuff.

Still doesn't answer the question, Jim.

>Seems to me that the real problem is that the FCC has been awful lenient for
>way too long. Now that Riley & Co. are trying to tighten things up, there are
>all sorts of complaints.

And American jurisprudence, as I understand it, says you aren't supposed to be able to go back after-the-fact (conviction and sentence) and impose new conditions of that conviction and sentence.

I still say hold out that carrot. If he screws up again, slap him with it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

367. Re: Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 18:22:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O2AexvUlBHA.1992@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 29828

CaliforniaCarDealer writes:

> That perpetual boil on the ass of ham radio
> and the FCC is keeping his latest rent-a-dxQTH
>scam alive! Just waiting for the next sucker.

That site has many DX stations for rent to
contesters, DXers, or just ham-on-vacation.

Are they all "scams", or just Herb's?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

368. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 19:01:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C35FC0F.92A1D8F5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29829

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> US population:
>
> 1970 - 203 million
> 1980 - 227 million
> 1990 - 249 million
> 2000 - 281 million
>
> US hams:
>
> 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> 1980 - 350,000
> 1990 -
> 2000 - 680,000

That looks good. But for a more meaningful comparison
we should strip out of the population numbers the kids
too young to likely get a license. How many 3 year old
extras are there? But ignoring this, a rough approx. would
be that the population increased by 1.38 times, and the
ham population increased 2.51 times. That would be
2.51/1.38=1.825 times faster. It seems that the ARS
is in fairly good shape in terms of growth over the long term.

369. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 19:04:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C35FCCD.27D7C556@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29830
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott Unit-69 wrote:

> No, sorry. Uppluss with TWO s's is the ONLY true Scott Unit-69
> address.

But both of you are really Scott Unich 69. :-)

370. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 19:15:34 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201041115.3e933a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com wrote:
Scott Unit-69 wrote:
> >
> > No, sorry. Uppluss with TWO s's is the ONLY true Scott Unit-69
> > address.
>
>But both of you are really Scott Unich 69. :-)

No we're not and that is why it is so easy to tell the forges from the real me. If you note the headers I have no () around "Unit-69" and the faker does. I sign with "Chesapeake Bay" and the faker doesn't (he doesn't even know where it is). Also another sure way to tell the fake is that he obsesses about IP numbers. All you have to do is look for the TWO "s's in "uppluss" and you know you have tjhe GENUINE Scott.

Scott Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay
--

371. Re: Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 19:39:49 UTC
From: unkadean <dnorris@k7no.com>
Message-ID: <p51c3u802p448as9lf3vnmk0pa851u0o70@4ax.com>
Source record: 29832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

On Fri, 4 Jan 2002 11:31:49 -0500, "Ralph Williams"
<CaliforniaCarDealer@juno.com> wrote:

> Check this out. That perpetual boil on the ass of ham radio
>and the FCC is keeping his latest rent-a-dxQTH scam alive!
>Just waiting for the next sucker.
>
> www.dxholiday.com/na/kp2.htm
>
>Without a doubt, KV4FZ has got to be the all time scam
>artist ever to key a ham radio mic. Got to hand it to him,
>even his BARF organization is coming back to life on
>14313 and 3894.5
>
>Ralph
>

Wats wrong. Did Herb lick the red of'n ur lollipop? What is the beef
with the URL?

Take a prozac and call Don Search in the morning.!

--
Let's Roll

372. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 19:56:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpfary0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29833

On Fri, 04 Jan 2002 01:50:59 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>> Has there been much/any success in that route regarding ham antennas?
>> Existing cases/case law, etc.
>
>Not sure how revalent or successful, but a ham in River Edge NJ
>sued all the members of the town consul when they did an antenna
>ordinance. They all quit to avoid the suit. I don't know enough law
>to know if that would work or make sense.

That was in regard to an ordinance.

The question was in regard to changing a HOA rule. Usually the
courts will find that the rule is unenforceable or unreasonable - as
they did for a requirement to have a Washington Palm Tree on the
front lawn of each home - rather than to order a specific
rewording/change of a rule.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

373. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 20:22:10 UTC
From: N4ZN <nevermind@all.com>
Message-ID: <gg3c3uoj274b47lritib8cvkfkd8vbcsab@4ax.com>
Source record: 29834
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
(Joshua Senecal) wrote:

>Hi all,
>
>I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
>carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
>having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
>situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
>them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>
>Thanks!
>
>-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF

Pack it with the suitcases and it's no problem. Pack it in the carry
on, and be prepared to unpack it and do all that explaining every time
you change flights.

374. Re: Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 20:39:12 UTC
From: Loouie loouie <tfarree@aol.com>
Message-ID: <QpoZ7.3322$zw3.500147@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Jim Kehler" <kh2d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:3c35eae0.42079567@basic.bs.webusenet.com...
> On Fri, 4 Jan 2002 11:31:49 -0500, "Ralph Williams"
> <CaliforniaCarDealer@juno.com> wrote:
>
> > Check this out. That perpetual boil on the ass of ham radio
> >and the FCC is keeping his latest rent-a-dxQTH scam alive!
> >Just waiting for the next sucker.
> >
>
> Ralph, I don't think KV4FZ invented the rent-a-shack idea.
> Seems like a whole bunch of people been doing that for
> some time.....
>
> Are you suggesting that we should require a license to
> offer a shack for rental ?
>
> 73, Jim KH2D

True Jim, but you must remember that
Herbie lives for getting onto ham radio
and generating as much trouble on the
airwaves as possible. His stellar track
record of verbal harassment of the Maritime
Mobile and Intercon Nets for over 15 Years
prove that beyond any doubt whatsoever.

He may have had his wings clipped by
R.H. for now, but he will find a way to
get back on the air if at all possible.
This guy's a ultra right wing pariah
with OCD and up until now, a microphone.
Ham radio is his brand of crack cocaine.

375. Re: Another KV4FZ Scam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 21:20:44 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <t27c3u4nkligqdqkbcha2u2busuq613uut@4ax.com>
Source record: 29836
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx

On Fri, 04 Jan 2002 20:39:12 GMT, "Loouie loouie" <tfarree@aol.com>
wrote:

>This guy's a ultra right wing pariah
>with OCD and up until now, a microphone.

"This year, tell an OCD friend that you like them."

http://www.ocfoundation.org/

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

376. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 22:42:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a15bcq$e5a$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29838

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C3550D3.A09C4613@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Has there been much/any success in that route regarding ham antennas?
> > Existing cases/case law, etc.
>
> Not sure how revalent or successful, but a ham in River Edge NJ
> sued all the members of the town consul when they did an antenna
> ordinance. They all quit to avoid the suit. I don't know enough law
> to know if that would work or make sense.

I find that hard to believe. Councilmembers are the recipients of lawsuits
all the time to which a common defense via the township's attorney
is the normal result. It is almost impossible for anyone to sue and win
againt
an elected official on an individual basis. The exception comes in
for gross negligence and or criminal activity.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK, former councilmember (12 years) Mt Olive Twp, NJ

377. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 22:45:23 UTC
From: "middlefinnger4@home.moc" <middlefinger4@home.comski>
Message-ID: <7gqZ7.354100$5A3.134814762@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29837
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sorry Mopar I don't have Aol, I am sure it counted all my nics just as i got
all of Landsharks forges and Twistys etc and probably even your forges.
<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20020103222539.084$SH@newsreader.com...
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote:
> > "middlefinnger4@home.moc" wrote:
> > >
> > > Early January Returns
> > >
> > > Top 10 Users
> > >
> > > [43] Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> 11.5%
> > > [40] Scott Unit-69 <uppluss@hotmail.com> 10.7%
> > > [24] Frank Gilliland <sparky@cet.com> 6.4%
> > > [22] \"Landshark\ <Landshark@TheLandshark.com> 5.9%
> > > [15] JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> 4.0%
> > > [14] Moparholic <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> 3.7%
> > > [14] SD SpecialDelivery Jones <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com>
> > > 3.7% [11] Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> 2.9%
> > > [9] Scott (Unit-69) <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> 2.4%
> > > [9] middlefinnger4@home.moc <middlefinger4@home.comski> 2.4%
> >
> > I like the way my forges make me the un-number 2.
> >
> > Please keep up the good work. You are amusing my lawyer.
> > (I think it's just the dollar signs in his eyes...)
> >
> > upplus (with ONE "S") at hotmail dot com @ 24.9.144.161.
> > Any other IP is fake. Don't feed the trolls.
> >
> Math doesn't add up,or is the rest spam?
>
> Did it count ALL of George's names and addy's,including AOL?
>
> Didn't think so.
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

378. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 22:46:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29839

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
>
> All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more accurate
> figures:
>
> US population:
>
> 1970 - 203 million
> 1980 - 227 million
> 1990 - 249 million
> 2000 - 281 million
>
> US hams:
>
> 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> 1980 - 350,000
> 1990 -
> 2000 - 680,000

Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
while ARS grew about 250%

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

379. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 22:59:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201041459.13d15f57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29840

> . . . a rough approx. would
> be that the population increased by 1.38 times, and the
> ham population increased 2.51 times. That would be
> 2.51/1.38=1.825 times faster. It seems that the ARS
> is in fairly good shape in terms of growth over the long term.
>
>
Which is why I refuse to get into the silly discussions in this NG
based on monthly variations and other related statistical minutiae.
Except for the predicted bubble of upgrades Restructuring hasn't
demonstrated a bloomin' thing as far as it's impact on the service,
particularly it's impact on growth.
>
>
w3rv

380. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 23:20:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201041520.3e36838d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29841

> > >
> > Dim recollection. Very dim. I think "cruiser skirts" were skirts that
> > stretched from the real wheel wells to the rear bumper. Looked best on
> > chopped 'n channelled '49 - '51 Mercs.
> > >
> > >
> > w3rv
>
> Yup, originally came from the Mercury Turnpike Cruiser, hence the name.
> That was the one with the rear power window slanting in rather than out.
>
>
'Way over my head at first so went surfing for the thing. NOW I
remember!
>
>

http://www.autocollections.com/moreinfo.cfm?key=683
>
>
> Don't see too many Insights in the Marvelous Midlands.
>
>
They're apparently a very low volume production model. This is a
heavily-populated area and I don't think I've spotted a half-dozen of
'em since they were introduced. I heard they're $20k, that's too much
bread for a commuter scooter for my taste, I'm not enough of a
tree-hugger to consider any such thing. The other scarce wheels is the
snake . . Dodge Viper? Now there's a real serious piece of road
machinery.
>
>
> Nï¿½BK
>
>
w3rv

381. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 23:24:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c363ae8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29842

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> >
> > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > understand? OKAY.
>
> Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
>
>

I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of apartment owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would rival that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned literal, "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.

However, just to make you feel better, I have heard on the air, hams speaking of other hams and to other hams who are apartment dwellers who have mighty impressive logs--by the sounds of it. I have never been a witness to said logs. I also know of hams who say they and other hams like them have worked the world--many times--with QRP. I, again, have not seen the logs of these said QRPers. And, I have heard of DX and Contest stations that have mighty impressive logs. I have not seen any of these said logs.

Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all the hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.

Kim W5TIT

382. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 23:30:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c363c54_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29843

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020104080748.27168.00000874@mb-cb.aol.com...
> " Kim" writes:
>
> >> > I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> Maybe. You ever worked HF/MF on an amateur band lower than 25 MHz?
>
> >Nope.
>
> K8MN, AC6XG, K0HB, myself and others have done so. It's a bit hard to
accept
> claims of "fully understand the difference between station set-ups" from
> someone who equates "HF" with only those frequencies near 10 meters.
>

The only thing I can suggest is that you try a little harder. Do you know
how self-serving you sound above?

> >> >
> >> > I also
> >> > fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a
Wilson
> >1000
> >> > magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday
and
> >> > talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii.
I
> >> > missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas.
>
> >> Obviously on 10 meters when the band was wide open at the peak of the
> >> sunspot cycle.
>
> It occurs to me that I am ASSUMING your operation was on 10 meters. Maybe
it
> wasn't.
>
> >> You got a log of that operation?
>
> >Nope.
>
> Then your memory may not be accurate. See below.
>

> > Don't write a thing down when I'm mobile and I'm not really all that
> >inclined to do it stationary either. I've never had QSL cards yet...save
> >the quick put together ones my husband and I made and sent here locally
for
> >our first night of operation on 10M.
>
> Then don't expect folks to accept your claim of a near-WAS under those
> conditions.
>

I don't care whether you accept it or not, Jim. I know I did and that is
good enough for me. Do you know how self-serving you sound above? And, if
you and others "can't" accept my "claim" then don't.

> >> > I haven't
> >> > done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out
and a
> >> > horizontally polarized beam
> >>
> >> How do you get 300 watts out of an FT-890?
>
> >Well, you could with an amp,
>
> Then it's the amplifier that's putting out 300 watts, not the FT-890
>
> > but he's just clarified for me that it does 100 watts, not 300.
>
> See how unreliable one's memory can be? Perhaps you worked 47 states that
day
> in '96 - or maybe it was 37, or 27, or 17. Hard to know for sure without a
> permanent record.
>

Nope, it was all 'round, except two states. One of those two states was one
of the Dakotas. The other, OHMYGAWD, I don't recall.

> >> > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> >> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better
most
> >of
> >> > the time.
> >>
> >> No, it can do better ALL of the time.
>
> >Really?
>
> Yeah, really. Ask K8MN - he not only works DX, he knows what is to BE DX.
Real
> DX.
>

Uh huh. wow

> >> > I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
> >>
> >> Yup. But 25 watts isn't QRP. It's more than an S-unit above QRP.
>
> >Where'd you get 25 watts from?
>
> You mentioned your results with 25 watts.
>

I didn't say I was working QRP, either Jim.

> > It's my understanding that 5 or less is QRP.
>
> Right. Been there, done that. Since 1967. My first rig was 6V6GT on 80
meters -
> 5 watts out on a good day. Not on a par with the Novice gallon folks by a
long
> shot.
>

Again: wow.

> >> > I
> >> > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard
work,
> >and
> >> > diligence one must have to do it with QRP.
> >>
> >> Much of which is on the other end of the QSO.
> >>
> >> > Big watts make the trip easy.
> >>
> >> Only with a decent antenna, which is the whole point. Given a choice
> >> between the legal limit into a limited antenna and QRP into a good
> >> antenna, I'll take antenna over power any day.
>
> >Yep.
>
> Which means that having effective antennas is essential to having an
effective
> ham station. That's what Larry and others
> are about in this thread.
>
> >Probably why a good QRP station does well.
>
> What constitutes "doing well" depends on experience and accomplishment. On
> Field Day, using a 100 watt rig and dipole at 50 feet, I can typically
average
> 30 QSOs per hour and peak at 60 QSOs during a really good hour on 80. 40
or 20
> CW. To many hams that is simply amazing performance (i.e., "doing well")
but to

> any real contester it's not even in the game. And I don't claim that it
is.
>
> Look at the contest-winning and section-winning scores in QST or the ARRL
> website. That's the standard to use.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I'm not interested in standards, show-offiness, or otherwise Jim. I guess I
am not that kind of ham.

Kim W5TIT

383. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-04 23:31:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c363cad_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29844

```
Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C353645.AC499B24@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C34EE8B.184224EB@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C33A195.7C642F7C@uci.edu...
> > > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > I am a proponent of experimentation, and it is through
experimentation
> > that
> > > > > we learn such things as that QRP can get around the world, and can
rack
> > up
> > > > > some pretty amazing log files.
> > > >
> > > > Under certain circumstances QRP can work around the world. QRP
doesn't
> > > > do very well on 160, 80 or 40m when it comes to working DX. The
amazing
> > > > logs would come after toiling in the QRP vineyards for a number of
years
> > > > or after you install the phenomenal antenna farm for use with your QRP
> > > > rig. Otherwise, the only time a visiting ham might find your log
amazing
> > > > is when he remarks, "Amazing--you've been on the air for five years
and
> > > > you're still on your first log book!".
> > > >
> > >
> > > I am not a QRPer, so you wouldn't find anything in my log book. In
fact,
> > you won't find a log book here at all.
>
> That's pretty much what I would have guessed.
>
> > >
```

> > > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > > > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better
most
> > of
> > > > the time. I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the
time.
> > >
> > > I just came from an early evening CW pileup on 40m. The DX was
> > > A61AJ and the calling horde must have numbered over a hundred stations
> > > in the U.S. alone. QRP rigs don't break piles like that anytime.
> > > If the propagation gods smile and if you have a decent antenna at
decent
> > > height, you'd have A61AJ in your amazing log....but only after the big
> > > cats are finished with their feeding.
> > >
> >
> > You know? Isn't CW also done in QRP? I'll get ahold of some of the
QRPers
> > down here and see if they can shed some light on this discussion of how
much
> > distance and how often QRP can be of any substance on the bands.
>
> Yeah, I'm sure one of the guys with a QRP rig and a G5RV at 25 feet will
> be in invalueable source of accurate information for you.
> >
> > I didn't say I have an amazing log. I don't have a log at all...not
into
> > that.
>
> Most hams are "into it".
>
> > > > >
> > > > I
> > > > > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard
work,
> > and
> > > > > diligence one must have to do it with QRP. Big watts make the trip
> > easy.
> > > >
> > > "Big watts" might make it easy but I'd rather have a hundred watts
into
> > > a couple of elements at 75 feet on 40m than have the legal limit going
> > > to a dipole at 30 feet. Some of the guys with "big watts" and big
> > > antennas are also hard working, patient and diligent. Their efforts
are
> > > directed toward building and maintaining their stations rather than
> > > sitting in line to work a rare one.
>
> > To each his own, Dave. I'll see if I can get ahold of some of the
QRPers

> > down here. It's big around this area, I know that. The guys are always
> > talking about the new rigs they are building.
>
> As you say, Kim, to each his own. There may actually be a few guys
> there who are as "into" poor antennas as they are QRP rigs.
> One can buy a T-shirt which sums it up pretty well: "Life is too short
> for QRP".
>
> Dave K8MN

384. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 00:29:47 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ONrZ7.366626$er5.9400291@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29845

Sorry,

In NC, if it is 2 AM and somebody invades your home, he's paid for. Just make sure you tell
the cop you saw something "glint" in the moonlight and you thought he had a gun. Just don't
shoot him in the back. It has happened around here several times, Homeowner went free
every time. Just about everyone of the perps were well known in the justice system, and the
legal boys don't shed a tear over their demise. Just before Christmas, a scumbag walked into
a store uptown for a little easy money. He became a little too fascinated with the sight of money being put in a bag. Storeowner whipped out a pistol and blew his brains out. Short
investigation, perp had a gun, DA ruled self defense, and case closed. Oughtta be MORE of
this.

Jerry

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020102203523.07928.00002240@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <Y6qY7.128397$BX4.8171604@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry
> Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Yeah,
> > >
> > >And if the perp comes in while I am at home, and I hear him, he'll get his
> > >butt filled with
> > >12 ga buckshot! One less "poor ole criminal" for the liberals to force me
> > >to keep up in
> > >prison.
> > >
> > >Jerry
>
> What a maroon! You'd probably end up in jail, getting your butt
> filled up with something you didn't plan on!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

385. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 00:53:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C364E75.67C83A1A@uci.edu>
Source record: 29846

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...

> > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.

> I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of apartment
> owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would rival
> that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned literal,
> "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.

Not sure what case are you trying to make then. That antenna
restrictions really aren't that bad after all? I honestly don't know
what point you are trying to make, Kim.

386. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 01:12:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a15jsv020b1@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29848

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> >
> > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > understand? OKAY.
>
> Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> station shows a lack of understanding of radio.

I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
dipole?

387. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 01:14:59 UTC
From: pkearn@iris.eircom.org.net
Message-ID: <3c365284.3241944@news1.tinet.ie>
Source record: 29847
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Doug & Lisa Cook" <twoeyedox@aol.com> wrote:

> I packed my Kenwood TH-F6A in my backpack alongside my laptop. It passed
> through the xray and airport security without a hitch.

mu own personal experience is that if yo try to be open about
anything electronic, then those nice people at security
will try to be nice back but will then suggest you put it
in your checked-baggage.

then you have the problem of wondering whether you will see it again!

388. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:12:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c366124_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29849

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> >
> > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
accurate
> > figures:
> >
> > US population:
> >
> > 1970 - 203 million
> > 1980 - 227 million
> > 1990 - 249 million
> > 2000 - 281 million
> >
> > US hams:
> >
> > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> > 1980 - 350,000
> > 1990 -
> > 2000 - 680,000
>
> Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> while ARS grew about 250%
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
of amateur growth relative to population came after
the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
entry point ...

73,
```

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDZhF5e+N6+q84HiEQLqUwCfVjIBja3kVcckL8vd3xj4H+CrI4sAoIAS
NeBkdIKFjgBYl/rl0Kb5QBC4
=5S/x
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

389. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:17:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C366249.1B3AB716@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29850

Krell wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > >
> > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > understand? OKAY.
> >
> > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
> I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> dipole?

Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
those who own the finest antenna farms.

Sure a guy with a 100w and an indoor attic dipole will work *some* DX if
the propagation gods smile and the pileup isn't too big. His logs will
rival those of the big guns only in his mind and perhaps Kim's. Kim's
statements do make it sound as if she lacks understanding of radio.

Dave K8MN

390. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:29:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29901

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word). That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here to there with any regularity on any number of bands.

It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.

Dave K8MN

391. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:35:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C366680.99F24EB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29902

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020104080748.27168.00000874@mb-cb.aol.com...

> > What constitutes "doing well" depends on experience and accomplishment. On
> > Field Day, using a 100 watt rig and dipole at 50 feet, I can typically
> average
> > 30 QSOs per hour and peak at 60 QSOs during a really good hour on 80. 40
> or 20
> > CW. To many hams that is simply amazing performance (i.e., "doing well")
> but to
> > any real contester it's not even in the game. And I don't claim that it
> is.
> >
> > Look at the contest-winning and section-winning scores in QST or the ARRL
> > website. That's the standard to use.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> I'm not interested in standards, show-offiness, or otherwise Jim. I guess I
> am not that kind of ham.

That's the spirit, Kim. Don't let Jim confuse you with facts.
You wouldn't want to be known as "that kind of ham".

Dave K8MN

392. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:43:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8LtZ7.215093$WW.12544583@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29903

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word).
> That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my
> word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment
> dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna
> farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish
> to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here
> to there with any regularity on any number of bands.
>
> It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in
> what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people
> believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There
> is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.
>
> Dave K8MN

The idea that an indoor lash up is going to equal a big-league Sterba Curtain would lead to Vatican Radio stringing dipoles in St. Peter's rather than fight with the Italian government's 6V/meter radiation standard (WHO limit is 80) and VOA running out of the Capitol where an eye could be kept on them.

Everyone but Kim has this figured out, and for that matter has Kim figured out. Do us all a favor and do not orbit in ever-tightening circles around her.

Dick NBK

393. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:46:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C366901.AFD7CC26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29904

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > >
> > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > understand? OKAY.
> >
> > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.

> I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of apartment
> owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would rival
> that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned literal,
> "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.

I don't mind getting literal, especially when we can cut to the chase.
After all, you seemed quite literal when you said "finest antenna farms"
and not "some antenna farms". It has been pointed out to you by at
least four individuals that your statement doesn't hold water.

> However, just to make you feel better, I have heard on the air, hams
> speaking of other hams and to other hams who are apartment dwellers who have
> mighty impressive logs--by the sounds of it. I have never been a witness to
> said logs.

A '73 Vega must seem like a mighty impressive automobile to one who has
never seen another car.

I also know of hams who say they and other hams like them have
> worked the world--many times--with QRP. I, again, have not seen the logs of
> these said QRPers.

There are some QRPers working the world with some really massive piles
of aluminum placed at extreme altitude. The QRPers living in apartments
and using marginal antennas are only working the known world.

And, I have heard of DX and Contest stations that have
> mighty impressive logs. I have not seen any of these said logs.

Them maybe you do need to check out the ARRL DX Contest results or the CQ Worldwide DX Contest results. Both mags break scores down by power level.

> Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all the
> hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.

The hullabaloo was caused by your highly inaccurate claim and subsequent attempts at defending it as factual.

Dave K8MN

394. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:52:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29905

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> > >
> > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
> accurate
> > > figures:
> > >
> > > US population:
> > >
> > > 1970 - 203 million
> > > 1980 - 227 million
> > > 1990 - 249 million
> > > 2000 - 281 million
> > >
> > > US hams:
> > >
> > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> > > 1980 - 350,000
> > > 1990 -
> > > 2000 - 680,000
> >
> > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > while ARS grew about 250%
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
> of amateur growth relative to population came after
> the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
```

> entry point ...

...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as an entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that, if you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be attracted.

Dave K8MN

395. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 02:57:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C366B7D.4AA04E09@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29906

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word).
> > That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my
> > word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment
> > dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna
> > farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish
> > to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here
> > to there with any regularity on any number of bands.
> >
> > It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in
> > what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people
> > believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There
> > is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> The idea that an indoor lash up is going to equal a big-league Sterba
> Curtain would lead to Vatican Radio stringing dipoles in St. Peter's
> rather than fight with the Italian government's 6V/meter radiation
> standard (WHO limit is 80) and VOA running out of the Capitol where an eye
> could be kept on them.
>
> Everyone but Kim has this figured out, and for that matter has Kim figured
> out. Do us all a favor and do not orbit in ever-tightening circles around
> her.

I think even Kim now grasps the concept. She's still patching holes
along her waterline.

Dave K8MN

396. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:26:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020104222655.13985.00002739@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29907

In article <3c33c55a_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> writes:

>> > filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.
>>
>> Yah but they sound so kewl, d00d!
>>
>>
>
>Tuned just right, and echo mic beats the heck out of the power limitations
>on CB... tuned just right means where there is no echo, just ever so slight
>reverberation.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Uhhh, Kim -- what's the difference between an echo and an "ever so slight reverberation?" Don't look now -- but an "ever so slight reverberation" is virtually a textbook definition of an echo.

73 de Larry, K3LT

397. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:26:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020104222656.13985.00002740@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29908

In article <a10lan015lt@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it takes
>to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
>right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what is
>necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary or
>hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they can
>still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.

Yes, Krell, things have changed.

Take a look at my own station as an example. I live in a 3rd floor
apartment in a wood-framed building. The plumbing is all PVC/ABS,
so there isn't even a way to make an effective ground on a cold water
pipe. I use indoor dipoles for 20- and 10-meters, and a piece of wire
tuned with a digital auto-tuner, mainly for 30- and 40-meters, but it's
not very efficient due to a lack of a ground. I consider myself to
have a highly effective station, based on the fact that I can
communicate to most parts of the world on CW and digital modes,
on days with reasonable propagation. However, I am nowhere near
as effective as I could be with a tower of modest height (35-50 feet)
and a 3- or 4-element Yagi and a good all-band dipole. If I lived
in a typical new home in my area, there would be no way I could
have that "marginal" setup, and my "compromise" set up would
end up not being as effective as what I have now, due to the fact
that I'd be living two floors closer to the ground. In fact, about
the best part of my station would be the fact that I could most
likely establish an effective RF-ground -- if not decent antennae.

In my POV, nobody has a right to limit me this severely. I believe
that there is a world of difference in aesthetics between a well-
installed tower/antenna setup and having a 16-foot bass boat
on a trailer permanently parked next door -- or living next door
to a junkyard, as Kim does. Until this latest decision by the FCC,
I always thought ham radio was an activity which could justify
being treated differently, based on the public service capabilities
hams can offer to their communities. However, it now appears that
we're to be relegated to portable/mobile operation unless we can
afford a few acres in the country. This would seem to me to limit
the ability of the ARS to even maintain it's present numbers,
much less grow…and that will ultimately result in huge loss
of spectrum -- which is the FCC's true agenda.

73 de Larry, K3LT

398. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:36:32 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a0850ceb1217c0989680@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29909

In article <3c363c54_1@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020104080748.27168.00000874@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > " Kim" writes:
> >
> > >> > I fully understand the difference between station set-ups.
> >
> > (N2EY wrote):
> >
> > >> Maybe. You ever worked HF/MF on an amateur band lower than 25 MHz?
> >
> > >Nope.
> >
> > K8MN, AC6XG, K0HB, myself and others have done so. It's a bit hard to
> accept
> > claims of "fully understand the difference between station set-ups" from
> > someone who equates "HF" with only those frequencies near 10 meters.
> >
>
> The only thing I can suggest is that you try a little harder. Do you know
> how self-serving you sound above?

Do you know totally ignorant you sound?? I think you do!!!

>
> > >> >
> > >> > I also
> > >> > fully understand that on a 25W Radio Shack 10M mobile, through a
> Wilson
> > >1000
> > >> > magmount antenna, on top of a 1996 Saturn SL1, I spent one Saturday
> and
> > >> > talked to nearly every state in the United States, including Hawaii.
> I
> > >> > missed something like North Dakota and one other...maybe Kansas.
> >
> > >> Obviously on 10 meters when the band was wide open at the peak of the
> > >> sunspot cycle.
> >
> > It occurs to me that I am ASSUMING your operation was on 10 meters. Maybe
> it
> > wasn't.
> >
> > >> You got a log of that operation?
> >

> > >Nope.
> >
> > Then your memory may not be accurate. See below.
> >
> > > Don't write a thing down when I'm mobile and I'm not really all that
> > >inclined to do it stationary either. I've never had QSL cards yet...save
> > >the quick put together ones my husband and I made and sent here locally
> for
> > >our first night of operation on 10M.
> >
> > Then don't expect folks to accept your claim of a near-WAS under those
> > conditions.
> >
>
> I don't care whether you accept it or not, Jim. I know I did and that is
> good enough for me. Do you know how self-serving you sound above? And, if
> you and others "can't" accept my "claim" then don't.

Do you know totally ignorant you sound?? I think you do!!!

I make more money that Bill Gates. And if you and the others can't
accept my claim, then don't.

>
> > >> > I haven't
> > >> > done that once with my husband's Yaesu 890FT-AT with 300 watts out
> and a
> > >> > horizontally polarized beam
> > >>
> > >> How do you get 300 watts out of an FT-890?
> >
> > >Well, you could with an amp,
> >
> > Then it's the amplifier that's putting out 300 watts, not the FT-890
> >
> > > but he's just clarified for me that it does 100 watts, not 300.
> >
> > See how unreliable one's memory can be? Perhaps you worked 47 states that
> day
> > in '96 - or maybe it was 37, or 27, or 17. Hard to know for sure without a
> > permanent record.
> >
>
> Nope, it was all 'round, except two states. One of those two states was one
> of the Dakotas. The other, OHMYGAWD, I don't recall.
>
> > >> > I understand that a "Henry 4K Ultra into a 4
> > >> > element mono-bander at 100+ feet during a DX contest" can do better
> most
> > >of
> > >> > the time.

> > >>
> > >> No, it can do better ALL of the time.
> >
> > >Really?
> >
> > Yeah, really. Ask K8MN - he not only works DX, he knows what is to BE DX.
> Real
> > DX.
> >
>
> Uh huh. wow

Great comeback there TIT. If only they were brains

>
> > >> > I also understand that a QRP rig can do it some of the time.
> > >>
> > >> Yup. But 25 watts isn't QRP. It's more than an S-unit above QRP.
> >
> > >Where'd you get 25 watts from?
> >
> > You mentioned your results with 25 watts.
> >
>
> I didn't say I was working QRP, either Jim.
>
> > > It's my understanding that 5 or less is QRP.
> >
> > Right. Been there, done that. Since 1967. My first rig was 6V6GT on 80
> meters -
> > 5 watts out on a good day. Not on a par with the Novice gallon folks by a
> long
> > shot.
> >
>
> Again: wow.
>

And yet another witty comeback from the sow of the south.

> > >> > I
> > >> > am also a discerning ham--and appreciate more the patience, hard
> work,
> > >and
> > >> > diligence one must have to do it with QRP.
> > >>
> > >> Much of which is on the other end of the QSO.
> > >>
> > >> > Big watts make the trip easy.
> > >>
> > >> Only with a decent antenna, which is the whole point. Given a choice

> > >> between the legal limit into a limited antenna and QRP into a good
> > >> antenna, I'll take antenna over power any day.
> >
> > >Yep.
> >
> > Which means that having effective antennas is essential to having an
> effective
> > ham station. That's what Larry and others
> > are about in this thread.
> >
> > >Probably why a good QRP station does well.
> >
> > What constitutes "doing well" depends on experience and accomplishment. On
> > Field Day, using a 100 watt rig and dipole at 50 feet, I can typically
> average
> > 30 QSOs per hour and peak at 60 QSOs during a really good hour on 80. 40
> or 20
> > CW. To many hams that is simply amazing performance (i.e., "doing well")
> but to
> > any real contester it's not even in the game. And I don't claim that it
> is.
> >
> > Look at the contest-winning and section-winning scores in QST or the ARRL
> > website. That's the standard to use.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
> I'm not interested in standards, show-offiness, or otherwise Jim. I guess I
> am not that kind of ham.

You're absolutely correct. You're not that kind of ham, but from the
description you portray yourself, you'd make a hell of a sow

soooooeeeeee sooooooeeeee

>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

399. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:37:25 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a0854cf2be98db989681@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29910

In article <3C366680.99F24EB8@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020104080748.27168.00000874@mb-cb.aol.com...
>
> > > What constitutes "doing well" depends on experience and accomplishment. On
> > > Field Day, using a 100 watt rig and dipole at 50 feet, I can typically
> > average
> > > 30 QSOs per hour and peak at 60 QSOs during a really good hour on 80. 40
> > or 20
> > > CW. To many hams that is simply amazing performance (i.e., "doing well")
> > but to
> > > any real contester it's not even in the game. And I don't claim that it
> > is.
> > >
> > > Look at the contest-winning and section-winning scores in QST or the ARRL
> > > website. That's the standard to use.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> > I'm not interested in standards, show-offiness, or otherwise Jim. I guess I
> > am not that kind of ham.
>
>
> That's the spirit, Kim. Don't let Jim confuse you with facts.
> You wouldn't want to be known as "that kind of ham".
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Not just a ham, butt, from her own descriptions, a very hefty ham (aka
sow)

400. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:38:45 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a085997691b9d7989682@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29911

In article <3c363ae8_1@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > >
> > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > understand? OKAY.
> > >
> > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of apartment
> > owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would rival
> > that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned literal,
> > "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.

Do you know totally ignorant you sound?? I think you do!!!

> > However, just to make you feel better, I have heard on the air, hams
> > speaking of other hams and to other hams who are apartment dwellers who have
> > mighty impressive logs--by the sounds of it. I have never been a witness to
> > said logs. I also know of hams who say they and other hams like them have
> > worked the world--many times--with QRP. I, again, have not seen the logs of
> > these said QRPers. And, I have heard of DX and Contest stations that have
> > mighty impressive logs. I have not seen any of these said logs.
> >
> > Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all the
> > hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.
> >

You set the standard TIT, you have to live by it

> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >

401. Re: FRS ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:42:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mCuZ7.215172$WW.12549441@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29912

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020104222655.13985.00002739@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c33c55a_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> > filtering. Echo mikes degrades intelligibility of your voice.
> >>
> >> Yah but they sound so kewl, d00d!
> >>
> >>
> > >Tuned just right, and echo mic beats the heck out of the power
limitations
> >on CB... tuned just right means where there is no echo, just ever so
slight
> >reverberation.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Uhhh, Kim -- what's the difference between an echo and an "ever so
slight
> reverberation?" Don't look now -- but an "ever so slight reverberation"
is
> virtually a textbook definition of an echo.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If I have waded thru the bulrushes without losing my way, I think her
point is that a very slight reverb helps communication. Debatable perhaps
but standard broadcast practice for years. Like anything else it can be
overdone and on 27 MHz EVERYTHING is overdone. Unfortunately most of the
people who have it sound like W-I-N-O Wonderful Wino or a bad caricature
of it.

Never thought I would find myself defending Kim. I think I will go get
drunk.

Dick NBK

402. Hiccup!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:48:11 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020104224811.06533.00000623@mb-fk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 29914

```
>I think I will go get
>drunk.
>
>Dick Nï¿½BK

I don't drink, but feel free to "knock back a cold (or smooth) one" for me. :-)
73 de Bert
KC2HMN
```

403. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 03:48:12 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29913

```
In article <3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> > > >
> > > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
> > accurate
> > > > figures:
> > > >
> > > > US population:
> > > >
> > > > 1970 - 203 million
> > > > 1980 - 227 million
> > > > 1990 - 249 million
> > > > 2000 - 281 million
> > > >
> > > > US hams:
> > > >
> > > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> > > > 1980 - 350,000
> > > > 1990 -
> > > > 2000 - 680,000
> > >
> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > > while ARS grew about 250%
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
> > of amateur growth relative to population came after
```

> > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> > entry point ...
>
> ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as an
> entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that, if
> you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be attracted.
>
>
> Dave K8MN

Careful Dave. Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.

He's the self proclaimed savior of amateur radio (according to his web-site)

Looking forward to working your with my 100 watts and my attic dipole (of course, the tower sits on my roof @ 40') and It have 40 and 80 m dipoles attached. And my logs would rival most.

Gotta run, having fresh sliced bacon for a snack. All this W5TIT talk has worked my up a powerful hunger for some ham products. W5TIT, the other OTHER white meat

sorry couldn't resist. Back to 6 meters, already in progress. If only the bans stay like this for the contest in 2 weeks wowie

dit dit

404. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000846.04115.00000833@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29915

In article <3C3206BB.D1CBA6E9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Like many porcine species - cute and cuddly when they're little, ugly and
>> disagreeable when they get older.
>
>Speaking of which, did you see those pig-like beasts on Discovery
>Channel's "Walking With Prehistoric Beasts".

Nope. Wish I'd caught that one.

> For awhile, they ruled the roost.

In some places, they still may do just that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

405. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000846.04115.00000834@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29917

In article <3C320462.939C1F70@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> No, I only infer what you imply. Often you deny what you imply.
>
>Oh, you infer infinitely more than I imply, Jim.

Just the opposite. I infer infinitely less than you imply.

>I have a narrow focus by nature.

But you make broad sweeping statements.

> You are determined to teach me a broad focus.

Nope. You infer that.

>Won't work.
>
>> Maybe the devil makes you do it.
>
>You are the one doing the devil's inference.

Must be the devil making you imply all those things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

406. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000847.04115.00000835@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29916

In article <3C320998.EFA508BB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>> We believe that marriage is not a jail.....
>
>"Love and marriage is an institution,
>We don't like living in an institution."
>
>- Homer and Jethro

Teacher asks the class: "What state has a woman governor?"

Little Billy answers: "The State of Matrimony"

73 de Jim, N2EY

407. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000848.04115.00000837@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29918

In article <a134vm$5iv$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> The rights to regulate interstate commerce. Radio is interstate commerce,
>and
>> has been recognized as such since the early days of broadcasting.
>"Commerce"
>> doesn't just mean commercial stations but all radio.
>
>Yet cities, counties and states can and do regulate interstate commerce in
>the cases where companies engaged in interstate commerce must
>comply with state and local building codes, tax laws, employment
>practices, etc.

Building codes and other similar regs are safety issues. A ham license doesn't
give one the right to put up an unsafe tower.

Many of the other laws involve commercial operations and do not involve
personal stuff like ham radio.

The important thing is that it's regulation, not prohibition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

408. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000848.04115.00000836@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29920

In article <20020103191745.14755.00003076@mb-bj.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>- Develop a good fist, then...
>- Crank up the speed

Yup - yup.

>- Scratch build a 3 el. 10m Yagi

I dunno about this.

>- Scratch build a 4 or 6 el. 2m quad

Good project but start with 3 elements.

>- Erect a Carolina Windom 80
>- Erect a 10 - 80 doublet

No need for both. My limited experience with "carolina" Windoms hasn't been
good.

Do the 80-10 doublet, open-wire line, BALANCED tuner, save yourself a lot of
headaches.

Download Reg Edwards DIPOLE1 and DIPOLE2 programs and see what the impedances
look like.

>- Set-up a nicely "organized" shack

Designed for good CW operation, I hope ;-)

>- Get XYL to take Technician exam (Easy, she already wants to.)
>- Get XYL to take element 1 (Not-so-easy, "it all sounds the same.")

Koch method.

>- Join an ARC.
>- Join FISTS
>- ARRL 20-wpm Code Proficiency Certificate
>- Add radar endorsement to GROL

COOL!

Good luck, Bert!

73 de Jim, N2EY

409. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000849.04115.00000838@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29919

In article <3C35FC0F.92A1D8F5@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>But for a more meaningful comparison
>we should strip out of the population numbers the kids
>too young to likely get a license. How many 3 year old
>extras are there?

US census data shows that the percentage of the population that are children has been dropping steadily since 1970. End of the baby boom, folks living longer, folks waiting longer to have kids and having fewer or nor nkids, etc., etc.

>But ignoring this, a rough approx. would
>be that the population increased by 1.38 times, and the
>ham population increased 2.51 times. That would be
>2.51/1.38=1.825 times faster. It seems that the ARS
>is in fairly good shape in terms of growth over the long term.

Think about that the next time somebody says the sky is falling and we gotta make radical changes to license requirements in order to save ham radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

410. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 05:08:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105000850.04115.00000839@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29921

In article <a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
>population.

Yup. But while the growth in the population has been steady, ham radio's growth speeds up and slows down.

Here's a list of the US ARS population from the end of WW2 until today. These were obtained from callbooks, published FCC bumbers and other historic data, not interpolated. Numbers are rounded off.

1946 - 60,000
1950 - 90,000
1956 - 140,000
1963 - 250,000
1970 - 270,000
1977 - 327,000
1989 - 500,000
2000 - 680,000

>Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
>while ARS grew about 250%

Which sez something about the need to make radical changes in order to "assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio" in the 21st century. Or about claims that ham radio is "dying". The 10 year license term thing in 1984 confuses the issue a bit, but those who claim the sky is falling aren't looking at the long-term numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

411. Re: Rec.radios.cb top users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:13:43 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201042213.6039ab49@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"\"Landshark\"" Landshark@TheLandshark.com wrote:
>I'm asking again that you cease this changing of screen
>names so you can by pass newsreader filters. I am inclosing
>a copy of this post to abuse@home.net.

I know Landshark, it's horrible just horrible. I don't want to read
his posts either. Here is a copy of the email I sent to abuse@home.net

Dear home.net,

One of your users middlefinger@home.net keeps disagreeing with me in a
newsgroup. I'd like to not see his posts at all. I have told him to
leave. But instead of leaving he is deliberately changing his screen
name so now I am having a hard time filtering him out. He is violating
our rights or something. So can you please cancel his account.

Scott Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay
--

412. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:21:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c369ea0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29924

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C366249.1B3AB716@earthlink.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > > >
> > > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > > understand? OKAY.
> > >
> > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big
gun
> > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
> >
> > I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> > can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> > dipole?
>
> Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
> were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
> those who own the finest antenna farms.
>

Sorry you hang so much on every word I say, Dave. Didn't say it as gospel,
didn't mean it as gospel.

> Sure a guy with a 100w and an indoor attic dipole will work *some* DX if
> the propagation gods smile and the pileup isn't too big. His logs will
> rival those of the big guns only in his mind and perhaps Kim's. Kim's
> statements do make it sound as if she lacks understanding of radio.
>
> Dave K8MN

I think your testosterone level is in overdrive, Dave.

Kim W5TIT
```

413. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:25:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c369ea1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29923

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word).
> That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my
> word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment
> dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna
> farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish
> to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here
> to there with any regularity on any number of bands.
>

OK, Dave. Let me get the crayons out again. Regularity isn't a
consideration of mine when I say that I have heard hams speak of their logs
from within the confines of apartment and similar conditions. Now, that
their logs can rival that of an antenna farm doesn't surprise me at all. I
didn't mean for you to take it as "gospel" that I mean they will do it with
regularity. Yeah, I can believe it. Maybe you've been a "big *cough* gun"
for too long.

> It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in
> what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people
> believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There
> is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.
>
> Dave K8MN

You haven't explained a thing, Dave, other than that you now wait with
baited cyberchips for my next words to be taken as gospel by you.

Kim W5TIT

414. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:29:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c369f23_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29925

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:8LtZ7.215093$WW.12544583@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word).
> > That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my
> > word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment
> > dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna
> > farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish
> > to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here
> > to there with any regularity on any number of bands.
> >
> > It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in
> > what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people
> > believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There
> > is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> The idea that an indoor lash up is going to equal a big-league Sterba
> Curtain would lead to Vatican Radio stringing dipoles in St. Peter's
> rather than fight with the Italian government's 6V/meter radiation
> standard (WHO limit is 80) and VOA running out of the Capitol where an eye
> could be kept on them.
>

A log rivaling another log, to me, has nothing to do with how it got that
way, Dick. Indoor, outdoor, big, little, whatever. Unless there are way
more bullshitters on the air than I thought, there sure are a lot of hams
out there who have operated under major constriction and yet report loads of
contacts in far away places. There sure are a lot of hams out there who
chase DX (for whatever reason I'll never understand) and make the contact.
There are, in addition, loads of QRPers who report the same thing.

> Everyone but Kim has this figured out, and for that matter has Kim figured
> out. Do us all a favor and do not orbit in ever-tightening circles around
> her.
>

> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>

You're ignorance is amazing.

Kim W5TIT

415. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:31:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c369f37_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29926

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C366901.AFD7CC26@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > > > >
> > > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > > understand? OKAY.
> > > >
> > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big
gun
> > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
>
> > I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of
apartment
> > owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would
rival
> > that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned
literal,
> > "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.
>
> I don't mind getting literal, especially when we can cut to the chase.
> After all, you seemed quite literal when you said "finest antenna farms"
> and not "some antenna farms". It has been pointed out to you by at
> least four individuals that your statement doesn't hold water.
>
> > However, just to make you feel better, I have heard on the air, hams
> > speaking of other hams and to other hams who are apartment dwellers who
have
> > mighty impressive logs--by the sounds of it. I have never been a
witness to
> > said logs.
>
> A '73 Vega must seem like a mighty impressive automobile to one who has
> never seen another car.
>
```

> I also know of hams who say they and other hams like them have
> > worked the world--many times--with QRP. I, again, have not seen the
logs of
> > these said QRPers.
>
> There are some QRPers working the world with some really massive piles
> of aluminum placed at extreme altitude. The QRPers living in apartments
> and using marginal antennas are only working the known world.
>
> And, I have heard of DX and Contest stations that have
> > mighty impressive logs. I have not seen any of these said logs.
>
> Them maybe you do need to check out the ARRL DX Contest results or the
> CQ Worldwide DX Contest results. Both mags break scores down by power
> level.
>
> > Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all the
> > hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.
>
> The hullabaloo was caused by your highly inaccurate claim and subsequent
> attempts at defending it as factual.
>
> Dave K8MN

The greatest claim I make is that I hear these hams talk all the time. How
'bout I tell them to contact you so you can call them a liar?

Kim W5TIT

416. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:34:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c369fc5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29927

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020104222656.13985.00002740@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <a10lan015lt@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it
takes
> >to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
> >right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what
is
> >necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary
or
> >hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they
can
> >still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.
>
> Yes, Krell, things have changed.
>
> Take a look at my own station as an example. I live in a 3rd floor
> apartment in a wood-framed building. The plumbing is all PVC/ABS,
> so there isn't even a way to make an effective ground on a cold water
> pipe. I use indoor dipoles for 20- and 10-meters, and a piece of wire
> tuned with a digital auto-tuner, mainly for 30- and 40-meters, but it's
> not very efficient due to a lack of a ground. I consider myself to
> have a highly effective station, based on the fact that I can
> communicate to most parts of the world on CW and digital modes,
> on days with reasonable propagation.
>

I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much sucks,
Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
eyes, sacrilege.

Kim W5TIT

417. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:55:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C3696BD.6DAF7EA@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29928

Jim Kelley wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
> > I don't think I was making said case, Jim. I said that I know of apartment
> > owners (meaning apartment dwellers when I said it) whose logs would rival
> > that of some antenna farms. Now, if you guys want to get so damned literal,
> > "know of" and "some" are classifiers there.
>
> Not sure what case are you trying to make then. That antenna
> restrictions really aren't that bad after all? I honestly don't know
> what point you are trying to make, Kim.

Well, Jim, that's not so strange. She doesn't know either.Topless.

418. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 06:59:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C369792.72DDD0CE@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29929

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>looks like the big increase in the slope

> of amateur growth relative to population came after
> the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> entry point ...

Yep, the name of the game is get the numbers up. To the dickens with whether or not they know anything or ever will, or whether or not they even care.

419. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 07:00:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C3697E1.55BD2A58@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29930

Dave Heil wrote:

> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > > >
> > > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > > understand? OKAY.
> > >
> > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
> >
> > I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> > can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> > dipole?
>
> Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
> were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
> those who own the finest antenna farms.
>

Gee, whatta surprise - Krell doens't know either!

420. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 07:09:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29931

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>
>
> I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much sucks,
> Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
> eyes, sacrilege.

I've had setups like Larry's and I've worked a fair amount of DX
using SSB and a 100W transceiver. I once did Antarctica. So it
can be done using indoor stealth antennas. Of course having
the beams and towers would help a lot.

Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
you a ground.

421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 07:16:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C369B9B.E3AC5E69@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29932

N2EY wrote:

> In article <a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> >population.
>
> Yup. But while the growth in the population has been steady, ham radio's growth
> speeds up and slows down.
>
> Here's a list of the US ARS population from the end of WW2 until today. These
> were obtained from callbooks, published FCC bumbers and other historic data,
> not interpolated. Numbers are rounded off.
>
> 1946 - 60,000
> 1950 - 90,000
> 1956 - 140,000
> 1963 - 250,000
> 1970 - 270,000
> 1977 - 327,000
> 1989 - 500,000
> 2000 - 680,000
>
> >Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> >while ARS grew about 250%
>
> Which sez something about the need to make radical changes in order to "assure
> the survival and prosperity of ham radio" in the 21st century. Or about claims
> that ham radio is "dying". The 10 year license term thing in 1984 confuses the
> issue a bit, but those who claim the sky is falling aren't looking at the
> long-term numbers.

If the sky is falling it wouldn't be because the numbers are high.

422. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 09:11:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <przZ7.325773$W8.12521404@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29933

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
sucks,
> > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in
their
> > eyes, sacrilege.
>

Actually, except for being able to get outside with a bit of stealth our
setups are not all that different.

Dick N&#65533;BK

423. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 14:26:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201050626.4e6356cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29934

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020103200732.01870.00000774@mb-fz.aol.com>...

>
> >> Yea, verily. Also Sky King and the Nabisco logo flying into the upper left
> >> corner of the screen.
> >>
> >Screen? What screen? We're talking RADIO days, the screen wuz in yer
> >head!
>
> I'm not THAT old!
>
>
Junior op, eh? Din have a family car or a TV rcvr until I wuz in high
school.
>
>
> > It gets worse a bit
> >north, New Hampshire loses an average of five citizens a year in
> >collisions with their 2,000 moose. Meese?
>
> Moose.
>
>
Meese dammit.
>
>
> >We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
> >is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.
>
> Nah. All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more doe
> licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.
>
>
Hoof around Rose Tree or Newtown Square with only a BB gun and see
what THAT gets ya let alone with a Remington or a Winchester. Will not
be a doe. Will involve dough.
>
>
Then of course cometh the next meeting of the township fathers and it
goes something like "Of course you can't SHOOT the pore things but fer
God's sake do SOMETHING, they ate all my Petunias last nite!"
>
>
> The dern things are basically big cute vermin. Rats with antlers.

>
>
And what's the classic vermin-exterminator going back into antiquity?
Meow.
>
>
> No natural
> enemies except two-legged and rubber-tired ones.
>
>
I rest my case.
>
>
> The folks who get all upset
> about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end of
> winter.
>
>
They'd take it to a vet then bitch about the Petunias again.
>
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

424. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 14:33:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C370ED5.EA85ADD1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29935

```
W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C366249.1B3AB716@earthlink.net...
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > > >
> > > > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > > > >
> > > > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > > > understand? OKAY.
> > > >
> > > > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big
> gun
> > > > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
> > >
> > > I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> > > can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> > > dipole?
> >
> > Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
> > were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
> > those who own the finest antenna farms.
> >
>
> Sorry you hang so much on every word I say, Dave. Didn't say it as gospel,
> didn't mean it as gospel.

If you didn't state it as gospel, then it would seem to be hot air.

> > Sure a guy with a 100w and an indoor attic dipole will work *some* DX if
> > the propagation gods smile and the pileup isn't too big. His logs will
> > rival those of the big guns only in his mind and perhaps Kim's. Kim's
> > statements do make it sound as if she lacks understanding of radio.

> I think your testosterone level is in overdrive, Dave.

What would make you write something like that, Kim? Is your estrogen
replacement program now up for discussion? You made some claims which
```

defy the laws of physics. You got called on it. That you don't like it is too bad.

It is okay if you don't understand radio. You aren't that kind of ham.

Dave K8MN

425. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 14:39:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C371032.89EB5FBC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29936

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3664FA.A20AA148@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > Your snubbiness is showing again, Dave.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Naw Kim, that isn't my "snubbiness" (you may have coined a new word).
> > That's just me attempting to clue you in. You don't have to take my
> > word for things. In fact, you can retain your beliefs that apartment
> > dweller's logs can rival those of the fellow with the finest antenna
> > farm. One of the problems with that is that you'll look pretty foolish
> > to anyone who really understands what it takes to get a signal from here
> > to there with any regularity on any number of bands.
> >
>
> OK, Dave. Let me get the crayons out again.

That's what got you into a jam in the first place. Why not attempt to
write with a pen like the grownups?

> Regularity isn't a
> consideration of mine when I say that I have heard hams speak of their logs
> from within the confines of apartment and similar conditions.

Your regularity isn't a consideration of mine either.

> Now, that
> their logs can rival that of an antenna farm doesn't surprise me at all. I
> didn't mean for you to take it as "gospel" that I mean they will do it with
> regularity. Yeah, I can believe it. Maybe you've been a "big *cough* gun"
> for too long.

Well, we wouldn't want to take everything you say as gospel, Kim. After
all, you may have meant that the guy with the fine tower and stacked
monobanders has been dead for a couple of years. That'd certainly help
to boost the score of the apartment dweller, wouldn't it.

> > It isn't my "snubbiness" at all. You may call it my steadfast belief in
> > what I've explained to you. There isn't any possibility of some people
> > believing one view and some people believing the opposite view. There
> > is only one correct position in this one. It isn't yours.

> You haven't explained a thing, Dave, other than that you now wait with
> baited cyberchips for my next words to be taken as gospel by you.

I've explained. You haven't understood. You're a real ditz.

Dave K8MN

426. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 14:45:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C37117F.88612BB0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29937

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C366901.AFD7CC26@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> > > Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all the
> > > hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.
> >
> > The hullabaloo was caused by your highly inaccurate claim and subsequent
> > attempts at defending it as factual.

>
> The greatest claim I make is that I hear these hams talk all the time. How
> 'bout I tell them to contact you so you can call them a liar?

Nope. That isn't the claim you made. No one else has stepped up to the
plate to make the claim you made. I won't even call *YOU* a liar. You
simply don't know what you are talking about.

Whatsa matter? No more ROTFLYAO?

Dave K8MN

427. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:33:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105103339.03703.00000974@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29938

In article <3c366124_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
>accurate
>> > figures:
>> >
>> > US population:
>> >
>> > 1970 - 203 million
>> > 1980 - 227 million
>> > 1990 - 249 million
>> > 2000 - 281 million
>> >
>> > US hams:
>> >
>> > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
>> > 1980 - 350,000
>> > 1990 -
>> > 2000 - 680,000
>>
>> Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
>> population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
>> while ARS grew about 250%
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
>of amateur growth relative to population came after
>the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
>entry point ...
>
Now how do you figure that from the above data, Carl? 'Specially without a
number for 1991? And how do you allow for the fact that the license term
doubled in 1984, which meant thaty from 1989 to 1994 there were NO expirations?

Here's a chart of US hams with annual growth percentages from the end of WW2 to
2000:

1946 - 60,000
1950 - 90,000 - 10.67% annual growth for 4 years
1956 - 140,000 - 7.65% annual growth for 6 years
1963 - 250,000 - 8.64% annual growth for 7 years
1970 - 270,000 - 1.11% annual growth for 7 years

1977 - 327,000 - 2.78% annual growth for 7 years
1989 - 500,000 - 3.61% annual growth for 12 years
2000 - 680,000 - 2.84% annual growth for 11 years

Note that the growth AFTER the dropping of the code test from the Tech is LOWER than before.

How about that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

428. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:34:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c371e68_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29939

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C370ED5.EA85ADD1@earthlink.net...
>
> > I think your testosterone level is in overdrive, Dave.
>
> What would make you write something like that, Kim? Is your estrogen
> replacement program now up for discussion? You made some claims which
> defy the laws of physics. You got called on it. That you don't like it
> is too bad.
>

Sorry, I am full woman here. Now, what claim have I made that defy the laws of physics: that I believe what I've heard when I hear hams talk about their logs--whose operation was out of either an apartment or similar situation? I didn't say a word about station setup, how long it took (I'd have no idea) for their logs to get that way, nothing--nothing--about station. ONLY that I hear of logs that will rival those of people who operate from the finest antenna farms. Now, either I am to believe that they are/were lying; or I am to believe that you just don't believe it. I don't believe they were lying--they may have been. The bottom line of this whole discussion is that the FCC, nor ARRL, need be requesting that--because "we" are ham radio operators--we be given some kind of special consideration for intervention with a CCR. I don't believe "we" as ham radio operators need to break the law by changing the law.

>
> It is okay if you don't understand radio. You aren't that kind of ham.
>
> Dave K8MN

And proud of it, if it means being thought of as among your kind.

Kim W5TIT

429. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:37:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c371f09_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29940

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C371032.89EB5FBC@earthlink.net...
>
> > Now, that
> > their logs can rival that of an antenna farm doesn't surprise me at all.
I
> > didn't mean for you to take it as "gospel" that I mean they will do it
with
> > regularity. Yeah, I can believe it. Maybe you've been a "big *cough*
gun"
> > for too long.
>
> Well, we wouldn't want to take everything you say as gospel, Kim. After
> all, you may have meant that the guy with the fine tower and stacked
> monobanders has been dead for a couple of years. That'd certainly help
> to boost the score of the apartment dweller, wouldn't it.
>

SCORE?! What the Hell are you talking about, Dave. Now I see why you're so
up in arms. This isn't about "winning" Dave--it's about having as much fun
as you *cough* big guns. It's also about reading and researching a property
before one is stupid enough to buy into it and then say, "OH BOOHOO, look,
here's something I missed and that I just can't live with."

Kim W5TIT

430. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:38:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c371f4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29941

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C37117F.88612BB0@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C366901.AFD7CC26@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > > > Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all
the
> > > > hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.
> > >
> > > The hullabaloo was caused by your highly inaccurate claim and
subsequent
> > > attempts at defending it as factual.
>
> >
> > The greatest claim I make is that I hear these hams talk all the time.
How
> > 'bout I tell them to contact you so you can call them a liar?
>
> Nope. That isn't the claim you made. No one else has stepped up to the
> plate to make the claim you made. I won't even call *YOU* a liar. You
> simply don't know what you are talking about.
>
> Whatsa matter? No more ROTFLYAO?
>
> Dave K8MN

I ROFLMAO with most of your posts, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

431. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:43:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c37209b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29942

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:przZ7.325773$W8.12521404@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
> sucks,
> > > > > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in
> their
> > > > > eyes, sacrilege.
> > >
> >
> > Actually, except for being able to get outside with a bit of stealth our
> > setups are not all that different.
> >
> > Dick N&#65533;BK
> >
> >

Doesn't say much for your thoughts of how "effective" you think that is. However, your comments are well noted, and I like to believe that we don't need the FCC, or Congress, to "help" ham radio by giving us special consideration on CCRs that we were too stupid to know about, read, and research before we signed with the dotted line.

Whether someone has a fine antenna farm, or comes up with other ways of operating, ham radio provides that those rare contacts can be had. I can't help but think of the analogy of CW vs. NO CW. If no (or little) CW is "dumbing down" the ham bands because it will cause a lack of "work" to get into the hobby; then what's that say for those who take the easy way out :^ and build their huge antenna farms? Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...

No? What, too hard?

Kim W5TIT

432. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 15:45:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3720f1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29943

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
sucks,
> > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
> > eyes, sacrilege.
>
> I've had setups like Larry's and I've worked a fair amount of DX
> using SSB and a 100W transceiver. I once did Antarctica. So it
> can be done using indoor stealth antennas. Of course having
> the beams and towers would help a lot.
>
> Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> you a ground.
>

The plumbing usually works for a good ground also. But, I'm just a dumbed
Tech+. I am sure that Larry's superiority has found a problem with using
good ground "workarounds".

Kim W5TIT

433. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:02:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rsFZ7.326762$W8.12543718@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29944

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201050626.4e6356cb@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20020103200732.01870.00000774@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>
> >
> > >> Yea, verily. Also Sky King and the Nabisco logo flying into the
upper left
> > >> corner of the screen.
> > >>
> > >Screen? What screen? We're talking RADIO days, the screen wuz in yer
> > >head!
> >
> > I'm not THAT old!
> >
> >
> Junior op, eh? Din have a family car or a TV rcvr until I wuz in high
> school.
> >
> >
> > > It gets worse a bit
> > >north, New Hampshire loses an average of five citizens a year in
> > >collisions with their 2,000 moose. Meese?
> >
> > Moose.
> >
> >
> Meese dammit.
> >
> >
> > >We're overrun with the damned Whitetails. My solution to the problem
> > >is to start importing pairs of cats from Idaho. BIG cats.
> >
> > Nah. All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more
doe
> > licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.
> >
> >
> Hoof around Rose Tree or Newtown Square with only a BB gun and see
> what THAT gets ya let alone with a Remington or a Winchester. Will not
> be a doe. Will involve dough.
> >
> >
> Then of course cometh the next meeting of the township fathers and it

> goes something like "Of course you can't SHOOT the pore things but fer
> God's sake do SOMETHING, they ate all my Petunias last nite!"
> >
> >
> > The dern things are basically big cute vermin. Rats with antlers.
> >
> >
> And what's the classic vermin-exterminator going back into antiquity?
> Meow.
> >
> >
> > No natural
> > enemies except two-legged and rubber-tired ones.
> >
> >
> I rest my case.
> >
> >
> > The folks who get all upset
> > about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end
of
> > winter.
> >
> >
> They'd take it to a vet then bitch about the Petunias again.
> >
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> w3rv

One of the more hilarious examples of just what Brian is saying occurred when a family of beaver moved into a Milwaukee burb and built their lodge out of the local ornamental and blessed expensive shrubery. Hoo-hah.

On your car insurance, there are two coverages generally that apply to the car: Collision and what might be called Comprehensive or simply Other that is all else. In most of the USA, Collision is far more expensive but not always. Places like El Paso where the car can be beyond hope and reach in a heartbeat are reversed because of theft; in the Great North Woods it is deer and it sounds like you are about to join the frozen northland for Comprensive rates. Oddly, whacking a moose or being whacked by one is not a Collision.

Putting out doe permits is not the total answer unless the local Nimrods get over blasting mommy deer. A lot of states have found that adding two days to the main season, setting a minimum for does, and giving the two days to the blackpowder boys the first year it isn't met is usually effective. Like you I am ready for landmines and hand grenades.

Dick N&#65533;BK

434. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:27:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C372954.AB124FBF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29945

N2EY wrote:
> 1946 - 60,000
> 1950 - 90,000 - 10.67% annual growth for 4 years
> 1956 - 140,000 - 7.65% annual growth for 6 years
> 1963 - 250,000 - 8.64% annual growth for 7 years
> 1970 - 270,000 - 1.11% annual growth for 7 years
> 1977 - 327,000 - 2.78% annual growth for 7 years
> 1989 - 500,000 - 3.61% annual growth for 12 years
> 2000 - 680,000 - 2.84% annual growth for 11 years
>
> Note that the growth AFTER the dropping of the code test from the Tech is LOWER
> than before.

The second ham licensed grew the ARS by 100%. Percent is probably not
the best way to look at things. Absolute number comparisons seem to
me to be more important since our limited resources can become
saturated.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

435. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:28:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3729CB.AC625449@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29946

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If the sky is falling it wouldn't be because the numbers are high.

Didn't you say the sky is falling because hordes of CBers and
freebanders are becoming hams, i.e. the numbers are too high?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

436. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:31:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C372A63.B5B6C9E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29947

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I have a narrow focus by nature.
>
> But you make broad sweeping statements.

Nope, I don't, Jim. You infer that I make broad sweeping statements.
That's the whole problem. Please stop inferring that I make broad
sweeping statements. My statements are always narrow even if I
don't specifically say they are narrow.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

437. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:32:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C372AA2.4F24E20B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29948

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Like many porcine species - cute and cuddly when they're little, ugly and
> >> disagreeable when they get older.
> > >
> > >Speaking of which, did you see those pig-like beasts on Discovery
> > >Channel's "Walking With Prehistoric Beasts".
> >
> > Nope. Wish I'd caught that one.

Keep a lookout. They repeat good programs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

438. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 16:39:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C372C4B.5DF96DB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29949

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
> I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> dipole?

Especially on 10m at the height of the sun-spot cycle. I feel sorry
for the apartment dwellers during the low of the sun-spot cycle.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

439. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 17:08:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105120852.01446.00000920@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29950

In article <d22b54c3.0201050626.4e6356cb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Junior op, eh?

Yup.

> Din have a family car or a TV rcvr until I wuz in high
>school.

Which was long before I hit high school.

Considering where work, school and stores were for your family a car was a luxury.

>Meese dammit.

I hates meeses to pieces.

>> All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more doe
>> licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.

>Hoof around Rose Tree or Newtown Square with only a BB gun and see
>what THAT gets ya let alone with a Remington or a Winchester. Will not
>be a doe. Will involve dough.

Controlled hunts in Ridley Creek will make a big dent (bad pun intended).

>Then of course cometh the next meeting of the township fathers and it
>goes something like "Of course you can't SHOOT the pore things but fer
>God's sake do SOMETHING, they ate all my Petunias last nite!"

Venison stew for the food banks and homeless shelters. Better yet, how much ya think the FreshFields crowd will pay for "all natural" low fat BambiBurgers? Yum!

>> The dern things are basically big cute vermin. Rats with antlers.

>And what's the classic vermin-exterminator going back into antiquity?
>Meow.

Until one of the big kitties eats somebody's dog. Or baby.
>>
>> No natural
>> enemies except two-legged and rubber-tired ones.

>I rest my case.

Maybe I should get the body shop to paint a little deer outline on the new quarter panel.

It's in the shop, I got a cheap rental, I'm out the deductible, trying not to think about it. Anybody know if those supersonic anti-deer whistles work?

>> The folks who get all upset
>> about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end of
>> winter.

>They'd take it to a vet then bitch about the Petunias again.

Too true. I am reminded of the PETA folks protesting fur while wearing leatner shoes. HUH?

73 de Jim, N2EY

440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 17:22:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_CGZ7.326865$W8.12555459@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30001

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105120852.01446.00000920@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0201050626.4e6356cb@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Junior op, eh?
>
> Yup.
>
> > Din have a family car or a TV rcvr until I wuz in high
> >school.
>
> Which was long before I hit high school.
>
> Considering where work, school and stores were for your family a car was
a
> luxury.
>
> >Meese dammit.
>
> I hates meeses to pieces.
>
> >> All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more doe
> >> licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.
>
> >Hoof around Rose Tree or Newtown Square with only a BB gun and see
> >what THAT gets ya let alone with a Remington or a Winchester. Will not
> >be a doe. Will involve dough.
>
> Controlled hunts in Ridley Creek will make a big dent (bad pun
intended).
>
> >Then of course cometh the next meeting of the township fathers and it
> >goes something like "Of course you can't SHOOT the pore things but fer
> >God's sake do SOMETHING, they ate all my Petunias last nite!"
>
> Venison stew for the food banks and homeless shelters. Better yet, how
much ya
> think the FreshFields crowd will pay for "all natural" low fat
BambiBurgers?
> Yum!
>
> >> The dern things are basically big cute vermin. Rats with antlers.

>
> >And what's the classic vermin-exterminator going back into antiquity?
> >Meow.
>
> Until one of the big kitties eats somebody's dog. Or baby.
> >>
> >> No natural
> >> enemies except two-legged and rubber-tired ones.
>
> >I rest my case.
>
> Maybe I should get the body shop to paint a little deer outline on the
new
> quarter panel.
>
> It's in the shop, I got a cheap rental, I'm out the deductible, trying
not to
> think about it. Anybody know if those supersonic anti-deer whistles
work?
>
> >> The folks who get all upset
> >> about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end
of
> >> winter.
>
> >They'd take it to a vet then bitch about the Petunias again.
>
> Too true. I am reminded of the PETA folks protesting fur while wearing
leatner
> shoes. HUH?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Re the deer whistles, experience in the Northland is mixed to say the least. Had at least one friend swear all they did was cause the deer to look at you before jumping out in front of you.

Sounds like you got one on his way to somewhere else that ignored the road with you in it. Not a lot you are going to do about that.

In days of old, no longer, it made a diff whether you hit the deer or the deer hit you on whether you had a deductible (Comp often did not at the time) or not. Caused a lot of complaints not the least among adjusters who felt it was kind of silly to do a psychoanalysis on a dead deer.

Dick NBK

441. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 18:22:32 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uSe1iUhlBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30002

W5TIT said:

> I don't believe "we" as ham radio operators need to
> break the law by changing the law.

??????????????????????????????

Now it's against the law to have a law changed????????

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

442. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 18:30:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ec9jBZhlBHA.908@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30003

W5TIT wrote:

> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...

K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
involved in radio transmission.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

443. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 18:36:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OIldmchlBHA.908@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30004

K3LT wrote:

> I live in a 3rd floor apartment in a wood-framed building.
> The plumbing is all PVC/ABS, so there isn't even a way
> to make an effective ground on a cold water pipe.

W5TIT didn't understand, so she said:

> The plumbing usually works for a good ground also. But, I'm
> just a dumbed.....

Yup, seems that you are.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

444. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:02:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C374DB8.5700D0E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30005

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C370ED5.EA85ADD1@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > I think your testosterone level is in overdrive, Dave.
> >
> > What would make you write something like that, Kim? Is your estrogen
> > replacement program now up for discussion? You made some claims which
> > defy the laws of physics. You got called on it. That you don't like it
> > is too bad.
> >
>
> Sorry, I am full woman here.

If you want to dish out crap about testosterone levels, be prepared to
be dealt with in kind.

> Now, what claim have I made that defy the laws
> of physics: that I believe what I've heard when I hear hams talk about their
> logs--whose operation was out of either an apartment or similar situation?
> I didn't say a word about station setup, how long it took (I'd have no idea)
> for their logs to get that way, nothing--nothing--about station. ONLY that
> I hear of logs that will rival those of people who operate from the finest
> antenna farms. Now, either I am to believe that they are/were lying; or I
> am to believe that you just don't believe it. I don't believe they were
> lying--they may have been. The bottom line of this whole discussion is that
> the FCC, nor ARRL, need be requesting that--because "we" are ham radio
> operators--we be given some kind of special consideration for intervention
> with a CCR. I don't believe "we" as ham radio operators need to break the
> law by changing the law.

Phew! You really are thick. Your claim was that you know hams living
in apartments whose logs rival those of hams with the finest antenna
farms. There. That was your claim. It cannot be right. It is wrong.
You don't know what you are talking about.

We can't tell if you are simply ignorant or perhaps gullible in
accepting the statements of other hams who are perhaps deluding
themselves because they've never seen the logs of those who have the
"finest antenna farms". For you to persist in the face of strong
evidence to the contrary is simply incredible.

> > It is okay if you don't understand radio. You aren't that kind of ham.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

>
> And proud of it, if it means being thought of as among your kind.

It would take a real air head to climb to the top of the pushup mast
supporting her Antron and bleat, "I'm ignorant and proud of it!"

Dave K8MN

445. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:07:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C374EFB.9C577DD9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30006

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C371032.89EB5FBC@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > Now, that
> > > their logs can rival that of an antenna farm doesn't surprise me at all.
> I
> > > didn't mean for you to take it as "gospel" that I mean they will do it
> with
> > > regularity. Yeah, I can believe it. Maybe you've been a "big *cough*
> gun"
> > > for too long.
> >
> > Well, we wouldn't want to take everything you say as gospel, Kim. After
> > all, you may have meant that the guy with the fine tower and stacked
> > monobanders has been dead for a couple of years. That'd certainly help
> > to boost the score of the apartment dweller, wouldn't it.
> >
>
> SCORE?! What the Hell are you talking about, Dave. Now I see why you're so
> up in arms. This isn't about "winning" Dave--it's about having as much fun
> as you *cough* big guns.

Simply not true, Kim. You didn't claim that hams who are apartment
dwellers have as much fun as those with the finest antenna farms. Cough
all you like. Your ignorance is showing.

It's also about reading and researching a property
> before one is stupid enough to buy into it and then say, "OH BOOHOO, look,
> here's something I missed and that I just can't live with."

Finding a home without restrictive covenenants is becoming increasingly
difficult for those who live near cities. That is a reality. The
covenants are often arbitrary and prevent the land owner from enjoying
the use of his land. This is a threat to the growth of amateur radio
and to the participation in amateur radio of many of those already
licensed. That you are incapable of seeing that is pathetic.

Dave K8MN

446. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:08:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C374F3F.C715D597@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30007

```
W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C37117F.88612BB0@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C366901.AFD7CC26@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Shall I get in the habit of being so extremely definitive--or is all
> the
> > > > > hullabaloo for the sake of argument? Good grief.
> > > > >
> > > > The hullabaloo was caused by your highly inaccurate claim and
> subsequent
> > > > attempts at defending it as factual.
> > >
> > >
> > > The greatest claim I make is that I hear these hams talk all the time.
> How
> > > 'bout I tell them to contact you so you can call them a liar?
> > >
> > Nope. That isn't the claim you made. No one else has stepped up to the
> > plate to make the claim you made. I won't even call *YOU* a liar. You
> > simply don't know what you are talking about.
> >
> > Whatsa matter? No more ROTFLYAO?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I ROFLMAO with most of your posts, Dave.

...just because you don't understand 'em. I'd think you'd have rolled
most of it off by now.

Dave K8MN
```

447. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:09:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105140904.01493.00000583@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30008

In article <3C372954.AB124FBF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> 1946 - 60,000
>> 1950 - 90,000 - 10.67% annual growth for 4 years
>> 1956 - 140,000 - 7.65% annual growth for 6 years
>> 1963 - 250,000 - 8.64% annual growth for 7 years
>> 1970 - 270,000 - 1.11% annual growth for 7 years
>> 1977 - 327,000 - 2.78% annual growth for 7 years
>> 1989 - 500,000 - 3.61% annual growth for 12 years
>> 2000 - 680,000 - 2.84% annual growth for 11 years
>>
>> Note that the growth AFTER the dropping of the code test from the Tech is
>LOWER
>> than before.
>
> Percent is probably not the best way to look at things.

It's a valid indicator if you are looking for trends.

> Absolute number comparisons seem to
>me to be more important since our limited resources can become
>saturated.

Then lets look at absolute numbers:

1977 to 1989 (all US hams take code tests, no code waivers, 5 year licenses still expiring): Growth of 173,000 in 12 years. Average 14,416 per year

1989 to 2000 (code waivers in 1990, nocodetest license in 1991, no expirations at all from 1989 to 1994): Growth of 180,000 in 11 years. Average 16,363 per year.

If the average dropout rate is 2.5% per year then the switch to 10 year licenses caused a "bubble" of 12,500 licenses per year from 1989 to 1994.

Is there any indication that our resources are saturated?

73 de Jim, N2EY

448. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:12:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C375009.C897BF65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30009

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
> sucks,
> > > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
> > > eyes, sacrilege.
> >
> > I've had setups like Larry's and I've worked a fair amount of DX
> > using SSB and a 100W transceiver. I once did Antarctica. So it
> > can be done using indoor stealth antennas. Of course having
> > the beams and towers would help a lot.
> >
> > Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> > The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> > and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> > with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> > you a ground.
> >
>
> The plumbing usually works for a good ground also. But, I'm just a dumbed
> Tech+. I am sure that Larry's superiority has found a problem with using
> good ground "workarounds".

The plastic plumbing makes for no ground at all, Kim. See any problems
with using CATV shielding as a ground for ham gear?

Dave K8MN

449. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:14:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C3743F3.32A996E0@townsqr.com>
Source record: 30010

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If the sky is falling it wouldn't be because the numbers are high.
>
> Didn't you say the sky is falling

No, I didn't at any time say the sky is falling, that's your ignorant statement.

> because hordes of CBers and
> freebanders are becoming hams, i.e. the numbers are too high?
>

Oh, that would depend on what you expect out of ham radio and ham radio operators, of whatever number.
If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is more than well.

450. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:14:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3750ee_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30011

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> > > >
> > > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
> > accurate
> > > > figures:
> > > >
> > > > US population:
> > > >
> > > > 1970 - 203 million
> > > > 1980 - 227 million
> > > > 1990 - 249 million
> > > > 2000 - 281 million
> > > >
> > > > US hams:
> > > >
> > > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> > > > 1980 - 350,000
> > > > 1990 -
> > > > 2000 - 680,000
> > >
> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > > while ARS grew about 250%
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
```

> > of amateur growth relative to population came after
> > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> > entry point ...
>
> ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as
an
> entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that,
if
> you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be
attracted.
>
>
> Dave K8MN

Or, as an alternative viewpoint, if your remove unnecessary,
arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry, those who
were interested, but disuaded by those unnecessary barriers
will "jump in."

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDdQlZe+N6+q84HiEQL4mQCgq4MQA3Gb9RFbKzlsg/yprk2F5GoAn1ef
dHmAecgRh9EaSXLKl9K60hhe
=ab4E
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

451. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:23:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C3745FC.80A6E91E@townsqr.com>
Source record: 30012

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > 1946 - 60,000
> > 1950 - 90,000 - 10.67% annual growth for 4 years
> > 1956 - 140,000 - 7.65% annual growth for 6 years
> > 1963 - 250,000 - 8.64% annual growth for 7 years
> > 1970 - 270,000 - 1.11% annual growth for 7 years
> > 1977 - 327,000 - 2.78% annual growth for 7 years
> > 1989 - 500,000 - 3.61% annual growth for 12 years
> > 2000 - 680,000 - 2.84% annual growth for 11 years
> >
> > Note that the growth AFTER the dropping of the code test from the Tech is LOWER
> > than before.
>
> The second ham licensed grew the ARS by 100%.

It Marconi was the first ham, tell us - who was the second? How did he know?

> Percent is probably not
> the best way to look at things.

Especially since it causes discomfiture to your stated position.

> Absolute number comparisons seem to
> me to be more important

Right! Get those numbers up, the heck with any and all actual qualification!

> since our limited resources can become
> saturated.

Well, that tells us you've been somewhere besides on the air lately. Our resources are anything BUT saturated, in fact are at risk of being lost as abandoned for lack of interest - that is from actual on-air use. Entire HF bands are nearly vacant. VHF and UHF are even worse. You can count on the fingers of one hand the total number of contacts being made at times on some of the OPEN HF bands.
Saturated? By all the codefree Kims? Not a chance.

452. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:32:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c375518_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30013

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
>
> Careful Dave. Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.

I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.
(I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
"listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)

Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ
DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
with my new privileges ... tough.

I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)

I don't believe I've ever made a comment one way or the other
regarding "W5TIT types" ... as far as I'm concerned, W5TIT
is simply another callsign ... an arbitrary combination of letters
and number, which uniquely identifies a particular station/op ...
if anyone else wants to make a big deal about that callsign,
leave me out ... I'm not interested in the incessant argument
about such inane subjects.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR

Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

453. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 19:45:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IJIZ7.326982$W8.12570261@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30014

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3750ee_1@news7.fast.net...
> Or, as an alternative viewpoint, if your remove unnecessary,
> arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry, those who
> were interested, but disuaded by those unnecessary barriers
> will "jump in."
>
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

And jump right back out again if the 15% renewal ratio of the codeless Tech is any indication.
May not necessarily be bad but it is an effect that needs to be recognized. I have no objection to the present Tech if it is detuned to be the bread-and-milk ticket it was always designed to be or a relatively simple entry ticket -- it let a lot of us OTs wander around and learn by breaking things. We differ slightly on the All-privilege ticket which is not going to guarantee competance but should probably guarantee experience which is really what the code tests did. And the privilege of giving exams should be 2 years minimum.

Dick N�BK

454. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 20:47:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C376662.81531EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30015

Richard McCollum wrote:
> I have no objection to the present Tech if it is detuned to
> be the bread-and-milk ticket it was always designed to be ...

Careful there, Dick. The original tech class is now grandfathered
into general class. We HF generals used to have a lot of respect
for the techs who dared to experiment with VHF/UHF.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

455. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:05:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C376A90.912B9F84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30016

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The second ham licensed grew the ARS by 100%.
>
> It Marconi was the first ham, tell us - who was the second? How did he know?

Uhhhhh Dick, the ARS is the 'United States of America Amateur Radio
Service'. Was Marconi licensed as a US amateur radio operator?
Do you know who was the first amateur radio license issued in the
US? Do you know who was second?

> > Percent is probably not
> > the best way to look at things.
>
> Especially since it causes discomfiture to your stated position.

What makes me uncomfortable is that one is 100% of one and one is
0.000147% of 680,000. It reminds me of the time my company cut
everyone's salary by 10% and then later increased everyone's
salary by 10%. The company said we were back where we had been
but it wasn't true.

> > Absolute number comparisons seem to
> > me to be more important
>
> Right! Get those numbers up, the heck with any and all actual qualification!

Dick, if I am worried about the ham frequencies being saturated, why
would I want to get the numbers up?

> > since our limited resources can become
> > saturated.
>
> Well, that tells us you've been somewhere besides on the air lately. Our resources
> are anything BUT saturated, ...

Uhhhh Dick, you are the one who said hordes of CBers and freebanders
are invading ham radio. You cannot have it both ways. If "our resources
are anything BUT saturated" then the CBers and freebanders are NOT
invading ham radio and increasing the ham population by lowering
the hoop that hams must jump through is probably a good thing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

456. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:09:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105160914.27168.00000949@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 30017

In article <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
>The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
>and you might be able to use it as a ground.

Maybe. But be aware that by doing so there's a chance of introducing your
transmitted RF directly into the entire CATV system.

>Combine that
>with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
>you a ground.

Another option is to run a counterpoise wire.

73 de Jim, N2EY

457. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:09:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105160915.27168.00000950@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 30018

In article <3C372A63.B5B6C9E7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >I have a narrow focus by nature.
>>
>> But you make broad sweeping statements.
>
>Nope, I don't, Jim.

Yes, you do, Cecil.

>You infer that I make broad sweeping statements.

Nope. I see the broad sweeping statements for what they are.

>That's the whole problem.

I agree. You make broad sweeping statements without realizing they are broad sweeping statements. Quite confusing, really.

>Please stop inferring that I make broad
>sweeping statements.

I can't stop what I've never started.

> My statements are always narrow even if I
>don't specifically say they are narrow.

That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

458. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:10:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C376BBF.B344AE99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30019

N2EY wrote:
> Is there any indication that our resources are saturated?

At the bottom of the last sunspot cycle, I thought the HF bands
were pretty crowded. I doubt that the present ARS HF bands can
support more than about 0.5% of the general population.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

459. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:17:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C376D4E.35CA3525@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30020

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is more
> than well.

I would certainly prefer W5TIT's in ham radio over more Dick's.

Your phrase, "the all is more than well", reminds me of
my three year old grandson who said, "one leg is both the
same".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

460. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:19:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C376DF7.D021201E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30021

Dave Heil wrote:
> See any problems with using CATV shielding as a ground for ham gear?

Not as long as the amateur radio currents remain common-mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

461. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 21:33:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C377132.BA6BFA0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30022

N2EY wrote:
> > My statements are always narrow even if I
> >don't specifically say they are narrow.
>
> That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.

See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

462. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 22:03:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C377847.781535A1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 30023

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
> sucks,
> > > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
> > > eyes, sacrilege.
> >
> > I've had setups like Larry's and I've worked a fair amount of DX
> > using SSB and a 100W transceiver. I once did Antarctica. So it
> > can be done using indoor stealth antennas. Of course having
> > the beams and towers would help a lot.
> >
> > Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> > The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> > and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> > with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> > you a ground.
> >
>
> The plumbing usually works for a good ground also.

Larry said that the pipes are plastic. Now if they were
copper, then he'd have something.

463. Re: 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 22:06:11 UTC
From: "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com>
Message-ID: <nNKZ7.357432$5A3.135716002@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30024

```
test
```

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years for the
> radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those things you
> will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your dwelling.
>
> Dick McCollum NBK
>
>

464. Re: 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 22:33:40 UTC
From: "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com>
Message-ID: <8bLZ7.357540$5A3.135732857@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30025

laydown boy test test
"Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com> wrote in message
news:nNKZ7.357432$5A3.135716002@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> test
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years for
the
> > radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those things
you
> > will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your
dwelling.
> >
> > Dick McCollum N&#65533;BK
> >
> >
>
>

465. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 22:44:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <98612482C9C98234.6F4725DF2A0D724B.893096D304B02CD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30026

On Sat, 05 Jan 2002 19:07:43 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Finding a home without restrictive covenenants is becoming increasingly
>difficult for those who live near cities. That is a reality. The
>covenants are often arbitrary and prevent the land owner from enjoying
>the use of his land. This is a threat to the growth of amateur radio
>and to the participation in amateur radio of many of those already
>licensed. That you are incapable of seeing that is pathetic.

Dave, maybe I'm naive but I just don't see anyone holding a
gun to your head (or anyone else's) to force them to buy a home with
restrictions!

Sure, it might be less convenient to find a home without
them--it may not be in "quite" as desirable a neighborhood (one reason
the restrictions probably exist in the first place), but that's a
trade off you make when you insist on certain requirements in a home.
For instance, if you want a home with three bedrooms, three baths, and
a large yard, you may not be able to afford to live in as exclusive a
neighborhood as if you wanted one with only two bedrooms and two
baths. That isn't unjust restriction--it's fair trade.

The FCC isn't letting hams down by not forcing neighborhoods
to accept ham antennas--it's allowing the residents to set their own
rules. If you look carefully at most restrictions, it isn't the
existence of an antenna that is banned (they can't--that DOES
violate the FCC ruling on home entertainment antennas), only its size
(it would be easy to defeat a restriction that was based on use not
size in any court--i.e., you can ban a 40' tower, but you CAN'T ban an
antenna for amateur use if an equivalent sized one for TV use is
permitted--that's discriminatory regulation). I live in an area with
just that kind of restriction and do quite adequately with a flag-pole
antenna (most neighborhoods DO permit a flag-pole with a US Flag,
which makes a great 18' to 27' vertical) and an MFJ Super Hi-Q loop on
the roof (about the same size as my legal DirecTV dishes and thus not
subject to limitation) that handles 10m-40m--according to both
experience and printed reviews it does just as well as a typical 40m
antenna system, and does so in a fraction of the space. I also have
antennas on my car (which restrictions CAN'T prohibit) and a small
2m/70cm antenna on my roof that isn't even noticeable from the street.
That may not be optimum, but I didn't buy my house with the thought in
mind of setting up an antenna farm--for that I would buy a home on
acreage in the country.

Frankly, ham or not, I can see some of the objections. A 40'+ tower topped by HF beams CAN detract from the appearance of a neighborhood from a non-ham perspective. The people who live there bought, in part, because their neighborhood DID have such restrictions--why do you feel it fair to deprive them of the right to live where there are NOT "unsightly" antennas simply because you choose to move to their area? It isn't discrimination to want to live where the neighborhood maintains a specific appearance. For myself, and most hams, that's not the kind of neighborhood we want (I bought this place knowing I would ultimately sell it and move where I could have an antenna farm), but that doesn't give us the right to demand that others agree with our interests.

As Cecil (and others) have pointed out, you agree to those terms when you sign the purchase contract. Failure to learn about them prior to the sale isn't a legitimate reason to complain that they exist--it's incumbent on anyone who signs a contract of ANY nature to know the specific terms and restrictions applicable to that contract. Anyone who buys a house without a careful examination of the title and a search to insure no objectionable restrictions exist, frankly deserves what he or she gets--it's no more excusable than signing a credit contract without knowing the interest rate, repayment method, or term of the contract. Fools do NOT deserve protection from themselves.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

466. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 23:00:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1ALZ7.216278$WW.12645469@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30027

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C376662.81531EF@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > I have no objection to the present Tech if it is detuned to
> > be the bread-and-milk ticket it was always designed to be ...
>
> Careful there, Dick. The original tech class is now grandfathered
> into general class. We HF generals used to have a lot of respect
> for the techs who dared to experiment with VHF/UHF.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I said 'Present Tech' for exactly that reason.

467. Re: 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 23:02:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <uCLZ7.216283$WW.12645756@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30028

Kind of barrel-scraping aren't we George?

"Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com> wrote in message
news:8bLZ7.357540$5A3.135732857@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> laydown boy test test
> "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:nNKZ7.357432$5A3.135716002@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > test
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years
for
> the
> > > radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those
things
> you
> > > will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your
> dwelling.
> > >
> > > Dick McCollum N�BK
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

468. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-05 23:48:35 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1838v01bbv@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30029

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3729CB.AC625449@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If the sky is falling it wouldn't be because the numbers are high.
>
> Didn't you say the sky is falling because hordes of CBers and
> freebanders are becoming hams, i.e. the numbers are too high?

Deja vu - I heard the same thing in the mid 70s when a lot of folks became
hams on the heels of the CB radio craze.

469. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 00:02:35 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1843701cau@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30030

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020104222656.13985.00002740@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <a10lan015lt@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it
takes
> >to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting the
> >right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define what
is
> >necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up temporary
or
> >hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and they
can
> >still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.
>
> Yes, Krell, things have changed.
>
> Take a look at my own station as an example. I live in a 3rd floor
> apartment in a wood-framed building. The plumbing is all PVC/ABS,
> so there isn't even a way to make an effective ground on a cold water

Since when does the FCC oversee plumbing codes?

> pipe. I use indoor dipoles for 20- and 10-meters, and a piece of wire
> tuned with a digital auto-tuner, mainly for 30- and 40-meters, but it's
> not very efficient due to a lack of a ground. I consider myself to
> have a highly effective station, based on the fact that I can
> communicate to most parts of the world on CW and digital modes,
> on days with reasonable propagation. However, I am nowhere near

So what are you complaining about?

> as effective as I could be with a tower of modest height (35-50 feet)
> and a 3- or 4-element Yagi and a good all-band dipole. If I lived

Ah, I see now. It's class envy.

> in a typical new home in my area, there would be no way I could
> have that "marginal" setup, and my "compromise" set up would
> end up not being as effective as what I have now, due to the fact
> that I'd be living two floors closer to the ground. In fact, about
> the best part of my station would be the fact that I could most
> likely establish an effective RF-ground -- if not decent antennae.
>

> In my POV, nobody has a right to limit me this severely. I believe

Like everyone else has been saying - if you don't like the rules, MOVE.

> that there is a world of difference in aesthetics between a well-
> installed tower/antenna setup and having a 16-foot bass boat
> on a trailer permanently parked next door -- or living next door
> to a junkyard, as Kim does. Until this latest decision by the FCC,
> I always thought ham radio was an activity which could justify
> being treated differently, based on the public service capabilities
> hams can offer to their communities. However, it now appears that
> we're to be relegated to portable/mobile operation unless we can
> afford a few acres in the country. This would seem to me to limit
> the ability of the ARS to even maintain it's present numbers,
> much less grow.and that will ultimately result in huge loss
> of spectrum -- which is the FCC's true agenda.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Perhaps a few FCC officials think the spectrum could be put to better use,
but I doubt that this is a hidden agenda of the Commission as a whole.

470. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 00:10:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a184hn01d4f@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30031

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C366249.1B3AB716@earthlink.net...
> > I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> > can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> > dipole?
>
> Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
> were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
> those who own the finest antenna farms.

Like the saying goes - it ain't how much ya got; It's how ya use it.

471. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 00:12:40 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a184m401dgr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30032

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C3697E1.55BD2A58@townsqr.com...

> > > I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that
you
> > > can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> > > dipole?
> >
> > Maybe you've forgotten what the misguided Ms. Walker claimed as if it
> > were gospel--the bit about "knowing" apartment dwellers whose logs rival
> > those who own the finest antenna farms.
> >
> Gee, whatta surprise - Krell doens't know either!

Neither do you, since she never made the claims that are being attributed to
her.

472. Re: Forge Check Instructions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 00:58:34 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201051658.10b9efb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30033
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C33A8DD.CF7FB077@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> Look for this string is a message from me:
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.9.144.161
>
> If it's not from this IP, it's not me. This IP may
> change when Comcast takes over from @Home. Cable is
> still faster, cheaper, and more reliable then DSL.

More BS from the troll forger. OK troll, if you're me, what's my shoe size?

Scott Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay
--

473. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:09:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gphhyf8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30034

On Sat, 05 Jan 2002 02:09:49 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
>The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
>and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
>with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
>you a ground.

Never use a CATV cable sheath as a transmitter rf ground.

RF ground is RF ground. Always separate unless one likes rf current
flowing all around the house.

Just like teaching a pig to whistle, the result is poor and you
annoy the pig.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

474. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:09:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gphjdma.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30036

K3LT wrote:

>> I live in a 3rd floor apartment in a wood-framed building.
>> The plumbing is all PVC/ABS, so there isn't even a way
>> to make an effective ground on a cold water pipe.

Actually, there's a way to get a mezzo-mezzo electrical ground.

As most electricians find out the hard way, it's not the
conductivity of the pipe that makes the ground, it's mostly the
conductivity of the water therein. A dry metal pipe has much lower
conductivity than one filled with water.

Connecting to a metal fitting tied into your system might work as an
poor-quality electrical ground.

Do not rely on it for an RF ground - in fact, do not rely on ANY
"ground" for that purpose unless you know EXACTLY where it goes,
what it connects to, and how long it is. Your "ground" may become
your "antenna".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

475. FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer to Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:09:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gphk3ab.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30035

On Sat, 05 Jan 2002 17:44:34 -0500, Rick Adams wrote:

>(it would be easy to defeat a restriction that was based on use not
>size in any court--i.e., you can ban a 40' tower, but you CAN'T ban an
>antenna for amateur use if an equivalent sized one for TV use is
>permitted--that's discriminatory regulation).

But that is EXACTLY what the law allows - the preemption is
use-based, not size-based. The intent of the legislation is very
clear, and absent any consitutional violation, the courts look to
the intent of the legislation.

>Frankly, ham or not, I can see some of the objections. A 40'+
>tower topped by HF beams CAN detract from the appearance of a
>neighborhood from a non-ham perspective.

Properly done, an antenna installation is a thing of beauty. Some
folks can't recognize that because they have no class.... <ggg>

>The people who live there
>bought, in part, because their neighborhood DID have such
>restrictions--why do you feel it fair to deprive them of the right to
>live where there are NOT "unsightly" antennas simply because you
>choose to move to their area?

Dialog:

Phil Kane, then W6VQM: "Ed, what does "of an unsightly nature" in
my CC&Rs mean?" (1968)

Ed Peck, K6AN, noted DXer and the dean of ham tower lawyers at the
time: "It means that you can put up any antenna that you want.
"Unsightly" is unenforceable."

(Ed went on to mentor me to do ham antenna litigation before he
passed away.)

>it's incumbent on anyone who signs a contract of ANY nature to
>know the specific terms and restrictions applicable to that contract.

And to be able to recognize when a term is unreasonable or can be
ignored because it is umenforceable.

That's where competent legal advice is mandatory.

Even dacades after _Shelley v Kramer_ one can write a racially
discrimibatory clause into a sales contract or set of CC&Rs. It
just can't be enforced.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

476. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:09:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105200942.01870.00000821@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 30037

In article <3C376DF7.D021201E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> See any problems with using CATV shielding as a ground for ham gear?
>
>Not as long as the amateur radio currents remain common-mode.

AND if the CATV system, plus everything connected to it, has adequate
common-mode rejection.

73 de Jim, N2EY

477. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:21:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gphkq1c.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30038

On Sat, 5 Jan 2002 19:02:35 -0500, Krell wrote:

>Perhaps a few FCC officials think the spectrum could be put to better
>use, but I doubt that this is a hidden agenda of the Commission as a
>whole.

The other way around...it's the Five Wise Men who have no clue as to
anything but the dollar value of spectrum. The working staff are the
folks juggling five balls in the air with competing needs of users.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

478. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:27:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#u$pz4nlBHA.908@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 29970

The opinion of Dick Carroll seems to be......

>
> We have more than enough TITs in ham radio already, yep.
>

Not like we used to have! Does anyone remember Anita,
ZS1TZ, in the mid '60s, and the photo on her QSL? Enough
to make a Baptist preacher break out in a sweat!

With all kind wishes for 2.002K,

de Hans, K0HB

479. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:35:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105203537.11806.00003613@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30039

From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>And jump right back out again if the 15% renewal ratio of the codeless
>Tech is any indication.

I think there are a number of factors. Many who entered as codeless techs did not jump out; they moved on and upgraded.

I would not have progressed very far in ham radio without the help of my Elmer, W1BNB. When the large influx of codeless techs occured, there were a lot more hams entering ham radio than available (or willing) Elmers.

Too, I have to wonder what the effect of the social factors of some small number of hams publically berating these newcomers for not being good enough to be "real" hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

480. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:37:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020105203737.11806.00003616@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30040

From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net

>W5TIT wrote:

>> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
>> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...

>K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
>involved in radio transmission.

Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

481. Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 01:53:11 UTC
From: moparho1ic@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30041
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I write to about this at the ARRL?

~/Moparholic~

482. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 02:01:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C37AFFC.BD69F9F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30042

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C376662.81531EF@IEEE.org...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > I have no objection to the present Tech if it is detuned to
> > > be the bread-and-milk ticket it was always designed to be ...
> >
> > Careful there, Dick. The original tech class is now grandfathered
> > into general class. We HF generals used to have a lot of respect
> > for the techs who dared to experiment with VHF/UHF.
>
> I said 'Present Tech' for exactly that reason.

It was the "was always designed to be" that caught my attention.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

483. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 02:18:11 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <DtOZ7.10019$fe1.404972@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30043
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Goggle. Yawn.

Jim AA2QA

"Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

484. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 02:28:55 UTC
From: Hammer <spam@spam.com>
Message-ID: <HDOZ7.1889$nI1.12697@news1.wwck1.ri.home.com>
Source record: 30044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If you just finished reading QST and have to ask where to write...DUH? Do you think you have any chance to pass a test? DUH..

HELLO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Maybe you can find who to write in QST....DUH... LOL...

"Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

485. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 02:32:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TGOZ7.10029$fe1.406345@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

We have here a reply by the same guy that wrote it. He IS barrel scraping tonite.

"Hammer" <spam@spam.com> wrote in message
news:HDOZ7.1889$nI1.12697@news1.wwck1.ri.home.com...
> If you just finished reading QST and have to ask where to write...DUH?
Do
> you think you have any chance to pass a test? DUH..
>
> HELLO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Maybe you can find who to write in
QST....DUH...
> LOL...
>
>
> "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > write to about this at the ARRL?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic~
>
>

486. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 02:33:03 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <zHOZ7.36564$Tt3.4467119@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 30046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

FAKE!
Train

"Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

487. K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 03:07:33 UTC
From: Mad Max <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com>
Message-ID: <a18f15$n5g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30047
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, is sending this notification. I don't know what he is trying to prove save for wasting his breath. I mean, who cares??
.....
.....

Subject: Re: Broadcasting

AMERICAN AMATEUR RADIO ASSOCIATION (AARA)
INTERNATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO NETWORK (IARN)
K1MAN BULLETIN SERVICE
FULL INFORMATION AT www.K1MAN.com

"AARA is your alternative to ARRL. We sponsor IARN, which is the most experienced amateur radio emergency communications organization in the world."

This is Glenn's claim. He cannot verify it and Who Cares??

"K1MAN bulletins have been heard world wide since 1987. Like W1AW, K1MAN transmissions are perfectly legal under FCC rules. Like W1AW, good amateur practice requires publishing a transmitting schedule and then sticking to it. It is far more disruptive to do otherwise."

And maliciously and deliberately interfering with ongoing QSO's is not "disruptive"? Is not rude? Is not ILLEGAL? And Glenn has the anabashed nerve to mention "good amateur practice"?

"Hams can be very childish and territorial about the use of amateur radio spectrum. Our surveys show that about 1 ham in 10 is against both K1MAN and W1AW one way bulletins. We are sure there are also those who are against contests, nets, etc. This is OK! There is plenty of room for everyone in our Amateur Radio Service. If you have a problem with this, try another hobby; you are probably not cut out for big time Amateur Radio."

Yes, Glenn. You can be "very childish and territorial about the use of amateur radio spectrum." Your surveys are just that....YOURS! No need to use the plural "our", Glenn. MY survey shows that 6 of ten active Amateurs are against the K1MAN broadcasts/intentional interference and my survey is just as valid and likely more accurate than yours. The comment, "you are probably not cut out for big-time radio" is laughable. And what makes you, Glenn, think that you are "big-time radio"? Your silly ego aside, I have news for you. The only thing "big-time" about you is the constant pain-in-the-ass that you are.
Perhaps you should try another hobby. It is quite obvious that you are not

cut out for Amateur Radio and hopefully Riley will make that point painfully clear to you, sooner rather than later.

"An experienced ham knows that if you are trying to talk to another station per a sked, you might have to QSY one or more times during any given hour. If you don't know this and practice this, you are not am experienced Radio Amateur."

You are not talking to another station, Glenn. You are maliciously interfering with good Amateur operators and you do so several times daily. It is YOU who should practice QSY'ing. One must therefore surmise that you are, in your own words, "not an experienced Radio Amateur."

"Actually, our amateur spectrum is UNDERUTILIZED. The commercial guys are drooling over our spectrum and would love to divide us and conquer us. They love to see us squabble and act like babies. There are even evil persons in the FCC (dressed like good guys) who are very subtly promoting and documenting amateur radio disruption under a long term private plan to assist commercial interests take as much amateur spectrum as possible. A primary function of AARA is to warn you about this frequency grab and to expose the corruption that exists within the FCC. Corruption is nothing new in American politics, and if you don't think that our amateur radio spectrum is worth billions upon billions of dollars, you are very naive."

Here we have Glenn's agenda in a nutshell. He's a conspiracy theorist. He thinks Riley is a government agent in the pockets of Big Business. Glenn....ever look up the definition of "delusional"?

"So, join the fun. Listen to K1MAN on 14.275, 7.224, 3.975, and 3.890 MHz. daily and also call in (207 495 2215). See www.K1MAN.com 73!

14.275 MHz. USB and 3.975 LSB at 1:00 AM to 2:30 AM;
3:30 AM to 5:00 AM; 6:30 AM to 8:00 AM; 4:00 PM to
5:30 PM; and also 8:00 PM to 9:30 PM. 7.224 MHz.
LSB at 3:30 AM to 5:00 AM. High fidelity amplitude
modulation on 3.890 MHz. at 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM.

(All times are in Eastern Local Time - In winter add 5 hours for UTC)
Join the fun! Get your unedited viewpoints on the air! 73 de K1MAN"

What "fun"? The real fun will begin when Riley comes knocking on your door! Go, Riley! Go!

488. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 03:24:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a18ft901h9h@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30050

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C376D4E.35CA3525@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is more
> > than well.
>
> I would certainly prefer W5TIT's in ham radio over more Dick's.

We already have enough of those.

489. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 03:25:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <JsPZ7.330041$W8.12611765@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30048

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105203537.11806.00003613@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >And jump right back out again if the 15% renewal ratio of the codeless
> >Tech is any indication.
>
> I think there are a number of factors. Many who entered as codeless
techs did
> not jump out; they moved on and upgraded.
>
> I would not have progressed very far in ham radio without the help of my
Elmer,
> W1BNB. When the large influx of codeless techs occured, there were a
lot more
> hams entering ham radio than available (or willing) Elmers.
>
> Too, I have to wonder what the effect of the social factors of some
small
> number of hams publically berating these newcomers for not being good
enough to
> be "real" hams.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

The vanity program does make a history of the Codeless Tech a little hard to write but we see here the one's who did not upgrade. My guess is that the renewals you see are those who did obtain it for largely bread-and-milk reasons. Those expiring are no longer with us, a fact for which you seem to have two hypotheses, both of which hold them blameless and unload on the OT community.

The available Elmer shortage if correct tends to imply sheer chaos when the licenses become codeless which is a point I tend to agree with. I have argued here that the point is not whom to exclude or standards but rather how one absorbs newbies in any large number into a hobby with long standing traditions and practices. It is not the hobby to fear for but the bright souls who easily pass the new exams and are kind of left there scratching their butts. Roast no newbie before his time! Politics and 20 meters ain't beanbag. It is useful as hell for the newbie to have a friend -- and you have to hand it to Bert for lining up a battalion of them -- but at the very least having the time, inclination, and if need be (I think so) the requirement to simply listen for a while is worth consideration. It is always useful to ask which side of a firing squad

one is volunteering for.

The willingness of the OT community, and it is nice to remember we are still in the 13wpm days for this discussion, was a result of a fraud: selling the Codeless Tech as the entry-level license for Amateur Radio. It was left to the OT community to deliver a message that was about as popular as creamed pork chops at a bar mitzvah: ye shall know the truth and the truth will make you work. As a practical matter, a new CT was going to take up the gauntlet in the first 6-9 months or so or he was not ever going to do it at all. So one was encouraging for a while and ultimately wrote the man off. If indeed your shortage argument holds water, what else would one expect the OT community to do except triage?

This had its sociological effects to be sure. We have all seen the classic Lifer Codeless Tech who becomes the resident genius in virtually everything, joins every group in existence, makes a pilgrimage to the OM's grave, and shows up at Dayton as regularly as the face of doom. We have seen an equally large number show up on the freeband. I have my opinions but let us leave it at that; some do not like the message and denial mode is generally not a thing of beauty. And having some fugitive from 27.555 regale the group with DXploits would not exactly win the Dale Carnegie seal of approval. They were misled but it was not the OTs doing the misleading. That some got a little bitter about it, joined NCI, and dedicated their lives to iconoclasm -- destroying Morse wherever it was found -- is simply one reaction to being told that you really do not own the Brooklyn Bridge.

The problem after 25.5 goes away is not the same problem that this was but it could very easily have the same effect: marching newbies thru like the four lines at Lenin's Tomb. There will undoubtedly be those who will write the same accounts that when dissected have the old Babushki doing the mile in 3:30 while crying for Evita, I mean Nikolai.

It seems to me that a lot more honesty with the outside world is in order here.

Dick N&#65533;BK

490. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 03:35:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5CPZ7.330050$W8.12613098@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30049
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote in message
news:a18f15$n5g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, is sending this notification. I don't know what he
is
> trying to prove save for wasting his breath. I mean, who cares??
>
>

Who cares indeed. So why are you spreading joy and happiness across a
half dozen groups?

Neither the topic nor the writer deserve this much, particularly a bozo
who doesn't know his own name.

Dick N&#65533;BK

491. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 03:58:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C37CB5F.CD163480@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29951

Krell wrote:

>
>
> Perhaps a few FCC officials think the spectrum could be put to better use,
> but I doubt that this is a hidden agenda of the Commission as a whole.

One of the reason the ARS exists is that we can do backup emergency
comms. There's enough of us so when the big hurricane or whatever
happens, enough of us with usable equipment survive to provide the
comms. Even if only 5% of ham stations survive, that would be enough.
No government agency is going to overbuild their systems by 20 times
as that is awful expensive. So they give us spectra to play with on
off times so we buy/build our stations and have fun. Also presumably
enough are tuning about on our transceivers looking for some interesting
DX to find that distress call. Only thing is that station with the antenna
farm and linears is most likely to lend assistance. That's fine by me,
I don't need to be a hero if someone else can do it better. But if
noone has antenna farms anymore....

492. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:01:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020105230122.19213.00002367@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 29953

In article <ONrZ7.366626$er5.9400291@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>
>Sorry,
>
>In NC, if it is 2 AM and somebody invades your home, he's paid for. Just
>make sure you tell
>the cop you saw something "glint" in the moonlight and you thought he had a
>gun. Just don't
>shoot him in the back. It has happened around here several times,
>Homeowner went free
>every time. Just about everyone of the perps were well known in the justice
>system, and the
>legal boys don't shed a tear over their demise. Just before Christmas, a
>scumbag walked into
>a store uptown for a little easy money. He became a little too fascinated
>with the sight of money being put in a bag. Storeowner whipped out a pistol
>and blew his brains out. Short
>investigation, perp had a gun, DA ruled self defense, and case closed.
>Oughtta be MORE of
>this.
>
>Jerry

Actually, there ought to be less of "this," but, in general, I am in favor of the individual's right to defend his life/property with the threat and/or actual use of deadly force. Having said that, I believe that that deadly force should be used only when it is absolutely clear that a life-threatening situation exists. I am also a firm believer in having the firearms proficiency required to be able to hit a guy in the shoulder, versus the head or chest. Trust me, if I get a guy in the shoulder with a 230-grain slug flying out of the barrel of my .45 at almost 600 mph, he'd WISH he were dead, if he didn't actually end up that way! At any range within my own apartment, that would be an easy shot for me. However, my goal in life is to never have to do any such thing. The problem I have with you is you sound like you are ready, willing, and eager to shoot an intruder in your house.

73 de Larry, K3LT

493. Re: Radio Policy (And Stock-Car Racing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:01:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020105230123.19213.00002368@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 29952

In article <3C34DFA6.DD6836B9@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>I do hear that hot rodders like Pintos for their
>spacious engine compartments and small size
>of the overall car. They put muscle engines in
>'em.

Bob:

Actually, what they do is build a muscle car with a Pinto-sized chassis, and drop a Pinto body on top of it. There's nothing in the original Pinto chassis/running gear that would endure the high torque of a big, fully-blown V-8 running upwards of 750 hp. What you see hurtling down the track is a custom-made car that looks like a Pinto, but is far from it. Same as the NASCAR cars that look like Fords, Chevies, Dodges, etc. but that's just because the custom-manufactured fiberglass body shell is made to the same basic shape. All they have is the car manufacturer's name on them, and money behind them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

494. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:06:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C37CD38.81626BBD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29954

Phil Kane wrote:

>
>
> Do not rely on it for an RF ground - in fact, do not rely on ANY
> "ground" for that purpose unless you know EXACTLY where it goes,
> what it connects to, and how long it is. Your "ground" may become
> your "antenna".
>

Or use a balun on the antenna so you don't have any common mode
RF currents on your feedline in the shack. A w2au balun or just use
about 20 loops 1.5 feet across of coax with some ferrite material to make
a 1:1 balun. See http://www.geocities.com/wa2ise/radios/ham.html

495. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:09:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C37CE05.1ABA09CF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I've written better trolls than this......

496. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:25:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AkQZ7.330097$W8.12619013@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29956
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20020105225446.731$5b@newsreader.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > We have here a reply by the same guy that wrote it. He IS barrel
> > scraping tonite.
> >
> I'm surprised it took the pea brain this long to start forging me.lol
> Dig the croos-post to the policy board..nice touch.
> >
> --
> ~Moparholic~

The Policy board has the moxie to take care of itself, believe me.

I figure he is an undiagnosed diabetic having the resulting head problems
or is getting head probs from blood pressure meds; they are notorious for
it.

Take it from me, aging is quite tolerable but not exactly pretty.

Dick N�BK

497. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:30:51 UTC
From: Mad Max <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com>
Message-ID: <a18jto$39t$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29957
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:5CPZ7.330050$W8.12613098@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote in message
> news:a18f15$n5g$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, is sending this notification. I don't know what he
> is
> > trying to prove save for wasting his breath. I mean, who cares??
> >
> >
>
> Who cares indeed. So why are you spreading joy and happiness across a
> half dozen groups?
>
> Neither the topic nor the writer deserve this much, particularly a bozo
> who doesn't know his own name.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
Ah...the old refrain "you are posting anonymously, you coward." Is that not
what you imply, Dick?
Maybe you like spam. It may be the only email you get. As for me? I prefer
to keep my real name and email address anonymous due to the lack of quality
that some of these posters have and all of them are Hams.
So there you have it, Big Dick. How I operate is my option, not yours.
73

498. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:32:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201052031.4e5f38a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29958

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020105120852.01446.00000920@mb-cs.aol.com>...

>
> >> All they need to do is make the season longer and give out more doe
> >> licenses. LOTS more doe licenses.
>
> >Hoof around Rose Tree or Newtown Square with only a BB gun and see
> >what THAT gets ya let alone with a Remington or a Winchester. Will not
> >be a doe. Will involve dough.
>
> Controlled hunts in Ridley Creek will make a big dent (bad pun intended).
>
>
They've been doing that for years, lotta deer in the park but they're
not the same deer which are doing the Petunias five miles from the
park. I suspect that they could wipe out every deer in the park and ya
wouldn't notice the dent. Pun intended.
>
>
> Venison stew for the food banks and homeless shelters. Better yet, how much ya
> think the FreshFields crowd will pay for "all natural" low fat BambiBurgers?
> Yum!
>
>
Cows & pigs are not "natural"???? And yuk. Stuff tastes terrible. Last
time I tried it I thought I was eating an old shoe and yeah, it was
cooked "right". Maybe when they come up with a Black Angus Whitetail.
>
>
> >And what's the classic vermin-exterminator going back into antiquity?
> >Meow.
>
> Until one of the big kitties eats somebody's dog. Or baby.
>
>
The annual number of big cat attacks on humans is miniscule compared
with the number of attacks on humans by their own and their neighbor's
dogs. I'd be a damned sight less concerned abt a mountain line roaming
the neighborhood than I would about a loose Pit Bull.
>
>
> It's in the shop, I got a cheap rental, I'm out the deductible, trying not to
> think about it. Anybody know if those supersonic anti-deer whistles work?
>

>
Can't hurt. I learned a long time ago to keep the speed down when
cruising the back roads via my eons of boonies commutes around here. I
wuz on winding hilly Providence Rd. one nite passing Ridley Creek Park
and caught something moving in the limit of my right side peripheral
vision and hit the brakes. The dude behind me damned near rear-ended
me and got all over his horn. We rounded the curve and there had to be
six-eight of the stupid things right in the middle of the road just
standing there staring at my headlites. Din hear his horn again.
>
>
> >> The folks who get all upset
> >> about Bambi-hunting never saw one slowly starving to death at the end of
> >> winter.
>
> >They'd take it to a vet then bitch about the Petunias again.
>
> Too true. I am reminded of the PETA folks protesting fur while wearing leatner
> shoes. HUH?
>
>
Yeah, everybody has a "cause". Until it takes something away from
them.
>
>
Like code tests. They'll finally figger it out but too late.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

499. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 04:55:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C37CC10.EBA1A325@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29959

Krell wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C376D4E.35CA3525@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is more
> > > than well.
> >
> > I would certainly prefer W5TIT's in ham radio over more Dick's.
>
> We already have enough of those.

We have more than enough TITs in ham radio already, yep.

500. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:09:11 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@IamBARF.net>
Message-ID: <a18m38$84l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29960
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a14dd5$8vi$7@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Suckingdick Susie" <Dummy@Crash.com> wrote in message
> news:a13ulc$4nc$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a12ekr$l3l$5@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "Polly FQF" <PollyFQF@mulehumperssociety.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a12af6$a3f$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > Will someone please post [DYOFDW, LLAARDASSSSSSS LLLLLLOYD]
> > >
> > > Hey "Polly, " dying from your diabetes yet?
> > > Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!
> > > Poor "Polly" drove his daughter from his first marriage to suicide.
> > >
> > > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
> > >
> > > N0VFP is going to get some letters, bwhahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!!
> > >
> > > Here's one of Polly's.......
> > >
> > > February 7, 2001
> > >
> > > CERTIFIED MAIL-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
> > >
> > > Mr. George A. Ashley
> > > 1138 Collierville Arlington Road
> > > Collierville, TN 38017
> > >
> > > Subject: Warning Notice: Amateur Radio Station W4FQF
> > >
> > > Dear Mr. Ashely:
> > >
> > > Information before the Commission indicates that you have engaged in
> > > deliberate interference on the 75 Meter Amateur Band (3.901 MHz) at
> > various
> > > times since October 2000. Some of the interference included tape
> > recordings.
> > > We note that on January 7, 1999 you were warned about such activities
on
> > the
> > > 20- Meter Amateur Band.
```

> > >
> > > This constitutes a second warning that any further incidents of such
> > > operation will result in enforcement action being taken against you,
> > > including license revocation, monetary forfeiture, or both.
> > >
> > > Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 18
U.S.C.
> > > Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to obtain
information
> > > from licensees about the operation of their station. Pursuant to
Section
> > > 308(b), you are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days of
> the
> > > above date. You are also requested to furnish the following
information.
> > > 1. Describe the radio transmitting equipment, including antennas, you
> have
> > > at the 1138 Collierville Arlington Road Address. State the
manufacturer,
> > > model and serial number of each item. If any items were constructed or
> > > modified by you, describe the item in detail.
> > > 2. Describe any radio transmitting equipment, including antennas, you
> have
> > > at any other address in Tennessee. State the manufacturer, model and
> > serial
> > > number of each item. If any items were constructed or modified by you,
> > > describe the item in detail.
> > >
> > > Please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully false
> > > response to a letter of this type. See 18 U.S.C. Section 1001.
> > >
> > > Sincerely,
> > >
> > >
> > > W. Riley Hollingsworth
> > >
> > > Special Counsel
> > > Enforcement Bureau
> > >
> > > GLENDALE, WV: The FCC requested July 11, 2000, that Roger L. Wiseman,
> > KC8JBO, retake the General examination elements under the supervision of
> an
> > ARRL-VEC volunteer examiner team. Wiseman must appear for retesting by
> > September 11, 2000, or his license will be canceled. Applicants
appearing
> > for re-examination are granted an Amateur Radio license consistent with
> the
> > elements passed. The FCC had written Wiseman on March 29, 2000, advising
> > that it had been made aware of "an ongoing personal dispute" between
> Wiseman

> > and another licensee that included allegations of interference or
jamming
> on
> > 20 meters. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> > Hollingsworth invited the two licensees to contact him to discuss the
> > matter. Additionally, the FCC had sent Wiseman a Warning Notice last
> > November in response to allegations of deliberate and malicious
> interference
> > on 20 meters.
>
> Mwuhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!
> And depite your efforts to try and get me out of here I passed the retest
> with EASE. You still have to pass it the FIRST fucking time.
> Poor Lllardasssssss Lllllllloyd.....
>

Roger,

You cannot be a member of BARF, if you have received
warning letters from Riley! I thought you already knew this?
Sorry, I cannot accept your application for BARF membership.
However, if you have $20,000 I will rent you my QTH.

Herbie KV4FZ

501. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:11:15 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <3C387677.2E186C4B@mailcity.com>
Source record: 29961
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Google through AOL, what else would you expect.

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>
> Goggle. Yawn.
>
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > write to about this at the ARRL?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic~

502. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:22:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C37DF1A.41F7C539@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29962

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> > > > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> > > > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> > > > >
> > > > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
> > > accurate
> > > > > figures:
> > > > >
> > > > > US population:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1970 - 203 million
> > > > > 1980 - 227 million
> > > > > 1990 - 249 million
> > > > > 2000 - 281 million
> > > > >
> > > > > US hams:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> > > > > 1980 - 350,000
> > > > > 1990 -
> > > > > 2000 - 680,000
> > > >
> > > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > > > while ARS grew about 250%
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
```

> > > of amateur growth relative to population came after
> > > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> > > entry point ...
> >
> > ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as
> an
> > entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that,
> if
> > you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be
> attracted.
> >
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Or, as an alternative viewpoint, if your remove unnecessary,
> arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry, those who
> were interested, but disuaded by those unnecessary barriers
> will "jump in."

Stow the arbitrary and distasteful stuff, Carl. What you are basically saying is that if you make something easy enough that people don't have to know much to do it, folks will flock to it. It is an interesting concept. My last visit to a local club meeting pretty much confirmed my impression that we are headed toward an amateur service where not many folks know much about radio. I'm not saying that the folks there weren't pleasant. Most of 'em are simply lost in the fog.

Dave K8MN

503. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:27:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C37E02E.6A0A4F86@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29963

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Careful Dave. Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> > radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.
>
> I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> ... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
> long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.
> (I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> "listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)

Carl, meet Kim. Kim, this is Carl.

> Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
> Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
> EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
> the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ
> DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
> with my new privileges ... tough.

Not at all, Carl. We knew that was the type of "experimentation" you
had in mind all along.

> I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
> wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
> about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)

That big knob in the center is sort of like a channel selector. Twist
it and listen to something else if you like. The Steven Hawking net
meets on 21.440 at 0100z.

Dave K8MN

504. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:29:16 UTC
From: Landshark <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <MgRZ7.24854$IR1.1883568361@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29964
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Again our resident forging troll at
work.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:DtOZ7.10019$fe1.404972@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Goggle. Yawn.
>
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > write to about this at the ARRL?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic~
>
>

505. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:36:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C37E274.83F6A010@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29965

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
>
> >W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> >> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...
>
> >K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
> >involved in radio transmission.
>
> Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.

Did you sit around for hours arguing with those who did know and tried to enlighten you or did you clam up and absorb the information?

One of the things I recall about my first few years in amateur radio is that I knew I didn't know very much. I listened to just about anyone who had something to teach me.

Dave K8MN

506. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 05:50:02 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C37E58A.5C75891F@coqui.net>
Source record: 29966
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Mad Max wrote:
>
> Ah...the old refrain "you are posting anonymously, you coward." Is that not
> what you imply, Dick?
> Maybe you like spam. It may be the only email you get. As for me? I prefer
> to keep my real name and email address anonymous due to the lack of quality
> that some of these posters have and all of them are Hams.
> So there you have it, Big Dick. How I operate is my option, not yours.
> 73
Truer words have never been spoken. If you present yourself under
fraudulent pretense, the best you can hope for is (are) fraudulent
responses so the whole effort of disguising your email identity is an
exercise of a clown in a transparent changing booth.
There's little purpose in being a crocodile (all mouth and no ears) when
registering posts on Usenet., If what you have to say is relevant
there's no overcoming need to fear spam if you take even the novice
approaches of NOSPAM in your address. Simply shouting shit with your
ears plugged puts you into the category of yammering old cat-women
pushing shopping carts in the middle of a one-way street
Apart from the lack of adapting the same uzenet approach as the
grown-ups, one can only consider you as a kid who snuck into Mom's
bedroom to mess with the computer.
For that reason alone I'll not use my favorite bad words with you lest
there be some law in your area about mouth-whipping stupid pre-teens..

Gethefucklost-youdontbelonghereifyoudonthaveenoughasstobackupyourwank,
lil chile,
Mmmm, kay?.
-ex

507. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 06:14:35 UTC
From: Mad Max <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com>
Message-ID: <a18q0pjfj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29967
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net> wrote
in message news:3C37E58A.5C75891F@coqui.net...
> Mad Max wrote:
> >
> > Ah...the old refrain "you are posting anonymously, you coward." Is that
not
> > what you imply, Dick?
> > Maybe you like spam. It may be the only email you get. As for me? I
prefer
> > to keep my real name and email address anonymous due to the lack of
quality
> > that some of these posters have and all of them are Hams.
> > So there you have it, Big Dick. How I operate is my option, not yours.
> > 73
> Truer words have never been spoken. If you present yourself under
> fraudulent pretense, the best you can hope for is (are) fraudulent
> responses so the whole effort of disguising your email identity is an
> exercise of a clown in a transparent changing booth.
> There's little purpose in being a crocodile (all mouth and no ears) when
> registering posts on Usenet., If what you have to say is relevant
> there's no overcoming need to fear spam if you take even the novice
> approaches of NOSPAM in your address. Simply shouting shit with your
> ears plugged puts you into the category of yammering old cat-women
> pushing shopping carts in the middle of a one-way street
> Apart from the lack of adapting the same uzenet approach as the
> grown-ups, one can only consider you as a kid who snuck into Mom's
> bedroom to mess with the computer.
> For that reason alone I'll not use my favorite bad words with you lest
> there be some law in your area about mouth-whipping stupid pre-teens..
>
> Gethefucklost-youdontbelonghereifyoudonthaveenoughasstobackupyourwank,
> lil chile,
> Mmmm, kay?.
> -ex
Oh, my. Aren't we a hoot? Now humor me if you will. Just what the heck is
the bottom line you were attempting to convey?
Name-calling aside, what is your point?
Using no-spam in an email address is so easily thwarted. Is that what you
propose I do? My...how mypopic.
Should I use my call sign? Is that "macho"? Do so if you wish, but gird
yourself for the dedicated stalkers that will look up your call sign and
flood your home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail and other

sorts of deviltry.
Your choice of words is interesting, though for the most part grammatically rife with errors. You might wish to seriously consider a remedial course in English Composition 101.

508. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 06:35:27 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201052235.1a099f1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<zHOZ7.36564$Tt3.4467119@news02.optonline.net>...
> FAKE!
> Train
>
> "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > write to about this at the ARRL?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic~

No that is the real Mopar, you are confused, Train.

Scott Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay
--

509. Re: Forge Check Instructions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 06:43:06 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0201052243.41434d3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29969
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Look for this string is a message from me:

NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.9.144.161

Then divide by 2 = 12.4.72.79

Then add 200 = 376

If it's not this number, it's not me. This IP may change when Landshark complains to @Home. Hetero sex is still faster, cheaper, and more reliable then sex with TS or TVs.

DO NOT BELIEVE ANYTHING THE FAKE SCOTT UNIT 69 SAYS. HE WILL TRY TO CONFUSE YOU WITH IP NUMBERS. I AM THE REAL SCOTT. WAIT TILL MY LAWYER GETS INVOLVED!

Scott Unit-69
Chesapeake Bay
--

510. Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:16:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201052316.5a07e12b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29971

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c375518_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Careful Dave.
>
>
Yeah, Heil better watch out for Carl. Bwaaahaha!
>
>
> Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> > radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.
>
> I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> ... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
> long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.
> (I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> "listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
>
>
You just keep paying attention to the admonitions in the ARRL "How To
Operate" pubs sweetums and we'll see who whacks who in the pileups and
contests. Go for it, less QRM and more confirmed for me, dit-dit.
While yer at it tell the Dallas Cowboys to get polite because it's
only a game.
>
>
> Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries,
>
>
Whatta bloody hero: Logging the first 72 mults simply happens with no
particular effort on the part of A Real DX Contest Operator well
before sunrise the morning after a major DX contest starts modes aside
and 100w into any antenna.
>
>
> 40 states and all but one
> Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
> EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
> the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ

> DX" :-)
>
>
Your cluelessness shineth thru the gloom like a kilowatt's worth of
red laser beams Squiggy. There absolutely are appropriate times &
conditions for statesiders to bellow CQs when surfing for DX cotacts
both during casual operations and in the contests. I'll let Dave
explain it to you if perchance he's so inclined, I don't have the
patience to deal with your lameness in this regard.
>
>
> I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
> with my new privileges ... tough.
>
>
Hate to bust yer bubble Sweetums but nobody really gives a shit what
you do with yer new lite-style feebie privs. From the regulatory and
Newington's perspectives thee and me are just 1/680,000ths of us. But
then in actuality we din all get on HF on an equal basis did we? Hmmm?
That's YOUR problem and there ain't no way you can hide from it.
Reality sucks huh? TOUGH.
>
>
>
> I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
> wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
> about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)
>
>
As if the Lumbago nets on 75 give a hoot about what you "approve" or
"disapprove".
>
>
> I don't believe I've ever made a comment one way or the other
> regarding "W5TIT types" ... as far as I'm concerned, W5TIT
> is simply another callsign ... an arbitrary combination of letters
> and number, which uniquely identifies a particular station/op ...
> if anyone else wants to make a big deal about that callsign,
> leave me out ... I'm not interested in the incessant argument
> about such inane subjects.
>
>
Hey Squiggy, wasn't it YOU who got into the ultimate inanity in this
NG awhile back, something abt you pushing for allowing
frequency-hopping spread-rectum comms on 20m??
>
>
>
> 73,
>

> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> ----------
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, TAPR
>
>
Good point Squig, glad you brought it up. TAPR has been futzing with
some FHSS boards since 1997 in their thrust to get FHSS running in the
902-928 Mhz ham band and they still ain't there. Given your assorted
chunks of bluster about your "leading edge technical accomplisments"
in this general field and your widely broadcast "thoughts" wrt to
these kindsa modes being the "future of ham radio" I find it rawther
odd that nowhere in the TAPR website is there any mention of any of
your contributions to their effort. Care to comment on this peculiar
state of affairs??
>
>
Good luck with Labrador, it's a real toughy. Hee!
>
>
> Member, ARRL
> ----------
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>
>
w3rv
Novice WAS/80cw
DXCC 300+ mixed
DXCC Phone
5BDXCC #142
WAZ
ARRL CP 30wpm
G'nite Sweetums, grease yer paddles, seeya ya down the bands. As if.

511. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:17:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c37fb8b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29972

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:OIldmchlBHA.908@cpimsnntpa02...
> K3LT wrote:
>
> > I live in a 3rd floor apartment in a wood-framed building.
> > The plumbing is all PVC/ABS, so there isn't even a way
> > to make an effective ground on a cold water pipe.
>
> W5TIT didn't understand, so she said:
>
> > The plumbing usually works for a good ground also. But, I'm
> > just a dumbed.....
>
> Yup, seems that you are.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Well, thank you for pointing out that correction, Hans. It's not that I didn't understand, though. More that I missed the part about the plumbing. I should pay more attention to the full text of what Larry posts...er, maybe.

Kim W5TIT

512. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:19:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c37fc02_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29973

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C374DB8.5700D0E7@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C370ED5.EA85ADD1@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > > I think your testosterone level is in overdrive, Dave.
> > >
> > > What would make you write something like that, Kim? Is your estrogen
> > > replacement program now up for discussion? You made some claims which
> > > defy the laws of physics. You got called on it. That you don't like
it
> > > is too bad.
> > >
> >
> > Sorry, I am full woman here.
>
> If you want to dish out crap about testosterone levels, be prepared to
> be dealt with in kind.
>

Oh, I am quite prepared. Just letting you know that I am not on any
estrogen replacement program.

> > Now, what claim have I made that defy the laws
> > of physics: that I believe what I've heard when I hear hams talk about
their
> > logs--whose operation was out of either an apartment or similar
situation?
> > I didn't say a word about station setup, how long it took (I'd have no
idea)
> > for their logs to get that way, nothing--nothing--about station. ONLY
that
> > I hear of logs that will rival those of people who operate from the
finest
> > antenna farms. Now, either I am to believe that they are/were lying; or
I
> > am to believe that you just don't believe it. I don't believe they were
> > lying--they may have been. The bottom line of this whole discussion is
that
> > the FCC, nor ARRL, need be requesting that--because "we" are ham radio
> > operators--we be given some kind of special consideration for
intervention
> > with a CCR. I don't believe "we" as ham radio operators need to break
```

the
> > law by changing the law.
>
>
> Phew! You really are thick. Your claim was that you know hams living
> in apartments whose logs rival those of hams with the finest antenna
> farms. There. That was your claim. It cannot be right. It is wrong.
> You don't know what you are talking about.
>

And, I corrected that later to say that I don't actually "know" them; I know
"of" them from conversations I hear on the air.

> We can't tell if you are simply ignorant or perhaps gullible in
> accepting the statements of other hams who are perhaps deluding
> themselves because they've never seen the logs of those who have the
> "finest antenna farms". For you to persist in the face of strong
> evidence to the contrary is simply incredible.
>

Whatever.

> > > It is okay if you don't understand radio. You aren't that kind of
ham.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > And proud of it, if it means being thought of as among your kind.
>
> It would take a real air head to climb to the top of the pushup mast
> supporting her Antron and bleat, "I'm ignorant and proud of it!"
>
> Dave K8MN

Aw, Dave. Feeling mighty, huh?

Kim W5TIT

513. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:22:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c37fc97_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29974

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C374EFB.9C577DD9@earthlink.net...
>
> Finding a home without restrictive covenenants is becoming increasingly
> difficult for those who live near cities. That is a reality. The
> covenants are often arbitrary and prevent the land owner from enjoying
> the use of his land. This is a threat to the growth of amateur radio
> and to the participation in amateur radio of many of those already
> licensed. That you are incapable of seeing that is pathetic.
>
> Dave K8MN

I don't believe it's as much a threat as you think, Dave. But, just in
case, there's always the next threat-of-the-month club. I'll pick up on one
someday.

Kim W5TIT

514. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:33:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c37fffd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29976

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C376D4E.35CA3525@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is more
> > than well.
>
> I would certainly prefer W5TIT's in ham radio over more Dick's.
>
> Your phrase, "the all is more than well", reminds me of
> my three year old grandson who said, "one leg is both the
> same".
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

You know what's pitiful? The holder of a callsign like W5TIT is considered by some folks (we won't mention names :o) to be vulgar, degrading, or take your pick of any other you'd like.

But, the behavior of those people is quite OK. I have to be a good little girl on ham radio; but they can be what they are any time they wish. I snicker....

Kim W5TIT

515. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:36:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c380010_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29977

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C375009.C897BF65@earthlink.net...
>
> The plastic plumbing makes for no ground at all, Kim. See any problems
> with using CATV shielding as a ground for ham gear?
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh, I forgot to answer your question.

I wouldn't know. The extent of my basic knowledge of grounding ends at knowing that copper plumbing will work in a pinch. I've never had to know, and only know that by osmosis. I have a yard that I just bury a copper rod into. One CBer I used to know had a ground wire going out to the lake he lived on...go figure, eh?

Kim W5TIT

516. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:41:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c380118_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29978

```
"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C377847.781535A1@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much
> > sucks,
> > > > Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in
their
> > > > eyes, sacrilege.
> > >
> > > I've had setups like Larry's and I've worked a fair amount of DX
> > > using SSB and a 100W transceiver. I once did Antarctica. So it
> > > can be done using indoor stealth antennas. Of course having
> > > the beams and towers would help a lot.
> > >
> > > Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> > > The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> > > and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> > > with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> > > you a ground.
> > >
> >
> > The plumbing usually works for a good ground also.
>
> Larry said that the pipes are plastic. Now if they were
> copper, then he'd have something.
>
>

Yeah, Robert. The guys are having fun with my missing the part where Larry
stated that the plumbing is PVC. My eyes usually glaze over at the first or
second line of one of Larry's posts. My bad.

Kim W5TIT
```

517. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:45:54 UTC
From: Mark Walsh <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com>
Message-ID: <a18v6vdtq1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 29975
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:

> Using no-spam in an email address is so easily thwarted...

Not if done right...

> Should I use my call sign? Is that "macho"?

Yes, and no. Those of us who aren't ashamed of what
we post have no problem identifying ourselves. The rest
of us should go to newusers and read the netiquette FAQ.
If one does not understand the simple concepts stated there,
one should probably not be armed with a computer.

> Do so if you wish, but gird yourself for the dedicated
> stalkers that will look up your call sign and flood your
> home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail
> and other sorts of deviltry.

That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.

Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com

518. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:54:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c380436_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29979

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C37E274.83F6A010@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
> >
> > >W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > >> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> > >> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...
> >
> > >K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
> > >involved in radio transmission.
> >
> > Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.
>
> Did you sit around for hours arguing with those who did know and tried
> to enlighten you or did you clam up and absorb the information?
>
> One of the things I recall about my first few years in amateur radio is
> that I knew I didn't know very much. I listened to just about anyone
> who had something to teach me.
>
> Dave K8MN

You must be better than me at who tells the truth, then.

Kim W5TIT

519. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 07:59:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c380574_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29980

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201052316.5a07e12b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c375518_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Careful Dave.
> >
> >
> Yeah, Heil better watch out for Carl. Bwaaahaha!
> >
> >
> > Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> > > radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.
> >
> > I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> > the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> > ... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
> > long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.
> > (I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> > "listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
> >
> >
> You just keep paying attention to the admonitions in the ARRL "How To
> Operate" pubs sweetums and we'll see who whacks who in the pileups and
> contests. Go for it, less QRM and more confirmed for me, dit-dit.
> While yer at it tell the Dallas Cowboys to get polite because it's
> only a game.
> >
> >
> > Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> > just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries,
> >
> >
> Whatta bloody hero: Logging the first 72 mults simply happens with no
> particular effort on the part of A Real DX Contest Operator well
> before sunrise the morning after a major DX contest starts modes aside
> and 100w into any antenna.
> >
> >
> > 40 states and all but one
> > Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> > dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without

> > EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
> > the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ
> > DX" :-)
> >
> >
> Your cluelessness shineth thru the gloom like a kilowatt's worth of
> red laser beams Squiggy. There absolutely are appropriate times &
> conditions for statesiders to bellow CQs when surfing for DX cotacts
> both during casual operations and in the contests. I'll let Dave
> explain it to you if perchance he's so inclined, I don't have the
> patience to deal with your lameness in this regard.
> >
> >
> > I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
> > with my new privileges ... tough.
> >
> >
> Hate to bust yer bubble Sweetums but nobody really gives a shit what
> you do with yer new lite-style feebie privs. From the regulatory and
> Newington's perspectives thee and me are just 1/680,000ths of us. But
> then in actuality we din all get on HF on an equal basis did we? Hmmm?
> That's YOUR problem and there ain't no way you can hide from it.
> Reality sucks huh? TOUGH.
> >
> >
> >
> > I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
> > wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
> > about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)
> >
> >
> As if the Lumbago nets on 75 give a hoot about what you "approve" or
> "disapprove".
> >
> >
> > I don't believe I've ever made a comment one way or the other
> > regarding "W5TIT types" ... as far as I'm concerned, W5TIT
> > is simply another callsign ... an arbitrary combination of letters
> > and number, which uniquely identifies a particular station/op ...
> > if anyone else wants to make a big deal about that callsign,
> > leave me out ... I'm not interested in the incessant argument
> > about such inane subjects.
> >
> >
> Hey Squiggy, wasn't it YOU who got into the ultimate inanity in this
> NG awhile back, something abt you pushing for allowing
> frequency-hopping spread-rectum comms on 20m??
> >
> >
> >

> > 73,
> >
> > --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> > <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> > <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> > --
> > NCI-1052
> > Executive Director, No Code International
> > Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> > Senior Member, IEEE
> > Member, TAPR
> >
> >
> Good point Squig, glad you brought it up. TAPR has been futzing with
> some FHSS boards since 1997 in their thrust to get FHSS running in the
> 902-928 Mhz ham band and they still ain't there. Given your assorted
> chunks of bluster about your "leading edge technical accomplisments"
> in this general field and your widely broadcast "thoughts" wrt to
> these kindsa modes being the "future of ham radio" I find it rawther
> odd that nowhere in the TAPR website is there any mention of any of
> your contributions to their effort. Care to comment on this peculiar
> state of affairs??
> >
> >
> Good luck with Labrador, it's a real toughy. Hee!
> >
> >
> > Member, ARRL
> > --
> > Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> > Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> > <http://www.nocode.org>
> >
> >
> w3rv
> Novice WAS/80cw
> DXCC 300+ mixed
> DXCC Phone
> 5BDXCC #142
> WAZ
> ARRL CP 30wpm
> G'nite Sweetums, grease yer paddles, seeya ya down the bands. As if.

Man, the "big guns" sure do get pissed off quick, don't they?! ROFLMAO....
Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a turn-off for
enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for anyone who
might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad side of
ham radio, that chest thumping.

Kim W5TIT

520. ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 08:06:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c380709_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29981

Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.

Response #1:
You are too stupid to realize the value of the color yellow.

Response #2:
(Includes more reference to the stupidity comment) and adds: Your low-class, trailer trash living life-style is a huge screen to your ability to see beyond the single color you've chosen to master life with.

Response #3:
(Includes more reference to the stupidity comment, but drops the low-class comment because it made absolutely no sense) and adds: If you would take the time to read and understand, you would know that the color yellow is important to the very nature of our society.

Response #4:
Will keep all of #3 and add: What color yellow are you talking about? Be clear and concise in your communication and maybe you'll be able to play with the adults.

And, so it goes... :)

Kim W5TIT

521. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 08:21:29 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C380909.3895CAD@coqui.net>
Source record: 29982
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Mad Max wrote:

> Oh, my. Aren't we a hoot? Now humor me if you will. Just what the heck is
> the bottom line you were attempting to convey?
> Name-calling aside, what is your point?

That you are simply an anonymous troll-type poster and nothing you have to say means squat because you don't have the balls to personify yourself.
Given that you are 14 years old at best, please don't bother me. Thats illegal. Your Mom will be really pissed that you are using her computer to start a little cross-posted flame war with characters on the monitor screen.

Nite now, mmmkay?

522. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 08:28:46 UTC
From: Mad Max <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com>
Message-ID: <a191t8$sb2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29983
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote in message
news:a18v6vdtq1@bob.news.rcn.net...
> "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:
>
> > Using no-spam in an email address is so easily thwarted...
>
> Not if done right...
>
> > Should I use my call sign? Is that "macho"?
>
> Yes, and no. Those of us who aren't ashamed of what
> we post have no problem identifying ourselves. The rest
> of us should go to newusers and read the netiquette FAQ.
> If one does not understand the simple concepts stated there,
> one should probably not be armed with a computer.
>
> > Do so if you wish, but gird yourself for the dedicated
> > stalkers that will look up your call sign and flood your
> > home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail
> > and other sorts of deviltry.
>
> That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
> ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.
>
> Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com
>
OK, Mark. Call the shots the way you see them. If it makes you feel better
to call names, go for it. Maybe that is what it takes to make you feel
better about yourself....perhaps you feel a need to do this to bolster your
self-image.
I, in the meantime, will continue to carry on as I have done for so many
years now. Your input is inconsequential. Your name-calling is even less
relevant.
I hope you feel better about yourself in the morning.

523. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 08:50:13 UTC
From: Roger Dodger <MommyBoy@GlenDale.com>
Message-ID: <a1935m$2vm$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29984
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Somewhere along the line the original thread of this post was "lost".
W4AMP is probably pleased that the jist of the conversation was steered away from his infamous and malicious acts over the past few years.
Do not forget for a minute that AMP is two-faced and has a malicious streak.
He is not to be trusted in any way, shape, or form.
He will be your buddy one minute and the next he will be jamming you. He is an accomplished liar. He will accuse others of stalking while he stalks others with spam, anonymously sent magazine subscriptions, false bills of lading and more. He will present himself as a victim while all the while victimizing others.
The mark of a Psycho....suffering from mental problems....

524. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 08:56:04 UTC
From: Roger Dodger <MommyBoy@GlenDale.com>
Message-ID: <a193gt$52o$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29985
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net> wrote
in message news:3C380909.3895CAD@coqui.net...
> Mad Max wrote:
>
> > Oh, my. Aren't we a hoot? Now humor me if you will. Just what the heck
is
> > the bottom line you were attempting to convey?
> > Name-calling aside, what is your point?
>
> That you are simply an anonymous troll-type poster and nothing you have
> to say means squat because you don't have the balls to personify
> yourself.
> Given that you are 14 years old at best, please don't bother me. Thats
> illegal. Your Mom will be really pissed that you are using her computer
> to start a little cross-posted flame war with characters on the monitor
> screen.
>
> Nite now, mmmkay?

I should refrain from responding to this tripe, but it is late and I rather
enjoy toying with the mentally inept.
Mmmkay. Gnight.

525. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 09:05:28 UTC
From: Roger Dodger <MommyBoy@GlenDale.com>
Message-ID: <a1942v$7qh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29986
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net> wrote
in message news:3C380909.3895CAD@coqui.net...
> Mad Max wrote:
>
> > Oh, my. Aren't we a hoot? Now humor me if you will. Just what the heck
is
> > the bottom line you were attempting to convey?
> > Name-calling aside, what is your point?
>
> That you are simply an anonymous troll-type poster and nothing you have
> to say means squat because you don't have the balls to personify
> yourself.

My "troll" obviously bore results. You could not resist responding, could
you?
And speaking of "balls", you of all people are hardly adept at describing
same.

> Given that you are 14 years old at best, please don't bother me. Thats
> illegal. Your Mom will be really pissed that you are using her computer
> to start a little cross-posted flame war with characters on the monitor
> screen.

OK. I will tell my mommy to turn off my account with the express intent of
not bothering you any further.
Also, given the impression that you are yourself rather juvenile and
somewhat limited in your ability to express yourself, I will cease making
you look like the fool you are.
>
> Nite now, mmmkay?
Mmmmkay.

526. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 09:54:04 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <60C4642E47FF2F3A.259F562555D5382B.3C9B9936D4116A4F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29987
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

On Sun, 6 Jan 2002 01:14:35 -0500, "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com>
wrote:

>Using no-spam in an email address is so easily thwarted. Is that what you
>propose I do? My...how mypopic.

Less than 1% of the spam I get daily comes to this address. (or any
of the variants) Most of it comes to my Yahoo address that I haven't
sent anything from in months.

>Should I use my call sign? Is that "macho"? Do so if you wish, but gird
>yourself for the dedicated stalkers that will look up your call sign and
>flood your home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail and other
>sorts of deviltry.

My call sign is listed with my home address. Everything else goes to
a P.O. box. All of the 'personalized' junk mail (stuff to "Current
Occupant" and "Resident doesn't count, since they obviously haven't
looked anything up) ends up at the post office.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

527. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 10:27:31 UTC
From: Mark Walsh <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com>
Message-ID: <a198m0$54v$1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 29988
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:
> "Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote:
> > "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:

> > Those of us who aren't ashamed of what
> > we post have no problem identifying ourselves. The rest
> > of us should go to newusers and read the netiquette FAQ.
> > If one does not understand the simple concepts stated there,
> > one should probably not be armed with a computer.

> > > Do so if you wish, but gird yourself for the dedicated
> > > stalkers that will look up your call sign and flood your
> > > home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail
> > > and other sorts of deviltry.

> > That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> > e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
> > ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> > having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> > how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> > to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.

> OK, Mark. Call the shots the way you see them.

Yes, I call a spade a spade. And the little spam that I have
received is a simple *fact* after a thousand posts over more
than a decade. Your "fear of spam" smokescreen is weak.

> If it makes you feel better to call names, go for it.

Huh?

> I, in the meantime, will continue to carry on as I have done
> for so many years now. Your input is inconsequential.

It is a shame that you refuse to learn from others.
I have learned much from these groups over the years.
Have you read the new users FAQ?

It is your choice to continue to ride your bicycle on the
wrong side of the road, but others will think ill of you for it.
I would have e-mailed you politely and privately,
but you didn't have the decency to provide even a
de-spammed address. Even Joe Mama does that!

Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com

528. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 11:31:31 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a19cmk$ng9$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29989
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

```
"Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote in message
news:a198m0$54v$1@bob.news.rcn.net...
> "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:
> > "Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote:
> > > "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:
>
> > > Those of us who aren't ashamed of what
> > > we post have no problem identifying ourselves. The rest
> > > of us should go to newusers and read the netiquette FAQ.
> > > If one does not understand the simple concepts stated there,
> > > one should probably not be armed with a computer.
>
> > > > Do so if you wish, but gird yourself for the dedicated
> > > > stalkers that will look up your call sign and flood your
> > > > home mailbox with magazine subscriptions, junk mail
> > > > and other sorts of deviltry.
>
> > > That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> > > e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
> > > ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> > > having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> > > how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> > > to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.
>
> > OK, Mark. Call the shots the way you see them.
>
> Yes, I call a spade a spade. And the little spam that I have
> received is a simple *fact* after a thousand posts over more
> than a decade. Your "fear of spam" smokescreen is weak.
>
> > If it makes you feel better to call names, go for it.
>
> Huh?
>
> > I, in the meantime, will continue to carry on as I have done
> > for so many years now. Your input is inconsequential.
>
> It is a shame that you refuse to learn from others.
> I have learned much from these groups over the years.
> Have you read the new users FAQ?
>
> It is your choice to continue to ride your bicycle on the
```

> wrong side of the road, but others will think ill of you for it.
> I would have e-mailed you politely and privately,
> but you didn't have the decency to provide even a
> de-spammed address. Even Joe Mama does that!
>
> Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com

Markie...you made my point so eloquently! You "would have emailed me"? That was my point exactly. You would have spammed me....that is what unasked-for email is.
You stated, " I would have e-mailed you politely and privately"....
Markie....Markie....get a grip. You have NO business emailing me either politely OR privately.
Markie...do yourself a great big favor...bend over and take a good, long look at yourself.
See that big old brown eye staring you in your face?
That is Mark Walsh in the flesh.

>
>

529. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 11:52:34 UTC
From: Mark Walsh <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com>
Message-ID: <a19dlekvi1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 29990
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz> wrote:
> "Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote:

> > It is your choice to continue to ride your bicycle on the
> > wrong side of the road, but others will think ill of you for it.
> > I would have e-mailed you politely and privately,
> > but you didn't have the decency to provide even a
> > de-spammed address. Even Joe Mama does that!

> Markie...you made my point so eloquently! You "would have emailed me"? That
> was my point exactly. You would have spammed me....that is what unasked-for
> email is.

Instead of answering me here (and worsening the signal
to noise ratio), you could have e-mailed me. I am sorry
to the others in this group that there are those who make
a mess of the USENET. This is like using a linked repeater
system (with many listeners) to talk to the guy just down the road.

> You stated, " I would have e-mailed you politely and privately"....
> Markie....Markie....get a grip. You have NO business emailing me either
> politely OR privately.

So you (and I) make a mess of the newsgroup instead. :-(
By extention, you then have no business responding to my post.
Gosh, what happened to the days when all hams were good
people and good communicators? Like most in this group,
I am proud of who I am and what I have done for amateur radio.
Let's try get this group back to amateur radio. Good night all...

Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com

530. Re: Radio Policy (And Stock-Car Racing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 12:01:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <G0XZ7.217164$WW.12705661@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29991

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020105230123.19213.00002368@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3C34DFA6.DD6836B9@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >I do hear that hot rodders like Pintos for their
> >spacious engine compartments and small size
> >of the overall car. They put muscle engines in
> >'em.
>
> Bob:
>
> Actually, what they do is build a muscle car with a Pinto-sized
> chassis, and drop a Pinto body on top of it. There's nothing in
> the original Pinto chassis/running gear that would endure the
> high torque of a big, fully-blown V-8 running upwards of 750 hp.
> What you see hurtling down the track is a custom-made car
> that looks like a Pinto, but is far from it. Same as the NASCAR
> cars that look like Fords, Chevies, Dodges, etc. but that's just
> because the custom-manufactured fiberglass body shell is made
> to the same basic shape. All they have is the car manufacturer's
> name on them, and money behind them.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And then NASCAR's Bill France owns a few tracks where sheer survival is
questionable and kills a few drivers. Right up there with gladatorial
games except the Romans did not plant land mines in the Coliseum.
Whatever else it may be, NASCAR ain't racing.

Dick NBK

531. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 13:16:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106081610.24724.00000763@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 29992

In article <3c3750ee_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>> > >
>> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
>> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
>> > > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
>> > > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
>> > > >
>> > > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
>> > accurate
>> > > > figures:
>> > > >
>> > > > US population:
>> > > >
>> > > > 1970 - 203 million
>> > > > 1980 - 227 million
>> > > > 1990 - 249 million
>> > > > 2000 - 281 million
>> > > >
>> > > > US hams:
>> > > >
>> > > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
>> > > > 1980 - 350,000
>> > > > 1990 -
>> > > > 2000 - 680,000
>> > >
>> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
>> > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
>> > > while ARS grew about 250%
>> > >
>> > > Cheers,
>> > > Bill K2UNK

Let's look at what happened more closely. Here's a summary:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1989: 500,000
1990: 514,000 (interpolated from 1989's 500,000 and 2.84% growth rate)
2000: 680,000

It has been shown previously that the growth rate from 1977 to 1989 was 3.61%
but that it dropped to 2.84% from 1989 to 2000.

Combining with population figures we get:

Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams

1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
1980: 227 million 1.12% 350,000 0.154%
1990: 249 million 0.93% 514,000 0.206%
2000: 281 million 1.22% 680,000 0.242%

US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in
the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s.

So the growth SLOWED after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech
lost its code test.

>> > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
>> > of amateur growth relative to population came after
>> > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
>> > entry point ...

NO. WRONG. Just the opposite:

1980 to 1990: 0.206/0.154 = 1.338
1990 to 2000: 0.242/0.206 = 1.175

In other words, the percentage of the population that had a ham license
increased 1.338 times during the '80s but only 1.175 times during the '90s.

The "slope of the line" DECREASED "after the no code tech license provided a
more reasonable entry point ..."

And we have not allowed for the effects of the change to 10 year licenses,
which does not begin to show until 1989.
>>
>> ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as
>an
>> entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that,
>if
>> you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be
>attracted.
>>
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>

>Or, as an alternative viewpoint, if your remove unnecessary,
>arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry, those who
>were interested, but disuaded by those unnecessary barriers
>will "jump in."
>
Except that's NOT what happened, according to the numbers. Growth DROPPED
during the '90s, compared to the '80s.

If anyone has more numbers, please post 'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

532. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 13:32:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c38520d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29993

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105203537.11806.00003613@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >And jump right back out again if the 15% renewal ratio
> > of the codeless Tech is any indication.
>
> I think there are a number of factors. Many who entered
> as codeless techs did not jump out; they moved on and
> upgraded.

And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
code barrier for many years (years during which many
could have been good, productive hams ...)

> I would not have progressed very far in ham radio without
> the help of my Elmer, W1BNB. When the large influx of
> codeless techs occured, there were a lot more
> hams entering ham radio than available (or willing) Elmers.
>
> Too, I have to wonder what the effect of the social factors of
> some small number of hams publically berating these
> newcomers for not being good enough to be "real" hams.

I personally know of some who felt " I thought this was going
to be nteresting and a nice crowd of people, now I find out
hams are a bunch of ***holes. I don't need to put up with this
crap from idiots of this caliber ... to hell with it."

Unfortunately, I believe we lost quite a few folks who were and
would have continued to be good hams because of the bad
behavior/attitude of superiority which was foisted upon them by
some other hams (individuals, who IMNSHO, are NOT good hams).

I saw evidence of this at a summer picnic of a local ham club summer
before last ... there was a table with a bunch of "CW Olde Fartz" who
sat there bitching about how "the techs aren't REAL hams" and a
couple of tables of techs ... all of whom were well-behaved, both in
person and on the radio, and greatly resented the abuse the CW
Olde Fartz were tossing at them.

In fact, one of the guys at the first table, (a CW DX "I'm superior"
type) who wrote a column for the club newsletter, wrote an totally
outrageous anti-tech rant, which caused such a fuss that he was
forced to abandon writing his column ... which was no big loss,
since most of the time it was focused on what a great DXer he
was and how the best DX clubs were "by invitation only" and
didn't accept anyone with less than an Extra license.

This sort of "I'm superior, you're a piece of crap" attitude
(inflation
of self-importance) has no place in ham radio. I've passed the
Extra, and the reality of my professional experience is that I know
a lot more about radio technology than many hams, but that doesn't
make me "better" than a newbie tech ... just more experienced.

It doesn't give me, nor do other examples of experience or skill give
anyone else, the "right" to berate, insult, and degrade other hams.

73,
- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhR7pe+N6+q84HiEQLbTQCfd78gtVeJfNtsBSFE2pVVHPncQCUAn0tp
Rz2lIR3w38U5DsL2zg1kr82U
=g6gx
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

533. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 13:57:39 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a26812aab10c22989685@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29994

In article <3c38520d_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

deleted the self serving stuff..
>
> I saw evidence of this at a summer picnic of a local ham club summer
> before last ... there was a table with a bunch of "CW Olde Fartz" who
> sat there bitching about how "the techs aren't REAL hams" and a
> couple of tables of techs ... all of whom were well-behaved, both in
> person and on the radio, and greatly resented the abuse the CW
> Olde Fartz were tossing at them.

Highly doubtful Carl would associate with non technical hams, but we'll
give him this one ;-)

>
> In fact, one of the guys at the first table, (a CW DX "I'm superior"
> type) who wrote a column for the club newsletter, wrote an totally
> outrageous anti-tech rant, which caused such a fuss that he was
> forced to abandon writing his column ... which was no big loss,
> since most of the time it was focused on what a great DXer he
> was and how the best DX clubs were "by invitation only" and
> didn't accept anyone with less than an Extra license.
>
> This sort of "I'm superior, you're a piece of crap" attitude
> (inflation
> of self-importance) has no place in ham radio. I've passed the
> Extra, and the reality of my professional experience is that I know
> a lot more about radio technology than many hams, but that doesn't
> make me "better" than a newbie tech ... just more experienced.

Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
pattern. If history is correct, he'll start berating people by posting
his resume of jobs , followed by a complete list of equipment that
99.99% of amateurs would have unless they have a job that requires it.

See, DX types can brag and be assholes according to Carl, but when Carl
does it, it's OK. YES IT'S HIS OPINION and he's entitled to it, I grant
you that, BUT he's no better then the DX types he hates,.. And by the
way Carl, your google postings show, for the record a profound hatred pf
DX, contest and rag chewers. According tor many posts ing the past,
only those that follow Part 97 to the letter of the law IE: the techno-
experimenters, had any business being hams. If fact, to paraphrase you,
"lawyers and doctors and regular people who do no experiment, do not
deserve amateur licenses because they fail to follow Part 97's example
for maintaining state of the art experimentationn."

>
> It doesn't give me, nor do other examples of experience or skill give
> anyone else, the "right" to berate, insult, and degrade other hams.

Gee, what a great statement from one who seems to live for berating,
insulting and degrading other hams

Sorry Charlie, you just lost your argument based oin this statement
alone

534. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:01:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3858dc_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29995

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:JsPZ7.330041$W8.12611765@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
[snip]
>
> The available Elmer shortage if correct tends to imply sheer
> chaos when the licenses become codeless which is a point
> I tend to agree with.

Why are codeless hams more likely to cause "chaos" than
coded ones? I don't get that one ... please explain.

> I have argued here that the point is not whom to exclude or
> standards but rather how one absorbs newbies in any large
> number into a hobby with long standing traditions and practices.

Heaven forbid that some of those "long standing traditions
an practices" might actually change a bit (after all, ham radio
must, for all time, remain ever as it was, right?) NOT!

This is not to say that everything would/should be turned
upside down over night ... but like everything else, ham
radio will have to accept *some* change over time in
order to remain relevant ... otherwise, it will ultimately go
the way of the dinosaurs ... unable (unwilling) to adapt to
changing conditions, thus unable to survive.

> It is not the hobby to fear for but the bright souls who
> easily pass the new exams and are kind of left there
> scratching their butts.

This still seems to presuppose that the exams are, in
fact, "easier" than those "back in the good old days."
I don't buy that ... and I think it's just an excuse used
by some old timers to assert that "newbies got a freebie,"
"newbies aren't *real* hams," etc.

As far as newbies "left there scratching their butts" goes,
so they may make a mistake or two as they learn ... how
many old timers could HONESTLY state that they NEVER
made a mistake when they were newbies (or can actually
remember accurately back that far, rather than conjuring
up a convenient, nostaligic "happy days" version of the past?

> Roast no newbie before his time!

Why roast them at all? (Unless of course they demonstrate
repeatedly that they are simply intent on being disruptive ...)
Let's just welcome them and help them (nicely and politely,
not insultingly) to learn the "ins and outs" ...

> This had its sociological effects to be sure. We have all seen the
> classic Lifer Codeless Tech who becomes the resident genius in
virtually
> everything, joins every group in existence, makes a pilgrimage to
the OM's
> grave, and shows up at Dayton as regularly as the face of doom. We
have
> seen an equally large number show up on the freeband. I have my
opinions
> but let us leave it at that; some do not like the message and denial
mode
> is generally not a thing of beauty. And having some fugitive from
27.555
> regale the group with DXploits would not exactly win the Dale
Carnegie
> seal of approval. They were misled but it was not the OTs doing the
> misleading. That some got a little bitter about it, joined NCI, and
> dedicated their lives to iconoclasm -- destroying Morse wherever it
was
> found -- is simply one reaction to being told that you really do not
own
> the Brooklyn Bridge.

OK ... now, let's set things straight ...

1st ... NCI's membership does not consist of "classic Lifer Codeless
Tech(s)," as you imply ... most of the NCI Board are Extras or their
national equivalents thereof ... and the membership consists of a very
broad mix of all license classes. Some of those who have been most
supportive in terms of financially supporting the organization are
long
time, 20 wpm Extras ...

2nd ... NCI's members are not "fugitives from 27.555.

3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
in any way.

You seem to feel that, Morse will "be destroyed" unless everyone
is forced to learn it by regulatory fiat ... that doesn't project a
very
confident view of the value and desirability of Morse ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhYzZe+N6+q84HiEQL+aACg98EOAvViQXGKIKc8Y6gEgLAI05UAoMHJ
4JA0diylRdy1qK+52zf34n2b
=Vwwu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

535. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:02:35 UTC
From: Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C3858FB.587EDB97@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 29996
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Mark Walsh wrote:
>
> "Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote:
>
> > Using no-spam in an email address is so easily thwarted...
>
> Not if done right...

If it can be done, a spammer can (and will) undo it.

>
>
> That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over

Well, goody for you, Petunia! The rest of us have had diametrically opposed experiences. I've been hanging around Usenet since it started, and never felt the need to disguise either my email address or my identity until the thundering hordes showed up on the Internet during the middle 90's. Just recently, I made an announcement via a moderated announce newsgroup and the spam immediately began (since it was a disposable email address generated JUST for the announcement, I know how the address was obtained by the spammers).

> ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.

Sorry, Petunia, your so-called "reasoning" doesn't wash either. The spamming is only part of it; the other part consists of stalkers.

Example: Two hams who have regularly posted to the rec.radio.amateur hierarchy in the past have harassed other posters by doing such things as calling their employers (even phoning Hawaii in one case), their neighbors, or their ISPs in an attempt at slander. One ham who still posts here under a pseudonym had to obtain a court order in an attempt to put a stop to the harassment. Another has had similar harassment by a non-ham, and is currently experiencing telephone calls and calls by "investigators" to his neighbors, again for the purpose of slander.

The standard response at this point is "take it to the police" or some such other nonsense, but the experienced harassee soon learns that there is actually very little relief to be obtained that way. I don't have

enough patience here to tell you about the failure of a court order to protect at least one ham from stalking. As with all things, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and the best way to deal with the creeps who now hang out on Usenet is to never give them the opportunity to stalk you in the first place. The two people currently stalking hams IN THE REC.RADIO.AMATEUR HIERARCHY are both convicted felons.

Nice, eh?

> Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com
-----------------------^^^^^^^^^^^^

Hahahahahaha! Continue to dream on, Petunia.

P.S. You need to learn the realities of true anonymous posting (which this is not). Any law enforcement agency can obtain my true identity by contacting my ISP with a subpoena. A truly anonymous post, such as those made through a mixmaster chain, cannot be traced.

536. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:09:21 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a26ad8cbad3ca9989686@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 29997

In article <3c375518_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Careful Dave. Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> > radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.
>
> I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> ... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
> long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.
> (I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> "listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
>

BOLOGNA..you have painted a broad picture of your complete dislike, nay, hatred of the aforementioned groups as they have no need for licences because they rarely if ever experiment as per your beloved Part 97.

> Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
> Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
> EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
> the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ
> DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
> with my new privileges ... tough.

With a homebrew transceiver? Probably not. With a home brew trapped vertical? Nah, probably either a Cushcraft or possibly a Gap. That seems the antennae of choice for the appliance operators.

By the way, according to google, it wasn't that you were going to call CQ, cause it;s doubtful most DX types would respond to someone who has vilified them so much in the past. It wASA that wou were gooijng to take you license, buy some store bought gear and start chasing DX,mstates, counties, IOTAS and such. A sure enough, it's exactly what you did. No experimentation needed, just plug and play.

Just remember Carl, always use your lass twp when calling the DX net-meister and remember if you can't work em on 14.247, you really aren't that smart.

Welcome to the DX world, I know I'll be listening for you. Keep smiling and keep experimenting. The amateur world needs more consumers like you.

>
> I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
> wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
> about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)

I guess as long as they experiment it's OK?? ;-)

OH..BTW, my AT&T 900 mhz phone has crapped out for 5th (really) time.
Since you designed the circuitry, can I send it to you. The morons at
their repair department keep telling me that the transmitter seems ok,
although there's a possible intermittent short?? Seems the 1st time,
they forgot to solder the antenna leads....

Gee, must be great working for a company (jn some convuluted corporate
chart) that takes your product and puts it into another product therebye
assuring that your product won;t or can't work.

GL on the bands. Remember, you need at least 104 confirmed before tou
can apply for DXCC. And I would advise you to stay away from clubs
where you superiorty to the others won't cause any more problems. Talk
to Bill. I think AT7T might still have a club. They coudl meet in the
Bedminister facility. Plenty of meeting rooms there

GL

dit dit

537. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:25:41 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a19v6i$b6n$3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30111
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Lllllllllllllllaaaaaaaaaaaardasssssssssssed
"Herb" <Herb@IamBARF.net> wrote in message news:a18m38$84l$0@pita.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a14dd5$8vi$7@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "Suckingdick Susie" <Dummy@Crash.com> wrote in message
> > news:a13ulc$4nc$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:a12ekr$l3l$5@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Polly FQF" <PollyFQF@mulehumperssociety.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:a12af6$a3f$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > Will someone please post [DYOFDW, LLAARDASSSSSSS LLLLLLOYD]
> > > >
> > > > Hey "Polly, " dying from your diabetes yet?
> > > > Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!
> > > > Poor "Polly" drove his daughter from his first marriage to suicide.
> > > >
> > > > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
> > > >
> > > > N0VFP is going to get some letters, bwhahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!!
> > > >
> > > > Here's one of Polly's.......
> > > >
> > > > February 7, 2001
> > > >
> > > > CERTIFIED MAIL-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
> > > >
> > > > Mr. George A. Ashley
> > > > 1138 Collierville Arlington Road
> > > > Collierville, TN 38017
> > > >
> > > > Subject: Warning Notice: Amateur Radio Station W4FQF
> > > >
> > > > Dear Mr. Ashely:
> > > >
> > > > Information before the Commission indicates that you have engaged in
> > > > deliberate interference on the 75 Meter Amateur Band (3.901 MHz) at
> > various
> > > > times since October 2000. Some of the interference included tape
> > recordings.
> > > > We note that on January 7, 1999 you were warned about such
```

activities
> on
> > > the
> > > > 20- Meter Amateur Band.
> > > >
> > > > This constitutes a second warning that any further incidents of such
> > > > operation will result in enforcement action being taken against you,
> > > > including license revocation, monetary forfeiture, or both.
> > > >
> > > > Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 18
> U.S.C.
> > > > Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to obtain
> information
> > > > from licensees about the operation of their station. Pursuant to
> Section
> > > > 308(b), you are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days
of
> > the
> > > > above date. You are also requested to furnish the following
> information.
> > > > 1. Describe the radio transmitting equipment, including antennas,
you
> > have
> > > > at the 1138 Collierville Arlington Road Address. State the
> manufacturer,
> > > > model and serial number of each item. If any items were constructed
or
> > > > modified by you, describe the item in detail.
> > > > 2. Describe any radio transmitting equipment, including antennas,
you
> > have
> > > > at any other address in Tennessee. State the manufacturer, model and
> > > serial
> > > > number of each item. If any items were constructed or modified by
you,
> > > > describe the item in detail.
> > > >
> > > > Please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully
false
> > > > response to a letter of this type. See 18 U.S.C. Section 1001.
> > > >
> > > > Sincerely,
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > W. Riley Hollingsworth
> > > >
> > > > Special Counsel
> > > > Enforcement Bureau
> > > >
> > > > GLENDALE, WV: The FCC requested July 11, 2000, that Roger L.

Wiseman,
> > > KC8JBO, retake the General examination elements under the supervision
of
> > an
> > > ARRL-VEC volunteer examiner team. Wiseman must appear for retesting by
> > > September 11, 2000, or his license will be canceled. Applicants
> appearing
> > > for re-examination are granted an Amateur Radio license consistent
with
> > the
> > > elements passed. The FCC had written Wiseman on March 29, 2000,
advising
> > > that it had been made aware of "an ongoing personal dispute" between
> > Wiseman
> > > and another licensee that included allegations of interference or
> jamming
> > on
> > > 20 meters. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> > > Hollingsworth invited the two licensees to contact him to discuss the
> > > matter. Additionally, the FCC had sent Wiseman a Warning Notice last
> > > November in response to allegations of deliberate and malicious
> > interference
> > > on 20 meters.
> >
> > Mwuhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!
> > And depite your efforts to try and get me out of here I passed the
retest
> > with EASE. You still have to pass it the FIRST fucking time.
> > Poor Lllardasssssss Lllllllloyd.....
> >
>
> Roger,
>
> You cannot be a member of BARF, if you have received
> warning letters from Riley! I thought you already knew this?
> Sorry, I cannot accept your application for BARF membership.
> However, if you have $20,000 I will rent you my QTH.

Receiving warning letters is an admission requirement for B.A.R.F.,
Llllardasssssss Llllllloyd. Not that you'd know, since you can't even pass
the General test anyways.

538. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:27:32 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a19v6k$b6n$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30110
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rumpranger Slater" <MommyBoy@Fucked.Eichorn.Up.The.Ass.com> wrote in
message news:a1935m$2vm$0@pita.alt.net...

> Somewhere along the line the original thread of this post was "lost".
> W4AMP is probably pleased that the jist of the conversation was steered
away
> from his infamous and malicious acts over the past few years.
> Do not forget for a minute that AMP is two-faced and has a malicious
streak.
> He is not to be trusted in any way, shape, or form.
> He will be your buddy one minute and the next he will be jamming you. He
is
> an accomplished liar. He will accuse others of stalking while he stalks
> others with spam, anonymously sent magazine subscriptions, false bills of
> lading and more. He will present himself as a victim while all the while
> victimizing others.
> The mark of a Psycho....suffering from mental problems....

Translation: "IKYWBWAI." And your posts obsessing on him are.....????

539. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:30:46 UTC
From: "Peter J. Bertini" <commquart@home.com>
Message-ID: <qcZZ7.106604$Y6.10423293@news1.rdc1.ct.home.com>
Source record: 29998
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

What a ponderous killfile I carry....

Pete

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net> wrote
in message news:3C37E58A.5C75891F@coqui.net...
> >> Truer words have never been spoken. If you present yourself under
> fraudulent pretense, the best you can hope for is (are) fraudulent
> responses so the whole effort of disguising your email identity is an
> exercise of a clown in a transparent changing booth.
> There's little purpose in being a crocodile (all mouth and no ears) when
> registering posts on Usenet., If what you have to say is relevant
> there's no overcoming need to fear spam if you take even the novice
> approaches of NOSPAM in your

540. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:34:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c38608d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29999

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C37DF1A.41F7C539@earthlink.net...
>
[snip]
>
> Stow the arbitrary and distasteful stuff, Carl. What you are
basically
> saying is that if you make something easy enough that people don't
have
> to know much to do it, folks will flock to it.

That's NOT what I'm saying at all, Dave ... I don't view the current system as "dumbing down" ... and I don't view the impending elmination of Morse testing as a "loss" ... you keep asserting that "It's too easy to get a ham license." I disagree ... I don't think it's "too hard" but I think it's "just about right" except for the continuation of Morse testing, even at a 5 wpm level.

Again, my view is that the license is a permit to "learn by doing," not a graduation certificate.

> It is an interesting
> concept. My last visit to a local club meeting pretty much
confirmed my
> impression that we are headed toward an amateur service where not
many
> folks know much about radio. I'm not saying that the folks there
> weren't pleasant. Most of 'em are simply lost in the fog.

There are clubs and there are clubs ... some are very technically oriented, others are more general, and some are purely social in nature ...

As for your comment that "Most of 'em are simply lost in the fog.", by whose standards? (yours presumably) ... I can't really judge what that means, because, other than knowing that you think that codeless hams are inherently unworthy, I don't have a clear view of what you see as being "lost in the fog."

As someone else said ... "Roast no newbie before his time." I qualfied that with "Why roast them at all (unless they repeatedly demonstrate that their intent is to be disruptive)?" Better to help and guide them than to berate them in an effort to drive them

away ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhgc5e+N6+q84HiEQJygQCcDr9IlMRd6xNNhWw+HelOXMWu7R4An10c
MqUurzMKZxZc5nQgZ5GRdiol
=BUiB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

541. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:35:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a19v6o$b6n$7@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30112
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mad Max" <SayWhat@DummyGlenn.com> wrote in message
news:a18f15$n5g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, is sending this notification. I don't know what he is
> trying to prove save for wasting his breath. I mean, who cares??
>
.....
> .....
>
> Subject: Re: Broadcasting
>
>
>
> AMERICAN AMATEUR RADIO ASSOCIATION (AARA)
> INTERNATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO NETWORK (IARN)
> K1MAN BULLETIN SERVICE
> FULL INFORMATION AT www.K1MAN.com
>
> "AARA is your alternative to ARRL. We sponsor IARN, which is the most
> experienced amateur radio emergency communications organization in the
> world."
>
> This is Glenn's claim. He cannot verify it and Who Cares??
>
> "K1MAN bulletins have been heard world wide since 1987. Like W1AW,
> K1MAN transmissions are perfectly legal under FCC rules. Like W1AW,
> good amateur practice requires publishing a transmitting schedule and
> then sticking to it. It is far more disruptive to do otherwise."
>
> And maliciously and deliberately interfering with ongoing QSO's is not
> "disruptive"? Is not rude? Is not ILLEGAL? And Glenn has the anabashed
nerve
> to mention "good amateur practice"?
>
> "Hams can be very childish and territorial about the use of amateur
> radio spectrum. Our surveys show that about 1 ham in 10 is against
> both K1MAN and W1AW one way bulletins. We are sure there are also
> those who are against contests, nets, etc. This is OK! There is
> plenty of room for everyone in our Amateur Radio Service. If you
> have a problem with this, try another hobby; you are probably not cut
> out for big time Amateur Radio."
>

> Yes, Glenn. You can be "very childish and territorial about the use of
> amateur radio spectrum." Your surveys are just that....YOURS! No need to
use
> the plural "our", Glenn. MY survey shows that 6 of ten active Amateurs are
> against the K1MAN broadcasts/intentional interference and my survey is
just
> as valid and likely more accurate than yours. The comment, "you are
probably
> not cut out for big-time radio" is laughable. And what makes you, Glenn,
> think that you are "big-time radio"? Your silly ego aside, I have news for
> you. The only thing "big-time" about you is the constant pain-in-the-ass
> that you are.
> Perhaps you should try another hobby. It is quite obvious that you are not
> cut out for Amateur Radio and hopefully Riley will make that point
painfully
> clear to you, sooner rather than later.
>
>
> "An experienced ham knows that if you are trying to talk to another
> station per a sked, you might have to QSY one or more times during any
> given hour. If you don't know this and practice this, you are not am
> experienced Radio Amateur."
>
>
> You are not talking to another station, Glenn. You are maliciously
> interfering with good Amateur operators and you do so several times daily.
> It is YOU who should practice QSY'ing. One must therefore surmise that you
> are, in your own words, "not an experienced Radio Amateur."
>
>
> "Actually, our amateur spectrum is UNDERUTILIZED. The commercial guys
> are drooling over our spectrum and would love to divide us and conquer
> us. They love to see us squabble and act like babies. There are
> even evil persons in the FCC (dressed like good guys) who are very
> subtly promoting and documenting amateur radio disruption under a
> long term private plan to assist commercial interests take as much
> amateur spectrum as possible. A primary function of AARA is to warn
> you about this frequency grab and to expose the corruption that exists
> within the FCC. Corruption is nothing new in American politics, and
> if you don't think that our amateur radio spectrum is worth billions
> upon billions of dollars, you are very naive."
>
> Here we have Glenn's agenda in a nutshell. He's a conspiracy theorist. He
> thinks Riley is a government agent in the pockets of Big Business.
> Glenn....ever look up the definition of "delusional"?
>
> "So, join the fun. Listen to K1MAN on 14.275, 7.224, 3.975, and 3.890
> MHz. daily and also call in (207 495 2215). See www.K1MAN.com 73!
>
> 14.275 MHz. USB and 3.975 LSB at 1:00 AM to 2:30 AM;

> 3:30 AM to 5:00 AM; 6:30 AM to 8:00 AM; 4:00 PM to
> 5:30 PM; and also 8:00 PM to 9:30 PM. 7.224 MHz.
> LSB at 3:30 AM to 5:00 AM. High fidelity amplitude
> modulation on 3.890 MHz. at 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM.
>
> (All times are in Eastern Local Time - In winter add 5 hours for UTC)
> Join the fun! Get your unedited viewpoints on the air! 73 de K1MAN"
>
>
> What "fun"? The real fun will begin when Riley comes knocking on your
door!
> Go, Riley! Go!

Riley's already sent him a letter about it to cease and desist.

542. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:39:03 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a19v6q$b6n$9@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30113
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Roger Dodger" <MommyBoy@GlenDale.com> wrote in message
news:a1942v$7qh$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply To Address"@coqui.net>
wrote
> in message news:3C380909.3895CAD@coqui.net...
> > Mad Max wrote:
> >
> > > Oh, my. Aren't we a hoot? Now humor me if you will. Just what the heck
> is
> > > the bottom line you were attempting to convey?
> > > Name-calling aside, what is your point?
> >
> > That you are simply an anonymous troll-type poster and nothing you have
> > to say means squat because you don't have the balls to personify
> > yourself.
>
> My "troll" obviously bore results. You could not resist responding, could
> you?
> And speaking of "balls", you of all people are hardly adept at describing
> same.

You don't have any except the ones from your dog in your mouth.

> > Given that you are 14 years old at best, please don't bother me. Thats
> > illegal. Your Mom will be really pissed that you are using her computer
> > to start a little cross-posted flame war with characters on the monitor
> > screen.
>
> OK. I will tell my mommy to turn off my account with the express intent of
> not bothering you any further.
> Also, given the impression that you are yourself rather juvenile and
> somewhat limited in your ability to express yourself, I will cease making
> you look like the fool you are.
> >
> > Nite now, mmmkay?
> Mmmmkay.

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous status makes the story even less credible."

543. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:45:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c38632a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30000

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C37E02E.6A0A4F86@earthlink.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
[snip]
>
> > Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> > just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
> > Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> > dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all
without
> > EVER calling "CQ" ONCE. (Just to counter previous assertions that
> > the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting
CQ
> > DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of
fun
> > with my new privileges ... tough.
>
> Not at all, Carl. We knew that was the type of "experimentation"
you
> had in mind all along.

You have no idea of what other activities I'm also engaging in.

I never said I wouldn't chat with interesting people around the
world or otherwise use my newly-earned privileges ... what I
said was that the (past) lack of HF access precluded me from
doing experimentation there. That restriction has now been
removed and I'm free to do other things as time permits.

> > I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's
nothing
> > wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
> > about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)
>
> That big knob in the center is sort of like a channel selector.
Twist
> it and listen to something else if you like.

Understood ... however, there are times when it seems no
matter where you tune you find the geriatric complaints theme
is prevalent ... and yes, I know ... there's that button (on my
transceiver it happens to be in the upper left corner) which
```

turns the thing off ... I use it when I can't find anything
interesting
to listen to or participate in (actually, I usually just turn the
volume
down and leave the rig on in the interest of keeping things at
a constant temperature to eliminate any warm-up drift.)

> The Steven Hawking net meets on 21.440 at 0100z.

Really? Cool ...Hawking is a REALLY smart guy ... I'll
have to check it out some time to see if you're just pulling
my leg ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhjEpe+N6+q84HiEQJdDgCgmG3tsygWNlKXFfE9KjwMf4N2QQAAn1VT
pPQLmZoFIsziWAe+0Ubaj88V
=fSnC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

544. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:48:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3863A5.A3BACA15@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30102

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I am also a firm
> believer in having the firearms proficiency required to be able to
> hit a guy in the shoulder, versus the head or chest.

Trouble is, if the perp moves 5 inches fast, you either miss or get
him in the chest. If you aim at the chest and he moves 5 inches fast,
you still hit him somewhere.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

545. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 14:48:41 UTC
From: "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com>
Message-ID: <dtZZ7.359055$5A3.136252648@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another nic change to by pass readers filters ... One more for the kill
file...

"Landshark" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com> wrote in message
news:MgRZ7.24854$IR1.1883568361@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Again our resident forging troll at
> work.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Please note that any post that is from
> S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
> is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
> be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
> been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
> time now. If you want to send a complaint,
> forward each message complete with headers
> to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
> groups-abuse@google.com
> Beware of George WA3MO^
>
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:DtOZ7.10019$fe1.404972@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Goggle. Yawn.
> >
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> >
> >
> > "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > > write to about this at the ARRL?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic~

> >
> >
>
>

546. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 15:16:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.06.10.16.39.880182.23651@arrl.org>
Source record: 30103

On Sun, 06 Jan 2002 03:06:28 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.
>
> Response #1:
> You are too stupid to realize the value of the color yellow.
>
> Response #2:
> (Includes more reference to the stupidity comment) and adds: Your
> low-class, trailer trash living life-style is a huge screen to your
> ability to see beyond the single color you've chosen to master life
> with.
>
> Response #3:
> (Includes more reference to the stupidity comment, but drops the
> low-class comment because it made absolutely no sense) and adds: If you
> would take the time to read and understand, you would know that the
> color yellow is important to the very nature of our society.
>
> Response #4:
> Will keep all of #3 and add: What color yellow are you talking about? Be
> clear and concise in your communication and maybe you'll be able to play
> with the adults.

Response #5:
All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they really
apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our great
hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!

Jon

547. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 15:24:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c386c50_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30104

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a26ad8cbad3ca9989686@news.earthlink.net...
>[snip]
>
> OH..BTW, my AT&T 900 mhz phone has crapped out for 5th (really)
time.
> Since you designed the circuitry, can I send it to you. The morons
at
> their repair department keep telling me that the transmitter seems
ok,
> although there's a possible intermittent short?? Seems the 1st
time,
> they forgot to solder the antenna leads....
>
> Gee, must be great working for a company (jn some convuluted
corporate
> chart) that takes your product and puts it into another product
therebye
> assuring that your product won;t or can't work.

What model phone do you have? I didn't design the phones,
nor do I work for the company which made them ... I designed
major parts of a chipset which was used in certain FHSS
cordless phones. If it's not FHSS, I didn't have *anything* to do
with it ... if it is FHSS, I designed the chipset and a "reference
design," but not the product which (the other company) put into
production.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhsMJe+N6+q84HiEQKpwQCeL+LFHZj1tyoxMoZRHAOoRVzrwIsAni+4
Z9P5lGPViMjWoeoDL/APygmc
=4GFz
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

548. Re: 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 15:39:24 UTC
From: george <pisseham@aol.com>
Message-ID: <Mc_Z7.359120$5A3.136291099@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30105

Who is George, Dick?

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:uCLZ7.216283$WW.12645756@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Kind of barrel-scraping aren't we George?
>
> "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:8bLZ7.357540$5A3.135732857@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > laydown boy test test
> > "Mr. Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.nospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:nNKZ7.357432$5A3.135716002@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > > test
> > >
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years
> for
> > the
> > > > radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those
> things
> > you
> > > > will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your
> > dwelling.
> > > >
> > > > Dick McCollum N&#65533;BK
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

549. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 15:49:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c38723d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30106

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201052316.5a07e12b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c375518_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16a087d374b9d5a6989684@news.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Careful Dave.
> >
> >
> Yeah, Heil better watch out for Carl. Bwaaahaha!
> >
> >
> > Carl holds you DXer types as the destroyers of amateur
> > > radio, along with contesters, rag chewers and W5TIT types.
> >
> > I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> > the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> > ... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues
calling
> > long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a
station.
> > (I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> > "listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
> >
> >
> You just keep paying attention to the admonitions in the ARRL "How
To
> Operate" pubs sweetums and we'll see who whacks who in the pileups
and
> contests. Go for it, less QRM and more confirmed for me, dit-dit.

That's EXACTLY the point I was making ... it shouldn't be
a question of brute-force "who 'wacks' who" ... but rather
a question of operator skill (which is not related to how
hard they can "wack" others) and other factors ...

You seem to espouse the brute force "stomp 'em into
the dust" philosophy ... I'm disappointed ... I thought you
were a better operator than that.
```

> Hey Squiggy, wasn't it YOU who got into the ultimate inanity in this
> NG awhile back, something abt you pushing for allowing
> frequency-hopping spread-rectum comms on 20m??

Both Garry Coffman and I postulated conceptual designs
for digital systems that, in the 150 kHz from 14.000-14.150
could handle at least several 10s of thousands of 20 wpm
Morse equivalent QSOs with virtually NO QRM or congestion.
(something well beyond the capabilities of Morse technology)
The proposed technology was not FHSS ...

> Good point Squig, glad you brought it up. TAPR has been futzing with
> some FHSS boards since 1997 in their thrust to get FHSS running in
the
> 902-928 Mhz ham band and they still ain't there. Given your assorted
> chunks of bluster about your "leading edge technical accomplisments"
> in this general field and your widely broadcast "thoughts" wrt to
> these kindsa modes being the "future of ham radio" I find it rawther
> odd that nowhere in the TAPR website is there any mention of any of
> your contributions to their effort. Care to comment on this peculiar
> state of affairs??

Frankly, I find the TAPR effort to be an unnecessarily complicated
approach to FHSS which will result in significantly higher cost than
necessary with little practical benefit and a lack of adoption by few
other than the TAPR development team. As a TAPR member, I'm
appalled at the amount of member funds which have gone into this
particular porkbarrel sinkhole ...

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhx85e+N6+q84HiEQL8JgCeOkY8yv89YIkPX2cQ3CQgcu/u/wsAnjfZ
zq2KcrxUfnRQsDyI5y26VXOM
=r/Q8
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

550. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 15:57:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3873fe_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30107

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c380574_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0201052316.5a07e12b@posting.google.com...
>
[snipped the "I'm a big gun DXer" diatribe]
>
> Man, the "big guns" sure do get pissed off quick, don't they?!
ROFLMAO....
> Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a
turn-off for
> enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for
anyone who
> might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad
side of
> ham radio, that chest thumping.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim,

You're absolutely right ... the "big guns" and "I can beep real
fast, so I'm vastly superior to you" types don't realize how their
attitudes are a turn off for "mainstream" radio enthusiasts (nor,
I'm sure, do they CARE).

It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
than theirs.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE

Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDhz4Je+N6+q84HiEQIdjQCgrA0QlG85XMC8+GEQSM63sQJ9mvAAoMqc
fFxlu/lPXfriQOsCzxhi7pJd
=XbPC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

551. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 16:25:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c387a3e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30108

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.06.10.16.39.880182.23651@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 06 Jan 2002 03:06:28 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.
> >
> > Response #1:
> > You are too stupid to realize the value of the color yellow.
> >
> > Response #2:
> > (Includes more reference to the stupidity comment) and adds: Your
> > low-class, trailer trash living life-style is a huge screen to your
> > ability to see beyond the single color you've chosen to master life
> > with.
> >
> > Response #3:
> > (Includes more reference to the stupidity comment, but drops the
> > low-class comment because it made absolutely no sense) and adds: If you
> > would take the time to read and understand, you would know that the
> > color yellow is important to the very nature of our society.
> >
> > Response #4:
> > Will keep all of #3 and add: What color yellow are you talking about? Be
> > clear and concise in your communication and maybe you'll be able to play
> > with the adults.
>
> Response #5:
> All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they really
> apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
> only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our great
> hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!
>
> Jon

Ah...yes....<BEG>

Kim W5TIT

552. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 16:36:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c387eca_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30115

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3873fe_2@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c380574_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0201052316.5a07e12b@posting.google.com...
> >
> [snipped the "I'm a big gun DXer" diatribe]
> >
> > Man, the "big guns" sure do get pissed off quick, don't they?!
> ROFLMAO....
> > Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a
> turn-off for
> > enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for
> anyone who
> > might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad
> side of
> > ham radio, that chest thumping.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim,
>
> You're absolutely right ... the "big guns" and "I can beep real
> fast, so I'm vastly superior to you" types don't realize how their
> attitudes are a turn off for "mainstream" radio enthusiasts (nor,
> I'm sure, do they CARE).
>

Yeah, I think the latter is the key. I don't really have a problem with all DXers, Contesters, etc. I don't have a problem with folks who love the fine art of CW. I *do* have a problem with people who wield the very attitude you (and I earlier) mention--that of braggadocio. Just a bit earlier this week I was mentioning some all-but-two states contacts I'd had on a mobile station over one weekend. That I had no log of this fully negated that I was speaking truth. To the person who said that, it meant something. To me, I *was there* :) and know the truth so that's all I need. (I didn't do the contacts because I was out to "score." I did the contacts because I happened to buy the radio on a weekend when I'd be mobile most of--what better way to test a *mobile* rig?) I was mighty impressed with it--by the way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile, better

audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not imposing at all. (We won't mention that since that weekend I've not operated 10M mobile).

>
> It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
> in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
> that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
> that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
> than theirs.
>
> 73,
>
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

Yes, Narcicism(sp) is a dangerous thing...

Kim W5TIT

553. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 16:44:09 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <5E0A67F47DF46DE6.595CF60EC2382A46.62E72208C2AD0397@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30109

On Sun, 6 Jan 2002 02:06:28 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net>
wrote:

>Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.

Yelowbanding is my rite, and u and ur dam FCC cant do nuthing about
it, fukers.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

554. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 16:45:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c387ecc$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30114

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:5E0A67F47DF46DE6.595CF60EC2382A46.62E72208C2AD0397@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 6 Jan 2002 02:06:28 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.
>
> Yelowbanding is my rite, and u and ur dam FCC cant do nuthing about
> it, fukers.
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

hehehe...yellowbanding sounds so appropo.... ;)

Kim W5TIT

555. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 17:08:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <umju3PtlBHA.1368@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30116

Carl writes:

> It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
> in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
> that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
> that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
> than theirs.

One of the strengths of the Amateur Radio service is the fortunate fact that there are so many different views of what ham radio is "all about", and there seems to be plenty of room for all those views to have a place to play. My views as to what it's "all about" tend toward tinkering and experimenting, your's toward changing the regulatory scheme, others tend toward radiosport, QRP, public service, chatting with old pals, collecting counties/countries/islands/states/numbers, or whatever. Until you succeed in changing the regulations to outlaw those "views", I'll discount your arrogant rhetoric about "misguided".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

556. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 17:33:40 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30117

>And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
>entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
>code barrier for many years (years during which many
>could have been good, productive hams ...)

Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

557. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 17:38:47 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106123847.19179.00000016@mb-mg.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30118

>3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
>found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
>requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
>WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
>in any way.

Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten years now?

BTW, good luck w/Russia. They've already said phooey re. total
elimination...oops, "Nyet!"

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

558. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 17:55:37 UTC
From: Whoisgeorge <whoisgeorge@home.comspam>
Message-ID: <tc0_7.359195$5A3.136395814@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30119

Here goes the game face theory. I forgot they are all old jocks or ex athletes right?

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message news:6LPX7.776$jg4.679473@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> : > However, what I have a problem with is that
> : > so many in the US just can not accept that someone
> : > might be better than they.
> :
> : Well sweetheart, you have a *huge* problem with me
> : then.
> :
> : I do not accept that anyone is "better" than I, and I
> : especially do not accept that a uniform, badge,
> : or election results makes them better.
> :
> : Our founding fathers, whom you are so proud to
> : cite, seemed to feel a lot like me when they
> : said.... "We hold these truths to be self-evident...
> : ...that all men are created equal...."
>
> Our country is based on people being unequal.
> Is everyone born with the same wealth? Can you
> be the best you can be? If you can then some
> will be superior to others.
>
> Likewise so many Americans, especially in the
> suburbs, have become such wimps that those
> who have served in the military, police and
> fire fighting (to include those who did so in the
> past) are superior due to their ability to survive
> in a crisis situation. People have become so
> specialized that many no longer have across
> the board life skills thus making them dependent
> (inferior) to those who still have such skills.
> We just are not a nation of farm boys anymore.
>
> The police see how weak minded folks are,
> what a bunch of sheeple they are. And remember
> that the police academy preaches superiority. It
> is felt that if a cop does not think he is superior then
> he not only risks his life but the lives of his fellow
> officers. He has to have the attitude, the game face,
> to survive on the streets.

>
>
>
>

559. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 17:57:59 UTC
From: Whoisgeorge <whoisgeorge@home.comspam>
Message-ID: <He0_7.359196$5A3.136398081@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30120

Bill the local police probably didn't have to do anything, I am sure after the ordinance was passed he did the right thing. I am not saying this is what happened but...
If I was him I would have went on standby if operating illegally.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:a0jnmgkik1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> > > On 22 Dec 2001 05:03:15 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> > > >One has to wonder what sparked the passage of such a law. Were
> > > >residents experiencing TVI or other problems? Somebody had to have a
> > > >reaosn to push this through.
>
> Phil wrote:
> > > We'd be interested in hearing how this was
> > > applied to the "culprit" in question and what the results were.
>
> "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
> news:8GcX7.336613$5A3.129663404@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > Phil, I spoke to a clerk from Tacoma she told me the bill was passed as a
> > result of one Cb operator bleeding TV's, Telephones etc,etc... He thumbed
> > his nose at them supposedly I guess since the FCC did nothing about it
> they
> > passed the ordinance.
>
> Did the clerk offer any information as to what
> happened AFTER the ordinance passed?
>
> Did the local police file charges against the CBer?
>
> Just what did the local police do?
>
> Really curious,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> > >
> > > That was the reason that Sen. Feingold pushed the bill through
> > > The Congress giving away the FCC's jurisdiction to local entities.
> > >
> > > The local worthies of Beloit whined that the FCC wouldn't do
> > > anything - most probably because it was audio rectification and/or
> > > fundamental overload which the FCC told them - rightfully - was

> > > curable only at the affected equipment.
> > >
>
> > >
> > > "You can't make chicken stew out of chicken feathers."
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

560. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:11:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106131144.11381.00000044@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 30121

>I'm
>appalled at the amount of member funds which have gone into this
>particular porkbarrel sinkhole ...
>
>Carl -

Sounds like NCI to me, Carl why did it take you so long to upgrade?

561. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:15:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106131544.11381.00000045@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 30122

>I was mighty impressed with it--by the
>way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile, better
>audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not
>imposing at all.

I see you still cant get away from the CB Style Radios.

562. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:16:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3895f6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30123

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:umju3PtlBHA.1368@cpimsnntpa02...
> Carl writes:
>
> > It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
> > in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
> > that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
> > that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
> > than theirs.
>
> One of the strengths of the Amateur Radio service is the fortunate
> fact that there are so many different views of what ham radio is
> "all about", and there seems to be plenty of room for all those views
> to have a place to play. My views as to what it's "all about" tend
> toward tinkering and experimenting, your's toward changing the
> regulatory scheme, others tend toward radiosport, QRP, public
> service, chatting with old pals, collecting counties/countries/islands/
> states/numbers, or whatever. Until you succeed in changing the
> regulations to outlaw those "views", I'll discount your arrogant rhetoric
> about "misguided".
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

I took the use of "misguided" to mean the misguided views that what one thinks ham radio is about is what all hams should think ham radio is about. It does sometimes seem that the preferences of one are the junk of another--and that is OK until the junk of another is viewed as some sort of thorn in a side somewhere...

Kim W5TIT

563. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:52:06 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a2ad204840e175989687@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30124

In article <3c3895f6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:umju3PtlBHA.1368@cpimsnntpa02...
> > Carl writes:
> >
> > > It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
> > > in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
> > > that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
> > > that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
> > > than theirs.
> >
> > One of the strengths of the Amateur Radio service is the fortunate
> > fact that there are so many different views of what ham radio is
> > "all about", and there seems to be plenty of room for all those views
> > to have a place to play. My views as to what it's "all about" tend
> > toward tinkering and experimenting, your's toward changing the
> > regulatory scheme, others tend toward radiosport, QRP, public
> > service, chatting with old pals, collecting counties/countries/islands/
> > states/numbers, or whatever. Until you succeed in changing the
> > regulations to outlaw those "views", I'll discount your arrogant rhetoric
> > about "misguided".
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> I took the use of "misguided" to mean the misguided views that what one
> thinks ham radio is about is what all hams should think ham radio is about.
> It does sometimes seem that the preferences of one are the junk of
> another--and that is OK until the junk of another is viewed as some sort of
> thorn in a side somewhere...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Ya see Kimmie, you wouldn't fit into Carl's world of amateur radio. You
do absolutely NO experimenting. You're into DX (sort of, I guess) and
he has no use for people who think they know it all. See, according to
google you seem to think yourself a self appointed radio cop, monitoring
who is legal and who isn't.

I suggest you research a bit before taking sides. Carl and
you..certainly aren't perfect together. You have no place in the google
world of Carl Stevenson. Come to think of it, I, as a medical
profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably is.

Kim is not

564. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:52:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30125

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> >could have been good, productive hams ...)
>
> Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing issue is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a barrier to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I am told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.

My opinion is that for a mode I don't personally like to use myself, I have no desire to learn it--it wastes my valuable time. But, for the Tech+ license I was *willing* to learn it at 5wpm. I used it once the night I passed to placate an "overzealous" friend who wanted to see me use it on the air, and have never used it since--have no intention of ever using it again...in fact, I'd be hard pressed to even know it now. I've never wasted my valuable time learning loads of other modes I have no intention of using. I've never wasted my time learning things about ham radio that, say, an experimenter might learn--because I am not an experimenter.

While it goes against the angst of some hams, I am one of those dreaded "light-duty" ham radio enthusiasts (if the term enthusiast can be used for my type of ham). The "hobby" of ham radio is a distraction for me, not an avocation. I do enjoy emergency communication, and some public service. What do I mean by that? I mean that I enjoy the storm spotting aspect of emergency communication because I've always enjoyed observing severe weather anyway--that I am a ham radio operator fits right in with that. I enjoy public service--but *not* in the middle of summer here in Texas in the 100+ degree heat; they can find someone else who wants to do that (I'll provide radio equipment, logistics, etc., but I ain't sittin' in no heat for some 'nidiot [said affectionately] bike rider who finds it compelling to push the physical limitations of mind and body by cycling in this Summer weather down here).

But, if pressed, i.e., in a severe or disaster situation, I would operate as needed for as long as needed, with a smile on my face and knowing that the time I *have* taken to learn operating skills specific to my

needs/want/interests can be of some value to the community. I also believe that emergency communication and public service is a major consideration for ham radio's "existence." In my opinion, experimentation would be the second-most point for consideration; however, I am not personally into experimentation (if I build, I build by specification and blueprint--not willing to "play"). There is an exception to that: I do enjoy experimenting with better portable communicating methods/practices. I used to do it a lot, but haven't now in a couple/few years. These things are not generally taught to hams in emergency communication. Concepts like remote control of a mobile radio with a talkie when you are a distance away from your vehicle; cross-banding; using those bells and whistles we never use on our VHF/UHF radios: paging, digital tones, encode/decode on simplex, pushing the limits of simplex by learning the extreme art of communicating and listening in worst case scenarios, (did you know if you key up and say a word or two at a time, the full message can often be fully understand? Know why?), etc.

I think the "hobby" of ham radio is there for anyone and everyone--I don't even particularly care about operating practice and being that involved in deciding good ham/bad ham issues. There's way too many frequencies to absorb myself with that. I hear operating practices I don't particularly "like" but I don't think I have permission to tell someone how to speak just because I have a license for ham radio--obviously they do, too. I *do* however, require and demand strict operating procedures for emergency communication, public service, and things such as NTS. In those situations, ham radio departs (for me) from enthusiasm to service--and in those situations we need to shine. It's just like at work, I suppose. When required to do so (meetings, serious projects, time-specific demands, when the manager is around...heh heh, etc.) we need to be forthright professionals with business as the motivating factor. But, in other situations at the office we can be just as lighthearted and relaxed as we would be outside work. I am fortunate to have never had a job where utmost professionalism is required at all times--and there are those. I couldn't do that, either. Oh wait, yes I could do it--I just wouldn't/don't want to. Just as I could learn CW at any practical speed, I suppose (maybe not, I've never tried). But I don't want to, don't have to, so I won't.

I think the government has a reasonable expectation to "test" for licenses--but I think it is an unreasonable expectation for our government, or anyone else, to have people learn something they don't intend to use. I think the provision of the word "barrier" is probably more severe than reality--it isn't a true barrier in that one cannot learn it (unless deaf, etc.). But, in the spirit of the game, it is a barrier for those who don't wish to learn it. I have no problem with learning whatever for a written test--and I've been a proponent of such strict written testing that I probably wouldn't spend the time to learn for--but I am not in support of any kind of "mode" testing. It sets the stage for the very kind of attitudes we often see displayed here, and gosh knows that we hear on the air. Heck, the license itself is enough of an ego-maniacal booster for some!

Kim W5TIT

565. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 18:55:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c389f16_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30126

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106131544.11381.00000045@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >I was mighty impressed with it--by the
> >way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile,
better
> >audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not
> >imposing at all.
>
> I see you still cant get away from the CB Style Radios.

Hey, Bert:

Here's an example of that long post I just made a few minutes ago. This guy is so wrapped up in what his ham radio should be (for everyone else) that he even has a preference for what type of equipment people should use. Plus, he acts like he knows me...

Guess how much credence I lend to this?

Kim W5TIT

566. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey Bert, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:01:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c38a087_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30127

The RE: line should have been Hey Bert.

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c389f16_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020106131544.11381.00000045@mb-cg.aol.com...
> > >I was mighty impressed with it--by the
> > >way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile,
> better
> > >audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not
> > >imposing at all.
> >
> > I see you still cant get away from the CB Style Radios.
>
> Hey, Bert:
>
> Here's an example of that long post I just made a few minutes ago. This
guy
> is so wrapped up in what his ham radio should be (for everyone else) that
he
> even has a preference for what type of equipment people should use. Plus,
> he acts like he knows me...
>
> Guess how much credence I lend to this?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

567. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:07:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c38a1d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30128

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a2ad204840e175989687@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c3895f6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:umju3PtlBHA.1368@cpimsnntpa02...
> > > Carl writes:
> > >
> > > > It appears that their egos and self-worth are SO wrapped up
> > > > in their own misguided views of what ham radio is all about
> > > > that they can't risk the vulnerability posed by even considering
> > > > that there might be other (horrors, possibly even better) ways
> > > > than theirs.
> > >
> > > One of the strengths of the Amateur Radio service is the fortunate
> > > fact that there are so many different views of what ham radio is
> > > "all about", and there seems to be plenty of room for all those views
> > > to have a place to play. My views as to what it's "all about" tend
> > > toward tinkering and experimenting, your's toward changing the
> > > regulatory scheme, others tend toward radiosport, QRP, public
> > > service, chatting with old pals, collecting
counties/countries/islands/
> > > states/numbers, or whatever. Until you succeed in changing the
> > > regulations to outlaw those "views", I'll discount your arrogant
rhetoric
> > > about "misguided".
> > >
> > > With all kind wishes,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> >
> > I took the use of "misguided" to mean the misguided views that what one
> > thinks ham radio is about is what all hams should think ham radio is
about.
> > It does sometimes seem that the preferences of one are the junk of
> > another--and that is OK until the junk of another is viewed as some sort
of
> > thorn in a side somewhere...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Ya see Kimmie, you wouldn't fit into Carl's world of amateur radio. You
> do absolutely NO experimenting. You're into DX (sort of, I guess) and
> he has no use for people who think they know it all. See, according to

> google you seem to think yourself a self appointed radio cop, monitoring
> who is legal and who isn't.
>

Wow, I don't know who you are, probaby good 'ol Dickie--but I am about the furthest thing from a raido cop that could be. However, since you're so misinformed that you think I am into DX, then your ignorance in other areas is certainly warranted and no surprise.

Now, on to your comments about my fitting into "Carl's world" of amateur radio. If Carl has a propensity for fitting square pegs into round holes, or v/v, then he can kiss my not-so-royal ass. So can you. (Carl, I *don't* think you do as noted, though).

>
> I suggest you research a bit before taking sides. Carl and
> you..certainly aren't perfect together. You have no place in the google
> world of Carl Stevenson. Come to think of it, I, as a medical
> profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably is.
> Kim is not

As I said, your misunderstanding of what my needs are as a person are, well, warranted and expected. I fit into my world, Dorkie... If it's your game to fit people into others' worlds, and to fit yourself into one somewhere, I suggest you get busy. It doesn't seem there *is* a hole for you--round or square.

Kim W5TIT

568. I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:17:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c38a433_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30130

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106131544.11381.00000045@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >I was mighty impressed with it--by the
> >way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile,
better
> >audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not
> >imposing at all.
>
> I see you still cant get away from the CB Style Radios.

From QRZ:
.....
WA8ULX Lookups: 200
BRUCE A BEYNON
804 W 12TH AVE
COVINGTON LA 70433
USA
Detailed info Update this listing Update Policy...

Mailing Label Postcard

Email: WA8ULX@AOL.COM

One of the only Real Hams left, most of the new ones are CBplussers
.....

Regarding last line, above, I shoulda known...LOL

Kim W5TIT

569. ARNewsline 1273 - Jan 4 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:22:12 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106142212.08107.00000036@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 30129

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1273 - January 4 2002
(Total Running Time with RAIN Promo: 24:48)

==========

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the “spoken word.” It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Three methods of delivery are available: Streaming audio using RealAudio, FTP RealAudio, FTP MP3 or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to audio servers providing our voice newscast. On site free FTP Downloads are available at our site by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the page.

de
The Newsline Production Team

==========

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1273 with a release date of Friday, January 4 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A “V-E team” finds a way to test kids in one of the most remote regions of the country and the FCC again says no to expanding PRB-. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1273 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING REACHES WHITE MOUNTAIN ALASKA

Ham radio examinations have finally come to one of the remotest areas of the nation. This, after a team of examiners from the W5YI VEC perform a fly-in examination session in White Mountain Alaska. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--

White Mountain is a remote fishing village in the far North-West of Alaska. It’s major claim to fame is that its the next to the last checkpoint for the famed Iditarod dog sled race. And it wanted someone to come in and give ham

radio exams.

The closest big city is Nome. White Mountain is only about sixty miles from Nome but its over some rather treacherous terrain. There are no roads in or out and all supplies to White Mountain have to be delivered by plane or boat.

But White Mountain does ham a ham radio operator for its mayor. He is reindeer farmer Tom Gray KL0CQ. And one of its school board members is Eric Morris KL7HT. Both will tell you that a temperature of minus 40 degrees Fahrenheit and a wind-chill factor of minus 100 degrees is not uncommon in winter. These were the conditions faced by a four member W5YI VEC test team when it chartered a plane and flew in on December 11th to administer exams to four adults and fourteen youngsters who were determined to make ham radio a part of their life.

The trip which cost $800 for the flight alone was sponsored by the Seward Peninsula Amateur Radio Club. Braving the weather were examiners Ramon Gandia AL7X, Michael Nurse KL7UJ, Scott Webber AL7RJ and Thomas Busch NL7H. Al four are from Nome. Most of those to be tested came from the Bearing Strait School District’s only inland school. They had all been studying for their Amateur license as part of a search and rescue course. Neither the applicant or the VE team were disappointed. All eighteen passed the Technician class exam.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

Those involved in ham radio testing are keenly aware of the problems faced by remote areas of Alaska. At last July’s VEC Conference in Gettysburg Pennsylvania Jim Wiley KL7CC told the group that many applicants in Alaska are denied n Amateur Radio license exam due to the inaccessibility of their locations or the high cost of travel in that state. (W5YI)

**

HAM RADIO AND THE LAW: FCC SAYS NO ON PRB-1 EXPANSION REQUEST

Ham radio has lost yet another battle against deed restrictions, but the war is not over yet. At least that’s what the ARRL appears to be saying in a bulletin that describes the latest skirmish with the FCC over this politically volatile issue.

In the latest round, the FCC has affirmed a November 2000 staff-level decision that declined to include privately imposed deed covenants, conditions and restrictions under the limited federal preemption known as PRB-1. That’s the federal government policy requires municipalities to ''reasonably accommodate'' amateur communication in antenna-related zoning and regulation.

The ARRL last year appealed to have the full FCC review the earlier denial. The Commission turned down the League's Application for Review December 18 in a Memorandum Opinion and Order released December 26. As a result, it now looks as if the ARRL will bypass any further dealings on this issue with the FCC and will look for congressional relief instead.

The FCC itself even hinted that Congressional action by the ham community might be a next logical step. Its memorandum, opinion and order of dismissal did note that if Congress were to see fit to enact a statutory directive mandating the expansion of the FCC’s reasonable accommodation policy that the Commission would expeditiously act to fulfill its obligation there under. Translated: If Congress tells the FCC to include deed restrictions under the provisions of PRB-1, it will be more than happy to do so. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: PROJECT JJ - HE EAGLE HAS LANDED

AMSAT-NA's newest satellite project, known as Project JJ for the past year, now has a new and official name. This, as AMSAT North America President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, announces that effective January 1, 2002, the satellite will officially be known as 'Eagle'.

The name Eagle was submitted by Bill Allen, W7US, of Tucson, Arizona. It was selected from a list of forty-five names submitted by twenty-nine satellite operators.

For his winning suggestion, W7US will receive a free dinner at the annual AMSAT dinner held during the Dayton Hamvention. We will have more ham radio space related news later on in this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (AMSAT-NA, ANS)

**

BREAK 1

Welcoming in the new year with ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including the N7VGS repeater serving the Salt River Star Valley Wyoming and congratulating 13 year old Devin Cassity, on becoming the youngest ham in South West Wyoming. Devin is now KD7PHN.

(5 Sec Pause Here)

**

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS: NORTHERN CAL TOWN CHOOSES HAM RADIO

Ham radio started the year with some very positive public exposure in the Los Angeles Times. The January 1st edition featured an in depth article about a Northern California town that will tap into older technology to prepare for future emergencies.

Worried that a disaster will knock out e-mail and cell phones, Los Altos Hills has decided to turn to its local ham radio community and make it the primary back-up to normal disaster preparedness communications. And as you might expect, the hams are more than ready to oblige

The complete story can be read at the Los Angeles Times website. The complex URL is http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-000000203jan01.story. (Highlighted by ARNewsline™)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: POPCOMM COLUMNISTS SAYS “DONT TURN THE OTHER CHEEK”

Popular Communications writer Eric Force has some strong words that are obviously aimed at the pacifists who oppose the United States military retaliation against Osuma bin Laden and his al-Quida terrorist network. As a response to those he calls the “do-gooders of the world” who promote turning the other cheek, Force says to look, really look at the attack that brought down New York City’s World Trade Center twin towers. He then says that it could have struck a lot closer to them.

Force says and we quote: “Consider that it could have been you, your mom, dad, brother, sister other relative or a close friend in those planes and buildings who were terrorized, murdered and buried in the rubble.” He adds that just thinking about the incomprehensible terror, suffering and losses incurred by innocent human beings a the cowardly hands of international thugs continues to tear at his heart.

Force has dedicated his latest I-Waves column to the sights and sounds of September 11th that are available on the Internet and to the victims of the tragedy. Its a very compelling article. You can find it starting on page 66 of the January edition of Popular Communications Magazine that’s on newsstands right now. (PopComm)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: FEDS TO AID NYC TV STATION REBUILD

New York television stations will be getting federal help rebuilding transmitters that were destroyed in the September 11th terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. A total of ten New York area stations will receive eight point two million to offset the thirty million to forty million dollar price tag for purchasing and
constructing a new transmission facility.

According to the Broadcasting and Cable newsletter, Senator Charles Schumer managed to secure the funding as addition to emergency aid appropriation for victims of the attacks. As previously reported, there is some speculation that the replacement transmitting facility could be a 1500 to 2000 foot high stand-alone tower constructed near the former site of the Twin Towers. (Broadcasting & Cable)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NAL CANCELED

The FCC has canceled a proposed ten thousand dollar fine that it had issued to Jeffrey Alan Pettrey, This, for his apparent violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act involving operation of an unlicensed radio transmitter.

Back on July 30, 2001, the District Director of the Commission's Columbia, Maryland Field Office issued a Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture in the amount of $10,000 to Pettrey for the infraction. Pettrey filed a response to the N-A-L on August 7, 2001 accompanied by documentation regarding his

inability to pay the proposed fine. After reviewing Pettrey's response, the FCC conclude that cancellation of the proposed $10,000 forfeiture is warranted based on Pettrey’s inability to pay. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC CANCELS CONVICTED HAMS LICENSE

The FCC has canceled the Amateur license of Kenneth P. Kelly, WT2FBI, of Greensboro North Carolina after Kelly failed to show up for a re-examination. But at the time of the FCC retest order Kelly was otherwise occupied. He was fighting criminal charges in relation to a jamming case in Ohio. We have this report:

--
On November 30, 2001, Kenneth Kelly, the ex-WT2FBI was sentenced to 5 years probation by the Judge H. J. Bressler in a Butler County Ohio court. He had previously been indicted on a 4 th degree felony charge of disrupting public service by his jamming and talking on the Middletown Ohio police radio system.

At his hearing, Kelly agreed to a plea bargain. He admitted his guilt to a reduced charge attempted disrupting public services. At the time the FCC pulled his ham radio ticket Kelly was being held in the Butler County Ohio Jail pending sentencing.

By way of background, a person later proven to be Kelly was first noticed on the Middletown police radio channel the third week of July 2001. Initially the police dispatch radio system was not recording him but that was soon remedied by city radio technicians. After several days of taping, it was observed that the voice on the police radio was similar to one heard on the local 2 meter Amateur frequencies.

Several members of the Dial Radio Club then assisted police by monitoring and taping Kelly on the 2 meter band. Tapes from 2 meters and from the police were then voice printed the aid of computers to check similarities. Dial club members also tried to direction find and locate the signal both on 2 meters and on the police channel.

Through some luck, detectives working with a metro housing police officer and discovered that Kelly was now living in their jurisdiction. After they interviewed him, they felt that he was the person interfering. As the investigation progressed, he admitted to detectives that he may have accidentally transmitted on their frequency by accident. He claimed that his signal may have been mixing with an FM broadcast station and another ham repeater.

But Police did not believe it was accidental, because he was taped trying to talk directly to the police dispatcher and the cars. Later Kelly did admit his guilt and entered into the plea bargain. Now sentence has been passed by both the local court and the FCC.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Burt Hicks, WB6MQV, reporting.

--

When he was finally caught Kelly had a Yaesu VX-5 hand held in his possession that had been modified to transmit out of band. The assistance of the Dial Radio Club members is credited with helping to solve this case.

Note: Information and documents from the case can be obtained from the Butler County Ohio Clerk's office or online at: http://www.butlercountyclerk.org/ Click on Butler County Court Records Search. Then enter Kenneth Kelly. (FCC, Dial ARC, others)

**

ENFORCEMENT: MITNICK TO FIGHT TO KEEP HIS HAM LICENSE

Another ham who appears to be getting ready to do battle with the FCC is former computer hacker turned talk show host Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF has the latest:

--

As reported last week, the FCC is challenging Kevin David Mitnick's request to renew his ham radio license. The agency claims that his criminal background raises a substantial and material question of fact as to whether Mitnick possesses the requisite character qualifications to be and remain a commission licensee.

Now, N6NHG has told the U-K Newspaper the Register: "It's just another example of them trying to harass me. Now I've got to spend money to keep a ham license."

Mitnick insists that he has totally abandoned his former ways. The Register article notes that that he was recently called to testify before Congress on federal computer security matters. Also that he spent two days briefing the U-S Commission on National Security on these issues. Mitnick tells the Register that he cannot understand why the government is now questioning his character.

Mitnick is currently the host of the radio program called The Dark Side of the Internet. It airs in the Los Angeles area from 5 to 7 a.m. Sunday mornings over radio station KFI 640 AM. And in a recent appearance on Coast to Coast A-M hosted by Art Bell, W6OBB, Mitnick said that he is hoping for a career in computer security once his term of supervised release from prison has been completed.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

The complete Register story and interview with Mitnick is on the web at a rather long and complex U-R-L. You will find it at http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/55/23494.html (Adapted from the Register)

**

INTERNET SECURITY: CIA GOES OUT OF ENCRYPTION COMPANY FUNDING

And speaking of Internet security, word that a Central Intelligence Agency funded company that allowed Web surfers to browse anonymously has closed. According to news reports, Emeryville California based SafeWeb enabled Internet users to gain access to the World Wide Web and browse sites through its encrypted service. This made their on-line habits and history untraceable. In the 2000 - 2001 fiscal year, SafeWeb received one million dollars in funding from the U-S Central Intelligence Agency's venture capital arm. (published reports)

**

BREAK 2

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: AMATEUR RADIO TRADER CEASES PUBLICATION

Ham radio Internet auction sites may be responsible for a twice a month ham radio equipment sales magazine going away. This, after Amateur Radio Trader magazine announces that it has ceased publication.

According to Editor Barbara Patterson, KF4MMV, the Amateur Radio Trader was no longer a viable product. She says that the firm will be redirecting its resources into other areas.

Meantime, the company has also pulled its amateuradiotrader.com website off line. But unlike other publications which have gone under, in this case subscribers are being reimbursed for any outstanding issues. In addition to handling buy and sell ads, Amateur Radio Trader also donated page space to advertising the annual Newsline Young Ham of the Year award. (ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO HERITAGE: MAKING WCC A PART OF THE FUTURE

A ham is campaigning to preserve part of radios past and have it become a part of the future. This as Lewis Masson, K1LJ-S, says that the town of Chatham Massachusetts should convert the site of radio station WCC into an Amateur Radio station along with a training curriculum to teach the kids in the area about communications technology.

WCC is one of the original Marconi Marine Radio Stations. Masson is an ex-marine telex operator at WCC. The site was recently turned over to the town of Chatham and Masson believes it is important to preserve the operations building as an operating amateur radio station and keep the hotel building as a museum to preserve and display memorabilia.

Masson says over the Internet that he has formed a committee to work on this project and that they are looking for nationwide support for this campaign. If preserving the past as an investment in the future is of interest to you, please contact K1LJS by e-mail to lemasson@juno.com. (Internet)

**

SPECIAL EVENTS: HAM RADIO UNIVERSITY 2002

A reminder the third annual Ham Radio University event takes place on January 20, 2002. Location is the Babylon Long Island New York Town Hall Annex with the doors opening at 9 a-m Eastern time.

Ham Radio University is a day of education about Amateur Radio. This there will be twenty, one-hour presentations with special forums geared to the non-ham as well as the experienced Amateur Radio operator. The focus will be "hands on" with many demonstrations. Besides the forums, there will be tables set up with information about the different groups, ham radio classes, exam session schedules, public service and other activities.

For more information about Ham Radio University, please contact its Chairman Phil Lewis N2MUN by e-mail to n2mun@optonline.net. You can also get in touch with ARRL New York and Long Island Section Manager, George Tranos N2GA by e-mail to n2ga@arrl.org. Also check the Ham Radio University website for a full list of forums, directions and talk-in information. Its in cyberspace at www.arrlhudson.org/nli/hru2002.htm (N2DO)

**

HAM RADIO RECORDS: BEST OF THE WEST AND VHF CONTEST HONOR ROLLS

Tim Marek, K7XC, says that he has updated W6 / W7 & "Best In The West" VHF Contest Honor Rolls. They are now available at the following web sites.

http://k7xc.tripod.com/VHF_Records/index.html s the stand alone records page. http://k7xc.tripod.com/K7XCweaksignal/ is where individual links can be found to each contest. (VHF Reflector)

**

HAM RADIO SCIENCE: NEW 6 METER PROPAGATION BEACON IN WASHINGTON STATE

Rich Ewing, KO7N reports over the VHF Reflector that Bruce Shurtz, W7BAS, has installed a propagation beacon in gridsquare CN87TG near Kennmore Washington. It operates on 50.069 MHz putting out 10 watts to a 5 element yagi pointing 90 degrees. The beacon is operational 24 hours a day, seven days a week. QSN reports go to W7BAS, at his callbook address. (VHF Reflector)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: VERY FEW LAUNCHES

Peter Guezlow, DB2OS, reported that 2001 has turned out to be the slowest year for space launches in nearly 40 years. Ham radio or otherwise. According to DB2OS, only 58 flights reached orbit, and there was one complete failure.

Guezlow says that historians note that we must look back to 1963 to find a year that produced fewer launches. He says that in 2000 there were 82 launches to orbit plus three failures. By contrast the most productive year was 1984 when 129 launches delivered payloads into orbit.

But there is at least one bright note. Russia successfully placed five satellites into orbit recently after launching them aboard a Zenit rocket. The cargo rocket, carrying three Russian, one Moroccan and one Pakistani satellite, took off from the Baikonur space center in Kazakhstan. (AMSAT, ANS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW INDIA WEBSITE

The AMSAT-India website has been officially launched recently by the government of India and the Department of Space. VU2POP says that you can check it out by taking your browser over to www.amsatindia.org. (ANS)

**

CONTESTS: HUNTING LIONS ON THE AIR

The 31st annual Hunting Lions in the Air contest will take place on the weekend January 12th to the 13th. The contest period will be 48 hours and will run from midnight UTC Friday night to midnight UTC Sunday night, and all hams are welcome to participate.

According to its sponsors, the objective of this operating event is to create and foster a spirit of international understanding and cooperation among radio amateurs and members of the Lions Clubs through the use of world-wide radio communication. The contest also commemorates the birthday of Melvin Jones, the founder of the Association of Lions Clubs who was born at Ft. Thomas, Arizona on January 13, 1879. (Q-News)

**

DX

In DX, word that the recently postponed Ducie Island Dxpedition is on again for March. Ducie Island became a DXCC entity last November and it immediately jumped to the top of the most wanted contact list. But rough seas scuttle the first attempt to put it on the air. (RSGB)

Meantime 6 meters continues to be the V-H-F D-X band of choice. On Monday December 31st, Kevin Bishop WB8XX, says that he started hearing O-H-1-X-T at 1300 U-T-C on a backscatter path. From then on until 1620 U-T-C he worked 8 new countries and over thirty new grids in Europe and Asia. (VHF Reflector)

**

STRANGE TECHNOLOGY: ARE CELLPHONES KILLING GHOSTS?

Now, from radio communications to the effect of radio communications on supernatural communications. This, as a British expert who has spent years researching the occult says that cellular and other mobile phones are killing off ghosts. Don Wilbanks KC5MFA has the details:

--

No, we are not kidding you. In fact, Tony Cornell, of the Society for Psychical Research, has told the London Sunday Express that reports of ghost

sightings started to decline when mobile phones were introduced 15 years ago.

According to Cornell, ghost sightings had remained consistent for centuries. In fact, until three years ago the society received one or two new ghost sighting reports every week. But with the introduction of mobile phones 15 years ago, ghost sightings began to decline to the point where they are not receiving any.

And why are there no longer any ghosts being observed? Apparently paranormal events, which many scientists attribute to unusual electrical activity, my be drowned out by the electronic noise produced by cellular telephones and text messaging pager transmitters. And according to the newspaper, the lack of ghost sightings could adversely impact on the nations economy. It says that haunted tourist attractions in Britain could be under threat if the number of cellphones continues to grow from the present figure of about 39 million now in use in the U-K.

Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA.

--

And all of this begs that one question be asked. If ghosts are the spirits of the dead, how can anything actually kill them? (Science Today)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Mert Garlick, N6AWE, saying welcome to the year 2002, 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights are reserved.

**

END NEWSCAST - RAIN PROMO

570. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:29:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38A580.81DA5BDA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30131

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> >in any way.
>
> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten years now?
>
> BTW, good luck w/Russia. They've already said phooey re. total
> elimination...oops, "Nyet!"

My, how times change. Now the Ruskkies are being held up as
role models.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

571. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:33:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38A670.AD4CD7B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30132

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Here's an example of that long post I just made a few minutes ago. This guy
> is so wrapped up in what his ham radio should be (for everyone else) that he
> even has a preference for what type of equipment people should use. Plus,
> he acts like he knows me...

Yep, Bruce is one of the anti-live-and-let-livers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

572. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:37:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38A768.9EF0404E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30134

krill wrote:
> Come to think of it, I, as a medical
> profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably is.

Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
'one' or 'zero', it's broke.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

573. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:39:02 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106143902.19219.00000051@mb-mg.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30133

>> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
>> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
>> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
>> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
>> >in any way.
>>
>> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten years
>now?
>>
>> BTW, good luck w/Russia. They've already said phooey re. total
>> elimination...oops, "Nyet!"
>
>My, how times change. Now the Ruskkies are being held up as
>role models.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

LOL! It was that "global basis" thing that caught my eye, Cecil. For a second the name 'SPECTRE' came to mind. "I don't want you to slow, Mr. Morse...I wan't you to die!"

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

574. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:40:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38A849.41B58DD1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30135

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
> news:5E0A67F47DF46DE6.595CF60EC2382A46.62E72208C2AD0397@lp.airnews.net...
> > On Sun, 6 Jan 2002 02:06:28 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Statement: I can't stand the color yellow.
> >
> > Yelowbanding is my rite, and u and ur dam FCC cant do nuthing about
> > it, fukers.
> >
> hehehe...yellowbanding sounds so appropo.... ;)

By Jove, I think we are witnessing the coining of a new word -
Yellowbanders.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

575. Re: Amateur Licesnsing Statistics?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:41:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38A887.A660E162@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30136
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill, KD0HG" wrote:
> Can anyone point out a relevant URL or post the current breakout of amateur
> licenses by class?

Where are they breaking out of?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

576. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:54:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106145448.26452.00000007@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 30137

In article <3C377132.BA6BFA0E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> > My statements are always narrow even if I
>> >don't specifically say they are narrow.
>>
>> That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.
>
>See, you're doing it again.

Doing what? Saying Emperor Cecil has no logical clothes?

>That is an infinitely narrow statement.
>There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.

Lemme see...

The statement:

"My statements are always narrow even if I don't specifically say they are narrow."

logically equates to:

"All my statements are narrow".

But any statement that says "all my X's are Y" is a broad, sweeping statement. Therefore the statement which claims that all statements are narrow is, itself, a broad sweeping statement. Which means it cannot be a narrow statement, even though it says it is a narrow statement.

But Cecil claims it IS a narrow statement. And Cecil only makes narrow statements, so his statement that it is narrow is specific to the narrow statement. If not, then Cecil is not, but if Cecil is not, then the statement cannot exist, but if the statement does not exist, it can be neither broad nor narrow. And existence itself is a broad sweeping statement while nonexistence is a narrow statement, so Cecil's nonexistence proves the truth of his statement, which cannot exist without Cecil's existence sooooooooooo

Daisy, Daisy, give me your answer do.......

577. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:54:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106145448.26452.00000006@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 30138

In article <98612482C9C98234.6F4725DF2A0D724B.893096D304B02CD3@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>Finding a home without restrictive covenenants is becoming increasingly
>>difficult for those who live near cities. That is a reality. The
>>covenants are often arbitrary and prevent the land owner from enjoying
>>the use of his land. This is a threat to the growth of amateur radio
>>and to the participation in amateur radio of many of those already
>>licensed. That you are incapable of seeing that is pathetic.
>
> Dave, maybe I'm naive but I just don't see anyone holding a
>gun to your head (or anyone else's) to force them to buy a home with
>restrictions!

Nobody's talking about guns, Rick. In real life it comes down to practicality.
Many hams find themselves in a bad situation, choice-wise. Many would-be hams
simply wander away because it's simply too much hassle.
>
> Sure, it might be less convenient to find a home without
>them--it may not be in "quite" as desirable a neighborhood (one reason
>the restrictions probably exist in the first place), but that's a
>trade off you make when you insist on certain requirements in a home.
>For instance, if you want a home with three bedrooms, three baths, and
>a large yard, you may not be able to afford to live in as exclusive a
>neighborhood as if you wanted one with only two bedrooms and two
>baths. That isn't unjust restriction--it's fair trade.

It is interesting that you use the term "exclusive" to describe the
neighborhood. One of the meanings of the term "exclusive" is that entry was
forbidden to certain ethnic/religious groups.

In many housing markets today their simply isn't that much choice. In others,
there are plenty of options. But the tendency of builders to put in
unreasonable boilerplate restrictions is slowly but steadily painting hams into
a real-estate corner.

>The FCC isn't letting hams down by not forcing neighborhoods
>to accept ham antennas--it's allowing the residents to set their own
>rules.

Often those rules are unreasonable. The FCC IS letting hams down because they
are not taking the lead on this.

> If you look carefully at most restrictions, it isn't the
>_existence_ of an antenna that is banned (they can't--that DOES
>violate the FCC ruling on home entertainment antennas), only its size

Not true in many if not most cases. The classic restriction goes something like "no external antennas of any type are permitted". No size or use specified, just a blanket ban.

>(it would be easy to defeat a restriction that was based on use not
>size in any court--i.e., you can ban a 40' tower, but you CAN'T ban an
>antenna for amateur use if an equivalent sized one for TV use is
>permitted--that's discriminatory regulation).

Yet that is EXACTLY what the FCC is allowing!

The satcom folks went all the way to the Supremes over antennas that are literally the size of a large anchovy pizza. They did so because of the prevalence of restrictions that absolutely ban ALL antennas, regardless of size. The FCC only stepped in when forced to do so by Congress. And the FCC SPECIFICALLY named the USE of the antenna (broadcast TV reception) as being the deciding factor.

In other words, the exemption applies to a Channel 13 TV yagi but does NOT apply to a 220 MHz ham yagi, even though the only difference between the two antennas is that the ham yagi is slightly SMALLER.

>I live in an area with
>just that kind of restriction and do quite adequately with a flag-pole
>antenna (most neighborhoods DO permit a flag-pole with a US Flag,
>which makes a great 18' to 27' vertical)

There was a case in New Jersey over a flagpole. A WW2 veteran had family members fighting the Gulf War, and he put up a nice flagpole with the American flag on it. Raised it every morning and lowered it every night. The restrictions were enforced and he had to take it down.

>and an MFJ Super Hi-Q loop on
>the roof (about the same size as my legal DirecTV dishes and thus not
>subject to limitation)

Don't bet on it. If somebody wants to push the rules your dishes are exempted but an equal-size loop is not.

> that handles 10m-40m--according to both
>experience and printed reviews it does just as well as a typical 40m
>antenna system, and does so in a fraction of the space.

All depends what you consider a "typical" antenna system.

>I also have
>antennas on my car (which restrictions CAN'T prohibit) and a small
>2m/70cm antenna on my roof that isn't even noticeable from the street.

Doesn't matter. Hams have been forced to take down antennas that can't be seen from the street because of restrictions.

>That may not be optimum, but I didn't buy my house with the thought in
>mind of setting up an antenna farm--for that I would buy a home on
>acreage in the country.

In many cities "the country" is so far away from "the jobS" (intentional accent on the plural) that it's just not an option. One can end up spending so much time commuting that there's no time for ham radio.

What IS happening in many cases is that the older, inner-ring 'burbs have few or no restrictions - and tiny lots. The newer, "beltway" areas have the restrictions and are where people want to live. The "country" is an hour or more away.

> Frankly, ham or not, I can see some of the objections. A 40'+
>tower topped by HF beams CAN detract from the appearance of a
>neighborhood from a non-ham perspective.

That's where "reasonable" comes in. A big tower on a small lot may be unreasonable. But many of the restrictions are so fussy that even wire dipoles between trees are banned.

> The people who live there
>bought, in part, because their neighborhood DID have such
>restrictions

How do you know? Most of the people I know buy for entirely different reasons (in no particular order):

- Price
- Value
- Proximity to work/school/shopping/relatives/friends/health care/worship
- School district
- Taxes
- Crime
- Maintenance
- Style

>--why do you feel it fair to deprive them of the right to
>live where there are NOT "unsightly" antennas simply because you
>choose to move to their area? It isn't discrimination to want to live
>where the neighborhood maintains a specific appearance.

Yes, it is, if the restrictions are unreasonable and practically impossible to change.

73 de Jim, N2EY

578. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 19:57:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1aa8g$u4c$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30139

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a1354k$j5u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C33EA00.99F29ECC@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> >
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20020102203524.07928.00002242@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > > > I didn't say that the only meaning of the FCC's ruling was an
imminent
> > > > spectrum sell-off. However, the FCC obviously doesn't see any need
to
> > > > protect a radio amateur's right to establish an effective station on
> his
> > > > own property -- on their own initiative. They'll do it if Congress
> > > > forces them to, but somehow, I think that's a bill that would have a
> very
> > > > hard time getting to the floor, much less passing. This whole thing
> > > > circles back to the fact that amateur radio doesn't have much of an
> > > > economic impact -- at least, not enough to overcome it's nuisance
> > > > value to those who don't understand us.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > It would seem that the FCC already has its own perception of what it
> takes
> > > to effectively carry out communications. How are they not protecting
the
> > > right to establish an effective station? All they've done is define
what
> is
> > > necessary to carry out communications. Hams can still put up
temporary
> or
> > > hidden/indoor antennas if CC&Rs prohibit permanent structures, and
they
> can
> > > still have an effective station. Nothing has changed.
> >
> > Ah, Really? My daughter and her husband lived in a new subdivision with
> all
```

> > wires and cables buried underground where the CCCR said "no additional
> > transmission lines of any type may be installed".
>
> A hidden indoor antenna wouldn't constitute a "transmission line."
> Indeed, it would seem that the FCC preemption for TV/Satellite
> reception would mandate allowing a transmission line from the
> TV antenna or SAT dish to the inside of the home.
> Bill K2UNK

As further consideration on this...EVEN if the councilmembers resigned,
that would NOT alleviate any personal liabilities IF such was the case.
If they did the crime or negligence, they'd have to answer for it.
Resigning
would offer no defense.

Cheers again,
Bill K2UNK

579. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:01:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38AD1C.678EE3C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30140

N2EY wrote:
> "All my statements are narrow".
>
> But any statement that says "all my X's are Y" is a broad, sweeping statement.

What I am talking about is the definition of "all". The definition of
"all" is very narrow and therefore my statement using "all" has a scope
that is very narrow. Sadly, you just don't understand me, Jim, and that's
a pity.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

580. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:17:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C38B0E6.121FF41C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30141

N2EY wrote:
> Nobody's talking about guns, Rick. In real life it comes down to practicality.
> Many hams find themselves in a bad situation, choice-wise. Many would-be hams
> simply wander away because it's simply too much hassle.

Would you wander away because it's simply too much hassle, Jim?
Neither would I. I have helped apartment dwellers install dipoles
in their attics. Chicken-wire end hats work very well. I helped a
ham in Tucson set up a vertical in his back yard ala St. Louis
Vertical style. The black SD-20 telescoping pole was virtually
invisible at night using black insulated wire.

One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
performed the attic dipole.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

581. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:34:42 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a2c5297f17f124989688@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30142

In article <3c38a1d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message

> > Ya see Kimmie, you wouldn't fit into Carl's world of amateur radio. You
> > do absolutely NO experimenting. You're into DX (sort of, I guess) and
> > he has no use for people who think they know it all. See, according to
> > google you seem to think yourself a self appointed radio cop, monitoring
> > who is legal and who isn't.
> >
>
> Wow, I don't know who you are, probaby good 'ol Dickie--but I am about the
> furthest thing from a raido cop that could be. However, since you're so
> misinformed that you think I am into DX, then your ignorance in other areas
> is certainly warranted and no surprise.

Hmmm really Kimber? I seem to have read where you perceived a 2 meter
repeater user as an illegal operator and harassed that person
repeatedly. Another fabrication on your part? or just another example
of telling half truths (seems that is your modus operandi)

>
> Now, on to your comments about my fitting into "Carl's world" of amateur
> radio. If Carl has a propensity for fitting square pegs into round holes,
> or v/v, then he can kiss my not-so-royal ass. So can you. (Carl, I *don't*
> think you do as noted, though).

I think that would be not-so-royal-FAT-ass, based on personal
descriptions of being 5' 4" and 200 pounds?? Wow Kim, better stay off
the Internet and on the slim-fast :-) see a smiley..just kidding

And yes. Carl is the square peg of amateur radio

>
> >
> > I suggest you research a bit before taking sides. Carl and
> > you..certainly aren't perfect together. You have no place in the google
> > world of Carl Stevenson. Come to think of it, I, as a medical
> > profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably is.
> > Kim is not
>
> As I said, your misunderstanding of what my needs are as a person are, well,
> warranted and expected. I fit into my world, Dorkie... If it's your game
> to fit people into others' worlds, and to fit yourself into one somewhere, I
> suggest you get busy. It doesn't seem there *is* a hole for you--round or
> square.

But as to yours, that would explain the 2x4 your hubby needs strapped to his little racer end, so he don't fall in?? ha ha :-) see, another smiley face

ta ta big BIG girl.

I am sure when your ROFLYFAO, the seismometers at Cal Tech will be definitely registering something from your neck of Texas

582. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:44:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106154419.25542.00000124@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30143

>Yep, Bruce is one of the anti-live-and-let-livers.
>--
>cheers, CAM

You got that right, down with CBplussers

583. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:46:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106154627.25542.00000127@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30144

>One of the only Real Hams left, most of the new ones are CBplussers
>.....................
>
>Regarding last line, above, I shoulda known...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Does that statement apply to you "TIT"?

584. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:49:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <UL2_7.30513$fe1.496894@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30145

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3858dc_1@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:JsPZ7.330041$W8.12611765@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> [snip]
> >
> > The available Elmer shortage if correct tends to imply sheer
> > chaos when the licenses become codeless which is a point
> > I tend to agree with.
>
> Why are codeless hams more likely to cause "chaos" than
> coded ones? I don't get that one ... please explain.
>
> > I have argued here that the point is not whom to exclude or
> > standards but rather how one absorbs newbies in any large
> > number into a hobby with long standing traditions and practices.
>
> Heaven forbid that some of those "long standing traditions
> an practices" might actually change a bit (after all, ham radio
> must, for all time, remain ever as it was, right?) NOT!
>
> This is not to say that everything would/should be turned
> upside down over night ... but like everything else, ham
> radio will have to accept *some* change over time in
> order to remain relevant ... otherwise, it will ultimately go
> the way of the dinosaurs ... unable (unwilling) to adapt to
> changing conditions, thus unable to survive.
>
> > It is not the hobby to fear for but the bright souls who
> > easily pass the new exams and are kind of left there
> > scratching their butts.
>
> This still seems to presuppose that the exams are, in
> fact, "easier" than those "back in the good old days."
> I don't buy that ... and I think it's just an excuse used
> by some old timers to assert that "newbies got a freebie,"
> "newbies aren't *real* hams," etc.
>
> As far as newbies "left there scratching their butts" goes,
> so they may make a mistake or two as they learn ... how

> many old timers could HONESTLY state that they NEVER
> made a mistake when they were newbies (or can actually
> remember accurately back that far, rather than conjuring
> up a convenient, nostaligic "happy days" version of the past?
>
> > Roast no newbie before his time!
>
> Why roast them at all? (Unless of course they demonstrate
> repeatedly that they are simply intent on being disruptive ...)
> Let's just welcome them and help them (nicely and politely,
> not insultingly) to learn the "ins and outs" ...
>
> > This had its sociological effects to be sure. We have all seen the
> > classic Lifer Codeless Tech who becomes the resident genius in
> virtually
> > everything, joins every group in existence, makes a pilgrimage to
> the OM's
> > grave, and shows up at Dayton as regularly as the face of doom. We
> have
> > seen an equally large number show up on the freeband. I have my
> opinions
> > but let us leave it at that; some do not like the message and denial
> mode
> > is generally not a thing of beauty. And having some fugitive from
> 27.555
> > regale the group with DXploits would not exactly win the Dale
> Carnegie
> > seal of approval. They were misled but it was not the OTs doing the
> > misleading. That some got a little bitter about it, joined NCI, and
> > dedicated their lives to iconoclasm -- destroying Morse wherever it
> was
> > found -- is simply one reaction to being told that you really do not
> own
> > the Brooklyn Bridge.
>
> OK ... now, let's set things straight ...
>
> 1st ... NCI's membership does not consist of "classic Lifer Codeless
> Tech(s)," as you imply ... most of the NCI Board are Extras or their
> national equivalents thereof ... and the membership consists of a very
> broad mix of all license classes. Some of those who have been most
> supportive in terms of financially supporting the organization are
> long
> time, 20 wpm Extras ...
>
> 2nd ... NCI's members are not "fugitives from 27.555.
>
> 3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal

> WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> in any way.
>
> You seem to feel that, Morse will "be destroyed" unless everyone
> is forced to learn it by regulatory fiat ... that doesn't project a
> very
> confident view of the value and desirability of Morse ...
>
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

I never said any of the above. NCI's board, founders, leadership etc. is totally tangential to the argument. As I have noted before, I cannot justify Morse testing and never could beyond 12wpm. That a significant fraction of your membership has carried it far beyond this point is undeniable by an honest man. 1&3

Where did I say that they were fugitives from 27.255? That some of them are and those who have taken the tests rather than bitch about them most certainly are is a simple reflection of numbers and nothing more. It is pretty hard to become radioactive without some exposure to that part of the world. A lot of SSB freebanders have become some very good ops and I am proud to have elmered any number of them. But raising it at the Amateur club is not a way toward a favorable impression. 2

Morse will live or die by itself as a mode. On this we agree. In fact it will stand a better chance when we stop crippling newbies with 5wpm bad habits.

I tried to make two points:
1. The Codeless Tech, when sold as the entry to the hobby IN THE PRESENCE OF 25.5 is a fraud. It was left to the OTs to handle the fraud and people as a rule do not welcome the news that they have been fleeced. What happened is simply the predictable result of fraudulent marketing. To some extent, NCI made some promises, or at least was perceived by its clients to have made promises, it could not deliver as well but that may well have been the result of the fraud more than a furthering of it.

2. The result was running a lot of bodies thru Gettysburg with no apparent benefit to the Amateur Service or more importantly the people themselves. And unless and until we deal with some of the reasons why we will do it again. The code tests whatever else one thought of them did serve the purpose of providing a gradual introduction into the hobby by taking some time. For a Novice to pass the test and get lost is one thing, he knows from the very title that it is time to get an orientation; for someone to play some number of questions with the friendly VE who if we don't watch it is 3 months off the freeband himself and be sent off to 20 or 75 meters is not kind to the newbie; not that it is not what a goodly number want at the moment but for their long term benefit a delay to the gratification is not impossible. Much like Watsamatta U requiring freshman English of techies.

I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to fight the next war and give the last one a rest.

Dick N&#65533;BK

585. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:51:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106155109.25542.00000132@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30146

>But as to yours, that would explain the 2x4 your hubby needs strapped to
>his little racer end, so he don't fall in?? ha ha :-) see, another
>smiley face
>
>ta ta big BIG girl.

Just as I thought, I knew she was a Heifer.

586. Re: Amateur Licesnsing Statistics?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 20:52:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106155216.20370.00000015@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 30147

In article <egtg3ucbthsjufk53hnts4aq4dlrqd06vc@4ax.com>, "Bill, KD0HG"
<shootspammers@nsight.org> writes:

>Can anyone point out a relevant URL or post the current breakout of amateur
>licenses by class?

Bill,

Some resources:

http://www.ah0a.org

http://www.arrl.org

then search on "license counts" and one of the results will show current
licenses by state and license class, as well as totals.

In addition, the thread "ARS License Numbers" contains posts by me of current
totals, going back a few months.

Here's the latest totals, with the totals of May 14, 2000 (one month after
restructuring) for comparison:

These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 1, 2002:

Novice - 40,155 (decrease of 9,174)
Tech - 234,319 (increase of 28,925)
Tech Plus - 85,438 (decrease of 43,422)
General - 138,657 (increase of 25,980)
Advanced - 86,546 (decrease of 13,236)
Extra - 97,995 (increase of 19,245)
Total - 683,110 (increase of 8,318)

73 de Jim, N2EY

587. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:09:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106160930.13187.00000014@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 30148

In article <_CGZ7.326865$W8.12555459@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Re the deer whistles, experience in the Northland is mixed to say the
>least. Had at least one friend swear all they did was cause the deer to
>look at you before jumping out in front of you.

I'd prefer a chin turret with twin fifties from a B-24J, actually.
>
>Sounds like you got one on his way to somewhere else that ignored the road
>with you in it. Not a lot you are going to do about that.

~6 PM, Rte 202 N near Dilworthtown Inn, on the way back from DuPont's little
greenhouse (now called Longwood Gardens). Took out a doe with a 2001 Honda
Odyssey. Game commission got the doe, body shop's got the car, I get the
deductible and the rental. And yes, it's comprehensive, not a collision.
>
>In days of old, no longer, it made a diff whether you hit the deer or the
>deer hit you on whether you had a deductible (Comp often did not at the
>time) or not. Caused a lot of complaints not the least among adjusters
>who felt it was kind of silly to do a psychoanalysis on a dead deer.
>
Exactamundo.

73 de Jim, N2EY

588. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:14:20 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uuVfHbvlBHA.1684@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30149

CAM wrote:

> My, how times change. Now the Ruskkies are being held up as
> role models.

The Russian licensing model was always admired by many.

To ensure their new amateurs were "ready for prime time",
transmitting licenses were issued only after a structured
"apprenticeship" at an organized club station. Their qualification
also included demonstrating their receiving abilities by collecting
"SWL" cards from a specified number of stations (100 IIRC)
before being issued a transmitting license.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

589. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:23:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1afh1urv1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30150

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105000849.04115.00000838@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3C35FC0F.92A1D8F5@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >But for a more meaningful comparison
> >we should strip out of the population numbers the kids
> >too young to likely get a license. How many 3 year old
> >extras are there?
>
> US census data shows that the percentage of the population that are
children
> has been dropping steadily since 1970. End of the baby boom, folks living
> longer, folks waiting longer to have kids and having fewer or nor nkids,
etc.,
> etc.
>
> >But ignoring this, a rough approx. would
> >be that the population increased by 1.38 times, and the
> >ham population increased 2.51 times. That would be
> >2.51/1.38=1.825 times faster. It seems that the ARS
> >is in fairly good shape in terms of growth over the long term.
>
> Think about that the next time somebody says the sky is falling and we
gotta
> make radical changes to license requirements in order to save ham radio.

So who said that? No such argument was used to justify the FCC
opening up the initial NPRM and only an occasional commentor
used the argument in their individual comments. Nothing in the final
R&O made any claim about any need to "save ham radio."

The end result is that no one bought the argument (certainly
not the FCC) that restructuring was needed to "save ham radio."
Restructuring was strictly the result of the biennial review
the FCC decided to self impose on all services (i.e. Congress
mandated the reviews on certain specific services, not
including Part 97...and the FCC decided to do them all.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

590. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:29:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1afkr$j02$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30051

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > > while ARS grew about 250%
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
> > of amateur growth relative to population came after
> > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> > entry point ...
>
> ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as an
> entry level license, was done away with.

Nope, the NOVICE was NOT eliminated at all until 4/15/00. That
can be used to reflect or suggest that people were willing to
go the extra distance (Novice theory + Tech theory exams) to
become a ham rather than simply Novice (theory + 5wpm code).

> It stands to reason that, if
> you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be attracted.

The question has been, why was it difficult. Clearly (IMHO) many
people did NOT want to go the code route at all, but they were
willing to study more theory to become a Tech than was needed to
become a Novice.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

591. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:38:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ag130t2h@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30058

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C37CC10.EBA1A325@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C376D4E.35CA3525@IEEE.org...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > If you want ham radio to be overpopulated with W5TIT's the all is
more
> > > > than well.
> > >
> > > I would certainly prefer W5TIT's in ham radio over more Dick's.
> >
> > We already have enough of those.
>
> We have more than enough TITs in ham radio already, yep.

I was refering to the latter part of Cecil's statement, so be careful you
don't pull a muscle while giving yourself that pat on the back.
>

592. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:40:49 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ag560t88@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30059

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:#u$pz4nlBHA.908@cpimsnntpa02...
> The opinion of Dick Carroll seems to be......
>
> >
> > We have more than enough TITs in ham radio already, yep.
> >
>
> Not like we used to have! Does anyone remember Anita,
> ZS1TZ, in the mid '60s, and the photo on her QSL? Enough
> to make a Baptist preacher break out in a sweat!
>
> With all kind wishes for 2.002K,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

WTH! Scan it and post it so the rest of us can see it!

593. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:41:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1agap$c7q$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30052

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106123847.19179.00000016@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> >in any way.
>
> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten years
now?

NO it hasn't. There is still an HF code requirement (5 wpm in
the USA) which lingers because the international
treaty (25.5) still requires HF licensed hams to know
morse code.

> BTW, good luck w/Russia. They've already said phooey re. total
> elimination...oops, "Nyet!"

Once the ITU treaty changes, that means nothing
beyond the Russian borders.

Other than the Soviets, no other country has taken
such a "keep the code" position.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

594. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:46:26 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201062144530.14253-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 30053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 5 Jan 2002, Moparholic wrote:
>I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
>that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
>freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
>freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
>you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
>we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
>write to about this at the ARRL?

Articles about "freeband DX or ... mods to get 25 to 32 MHz ...."

Oh, you mean those things which are ILLEGAL? Why do you expect such things to
be even recognized, let alone in other than a negative light?

Perhaps there's your problem....

595. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:47:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1agmt$ut6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30054

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:UL2_7.30513$fe1.496894@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3c3858dc_1@news7.fast.net...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:JsPZ7.330041$W8.12611765@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > [snip]
> > >
> > > The available Elmer shortage if correct tends to imply sheer
> > > chaos when the licenses become codeless which is a point
> > > I tend to agree with.
> >
> > Why are codeless hams more likely to cause "chaos" than
> > coded ones? I don't get that one ... please explain.
> >
> > > I have argued here that the point is not whom to exclude or
> > > standards but rather how one absorbs newbies in any large
> > > number into a hobby with long standing traditions and practices.
> >
> > Heaven forbid that some of those "long standing traditions
> > an practices" might actually change a bit (after all, ham radio
> > must, for all time, remain ever as it was, right?) NOT!
> >
> > This is not to say that everything would/should be turned
> > upside down over night ... but like everything else, ham
> > radio will have to accept *some* change over time in
> > order to remain relevant ... otherwise, it will ultimately go
> > the way of the dinosaurs ... unable (unwilling) to adapt to
> > changing conditions, thus unable to survive.
> >
> > > It is not the hobby to fear for but the bright souls who
> > > easily pass the new exams and are kind of left there
> > > scratching their butts.
> >
> > This still seems to presuppose that the exams are, in
> > fact, "easier" than those "back in the good old days."
> > I don't buy that ... and I think it's just an excuse used
> > by some old timers to assert that "newbies got a freebie,"
> > "newbies aren't *real* hams," etc.

> >
> > As far as newbies "left there scratching their butts" goes,
> > so they may make a mistake or two as they learn ... how
> > many old timers could HONESTLY state that they NEVER
> > made a mistake when they were newbies (or can actually
> > remember accurately back that far, rather than conjuring
> > up a convenient, nostaligic "happy days" version of the past?
> >
> > > Roast no newbie before his time!
> >
> > Why roast them at all? (Unless of course they demonstrate
> > repeatedly that they are simply intent on being disruptive ...)
> > Let's just welcome them and help them (nicely and politely,
> > not insultingly) to learn the "ins and outs" ...
> >
> > > This had its sociological effects to be sure. We have all seen the
> > > classic Lifer Codeless Tech who becomes the resident genius in
> > virtually
> > > everything, joins every group in existence, makes a pilgrimage to
> > the OM's
> > > grave, and shows up at Dayton as regularly as the face of doom. We
> > have
> > > seen an equally large number show up on the freeband. I have my
> > opinions
> > > but let us leave it at that; some do not like the message and denial
> > mode
> > > is generally not a thing of beauty. And having some fugitive from
> > 27.555
> > > regale the group with DXploits would not exactly win the Dale
> > Carnegie
> > > seal of approval. They were misled but it was not the OTs doing the
> > > misleading. That some got a little bitter about it, joined NCI, and
> > > dedicated their lives to iconoclasm -- destroying Morse wherever it
> > was
> > > found -- is simply one reaction to being told that you really do not
> > own
> > > the Brooklyn Bridge.
> >
> > OK ... now, let's set things straight ...
> >
> > 1st ... NCI's membership does not consist of "classic Lifer Codeless
> > Tech(s)," as you imply ... most of the NCI Board are Extras or their
> > national equivalents thereof ... and the membership consists of a very
> > broad mix of all license classes. Some of those who have been most
> > supportive in terms of financially supporting the organization are
> > long
> > time, 20 wpm Extras ...
> >
> > 2nd ... NCI's members are not "fugitives from 27.555.
> >

> > 3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> > found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> > requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> > WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> > in any way.
> >
> > You seem to feel that, Morse will "be destroyed" unless everyone
> > is forced to learn it by regulatory fiat ... that doesn't project a
> > very
> > confident view of the value and desirability of Morse ...
> >
> > - --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
>
> I never said any of the above. NCI's board, founders, leadership etc. is
> totally tangential to the argument. As I have noted before, I cannot
> justify Morse testing and never could beyond 12wpm. That a significant
> fraction of your membership has carried it far beyond this point is
> undeniable by an honest man. 1&3

We have and continue to "undeniably" work for the TOTAL
elimination of all code TESTING.

NOTHING in our efforts, our charter or otherwise exists
whereby we (NCI) want to end or eliminate anyone's
ability to use Morse as a ham.

> Morse will live or die by itself as a mode. On this we agree. In fact it
> will stand a better chance when we stop crippling newbies with 5wpm bad
> habits.
>
> I tried to make two points:
> 1. The Codeless Tech, when sold as the entry to the hobby IN THE PRESENCE
> OF 25.5 is a fraud. It was left to the OTs to handle the fraud and people
> as a rule do not welcome the news that they have been fleeced. What
> happened is simply the predictable result of fraudulent marketing. To
> some extent, NCI made some promises, or at least was perceived by its
> clients to have made promises, it could not deliver as well but that may
> well have been the result of the fraud more than a furthering of it.

I have no clue as to "what promises" you attribute to NCI.
Please enlighten us.

> 2. The result was running a lot of bodies thru Gettysburg with no apparent
> benefit to the Amateur Service or more importantly the people themselves.
> And unless and until we deal with some of the reasons why we will do it
> again. The code tests whatever else one thought of them did serve the
> purpose of providing a gradual introduction into the hobby by taking some
> time. For a Novice to pass the test and get lost is one thing, he knows
> from the very title that it is time to get an orientation; for someone to
> play some number of questions with the friendly VE who if we don't watch
> it is 3 months off the freeband himself and be sent off to 20 or 75 meters

> is not kind to the newbie; not that it is not what a goodly number want at
> the moment but for their long term benefit a delay to the gratification is
> not impossible. Much like Watsamatta U requiring freshman English of
> techies.

Yet your point 2 hasn't ever been brought up in FCC
comments and, therefore, held in any positive light by
the FCC or anyone else.

> I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to fight
> the next war and give the last one a rest.

The "war" isn't over until ALL code testing ends...it is
that simple.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

596. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:52:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ah0svob1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30055

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> > >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> > >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> > >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> > >could have been good, productive hams ...)
> >
> > Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
> > 73 de Bert
> > KC2HMN
>
> I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing issue
> is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a barrier
> to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can
> certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I am
> told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.

In addition to Kim's comments...
It is a barier because it is, in this day and age,
nothing but an old requirement that causes
people to spend considerable (for some) time
with no real purpose. You can disagree on that,
but that is clearly the mindset of most administrations
today and the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

597. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:54:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1agvo0uhs@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30063
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote in message
news:a18v6vdtq1@bob.news.rcn.net...

> That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
> ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.
>
> Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com

20,000-plus newsgroups on usenet, some have flame wars and trolls that would make this newsgroup look like a Teletubby show. Yet, this is the only group in which a few people insist that you post a piece of information about yourself that can be searched to reveal your name, address, and, using that information, possibly credit card, Social Security, and telephone numbers. Can you say identity theft? I thought you could.

598. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 21:58:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ahau$ja0$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30056

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106081610.24724.00000763@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c3750ee_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
> >> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >> >
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> > >
> >> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> >> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > > What is the actual ratio of 1970 hams vs 1970 population
> >> > > > > compared to today? The population has not been growing
> >> > > > > anywhere like it used to (abortions, birth control, etc.)
> >> > > >
> >> > > > All numbers are rounded off - others are invited to post more
> >> > accurate
> >> > > > figures:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > US population:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > 1970 - 203 million
> >> > > > 1980 - 227 million
> >> > > > 1990 - 249 million
> >> > > > 2000 - 281 million
> >> > > >
> >> > > > US hams:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > 1970 - 270,000 (approximate, interpolated from other data)
> >> > > > 1980 - 350,000
> >> > > > 1990 -
> >> > > > 2000 - 680,000
> >> > >
> >> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> >> > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> >> > > while ARS grew about 250%
> >> > >
> >> > > Cheers,
> >> > > Bill K2UNK
```

>
> Let's look at what happened more closely. Here's a summary:
>
> US Hams:
>
> 1970: 270,000
> 1980: 350,000
> 1989: 500,000
> 1990: 514,000 (interpolated from 1989's 500,000 and 2.84% growth rate)
> 2000: 680,000
>
> It has been shown previously that the growth rate from 1977 to 1989 was
3.61%
> but that it dropped to 2.84% from 1989 to 2000.
>
> Combining with population figures we get:
>
> Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
>
> 1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
> 1980: 227 million 1.12% 350,000 0.154%
> 1990: 249 million 0.93% 514,000 0.206%
> 2000: 281 million 1.22% 680,000 0.242%
>
> US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052%
in
> the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s.
>
> So the growth SLOWED after the introduction of code test waivers and the
Tech
> lost its code test.
>
> >> > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
> >> > of amateur growth relative to population came after
> >> > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> >> > entry point ...
>
> NO. WRONG. Just the opposite:
>
> 1980 to 1990: 0.206/0.154 = 1.338
> 1990 to 2000: 0.242/0.206 = 1.175
>
> In other words, the percentage of the population that had a ham license
> increased 1.338 times during the '80s but only 1.175 times during the
'90s.
>
> The "slope of the line" DECREASED "after the no code tech license provided
a
> more reasonable entry point ..."
>

> And we have not allowed for the effects of the change to 10 year licenses,
> which does not begin to show until 1989.
> >>
> >> ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as
> >an
> >> entry level license, was done away with. It stands to reason that,
> >if
> >> you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be
> >attracted.
> >>
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Or, as an alternative viewpoint, if your remove unnecessary,
> >arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry, those who
> >were interested, but disuaded by those unnecessary barriers
> >will "jump in."
> >
> Except that's NOT what happened, according to the numbers. Growth DROPPED
> during the '90s, compared to the '80s.
>
> If anyone has more numbers, please post 'em.

But the rate didn't appear to drop below the rate of
general population growth. That is the key issue...
if one is concerned about that at all. The intitial comment
was that the growth of ham radio was LESS than the growth
of the general population. Unless you map that year
by year to see individual yearly stats,
the long term numbers still contradict that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

599. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:01:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ahgr$84k$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30057

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105000850.04115.00000839@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a15bmrrdq1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> >population.
>
> Yup. But while the growth in the population has been steady, ham radio's
growth
> speeds up and slows down.
>
> Here's a list of the US ARS population from the end of WW2 until today.
These
> were obtained from callbooks, published FCC bumbers and other historic
data,
> not interpolated. Numbers are rounded off.
>
> 1946 - 60,000
> 1950 - 90,000
> 1956 - 140,000
> 1963 - 250,000
> 1970 - 270,000
> 1977 - 327,000
> 1989 - 500,000
> 2000 - 680,000
>
> >Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> >while ARS grew about 250%
>
> Which sez something about the need to make radical changes in order to
"assure
> the survival and prosperity of ham radio" in the 21st century. Or about
claims
> that ham radio is "dying". The 10 year license term thing in 1984 confuses
the
> issue a bit, but those who claim the sky is falling aren't looking at the
> long-term numbers.

I agree, which is why I have never accepted the
claim/argument that ham radio is dying.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

600. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:06:25 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <BT3_7.342510$W8.12702228@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The post is a forgery. Most things cross-posted between the two groups
are.

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10201062144530.14253-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 5 Jan 2002, Moparholic wrote:
> >I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> >that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> >freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> >freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> >you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> >we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> >write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> Articles about "freeband DX or ... mods to get 25 to 32 MHz ...."
>
> Oh, you mean those things which are ILLEGAL? Why do you expect such
things to
> be even recognized, let alone in other than a negative light?
>
> Perhaps there's your problem....
>

601. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:06:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ahlt0vct@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30065

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106131144.11381.00000044@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >I'm
> >appalled at the amount of member funds which have gone into this
> >particular porkbarrel sinkhole ...
> >
> >Carl -
>
> Sounds like NCI to me, Carl why did it take you so long to upgrade?

Why did it take you so long to change your address in QRZ when you moved?

602. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:08:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ahuerhm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30061

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020105000848.04115.00000837@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a134vm$5iv$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> The rights to regulate interstate commerce. Radio is interstate
commerce,
> >and
> >> has been recognized as such since the early days of broadcasting.
> >"Commerce"
> >> doesn't just mean commercial stations but all radio.
> >
> >Yet cities, counties and states can and do regulate interstate commerce
in
> >the cases where companies engaged in interstate commerce must
> >comply with state and local building codes, tax laws, employment
> >practices, etc.
>
> Building codes and other similar regs are safety issues. A ham license
doesn't
> give one the right to put up an unsafe tower.

It is NOT only building codes. It is zoning, hours of operation,
etc. The feds have NOT pre-empted such laws simply
because the company is engaged in interstate commerce.

> Many of the other laws involve commercial operations and do not involve
> personal stuff like ham radio.

BUT the argument is/was that the states can't regulate
interstae commerce. Clearly, there are many ways
in which that does happen.

> The important thing is that it's regulation, not prohibition.

Your point?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

603. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:11:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1aia3$s33$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

If you're really serious (I doubt), look in the QST masthead
and send a letter to the Pres...or to the correspondence
page. Make a fool of yourself it it makes you happy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

604. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:31:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <qf4_7.342543$W8.12705162@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30064

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a1agmt$ut6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:UL2_7.30513$fe1.496894@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c3858dc_1@news7.fast.net...
> > > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > > Hash: SHA1
> > >
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:JsPZ7.330041$W8.12611765@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > [snip]
> > > >
> > > > The available Elmer shortage if correct tends to imply sheer
> > > > chaos when the licenses become codeless which is a point
> > > > I tend to agree with.
> > >
> > > Why are codeless hams more likely to cause "chaos" than
> > > coded ones? I don't get that one ... please explain.
> > >
> > > > I have argued here that the point is not whom to exclude or
> > > > standards but rather how one absorbs newbies in any large
> > > > number into a hobby with long standing traditions and practices.
> > >
> > > Heaven forbid that some of those "long standing traditions
> > > an practices" might actually change a bit (after all, ham radio
> > > must, for all time, remain ever as it was, right?) NOT!
> > >
> > > This is not to say that everything would/should be turned
> > > upside down over night ... but like everything else, ham
> > > radio will have to accept *some* change over time in
> > > order to remain relevant ... otherwise, it will ultimately go
> > > the way of the dinosaurs ... unable (unwilling) to adapt to
> > > changing conditions, thus unable to survive.
> > >
> > > > It is not the hobby to fear for but the bright souls who
> > > > easily pass the new exams and are kind of left there
> > > > scratching their butts.
> > >
> > > This still seems to presuppose that the exams are, in
> > > fact, "easier" than those "back in the good old days."
```

> > > I don't buy that ... and I think it's just an excuse used
> > > by some old timers to assert that "newbies got a freebie,"
> > > "newbies aren't *real* hams," etc.
> > >
> > > As far as newbies "left there scratching their butts" goes,
> > > so they may make a mistake or two as they learn ... how
> > > many old timers could HONESTLY state that they NEVER
> > > made a mistake when they were newbies (or can actually
> > > remember accurately back that far, rather than conjuring
> > > up a convenient, nostaligic "happy days" version of the past?
> > >
> > > > Roast no newbie before his time!
> > >
> > > Why roast them at all? (Unless of course they demonstrate
> > > repeatedly that they are simply intent on being disruptive ...)
> > > Let's just welcome them and help them (nicely and politely,
> > > not insultingly) to learn the "ins and outs" ...
> > >
> > > > This had its sociological effects to be sure. We have all seen
the
> > > > classic Lifer Codeless Tech who becomes the resident genius in
> > > virtually
> > > > everything, joins every group in existence, makes a pilgrimage to
> > > the OM's
> > > > grave, and shows up at Dayton as regularly as the face of doom.
We
> > > have
> > > > seen an equally large number show up on the freeband. I have my
> > > opinions
> > > > but let us leave it at that; some do not like the message and
denial
> > > mode
> > > > is generally not a thing of beauty. And having some fugitive from
> > > 27.555
> > > > regale the group with DXploits would not exactly win the Dale
> > > Carnegie
> > > > seal of approval. They were misled but it was not the OTs doing
the
> > > > misleading. That some got a little bitter about it, joined NCI,
and
> > > > dedicated their lives to iconoclasm -- destroying Morse wherever
it
> > > was
> > > > found -- is simply one reaction to being told that you really do
not
> > > own
> > > > the Brooklyn Bridge.
> > >
> > > OK ... now, let's set things straight ...
> > >

> > > 1st ... NCI's membership does not consist of "classic Lifer Codeless
> > > Tech(s)," as you imply ... most of the NCI Board are Extras or their
> > > national equivalents thereof ... and the membership consists of a
very
> > > broad mix of all license classes. Some of those who have been most
> > > supportive in terms of financially supporting the organization are
> > > long
> > > time, 20 wpm Extras ...
> > >
> > > 2nd ... NCI's members are not "fugitives from 27.555.
> > >
> > > 3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> > > found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> > > requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> > > WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> > > in any way.
> > >
> > > You seem to feel that, Morse will "be destroyed" unless everyone
> > > is forced to learn it by regulatory fiat ... that doesn't project a
> > > very
> > > confident view of the value and desirability of Morse ...
> > >
> > > - --
> > > Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> >
> > I never said any of the above. NCI's board, founders, leadership etc.
is
> > totally tangential to the argument. As I have noted before, I cannot
> > justify Morse testing and never could beyond 12wpm. That a
significant
> > fraction of your membership has carried it far beyond this point is
> > undeniable by an honest man. 1&3
>
> We have and continue to "undeniably" work for the TOTAL
> elimination of all code TESTING.
>
> NOTHING in our efforts, our charter or otherwise exists
> whereby we (NCI) want to end or eliminate anyone's
> ability to use Morse as a ham.
>
> > Morse will live or die by itself as a mode. On this we agree. In
fact it
> > will stand a better chance when we stop crippling newbies with 5wpm
bad
> > habits.
> >
> > I tried to make two points:
> > 1. The Codeless Tech, when sold as the entry to the hobby IN THE
PRESENCE
> > OF 25.5 is a fraud. It was left to the OTs to handle the fraud and

people
> > as a rule do not welcome the news that they have been fleeced. What
> > happened is simply the predictable result of fraudulent marketing. To
> > some extent, NCI made some promises, or at least was perceived by its
> > clients to have made promises, it could not deliver as well but that
may
> > well have been the result of the fraud more than a furthering of it.
>
> I have no clue as to "what promises" you attribute to NCI.
> Please enlighten us.
>
> > 2. The result was running a lot of bodies thru Gettysburg with no
apparent
> > benefit to the Amateur Service or more importantly the people
themselves.
> > And unless and until we deal with some of the reasons why we will do
it
> > again. The code tests whatever else one thought of them did serve the
> > purpose of providing a gradual introduction into the hobby by taking
some
> > time. For a Novice to pass the test and get lost is one thing, he
knows
> > from the very title that it is time to get an orientation; for someone
to
> > play some number of questions with the friendly VE who if we don't
watch
> > it is 3 months off the freeband himself and be sent off to 20 or 75
meters
> > is not kind to the newbie; not that it is not what a goodly number
want at
> > the moment but for their long term benefit a delay to the
gratification is
> > not impossible. Much like Watsamatta U requiring freshman English of
> > techies.
>
> Yet your point 2 hasn't ever been brought up in FCC
> comments and, therefore, held in any positive light by
> the FCC or anyone else.
>
> > I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to
fight
> > the next war and give the last one a rest.
>
> The "war" isn't over until ALL code testing ends...it is
> that simple.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

>

You want to fight it, feel free. I think you may, however, have illustrated that the fanaticism goes a bit further up the organization than Carl at least is willing to admit.

Just what in hell does the lack of FCC pronouncement have to do with the price of beans? It does not involve code testing, it involves a decent transition after you have won your war. Nothing exists in a vacuum and the Law of Unintended Consequences is out there to bite you. When it required 20, it took some time to get there so requiring the VE to be an Extra for HF licenses guaranteed that he would have some time in the hobby and presumably not be subject to pressures to give things away. If all that happens is Element 1 being flushed, it is not only possible but almost probable that you will have exam sessions at CB keydowns in 6 months. So one of the potential by-products of winning your war is complete destruction of the VE system. Regardless of your estimate of the odds, it would seem first that this is not likely to dawn on the FCC by itself, and second that it is the responsibility of NCI to perhaps suggest that two years as an Extra be required for being a VE for the good of the service. Even the Geneva Convention requires the victors to feed the refugees.

Bill, even you could not be oblivious to the number of people even in my short span who were firmly convinced No-code would be the rule by 2000 at the latest. Self-deception, fraudulent marketing, damfino.

Dick NBK

605. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 22:45:17 UTC
From: Whoisgeorge <whoisgeorge@home.comspam>
Message-ID: <1s4_7.359640$5A3.136616174@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick, I see you have fit right in with the CB Band Of Hypocrites, your blaming a guy for something he didn't do here is the header of the original poster and the guy who you accuse of replying to himself. Think before you speak Dick, you have guys sticking up for you behind the scenes but if you keep this type of idiocy up I think you will loose all support from them. Since you have been labeled as head Keyclown Cheerleader. If you do reply make it understandable not a twistedhed type Rant.

Original Poster

From: moparho1ic@hotmail.com (Moparholic)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Damn Hams!
Date: 5 Jan 2002 17:53:11 -0800
Organization: http://groups.google.com/
Lines: 9
Message-ID: <b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 64.12.106.33
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1010281992 491 127.0.0.1 (6 Jan 2002 01:53:12 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: 6 Jan 2002 01:53:12 GMT

Accused Poster of Original by Dick:

Reply-To: "Hammer" <spam@spam.com>
From: "Hammer" <spam@spam.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy
References: <b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>
Subject: Re: Damn Hams!
Lines: 20
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
Message-ID: <HDOZ7.1889$nI1.12697@news1.wwck1.ri.home.com>
Date: Sun, 06 Jan 2002 02:28:55 GMT
NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.8.104.52
X-Complaints-To: abuse@home.net
X-Trace: news1.wwck1.ri.home.com 1010284135 24.8.104.52 (Sat, 05 Jan 2002 18:28:55 PST)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 05 Jan 2002 18:28:55 PST

Organization: Excite@Home - The Leader in Broadband http://home.com/faster

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:TGOZ7.10029$fe1.406345@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> We have here a reply by the same guy that wrote it. He IS barrel scraping
> tonite.
>
> "Hammer" <spam@spam.com> wrote in message
> news:HDOZ7.1889$nI1.12697@news1.wwck1.ri.home.com...
> > If you just finished reading QST and have to ask where to write...DUH?
> Do
> > you think you have any chance to pass a test? DUH..
> >
> > HELLO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Maybe you can find who to write in
> QST....DUH...
> > LOL...
> >
> >
> > "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > > write to about this at the ARRL?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic~
> >
> >
>
>

606. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 23:09:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106180945.07935.00000007@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30067

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
>the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"

Let's hold it there a second. Who are these folks, exactly?

>... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues calling
>long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a station.

Rude is one reason, but only one. Usually, when you hear that sort of thing, those in the pile don't know that the DX station has answered someone else. On HF SSB, most stations are either talking or listening. Even though practical IVI (instantaneous voice interruption) was demonstrated by K3JH in the late 1960s.

>(I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
>"listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)

The problem is that they can't listen WHILE transmitting.
>
>Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
>just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
>Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
>dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
>EVER calling "CQ" ONCE.

Cool. Pretty nice when the spots are up and ya live on top of a hill, huh?

Just for the record, two months ago I worked 48 states and six Canadian provinces in 13 hours using 5 watts output from a homebuilt rig and a homebrew trap inverted V at 35 feet. And I didn't call CQ to work any of 'em.

btw, what bands/modes didja use for the above? Rig and antenna homebuilt?

> (Just to counter previous assertions that
>the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting CQ
>DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of fun
>with my new privileges ... tough.

Considering your comments about "electronic paintball wars" and such in the past, it's kinda surreal to see you counting countries, Carl. ;-)

Waddya think about eQSLs? Should they be accepted for award credit?
>
>I don't recall "bad-mouthing" rag chewers in general ... there's nothing
>wrong with conversation ... however, some of the incessant banter
>about the problems of aging ... well... gets old :-)

I recall all sorts of jeremiads and jihads from you against virtually everything hams actually DO on the air. Maybe that's all in the past.

Talk about the problems of aging may seem "old" until it's somebody you care about as a friend, and haven't heard from in a while. Then it's another story.

73 de Jim, N2EY

607. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-06 23:10:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106181034.05495.00000135@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 30068

>Why did it take you so long to change your address in QRZ when you moved?
>

What are you talking about? When did I move?

608. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 00:10:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpjbu10.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30069

On Sun, 06 Jan 2002 22:31:50 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:

>If all
>that happens is Element 1 being flushed, it is not only possible but
>almost probable that you will have exam sessions at CB keydowns in 6
>months. So one of the potential by-products of winning your war is
>complete destruction of the VE system. Regardless of your estimate of the
>odds, it would seem first that this is not likely to dawn on the FCC by
>itself,

I don't know if there are any FCC folks left who wasnt to
relive or remember the fiasco of farming out amateur written
tests to several local civil service exam points before the VE
system came into use.

>and second that it is the responsibility of NCI to perhaps suggest
>that two years as an Extra be required for being a VE for the good of the
>service.

I'm totally in favor of that.

>Even the Geneva Convention requires the victors to feed the
>refugees.

No comment.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

(49 years licensed, 26 as an Extra)

609. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:09:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106200950.06877.00001050@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30071

In article <3C38B0E6.121FF41C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Nobody's talking about guns, Rick. In real life it comes down to
>practicality.
>> Many hams find themselves in a bad situation, choice-wise. Many would-be
>hams
>> simply wander away because it's simply too much hassle.
>
>Would you wander away because it's simply too much hassle, Jim?

Cecil, you have no idea how much hassle I've gone through to get/stay on the
air.

>Neither would I.

So everyone must do as you have done?

>I have helped apartment dwellers install dipoles
>in their attics. Chicken-wire end hats work very well.

Been there, done that.

>I helped a
>ham in Tucson set up a vertical in his back yard ala St. Louis
>Vertical style. The black SD-20 telescoping pole was virtually
>invisible at night using black insulated wire.

But not during the day!
>
>One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
>was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
>wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
>performed the attic dipole.

It would be interesting to know the RF exposure from that thing at the 100W
level...

73 de Jim, N2EY

610. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:09:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106200951.06877.00001051@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30070

In article <uuVfHbvlBHA.1684@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>The Russian licensing model was always admired by many.
>
>To ensure their new amateurs were "ready for prime time",
>transmitting licenses were issued only after a structured
>"apprenticeship" at an organized club station. Their qualification
>also included demonstrating their receiving abilities by collecting
>"SWL" cards from a specified number of stations (100 IIRC)
>before being issued a transmitting license.
>
All true. But there's more! I don't know if they still do all of this, though.

Besides all of the above, an aspiring amateur was required to scratch build a receiver of a certain complexity, then use it to collect the required confirmations. He/she would then be required to present receiver for review, and answer any questions on its operation and construction. Only then could the would-be ham have a chance at the code and written tests.

If all requirements were met, a beginner's transmitting license would be granted. Upgrading required not only more tests but more QSLs and more involved construction projects.

Soviet/Russian hams sure aren't appliance operators.

73 de Jim, N2EY

611. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:33:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c38fc49_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30072

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C38B0E6.121FF41C@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Nobody's talking about guns, Rick. In real life it comes down to
practicality.
> > Many hams find themselves in a bad situation, choice-wise. Many would-be
hams
> > simply wander away because it's simply too much hassle.
>
> Would you wander away because it's simply too much hassle, Jim?
> Neither would I. I have helped apartment dwellers install dipoles
> in their attics. Chicken-wire end hats work very well. I helped a
> ham in Tucson set up a vertical in his back yard ala St. Louis
> Vertical style. The black SD-20 telescoping pole was virtually
> invisible at night using black insulated wire.
>
> One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
> was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
> wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
> performed the attic dipole.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Ya know what I want to know? What's proposed for the ham who has a spouse who says, "absolutely not" to the hobby of ham radio in their house, the yard, the garage, the car, etc.? Isn't that grounds for a divorce? When we gonna go to work on Congress for a law that stipulates that spouses and other family members *must* support the hobby of ham radio at their abode? That's what I want to know :o (This tongue-in-cheek episode brought to you as a result of conversations over coffee today...LOL)

Kim W5TIT

612. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:40:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c38fc53_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30073

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a2c5297f17f124989688@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c38a1d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> > "krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
> >
> > Wow, I don't know who you are, probaby good 'ol Dickie--but I am about
the
> > furthest thing from a raido cop that could be. However, since you're so
> > misinformed that you think I am into DX, then your ignorance in other
areas
> > is certainly warranted and no surprise.
>
> Hmmm really Kimber? I seem to have read where you perceived a 2 meter
> repeater user as an illegal operator and harassed that person
> repeatedly. Another fabrication on your part? or just another example
> of telling half truths (seems that is your modus operandi)
>

Show me the post, and I'll decide. If I hear an illegal operator, I *will*
let others know that they are illegal. What do you suggest I do? Hmmmm? I
think that's a far cry from being--how did you put it?--a "radio cop?"

>
> >
> > Now, on to your comments about my fitting into "Carl's world" of amateur
> > radio. If Carl has a propensity for fitting square pegs into round
holes,
> > or v/v, then he can kiss my not-so-royal ass. So can you. (Carl, I
don't
> > think you do as noted, though).
>
> I think that would be not-so-royal-FAT-ass, based on personal
> descriptions of being 5' 4" and 200 pounds?? Wow Kim, better stay off
> the Internet and on the slim-fast :-) see a smiley..just kidding
>

OK, my not-so-royal-FAT-ass, if that suits you better. Is that, somehow,
supposed to mean something to me? It must to you.

>
> But as to yours, that would explain the 2x4 your hubby needs strapped to
> his little racer end, so he don't fall in?? ha ha :-) see, another
> smiley face
>
> ta ta big BIG girl.

>
> I am sure when your ROFLYFAO, the seismometers at Cal Tech will be
> definitely registering something from your neck of Texas

Feeling a little better now?

Kim W5TIT

613. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:51:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1av08mnn1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30074

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:qf4_7.342543$W8.12705162@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a1agmt$ut6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > The "war" isn't over until ALL code testing ends...it is
> > that simple.
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> You want to fight it, feel free. I think you may, however, have
> illustrated that the fanaticism goes a bit further up the organization
> than Carl at least is willing to admit.

I have ONLY illustrated that the "war" is about code
testing. Nothing I have ever stated has been anything more.

> Just what in hell does the lack of FCC pronouncement have to do with the
> price of beans? It does not involve code testing, it involves a decent
> transition after you have won your war.

No transition is needed. But for the 5wpm current test to
stay compliant with the treaty, the FCC would have (IMHO)
dropped that too. Nothing in the FCC R&O addressed any
need for any "transition".

> Nothing exists in a vacuum and
> the Law of Unintended Consequences is out there to bite you. When it
> required 20, it took some time to get there so requiring the VE to be an
> Extra for HF licenses guaranteed that he would have some time in the hobby
> and presumably not be subject to pressures to give things away. If all
> that happens is Element 1 being flushed, it is not only possible but
> almost probable that you will have exam sessions at CB keydowns in 6
> months.

The same dooom & gloom predictions were made about going
to only 5 wpm.

> So one of the potential by-products of winning your war is
> complete destruction of the VE system. Regardless of your estimate of the
> odds, it would seem first that this is not likely to dawn on the FCC by
> itself, and second that it is the responsibility of NCI to perhaps suggest
> that two years as an Extra be required for being a VE for the good of the
> service. Even the Geneva Convention requires the victors to feed the
> refugees.

More same old/same old, doom and gloom.

> Bill, even you could not be oblivious to the number of people even in my
> short span who were firmly convinced No-code would be the rule by 2000 at
> the latest. Self-deception, fraudulent marketing, damfino.

No one in NCI ever predicted all code testing would end by 2000.
The treaty was a well recognized roadblock to that happening.
Even in NCI's filed comments we acknowledged that expectation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

614. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:55:28 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106205528.14659.00000118@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30075

>> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
>> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
>> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
>> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
>> >in any way.
>>
>> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten years
>now?
>
>NO it hasn't. There is still an HF code requirement (5 wpm in
>the USA) which lingers because the international
>treaty (25.5) still requires HF licensed hams to know
>morse code.

Egad, Bill. It sounds like an "all or nothing" demand. Perhaps it "lingers" because many want it to linger. Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement is dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

615. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 01:57:59 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106205759.14659.00000119@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30076

>> >I was mighty impressed with it--by the
>> >way it is the Radio Shack 10M mobile. Very easy to operate mobile,
>better
>> >audio quality than I've heard mobile (it seems to "run quiet"), and not
>> >imposing at all.
>>
>> I see you still cant get away from the CB Style Radios.
>
>Hey, Bert:
>
>Here's an example of that long post I just made a few minutes ago. This guy
>is so wrapped up in what his ham radio should be (for everyone else) that he
>even has a preference for what type of equipment people should use. Plus,
>he acts like he knows me...
>
>Guess how much credence I lend to this?
>
>Kim W5TIT

No sweat Kim,

I have the RF Ltd. version for the mobile.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

616. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey Bert, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:00:34 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106210034.14659.00000120@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30077

>The RE: line should have been Hey Bert.

No sweat again, Kim. At least you didn't call me butt. Oops, does that count as an anatomical reference? I know that's a touchy (Ouch!) subject. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

617. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:01:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c390130_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30078

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106154627.25542.00000127@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >One of the only Real Hams left, most of the new ones are CBplussers
> >.....
> >
> >Regarding last line, above, I shoulda known...LOL
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Does that statement apply to you "TIT"?

The "handle" here is Kim.

Moi? Certainly not. I am a fine, upstanding ham radio operator. However,
by your actions on this newsgroup and in your posts, and on the QRZ website,
I'd say you come pretty darned close to the attributes you so dislike in
some CBers, and ham radio operators.

Maybe you can improve your practices?

Kim W5TIT

618. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey Bert, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:05:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3901f1$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30080

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106210034.14659.00000120@mb-bj.news.cs.com...
> >The RE: line should have been Hey Bert.
>
> No sweat again, Kim. At least you didn't call me butt. Oops, does that
count as
> an anatomical reference? I know that's a touchy (Ouch!) subject. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

hohohoho, you are on a roll... Er, not *that* roll...LOL

Kim W5TIT

619. Re: Amateur Licesnsing Statistics?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:09:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1avul0ro4@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill, KD0HG" <shootspammers@nsight.org> wrote in message
news:egtg3ucbthsjufk53hnts4aq4dlrqd06vc@4ax.com...
>
> Can anyone point out a relevant URL or post the current breakout of
amateur
> licenses by class?
>
> 73,
>
> Bill

Yes.

620. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:10:14 UTC
From: eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e9af79fa.0201061810.5a3e3c85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Depending on the type of equipment you have or are willing to get
there are plenty of places to go.

29.7 to 30 mhz is one choice. It's just above the ham band.

The other solution is to go down. The advantage of going down is that
the band tends to be open longer. You may want to look at operating
between 26 and 26.5.

wavelengthzero@aol.com (The Dude) wrote in message
news:<8b6cfc98.0201031619.26653dfe@posting.google.com>...
> > > Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> > > crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> > > messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> > > gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> > > Truckers are leading the way....
> > >
> > > Scott, Unit-69
> > > Chesapeake Bay
> > >
> > > --
> > > NOTE that someone is forging me using "upplus@hotmailNOSPAM.com". Pay
> > > not attention to this idiot. My posts always come from
> > > "uppluss@hotmail.com".
>
> hehe pretty soon we are going to be transmitting on the 30Mhz band.
> but seriously you cant move on up past 27.990, I dont want to mess
> with the Ham Radio Users, so this is the last stand. no where else to
> go.

621. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:17:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <exRZ8kylBHA.1248@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30091

CAM wrote:

> One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
> was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
> wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
> performed the attic dipole.

Living inside your own quad, Cecil?

Now that starts to explain some things! ;-)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

622. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:31:52 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30081

Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still irritates me to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and called CQ with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called me to tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch traffic somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if there was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX) I'd have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling from KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a doctor, and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made about amateur radio.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only about 5 over a good straight key.

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c380574_1@newsa.ev1.net...
>
> Man, the "big guns" sure do get pissed off quick, don't they?!
ROFLMAO....
> Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a turn-off for
> enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for anyone who
> might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad side of
> ham radio, that chest thumping.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>

623. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:32:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201061832.3aa13023@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30082

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C38A768.9EF0404E@IEEE.org>...
> krill wrote:
> > Come to think of it, I, as a medical
> > profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably is.
>
> Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
> 'one' or 'zero', it's broke.
>
>
Now lessee here Cecil, I did copy your "digital" straight key pumping
"digital" cw on 40 into yer "digital" aerial via yer "digital" radio
and obviously none of those were broke, they worked ducky . . you
schitzoid, stupid, trolling again or what?
>
>
w3rv

624. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:37:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106213731.23507.00000071@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30085

In article <3c369fc5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> writes:

>
>I imagine that Dave Heil and Dick M. think your station pretty much sucks,
>Larry. In fact, to call your station "effective" is probably, in their
>eyes, sacrilege.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Well, if that's what they think, they haven't said so, yet. However,
rather than allowing you to put words into their mouths, I think I'll
let them say so themselves, if they're so inclined.

73 de Larry, K3LT

625. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:37:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106213731.23507.00000072@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30087

In article <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
>The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
>and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
>with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
>you a ground.

Bob:

Omigosh. Why the heck would I want to do THAT??? All I need
to be forced to go QRT for good is to introduce an RF current directly
into the building's CATV system! Thanks, but no thanks!

73 de Larry, K3LT

626. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:37:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106213732.23507.00000074@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30084

In article <20020105160914.27168.00000949@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Another option is to run a counterpoise wire.

Jim:

I'm already doing that, using an RF "artificial ground." Seems to work, after a fashion.

73 de Larry, K3LT

627. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:37:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106213732.23507.00000073@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30086

In article <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
>The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
>and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
>with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
>you a ground.

Bob:

Omigosh. Why the heck would I want to do THAT???

628. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey Bert, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:39:40 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020106213940.14659.00000125@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30088

>hohohoho, you are on a roll... Er, not *that* roll...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Sorry if that didn't come off as humorously as I'd wanted. (I certainly meant no offense.) BTW, Happy New Year. :-) I'll be answering your other post re. the 5-wpm code requirement in the morning. I've a revved up 1-yr. old on my shoulder (2nd harmonic) who just came home from his first birthday party. Tired/exhausted doesn't even begin to describe us. (Particularly my XYL.)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

629. Re: Amateur Licesnsing Statistics?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:40:58 UTC
From: ac6v <hamguide73@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C390ABA.AF0C6B2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 30089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

For Ham Populations etc -- See URL:
http://ac6v.com/qslmisc.htm#HAM

"Bill, KD0HG" wrote:

> Can anyone point out a relevant URL or post the current breakout of amateur
> licenses by class?
>
> 73,
>
> Bill

--
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
I doubt, therefore I might be!
http://ac6v.com

630. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 02:45:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1b26aslb1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30090

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106205528.14659.00000118@mb-bj.news.cs.com...
> >> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it is
> >> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> >> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> >> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> >> >in any way.
> >>
> >> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten
years
> >now?
> >
> >NO it hasn't. There is still an HF code requirement (5 wpm in
> >the USA) which lingers because the international
> >treaty (25.5) still requires HF licensed hams to know
> >morse code.
>
> Egad, Bill. It sounds like an "all or nothing" demand. Perhaps it
"lingers"
> because many want it to linger. Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement is
> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"

I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.

Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
but that in as much as you only want the voice
of existing hams heard.

The issue of testing or not is NOT nor should it be
a function of what already licensed hams want as
might be determined by a vote. The issue of the code
test as a requirement (or any other requirement for
a ham license) is purely a function of what should be
required as a matter of public policy
as determined in the USA through the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

631. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 03:43:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3918ed$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30092

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still irritates
me
> to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and called
CQ
> with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called me
to
> tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch
traffic
> somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if
there
> was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX) I'd
> have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a doctor,
> and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made about
> amateur radio.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only about 5
> over a good straight key.
>

Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.

Kim W5TIT

632. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 03:55:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30093

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpjbu10.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sun, 06 Jan 2002 22:31:50 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >If all
> >that happens is Element 1 being flushed, it is not only possible but
> >almost probable that you will have exam sessions at CB keydowns in 6
> >months. So one of the potential by-products of winning your war is
> >complete destruction of the VE system. Regardless of your estimate of
the
> >odds, it would seem first that this is not likely to dawn on the FCC by
> >itself,
>
> I don't know if there are any FCC folks left who wasnt to
> relive or remember the fiasco of farming out amateur written
> tests to several local civil service exam points before the VE
> system came into use.
>
> >and second that it is the responsibility of NCI to perhaps suggest
> >that two years as an Extra be required for being a VE for the good of
the
> >service.
>
> I'm totally in favor of that.
>
> >Even the Geneva Convention requires the victors to feed the
> >refugees.
>
> No comment.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> (49 years licensed, 26 as an Extra)
>
>
>

I wouldn't either and you have a few, only a few, on me in years.

But when the war ends it is kind of nice to have a picture of what things
ought to look like. If these cats figure that virtue will be its own
reward and we will all procede arm in arm into the sunset they are dumber
than even I think they are.

Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones you can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some responsibility to forsee and fix. They will get it wrong: hell the framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe in blowing things up far more than putting them together again.

The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to have proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang the old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives of the apparatchiks.

Dick N&#65533;BK

633. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 04:07:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30094

```
>The "handle" here is Kim.
>

Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT
```

634. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 04:11:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020106231102.25512.00000221@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30095

>by your actions on this newsgroup and in your posts, and on the QRZ website,

I think your just jealous, or maybe just a CB TIT with a Ham License.

635. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 04:14:51 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%g9_7.31508$fe1.545407@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30096

Thanks, Kim. You make an excellent point.

73 from Rochester, NY

Jim AA2QA

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c3918ed$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still
irritates
> me
> > to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and
called
> CQ
> > with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called
me
> to
> > tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch
> traffic
> > somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if
> there
> > was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX)
I'd
> > have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a
doctor,
> > and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made
about
> > amateur radio.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> > ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only about
5
> > over a good straight key.
> >
>
> Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
>
> Kim W5TIT

>
>
>
>

636. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 04:50:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C391C8E.415CE42@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30097

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> >The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> >and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> >with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> >you a ground.
>
> Bob:
>
> Omigosh. Why the heck would I want to do THAT??? All I need
> to be forced to go QRT for good is to introduce an RF current directly
> into the building's CATV system! Thanks, but no thanks!

Exactly! Such advice you can well do without.

637. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:12:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C392E30.E225D701@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30099

Richard McCollum wrote:
> I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to fight
> the next war and give the last one a rest.

NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

638. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:19:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uYUp7nzlBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30098

AA2QA writes:

> What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. ...blah, blah, blah...

Jim,

If you have to go back that far in time to dredge up a sob-story,
then things must be basically pretty damned good on the
ham bands.

I ran literally thousands of phone patches from KG6AQI
on Guam and *never* had such an incident happen.

I also worked tens-of-thousands of contest and DX
contacts from KG6AQI and KG6AAY on Guam and
never heard of an incident like you describe.

I also (along with two other Guam hams) flew on our own
dime to Saipan after Typhoon Carole and provided the
only communications to the world for weeks after the
typhoon, moving thousands of pieces of recovery
traffic on the amateur bands for the TTPI Commissioner
without a single incident like you describe.

And, yes Kim, I *am* beating my chest about it! Sorry
if that offends you.

with all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

639. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:20:17 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lea_7.237254$WW.12805456@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30100

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C392E30.E225D701@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to
fight
> > the next war and give the last one a rest.
>
> NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Absolutely, and it is their responsibility to do their best to make sure
that is all that is eliminated. It is the difference between a statesman
or even good hack politician and a third-rate bomb tosser.

640. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:22:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C393086.6758129C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30151

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Would you wander away because it's simply too much hassle, Jim?
> >Neither would I.
>
> So everyone must do as you have done?

There you go again. Some of us care more about getting on the air
than others.

> But not during the day!

He had a day job.

> It would be interesting to know the RF exposure from that thing at the 100W
> level...

The quad was in the dining room. The hamshack was in a bedroom not in
line with the quad's major lobe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

641. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:24:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3930F6.1BC78F34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30153

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Ya know what I want to know? What's proposed for the ham who has a spouse
> who says, "absolutely not" to the hobby of ham radio in their house, the
> yard, the garage, the car, etc.?

This guy wasn't married.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

642. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:26:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Sja_7.237259$WW.12804945@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30152

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106213732.23507.00000073@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3C36A6BD.144F9B13@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, do you have a CATV outlet near the ham setup?
> >The outer shield of the CATV coax is usually grounded
> >and you might be able to use it as a ground. Combine that
> >with the electrical safety ground and that should help get
> >you a ground.
>
> Bob:
>
> Omigosh. Why the heck would I want to do THAT???

Damfino. The CATV in my building is along the front of the building and
roof; guess why my coax and antenna is on the back.

643. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:28:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C393206.B2983C30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30154

K0HB wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
> > was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
> > wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
> > performed the attic dipole.
>
> Living inside your own quad, Cecil?

It wasn't mine. And the antenna was in the dining room, a good
30 ft from the transceiver. The major lobe pointed East through
an outside wall on the third floor.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

644. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:31:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3932AB.D3343895@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30155

WA8ULX wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >Yep, Bruce is one of the anti-live-and-let-livers.
>
> You got that right, down with CBplussers

Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

645. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:33:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39333D.ECCA5610@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30156

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.

Some say: Life is too short for QRP. I say: Life is too short for pileups.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

646. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:38:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Ava_7.237322$WW.12807121@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30157

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C38B0E6.121FF41C@IEEE.org...
>
> One apartment antenna that surprised me by its performance
> was a 20m quad the shape of a room. The reflector was on one
> wall and the driven element was on the other wall. It out-
> performed the attic dipole.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Let us see, a 20-meter quad is -- guess what -- 20 meters in
circumference, actually a bit more but WTH. Now the ceilings in my place
are the usual 7'8" 2.2 meters or so, so the length was close to 8 meters.
It was?

Was this an apartment or a suite at the Waldorf??

647. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:40:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3934D2.777790ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30158

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message:
> > Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
> > 'one' or 'zero', it's broke.
> >
> Now lessee here Cecil, I did copy your "digital" straight key pumping
> "digital" cw on 40 into yer "digital" aerial via yer "digital" radio
> and obviously none of those were broke, they worked ducky . . you
> schitzoid, stupid, trolling again or what?

11101110101010001010101110111000001110101010001011101000101000101110001110 1

Yep, Morse code looks digital to me, and all 'ones' and 'zeros' to boot.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

648. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 05:55:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C393858.306D2142@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30159

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Let us see, a 20-meter quad is -- guess what -- 20 meters in
> circumference, actually a bit more but WTH. Now the ceilings in my place
> are the usual 7'8" 2.2 meters or so, so the length was close to 8 meters.
> It was?
>
> Was this an apartment or a suite at the Waldorf??

The loops were 8'x12' copper tape and used a Maltese Cross
type of loading from one of the then current ham magazines.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

649. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 06:26:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2cb_7.343120$W8.12750579@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30160

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C393858.306D2142@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Let us see, a 20-meter quad is -- guess what -- 20 meters in
> > circumference, actually a bit more but WTH. Now the ceilings in my
place
> > are the usual 7'8" 2.2 meters or so, so the length was close to 8
meters.
> > It was?
> >
> > Was this an apartment or a suite at the Waldorf??
>
> The loops were 8'x12' copper tape and used a Maltese Cross
> type of loading from one of the then current ham magazines.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Makes sense more or less. Another triumph for the loop.

650. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 10:24:04 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020107052404.00755.00000114@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30161

>> I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to fight
>> the next war and give the last one a rest.
>
>NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.

Herein lies my error. I always assumed (silly) me that NCI wanted to eliminate the code as an obstacle to obtaining a amateur radio license. The No-code Technician license did just that...with a bunch of privies, (They are still considered privileges, correct?) I might add. The code remained solely in conjunction with more written tests as a means of "earning" more "privies." It's an interesting plight to observe, nonetheless.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

651. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 11:30:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107063056.16278.00000057@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 30162

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 1/6/2002 7:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c38520d_1@news7.fast.net>

>And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
>entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
>code barrier for many years (years during which many
>could have been good, productive hams ...)

With very few REAL barriers (ie: deafness, mental retardation, death...),
the only barrier keeping them out was lack of initiative.
When 5WPM code is finally gone, there will be those who start talking
about the barriers of the written exam...One excuse down, one more to go. Then
when it get's down to nothing more than $.50 and two boxtops from your favorite
breakfast cereal, there will be those who complain about the $.50.

How low is low, Carl?

>I personally know of some who felt " I thought this was going
>to be nteresting and a nice crowd of people, now I find out
>hams are a bunch of ***holes. I don't need to put up with this
>crap from idiots of this caliber ... to hell with it."

I've known people to respond that way to the local Red Cross chapter and
church socials...Why is Amateur Radio any different?

>Unfortunately, I believe we lost quite a few folks who were and
>would have continued to be good hams because of the bad
>behavior/attitude of superiority which was foisted upon them by
>some other hams (individuals, who IMNSHO, are NOT good hams).

I reitereate the above. Someone will always feel "foisted upon" by
someone. Stuff happens.

>This sort of "I'm superior, you're a piece of crap" attitude
>(inflation
>of self-importance) has no place in ham radio

And inventing such things is crap too. Ever since I "joined" this forum,
I have been LOOKING for the alleged abuses that some here say are prevalent.

With the occasional sore-loser, the likes of which you find in EVERY
avocation, it is ABSENT! If there is ANY "discord" because of the current
licensing requirements, it is directed at the FCC for "allowing" it, NOT the
persons who simply took the currently required exam.

>I've passed the
>Extra, and the reality of my professional experience is that I know
>a lot more about radio technology than many hams, but that doesn't
>make me "better" than a newbie tech ... just more experienced.

Congratulations...And I ALSO know some "newbies" who are NOT
"professionals" but are infinitely more qualfied to discuss technical matters
than many who are "professional".

>It doesn't give me, nor do other examples of experience or skill give
>anyone else, the "right" to berate, insult, and degrade other hams.

Nor does it give you any right to completely misrepresent the character of
entire segments of the Amateur Radio population, Carl.

73

Steve, K4YZ

652. Re: Amateur Licesnsing Statistics?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 12:42:23 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <00031F76F25F6E15.A47198E4E83B9682.CA7661B3D2D34B71@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 06 Jan 2002 13:41:59 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"Bill, KD0HG" wrote:
>> Can anyone point out a relevant URL or post the current breakout of amateur
>> licenses by class?
>
>Where are they breaking out of?

Maybe they're trying to get away from those amateur rustlers mentioned
in another thread.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

653. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 12:48:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30164

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C37DF1A.41F7C539@earthlink.net...
> >
> [snip]
> >
> > Stow the arbitrary and distasteful stuff, Carl. What you are
> basically
> > saying is that if you make something easy enough that people don't
> have
> > to know much to do it, folks will flock to it.
>
> That's NOT what I'm saying at all, Dave ... I don't view the current
> system as "dumbing down" ... and I don't view the impending
> elmination of Morse testing as a "loss" ... you keep asserting
> that "It's too easy to get a ham license." I disagree ... I don't
> think it's "too hard" but I think it's "just about right" except for
> the continuation of Morse testing, even at a 5 wpm level.

Yeah I know you disagree and I know you think that even a 5 wpm morse test is too much. I do happen to believe that the ARS has been dumbed down. I believe it will, over the course of the next several years, be dumbed down yet again.

> Again, my view is that the license is a permit to "learn by
> doing," not a graduation certificate.

Nobody was or is going to stop you from learning additional material, Carl.

> > It is an interesting
> > concept. My last visit to a local club meeting pretty much
> confirmed my
> > impression that we are headed toward an amateur service where not
> many
> > folks know much about radio. I'm not saying that the folks there
> > weren't pleasant. Most of 'em are simply lost in the fog.
>
> There are clubs and there are clubs ... some are very technically
> oriented, others are more general, and some are purely social
> in nature ...
>
> As for your comment that "Most of 'em are simply lost in the fog.",
> by whose standards? (yours presumably) ... I can't really judge
> what that means, because, other than knowing that you think that

> codeless hams are inherently unworthy, I don't have a clear view
> of what you see as being "lost in the fog."

Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting and use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless hams are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream. They do tend to latch on to one band and one mode.

> As someone else said ... "Roast no newbie before his time." I
> qualfied that with "Why roast them at all (unless they repeatedly
> demonstrate that their intent is to be disruptive)?" Better to help
> and guide them than to berate them in an effort to drive them
> away ...

I didn't roast anyone at that club meeting before, during or after. I stated what I observed. I did not use the name of the clubs nor did I use the names or calls of anyone there.

You can only help and guide someone who is willing to be helped and guided.

Dave K8MN

654. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 12:54:20 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1cetlfuu5@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30185
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a1agvo0uhs@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Mark Walsh" <mark@km6xu.die.spam.die.com> wrote in message
> news:a18v6vdtq1@bob.news.rcn.net...
>
> > That's bull. I've been appending my crudely de-spammed
> > e-mail address and call sign to my USENET posts for over
> > ten years, and the little spam that I receive is the result of my
> > having a domain name (the address is different). It's funny
> > how anonymous cowards come up with all sorts of reasons
> > to justify their childish behaviors. Sorry, it just won't wash.
> >
> > Mark Walsh ***** mark@die.spam.die.km6xu.com ***** http://www.km6xu.com
>
> 20,000-plus newsgroups on usenet, some have flame wars and trolls that
would
> make this newsgroup look like a Teletubby show. Yet, this is the only
group
> in which a few people insist that you post a piece of information about
> yourself that can be searched to reveal your name, address, and, using
that
> information, possibly credit card, Social Security, and telephone numbers.
> Can you say identity theft? I thought you could.

Paranoid much?

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Milhaus Romain Fentworth Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

655. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:09:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107080949.13187.00000023@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 30166

In article <a1b26aslb1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(Bert Craig wrote):

>>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
>> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement is
>> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
>
>I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
>with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
>until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.

Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
>
>Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
>but that in as much as you only want the voice
>of existing hams heard.

But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not. The code test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for HF/MF privileges. Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue - codetest has gotta go".

73 de Jim, N2EY

656. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:09:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 30169

In article <P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>But when the war ends it is kind of nice to have a picture of what things
>ought to look like.

Don't expect NCI to provide one, other than "no more code tests". And maybe "no setasides for "legacy" modes".

Take a look back through this thread, or for that matter, back through rrap for 4-5 years. The only "vision" you'll see from NCI is "get rid of the code tests and everything will be rosy". If ya read Carl's posts about SS and "modern digital modes" you see a future where most of what is done today is crowded off the bands by "better mdoulations and codings".

> If these cats figure that virtue will be its own
>reward and we will all procede arm in arm into the sunset they are dumber
>than even I think they are.

Be afraid, be very afraid. Note that the proposed system batted around by Mr. Plourde and me included experience requirements that were roundly condemned by at least one NCI poobah.
>
>Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones you
>can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
>responsibility to forsee and fix.

Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.

> They will get it wrong: hell the
>framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but
>they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe in
>blowing things up far more than putting them together again.

Of course. "Not my job, man".

>The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to have
>proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang the
>old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives of
>the apparatchiks.

Precisely. Yet consider what has actually happened:

NCI is an "organization" of a website, some directors and maybe 2000 members. Exact numbers are not given out. Note that NCI member numbers started with #1000, not #1. Membership consists of signing up online and it's for life unless a member specifically requests to be removed. No dues or other member obligations.

When I first looked on the NCI website, there was a statement that NCI existed ONLY to eliminate code testing, and that when it was all gone the organization would simply disappear. That statement disappeared at some point, but does anybody really think NCI will continue after code testing?

FCC first tried to push a nocode ham license in 1975, then again in 1983, and finally succeeded in 1991 - long before NCI existed. FCC's opinion on code testing has been "it's only there because of the treaty" for at least a decade.

Way back in 1997 or so, there was a prediction here on rrap (I think it was by W4SCO, but I gotta check google) that the FCC was going to radically simplify the license structure. Three license classes, 5 wpm code test, a done deal. Most of us pooh-poohed it, particularly after the ARRL made its proposal and then the NPRM appeared.

Yet after the dust cleared in late 1999 the R&O EXACTLY matched everything that had been predicted 2+ years earlier.

Ever hear the expression "rooster taking credit for the dawn"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

657. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:09:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107080951.13187.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 30167

Phil Kane wrote:

>>> In the '50s the New Haven had some hybrid locomotives built for
>>> passenger service into/out of Grand Central Terminal in New York by
>>> EMD/General Motors.

N2EY wrote
>>
>>FL-9s. Looked like E-8s with third rail shoes.
>
> 'Cept that they had 2-axle leading trucks and 3-axle trailing
> trucks.

Yup. Oddly enough, the middle axle of the trailing truck was not powered. The
axle configuration is usually given as "B-A1A" for this reason.
>
>>> They drew power from electric third rail
>>> (nominally 750 V DC) until White Plains whereupon they used the
>>> diesel engine to generate the DC. They are still in use, as are
>>> several modern General Electric-built Genesis locomotives (same
>>> scheme) used by AMTRAK on the Albany-Penn Station (NY) portion
>>> of the Lake Shore Limited.
>>
>>The Turboliners have third rail shoes, too.
>
> It's good to see that they somehow solved the problem of switching
> on the fly, which the FL-9s could never do without tearing something
> up.

I did not know that!

>>When Grand Central was built at the turn of the century, the New York
>>Central tried to run steamers in the tunnels. A fire convinced the
>>city fathers to enact an ordinance forbidding the use of steam engines
>>underground, so the
>>railroad electrified as far north as Harmon and used electric locos.
>
> IIRC when the FL-9s were pretty well worn out (1980s) the engine
> crews would keep the diesel running all the way down into the
> hole in fear that they wouldn't restart and the air in GCT was
> the highest smog zone in the US.....

Yup. One of the big reasons they were retired.

> OnTopic - when I rode the Lake Shore Limited from CHI to NYP in the
> summer of 2000, there were two other hams working 2-m railroad

> mobile as well. It is rare that I ride an AMTRAK run that does not
> have another ham as well.

COOL! Of course most modern 2m handhelds will monitor RR freqs as well. QST had an article on RR radio a few years back. It was OK but they showed some safety rule violations in the pictures (like stepping on the rail).

73 de Jim, N2EY

(licensed 34 years - 31 of them as Extra)
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

658. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:15:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C399F4C.52BDA359@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30168

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C366A61.84FDC0A5@earthlink.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > > Hash: SHA1
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a15bmr$rdq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:9f4bfe89.0201040536.72542495@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > >> > > Looks like the ARS has been growing faster than the
> > > > population. Population grew about 40% from 1970-2000
> > > > while ARS grew about 250%
> > > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > Yes, but it also looks like the big increase in the slope
> > > of amateur growth relative to population came after
> > > the no code tech license provided a more reasonable
> > > entry point ...
> > >
> > ...especially since the Novice license, the class really intended as an
> > entry level license, was done away with.
>
> Nope, the NOVICE was NOT eliminated at all until 4/15/00. That
> can be used to reflect or suggest that people were willing to
> go the extra distance (Novice theory + Tech theory exams) to
> become a ham rather than simply Novice (theory + 5wpm code).

C'mon Bill, the Novice licensee had HF access. When Novice enhancement
came into being in the late '80s, 10m SSB was added. Carl was speaking
of the *no code Tech* which offers no HF privileges.

> > It stands to reason that, if
> > you make something easy enough to obtain, some people will be attracted.
>
> The question has been, why was it difficult. Clearly (IMHO) many
> people did NOT want to go the code route at all, but they were
> willing to study more theory to become a Tech than was needed to
```

> become a Novice.

Those folks just wanted to talk and they didn't care about HF privileges. They could call mama from the middle of the Safeway store and ask if she needed milk or bread. They've tended to stick to 2m and they've tended to stick to FM. I've not yet met a codeless Tech who is doing any experimentation (other than to reinvent the wheel). I've only met a few who have any aspirations toward obtaining HF access.

Dave K8MN

659. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:17:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201070517.1cc8dad4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30165

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c38723d_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1

> > >
> > You just keep paying attention to the admonitions in the ARRL "How
> To
> > Operate" pubs sweetums and we'll see who whacks who in the pileups
> and
> > contests. Go for it, less QRM and more confirmed for me, dit-dit.
>
> That's EXACTLY the point I was making ... it shouldn't be
> a question of brute-force "who 'wacks' who" ... but rather
> a question of operator skill (which is not related to how
> hard they can "wack" others) and other factors ...
>
>
That's PRECISELY my point but it went right over yer head. A 25 watt
station in the hands of a good op nails the guy and "whacks" the
alligator with a kilowatt who is still bellowing a half hour later.
Lemmee count the times . . .
>
>
>
>
> You seem to espouse the brute force "stomp 'em into
> the dust" philosophy ... I'm disappointed ... I thought you
> were a better operator than that.
>
>
The last time I used an HF amp was around 1975 so that puts yer "brute
force" nonsense to bed. The "stomp 'em into the dust" thing on the
part of the huge collection of even modestly skilled dxers and
contesters like myself is very analogous to playing chess. It's the
BRAIN, not in the plate amps or the "instuctions" in the "books". It's
the EARS and how well ya make proper use of what they're feeding you,
getting the grip on the modus operandi of the quarry of the moment
BEFORE ya hit the button or twitch the paddles, knowing yer radio far
beyond it's catalog specs and a lotta other factors. Which is howcum
we'll be in and out of the piles with the guy logged before you'll
even know many of us were even in the neighborhood.
>
>

> > Hey Squiggy, wasn't it YOU who got into the ultimate inanity in this
> > NG awhile back, something abt you pushing for allowing
> > frequency-hopping spread-rectum comms on 20m??
>
> Both Garry Coffman and I postulated conceptual designs
> for digital systems that, in the 150 kHz from 14.000-14.150
> could handle at least several 10s of thousands of 20 wpm
> Morse equivalent QSOs with virtually NO QRM or congestion.
> (something well beyond the capabilities of Morse technology)
>
>
Morse in not a technology Sweetums, it's a mode of electric
communications which is gonna outlive you by a helluva stretch. Keep
gnashing yer teeth, yer dentist needs the money.
>
>
I assume you two cw haters did eventually catch up with the fact that
your "brilliant concept" went over like the proverbial lead balloon.
Fart in a hurricane? Lotta obvious reasons for that Mr. Anderson. One
being that in my (typical)case I already have it all and then some via
my $15/month dialup connection so I have zero incentive to switch from
my $30 USR modem to some ratty bandwidth-lame 20m modem/computer/radio
kluge I'd have to pass a radio license test to operate. What kinda
grade did you get in Marketing 101? You were asleep the whole semester
or what?
>
>
Oh, and by the way, successfully dealing with QRM is part of the lure
and challenge of real radio vs. just one more "clear channel" means of
communications for the masses like the Internet and cell phones.
>
>
>
> The proposed technology was not FHSS ...
>
>
It would be 150Khz wide and would have detrimental effects on the
users of modes who would have no interest in participating in whatever
the hell ya wanna call it. More specifically it would trash the use of
cw within that spectrum space which would just thrill you huh? Talk
about a "stomp 'em into the dust" mindset, whatta flaming hypocrite.
The proposal epitomizes your whole attitude, i.e., your lack of
respect for everyone who doesn't happen to share YOUR particular hot
buttons and "visions".
>
>
> > Good point Squig, glad you brought it up. TAPR has been futzing with
> > some FHSS boards since 1997 in their thrust to get FHSS running in
> the
> > 902-928 Mhz ham band and they still ain't there. Given your assorted

> > chunks of bluster about your "leading edge technical accomplisments"
> > in this general field and your widely broadcast "thoughts" wrt to
> > these kindsa modes being the "future of ham radio" I find it rawther
> > odd that nowhere in the TAPR website is there any mention of any of
> > your contributions to their effort. Care to comment on this peculiar
> > state of affairs??
>
> Frankly, I find the TAPR effort to be an unnecessarily complicated
> approach to FHSS which will result in significantly higher cost than
> necessary
>
>
In these days of $2,000-3,000 xcvrs?? Or is the target user base those
with $100 Radio Shack "technology" mentalities? I think the hobby
already has enough of those.
>
>
> with little practical benefit and a lack of adoption by few
> other than the TAPR development team.
>
>
How could it be anything else on 900Mhz? Without an AT&T cell phone
type infrastructure which never in this world is gonna happen in ham
radio.
>
>
> As a TAPR member, I'm
> appalled at the amount of member funds which have gone into this
> particular porkbarrel sinkhole ...
>
>
A bit of dissention amongst the digigeeks eh? No surprise there but
they're not doing any of it on my dime so I'm outta this one. Except
that I'm still wondering why you haven't "straightened them out".
Considering yer widely advertised "leadership capabilities" in the
game and all that.
>
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

660. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:20:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201070520.710f77c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30170

```
CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3934D2.777790ED@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message:
> > > Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
> > > 'one' or 'zero', it's broke.
> > >
> > Now lessee here Cecil, I did copy your "digital" straight key pumping
> > "digital" cw on 40 into yer "digital" aerial via yer "digital" radio
> > and obviously none of those were broke, they worked ducky . . you
> > schitzoid, stupid, trolling again or what?
>
> 1110111010101000101010111011100000111010101000101110100010100010111000111101
>
> Yep, Morse code looks digital to me, and all 'ones' and 'zeros' to boot.
>
>
Yup, just trolling again, no problem.
```

661. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:21:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C39A0B1.F058BA94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30171

Bill Sohl wrote (martial music swells in the background):

> We have and continue to "undeniably" work for the TOTAL
> elimination of all code TESTING.
>
> NOTHING in our efforts, our charter or otherwise exists
> whereby we (NCI) want to end or eliminate anyone's
> ability to use Morse as a ham.

> The "war" isn't over until ALL code testing ends...it is
> that simple.

(fades to the strains of "The Internationale")

Quite the manifesto, Bill. You and your comrades must be proud.

Dave K8MN

662. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:26:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107082649.05502.00000223@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 30172

>NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.

Bull, the truth is that Carl and his buddies, were either to Lazy or to Stupid to learn a Basic Operating Mode. And as far as Carl he may have even had problems memorizing a BASIC written test, it only took him a Year to upgrade. Thank God for are new Welfare Status Testing.

663. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:28:10 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0201070528.88eec19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30173

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message news:<3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> > >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> > >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> > >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> > >could have been good, productive hams ...)
> >
> > Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > KC2HMN
>
> I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing issue
> is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a barrier
> to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can
> certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I am
> told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.

I can certainly respect that POV. Let me just clarify my position on
the code issue. I'm neither for nor against a no-code ticket. I
absolutely do NOT have any harsh or demeaning words for anybody who
wants to remain a NCT and enjoy 6m and higher for the duration of
their amateur radio lives. I can understand the abrasiveness of being
called a "Lifer No-code Tech," hence you'll not hear me call refer to
anybody as such. HOWEVER, having just gone through the current "rite
of passage," (...and it's perfectly ok to call it that, right?) I have
a fresh "newbie" kind of perspective that some might be missing. I'd
imagine that it'd tucker me out more battling to remove every last
shred of a code requirement in AR than to just sit down (...or
encourage someone else to) and spend 15 to 20 minutes every other day
or so and listen to a few dits and dahs. There's no time limit. I
imposed a time constraint upon myself, but that's nothing required.

> My opinion is that for a mode I don't personally like to use myself, I have
> no desire to learn it--it wastes my valuable time. But, for the Tech+
> license I was *willing* to learn it at 5wpm.

Perhaps this is what's it's all about? A "willingness" to fulfill the
requirements to "earn" additional privileges.

> I used it once the night I
> passed to placate an "overzealous" friend who wanted to see me use it on the
> air, and have never used it since--have no intention of ever using it
> again...in fact, I'd be hard pressed to even know it now. I've never wasted

> my valuable time learning loads of other modes I have no intention of using.
> I've never wasted my time learning things about ham radio that, say, an
> experimenter might learn--because I am not an experimenter.

Duly noted and once again, POV respected. I personally want my key to eventually "beg for mercy" when I use it...but that's just me. My wife just shook her head when the three new sets of ARRL 'Increasing Your Code Speed' CD's arrived this weekend. (The "I married a nerd" syndrome.) While I can respect the inclusion of a No-code ticket, the cry for it's total elimination is a touch extreme. It's hard for me to put it in a politically correct context...it's just kinda "feels" like asking for a "free ride." If there were no access to AR without knowing the code, (Speed issue set aside.) that'd be one thing. But to say it's a "barrier," please. An amateur radio license is a privilege, not a right. Rights are gauranteed, privileges are earned. I've never used plenty of stuff that I've learned in school. I'll bet you have too. I sat through three calculus courses, never had to differentiate in my life...for pay or pleasure. But I sure am glad it was part of my overall "formal" education and you'd better believe it was required. Do I think we'll ever actually "NEED" the code. IMHO, we've got folks in harms way right now who might have a need for it? I know that if I was trapped in an elevator or an "air pocket" in the WTC rubble on 9/11 and I banged out .- .-.. .. ...- . ...-.. .--., I'd pray that my guardian angel was a "coded" ham before filling his/her current position. Do we still need it...I dunno?

> While it goes against the angst of some hams, I am one of those dreaded
> "light-duty" ham radio enthusiasts (if the term enthusiast can be used for
> my type of ham). The "hobby" of ham radio is a distraction for me, not an
> avocation. I do enjoy emergency communication, and some public service.
> What do I mean by that? I mean that I enjoy the storm spotting aspect of
> emergency communication because I've always enjoyed observing severe weather
> anyway--that I am a ham radio operator fits right in with that. I enjoy
> public service--but *not* in the middle of summer here in Texas in the 100+
> degree heat; they can find someone else who wants to do that (I'll provide
> radio equipment, logistics, etc., but I ain't sittin' in no heat for some
> 'nidiot [said affectionately] bike rider who finds it compelling to push the
> physical limitations of mind and body by cycling in this Summer weather down
> here).

I was always a bit of a "techno-nerd." I'm easy either way. I'd just as soon see folks enjoy AR for what they glean from it.

> But, if pressed, i.e., in a severe or disaster situation, I would operate as
> needed for as long as needed, with a smile on my face and knowing that the
> time I *have* taken to learn operating skills specific to my
> needs/want/interests can be of some value to the community. I also believe
> that emergency communication and public service is a major consideration for
> ham radio's "existence." In my opinion, experimentation would be the
> second-most point for consideration; however, I am not personally into
> experimentation (if I build, I build by specification and blueprint--not

> willing to "play"). There is an exception to that: I do enjoy experimenting
> with better portable communicating methods/practices. I used to do it a
> lot, but haven't now in a couple/few years. These things are not generally
> taught to hams in emergency communication. Concepts like remote control of
> a mobile radio with a talkie when you are a distance away from your vehicle;
> cross-banding; using those bells and whistles we never use on our VHF/UHF
> radios: paging, digital tones, encode/decode on simplex, pushing the limits
> of simplex by learning the extreme art of communicating and listening in
> worst case scenarios, (did you know if you key up and say a word or two at a
> time, the full message can often be fully understand? Know why?), etc.

Entirely cool! I happen to catch part of the movie 'Contact' last
night and there's a line where Jodie Foster's character is given a
cyanide pill "just in case." When asked "why," the commander's
response seems to fit this discussion to a tee. "There are lots of
reasons we can think of for having this with you, <cyanide pill> but
most of all...it's for the reasons we CAN'T think of. Kim, I respect
and admire your approach toward the disaster/emergency service aspect
of AR...but I sure hope a Tech+ or above responds when I bang out that
short message above when my voice is lost due to smoke inhalation
and/or screaming in terror. (We all know what happened to the local
cell-phone service during the moments immediately following the second
strike to the WTC, right? It went the way of the 13 and 20-wpm
testing.

> I think the government has a reasonable expectation to "test" for
> licenses--but I think it is an unreasonable expectation for our government,
> or anyone else, to have people learn something they don't intend to use. I
> think the provision of the word "barrier" is probably more severe than
> reality--it isn't a true barrier in that one cannot learn it (unless deaf,
> etc.). But, in the spirit of the game, it is a barrier for those who don't
> wish to learn it. I have no problem with learning whatever for a written
> test--and I've been a proponent of such strict written testing that I
> probably wouldn't spend the time to learn for--but I am not in support of
> any kind of "mode" testing. It sets the stage for the very kind of
> attitudes we often see displayed here, and gosh knows that we hear on the
> air. Heck, the license itself is enough of an ego-maniacal booster for
> some!
>
> Kim W5TIT

Understood. Take it easy and talk with you later. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

664. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:28:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C39A238.B79638A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30174

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Ya know what I want to know? What's proposed for the ham who has a spouse
> who says, "absolutely not" to the hobby of ham radio in their house, the
> yard, the garage, the car, etc.? Isn't that grounds for a divorce? When we
> gonna go to work on Congress for a law that stipulates that spouses and
> other family members *must* support the hobby of ham radio at their abode?
> That's what I want to know :o (This tongue-in-cheek episode brought to you
> as a result of conversations over coffee today...LOL)

Perhaps you might want to consider switching to Decaf.

Dave K8MN

665. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:37:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C39A45E.F57B40F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30175

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still irritates
> me
> > to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and called
> CQ
> > with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called me
> to
> > tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch
> traffic
> > somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if
> there
> > was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX) I'd
> > have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a doctor,
> > and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made about
> > amateur radio.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> > ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only about 5
> > over a good straight key.
> >
>
> Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.

We all hear stories, Kim. All you need to do is develop an ability to
separate the true stories from the fictional accounts. There's an old
saw which goes, "If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is".

Dave K8MN

666. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:38:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107083833.13146.00000057@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30176

From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org

>All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they really
>apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
>only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our great
>hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!

You are only saying that because you want to protect your cushy job at ARRL.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

667. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:42:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C39A577.E9F3D7F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30177

CAM wrote:
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> > gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> > DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
>
> Some say: Life is too short for QRP. I say: Life is too short for pileups.

Not if you do it right.

Dave K8MN

668. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 13:49:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <pHh_7.237911$WW.12830759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30178

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article
<P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >But when the war ends it is kind of nice to have a picture of what
things
> >ought to look like.
>
> Don't expect NCI to provide one, other than "no more code tests". And
maybe "no
> setasides for "legacy" modes".
>
> Take a look back through this thread, or for that matter, back through
rrap for
> 4-5 years. The only "vision" you'll see from NCI is "get rid of the code
tests
> and everything will be rosy". If ya read Carl's posts about SS and
"modern
> digital modes" you see a future where most of what is done today is
crowded off
> the bands by "better mdoulations and codings".
>
> > If these cats figure that virtue will be its own
> >reward and we will all procede arm in arm into the sunset they are
dumber
> >than even I think they are.
>
> Be afraid, be very afraid. Note that the proposed system batted around
by Mr.
> Plourde and me included experience requirements that were roundly
condemned by
> at least one NCI poobah.
> >
> >Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones
you
> >can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
> >responsibility to forsee and fix.
>
> Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.
>
> > They will get it wrong: hell the
> >framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but

> >they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe
in
> >blowing things up far more than putting them together again.
>
> Of course. "Not my job, man".
>
> >The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to have
> >proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang the
> >old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives of
> >the apparatchiks.
>
> Precisely. Yet consider what has actually happened:
>
> NCI is an "organization" of a website, some directors and maybe 2000
members.
> Exact numbers are not given out. Note that NCI member numbers started
with
> #1000, not #1. Membership consists of signing up online and it's for
life
> unless a member specifically requests to be removed. No dues or other
member
> obligations.
>
> When I first looked on the NCI website, there was a statement that NCI
existed
> ONLY to eliminate code testing, and that when it was all gone the
organization
> would simply disappear. That statement disappeared at some point, but
does
> anybody really think NCI will continue after code testing?
>
> FCC first tried to push a nocode ham license in 1975, then again in
1983, and
> finally succeeded in 1991 - long before NCI existed. FCC's opinion on
code
> testing has been "it's only there because of the treaty" for at least a
decade.
>
> Way back in 1997 or so, there was a prediction here on rrap (I think it
was by
> W4SCO, but I gotta check google) that the FCC was going to radically
simplify
> the license structure. Three license classes, 5 wpm code test, a done
deal.
> Most of us pooh-poohed it, particularly after the ARRL made its proposal
and
> then the NPRM appeared.
>
> Yet after the dust cleared in late 1999 the R&O EXACTLY matched
everything that

> had been predicted 2+ years earlier.
>
> Ever hear the expression "rooster taking credit for the dawn"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yup, I also recall 'We had to destroy the village in order to save it'.

The silly part is that come the Revolution, Carl and Bill will be easy to find -- hanging from a lamp post.

669. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 14:10:40 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <A%h_7.34966$fe1.582936@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30179

Hans, to be honest, that was the ONLY time that ever happened. The timing was just so stinking LOUSY. I've run tons of phone patches from KG6AAY myself (I was stationed at the receiver site, working in crypto). We did have a typhoon wipe out the coast guard tower on Rota and sent a chief over there. When the guys at the receiver kept telling him he was 'loud, but garbbled', likely due to having the rf gain all the way to the right, we gave the chief a shout ('sparkplug one, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY'). Captain Delany showed up at the shack after we were asked to pass all traffic to ComNavMar direct - and 3 of us were secured from all other duties untill he directed otherwise. There are, of course, a zillion facets to amateur radio, none of which represents exactly what amateur radio is all about. Myself, I enjoyed CW a lot - even giving at least one novice his first overseas contact (a WN2 out of New Jersey). I used to rag chew a lot on RTTY - especially with Norm, VK2NP, for hours on end. What year were you stationed on Guam?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uYUp7nzlBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03...
> AA2QA writes:
>
> > What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. ...blah, blah, blah...
>
> Jim,
>
> If you have to go back that far in time to dredge up a sob-story,
> then things must be basically pretty damned good on the
> ham bands.
>
> I ran literally thousands of phone patches from KG6AQI
> on Guam and *never* had such an incident happen.
>
> I also worked tens-of-thousands of contest and DX
> contacts from KG6AQI and KG6AAY on Guam and
> *never* heard of an incident like you describe.
>
> I also (along with two other Guam hams) flew on our own
> dime to Saipan after Typhoon Carole and provided the
> only communications to the world for weeks after the
> typhoon, moving thousands of pieces of recovery
> traffic on the amateur bands for the TTPI Commissioner
> without a single incident like you describe.

>
> And, yes Kim, I *am* beating my chest about it! Sorry
> if that offends you.
>
> with all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

670. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 14:26:54 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Oei_7.17$xu.2005@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30180

Thanks Jim, with so much damned negativity, I like to see some positivity once in a while.

Ryan KC8PMX

My goals?

Pass the Code Test.

Explore a new band, (most likely 6 meters due to costs)

Bring at least 2-3 new hams into our ranks. Also working on selling our clubs ham radio classes to the law enforcement, fire departments, and EMS communities. With the nature of these people, they are perfect candidates to add to our ranks. The county fire training officer here where I live is a AWESOME supporter of amateur radio, and the thing we can do. I will definitely be utilizing him. This effort may get more than 2-3 hopefully.

Finish my "fire station project" (Goal is to get all of the volunteer fire departments set up with a 2m/7cm transciever to create one hell of a backup system for when a real disaster comes. This way ARES members can work from the fire station that is closest to them.

Get my step-brother back into the ham bands. He was licensed almost 20 years ago, let his license lapse and now is interested again once he found out I am licensed. He travels as a "missionary" as I understand it, as a doctor providing medical care in some interesting countries. Talk about some DXepiditions! Got him the text he needs to refresh his memory and hopefully get him to a testing session with the next 30-60 days!

I am pursuing a ton of training related to the fire department I am with, so my time is extremely limited until June, otherwise I would have more to add to my list, but need to be realistic.

I will keep those that care informed of my progress!

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020103080721.02371.00000823@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@tm.net>
> writes:
>
> >What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?
>
> Great question, Ryan.

>
> Here are some of mine (in no particular order):
>
> - Get workshop and station properly set up and in order.
> - Fix up antenna system with better materials, new coax, etc.
> - Add some options and mods to K2 #2084
> - Build kit or homebrew 100 W amp for same
> - Sell off about 50% of ham radio parts/material inventory (that's a BIG
job!)
> - Set new personal best scores on FD, SS, and other contests.
> - Attend a local hamfest or two
> - Get BMI (body mass index) under 23 so I'm in better physical shape for
all of
> the above
>
> Will they all get done by December 31 2002? We'll see!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

671. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 14:55:45 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0201070655.5f6496df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30181

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a1ah0svob1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> > > >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> > > >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> > > >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> > > >could have been good, productive hams ...)
> > >
> > > Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > KC2HMN
> >
> > I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing issue
> > is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a barrier
> > to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can
> > certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I am
> > told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.
>
> In addition to Kim's comments...
> It is a barier because it is, in this day and age,
> nothing but an old requirement that causes
> people to spend considerable (for some) time
> with no real purpose. You can disagree on that,
> but that is clearly the mindset of most administrations
> today and the FCC.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Ok Bill, I cheerfully disagree:

As I pointed out to Kim, I come to the table as a relatively
"unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens? Are not the
writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
questions? Why not just eliminate all testing as it's really kind of

open to interpretation as to what's "purposeful" and what's not? Do we really want to leave it to "most of the administrations and the FCC" to decide that for us. Sorta smacks of "my big brother says I'm right...so there!" C'mon, let's put it to the vote. A vote every five years polling all US licensed amateurs re. whether or not to retain element 1. After all, is it not OUR hobby/service to shape? Are we not a microcosm of society as a whole? "By the people, for the people, and OF the people?" Where's the "faith?" Let me be frank, (but call me Bert) 5-wpm's not a "barrier." It's an inconvenience, particularly if you don't plan on using CW. For me, it's the starting line. It's far easier to cross the starting line rather than try to paint it over and argue that it shouldn't have been there in the first place. Just MHO. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

672. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 14:57:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39B777.24BC16ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30182

N2EY wrote:
> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"

Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

673. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 15:02:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39B880.D6B1CCD2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30183

N2EY wrote:
> If ya read Carl's posts about SS and "modern
> digital modes" you see a future where most of what is done today is crowded off
> the bands by "better mdoulations and codings".

Well, spark gap was crowded off the bands by better methods. There
seems little doubt that technological progress will continue.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

674. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 15:11:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39BA9C.70F8C9E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30184

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > The loops were 8'x12' copper tape and used a Maltese Cross
> > type of loading from one of the then current ham magazines.
>
> Makes sense more or less. Another triumph for the loop.

The guy was overjoyed when that Maltese Cross Quad article
appeared. He had tried a 10m indoor quad but it was the
low of the sunspot cycle.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

675. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 16:37:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C39C23F.6610FDCB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30186

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
>
> Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)

Indeed, it is easy to see why you shouldn't be making policy! =)

676. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:18:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39d85f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30187

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a2ad204840e175989687@news.earthlink.net...
>
[snip]
> Ya see Kimmie, you wouldn't fit into Carl's world of amateur radio.
You
> do absolutely NO experimenting. You're into DX (sort of, I guess)
and
> he has no use for people who think they know it all. See, according
to
> google you seem to think yourself a self appointed radio cop,
monitoring
> who is legal and who isn't.
>
> I suggest you research a bit before taking sides. Carl and
> you..certainly aren't perfect together. You have no place in the
google
> world of Carl Stevenson. Come to think of it, I, as a medical
> profession, and certainly a non techno-type am not. Cecil probably
is.
> Kim is not

I have no problem with Kim ... I don't know her personally,
but from the small bit I've read, she and I seem to agree
that "bad attitudes" (the "I'm superior and you're dirt" sort
of thing based on "stomp 'em into the dust, 'big gun' mentalities,"
"I can beep fast and you can't," etc. are counterproductive
to amateur radio ...

Kim (or anyone else, for that matter) and I don't have to agree
on everything to get along and show some mutual respect.

What I have a problem with are blowhards who insist that
there is no place in amateur radio for anyone who isn't
a clone of them ... and that such people are dirt.

While I've stated that I think some attitudes are bad for
ham radio, I recognize that those people are entitled to
hold their views, regardless of whether I agree with them
or not ... I may state that *I* think their attitudes are bad
for ham radio, but I don't equate the holder of the attitude
with dirt because of their view.
```

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDnYSJe+N6+q84HiEQLiKQCdF9NQkXMW7jYhAgTaER6Z/pgL7/0AoLlV
fCAT+6oksT1OqZvRD002D/Ce
=t4A8
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

677. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:33:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39dbfa_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30188

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> >could have been good, productive hams ...)
>
> Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Yes.

To some people it is a barrier in the sense that
they simply don't have the physical/aural ability.

To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so
disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they
are unwilling to endure the "jumping through the
hoop," despite the fact that they are in other ways
completely qualified and would make good hams.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPDnb4pe+N6+q84HiEQKd8QCcDDWrcrw4wlZo8Nh2/hjg5bFRsFoAn1ZM
D/VPYdwO1gYND7nZPJa0W3rS
=nTHc
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

678. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:35:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39dc5d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30189

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020106123847.19179.00000016@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> >3rd ... NCI is not "dedicated to ... destroying Morse wherever it
is
> >found" ... NCI's objective is SIMPLY to eliminate Morse TESTING
> >requirements on a global basis ... we do NOT have any goal
> >WHATSOEVER of getting Morse usage banned or restricted
> >in any way.
>
> Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten
years now?

No ... for access to the bands below 30 MHz, Morse
proficiency is still required.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- -----------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- -----------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDncR5e+N6+q84HiEQLcVACeOl7JVmcbS98pYDzjrfoYuI3KbMsAnjV+
sI023/YNFwLetyMo8SLewg74
=HEbh
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

679. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:43:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39DE4B.4BA8DF33@uci.edu>
Source record: 30191

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a14ps2$n3d$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c351c30$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C34C8A6.33A7AA4F@uci.edu...
> > > > A lack of such understanding was evident in your comments.
> > >
> > > Because I know that QRP can do some real distance contacts, I don't
> > > understand? OKAY.
> >
> > Making a case that an apartment dweller can do just as good as a big gun
> > station shows a lack of understanding of radio.
>
> I don't recall ever seeing such a post from Kim. Are you saying that you
> can't make a long distance DX contact running 100 watts into an attic
> dipole?

You aren't THAT stupid, are you?
```

680. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:46:57 UTC
From: Benny Martinez <bamartz@satx.rr.com>
Message-ID: <3C39E02D.EA9F3B16@satx.rr.com>
Source record: 30192
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N4ZN wrote:
>
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
> (Joshua Senecal) wrote:
>
> >Hi all,
> >
> >I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
> >carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
> >having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
> >situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
> >them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
> >
> >Thanks!
> >
> >-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>
> Pack it with the suitcases and it's no problem. Pack it in the carry
> on, and be prepared to unpack it and do all that explaining every time
> you change flights.

I fly regularly. I always carry a handheld with me in my laptop case. I
also carry a cell phone. I have been asked to turn on my computer, open
my cell phone, but never been questioned about my ham radio.

What is the problem, you carry your ham license with you. You have ID
stating it is legal for you to use the radio.

681. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 17:50:12 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <odl_7.238137$WW.12848118@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30190

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C39B777.24BC16ED@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
>
> Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

And I am sure you have discovered there is little payoff in being the only
sane man in the asylum :-)

682. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 18:04:51 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39E343.BD1AE059@uci.edu>
Source record: 30193

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > > My statements are always narrow even if I
> > >don't specifically say they are narrow.
> >
> > That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.
>
> See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.

It's a pretty big lie, though.

683. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 18:06:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39E395.F21B42D0@uci.edu>
Source record: 30195

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 05 Jan 2002 19:07:43 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Finding a home without restrictive covenenants is becoming increasingly
> >difficult for those who live near cities. That is a reality. The
> >covenants are often arbitrary and prevent the land owner from enjoying
> >the use of his land. This is a threat to the growth of amateur radio
> >and to the participation in amateur radio of many of those already
> >licensed. That you are incapable of seeing that is pathetic.
>
> Dave, maybe I'm naive but I just don't see anyone holding a
> gun to your head (or anyone else's) to force them to buy a home with
> restrictions!

That's right. One could always choose simply to live in an apartment
with restrictions instead.
> Sure, it might be less convenient to find a home without
> them--it may not be in "quite" as desirable a neighborhood (one reason
> the restrictions probably exist in the first place), but that's a
> trade off you make when you insist on certain requirements in a home.
> For instance, if you want a home with three bedrooms, three baths, and
> a large yard, you may not be able to afford to live in as exclusive a
> neighborhood as if you wanted one with only two bedrooms and two
> baths. That isn't unjust restriction--it's fair trade.
>
> The FCC isn't letting hams down by not forcing neighborhoods
> to accept ham antennas--it's allowing the residents to set their own
> rules. If you look carefully at most restrictions, it isn't the
> _existence_ of an antenna that is banned (they can't--that DOES
> violate the FCC ruling on home entertainment antennas), only its size
> (it would be easy to defeat a restriction that was based on use not
> size in any court--i.e., you can ban a 40' tower, but you CAN'T ban an
> antenna for amateur use if an equivalent sized one for TV use is
> permitted--that's discriminatory regulation). I live in an area with
> just that kind of restriction and do quite adequately with a flag-pole
> antenna (most neighborhoods DO permit a flag-pole with a US Flag,
> which makes a great 18' to 27' vertical) and an MFJ Super Hi-Q loop on
> the roof (about the same size as my legal DirecTV dishes and thus not
> subject to limitation) that handles 10m-40m--according to both
> experience and printed reviews it does just as well as a typical 40m
> antenna system, and does so in a fraction of the space. I also have
> antennas on my car (which restrictions CAN'T prohibit) and a small

> 2m/70cm antenna on my roof that isn't even noticeable from the street.
> That may not be optimum, but I didn't buy my house with the thought in
> mind of setting up an antenna farm--for that I would buy a home on
> acreage in the country.
>
> Frankly, ham or not, I can see some of the objections. A 40'+
> tower topped by HF beams CAN detract from the appearance of a
> neighborhood from a non-ham perspective. The people who live there
> bought, in part, because their neighborhood DID have such
> restrictions--why do you feel it fair to deprive them of the right to
> live where there are NOT "unsightly" antennas simply because you
> choose to move to their area? It isn't discrimination to want to live
> where the neighborhood maintains a specific appearance. For myself,
> and most hams, that's not the kind of neighborhood we want (I bought
> this place knowing I would ultimately sell it and move where I could
> have an antenna farm), but that doesn't give us the right to demand
> that others agree with our interests.
>
> As Cecil (and others) have pointed out, you agree to those
> terms when you sign the purchase contract. Failure to learn about them
> prior to the sale isn't a legitimate reason to complain that they
> exist--it's incumbent on anyone who signs a contract of ANY nature to
> know the specific terms and restrictions applicable to that contract.
> Anyone who buys a house without a careful examination of the title and
> a search to insure no objectionable restrictions exist, frankly
> deserves what he or she gets--it's no more excusable than signing a
> credit contract without knowing the interest rate, repayment method,
> or term of the contract. Fools do NOT deserve protection from
> themselves.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

684. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 18:11:33 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39E4D5.9E66DD95@uci.edu>
Source record: 30194

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
>
> >W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> >> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...
>
> >K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
> >involved in radio transmission.
>
> Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.

But you probably weren't lecturing to people about it on a newsgroup.

685. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 18:54:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39eef3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30196

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106180945.07935.00000007@mb-mw.aol.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> >the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
>
> Let's hold it there a second. Who are these folks, exactly?

I don't have a list of callsigns ... I tend to avoid such folks
rather than gravitate towards them ... it's the "type" and
the behavior that I'm talking about, not focusing on specific
individuals.

> >... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues
calling
> >long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a
station.
>
> Rude is one reason, but only one. Usually, when you hear that sort
of thing,
> those in the pile don't know that the DX station has answered
someone else. On
> HF SSB, most stations are either talking or listening.

That's EXACTLY the problem ... too much calling (trying to "drown
out everyone else") and not enough listening ... I frequently hear
some twit sending his call over and over and over without even
listening, long after the DX station has (at least tried to) answered
someone else ... if there was a bit less outright aggression, things
would work better for everyone ... including the DX station.

> >(I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> >"listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
>
> The problem is that they can't listen WHILE transmitting.

See above ...

> >
> >Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> >just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
> >Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband

> >dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
> >EVER calling "CQ" ONCE.
>
> Cool. Pretty nice when the spots are up and ya live on top of a
hill, huh?

I tune around and LISTEN ... in many instances, I was apparently
the first to notice a station calling ... in other cases, I throw my
call
out when the station I'm trying to contact ends a contact and says
"QRZ?," then wait to see if he heard me ... I don't keep repeating
my callsign over and over for 60 seconds ...

> Just for the record, two months ago I worked 48 states and six
Canadian
> provinces in 13 hours using 5 watts output from a homebuilt rig and
a homebrew
> trap inverted V at 35 feet. And I didn't call CQ to work any of 'em.

Good work ...

> btw, what bands/modes didja use for the above?

80m-6m ... lots on 10m ... yesterday worked Vancouver Is., BC on 6m
from my E. PA location ...

>Rig and antenna homebuilt?

Using commercial gear I've had for a while ... my design/building
is not aimed at the "conventional" modes ...

> > (Just to counter previous assertions that
> >the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting
CQ
> >DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of
fun
> >with my new privileges ... tough.
>
> Considering your comments about "electronic paintball wars" and such
in the
> past, it's kinda surreal to see you counting countries, Carl. ;-)

It's more a curiosity/casual amusement than a passion ... I'm not in
a huge rush to gather paper or rack up awards ... just playing around
a bit in my spare time. I never said I wouldn't use conventional
modes
or have some fun ... just that my major interest is in new technology
(which I'm working on at my own pace as I get my lab organized
in the new house ...)

> Waddya think about eQSLs? Should they be accepted for award credit?

PERSONALLY, I think so ... having looked at the measures that
eQSL is taking (registration process, logon with password, and

sending a scanned copy of license for verification), I think it's secure enough to reasonable insure the integrity of the process.

I also see significant benefit to the ham community in terms of cost savings through the use of such technology as an alternative to the expense of mailing conventional QSL cards via conventional postal means.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDnu25e+N6+q84HiEQIejgCeJMyjO2vO+nHfn3y+IgsRmglVIugAnRed
fcu679UFerqAmj+p8pMKVxJ2
=elVt
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

686. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:12:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107141229.11160.00000212@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30197

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
>'one' or 'zero', it's broke.

Tristate...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

687. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:17:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39f47a$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30198

[No readable article body recovered]

688. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:18:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c39f4b8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30199

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201070517.1cc8dad4@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c38723d_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > Both Garry Coffman and I postulated conceptual designs
> > for digital systems that, in the 150 kHz from 14.000-14.150
> > could handle at least several 10s of thousands of 20 wpm
> > Morse equivalent QSOs with virtually NO QRM or congestion.
> > (something well beyond the capabilities of Morse technology)
> >
> >
> Morse in not a technology Sweetums, it's a mode of electric
> communications which is gonna outlive you by a helluva stretch. Keep
> gnashing yer teeth, yer dentist needs the money.

I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
> >
> I assume you two cw haters did eventually catch up with the fact
that
> your "brilliant concept" went over like the proverbial lead balloon.

The major objections were that it wasn't a purely manual skill.
Also, it was objected that something that worked well with
no QRM/QRN/QSB would "take the fun out of it." (To which
I responded that it would be easy to program all kinds of
hellish channel impairments ... in the receiver ... without having
to trash the underlying communications channel.) I even pointed
out that this could be a "feature" for contesters, wherein the
paying field would be leveled in terms of impariments and the
result would truly be a matter of skill, rather that "who can afford
the biggest amp/tower/etc."

[snip]
> >
> > The proposed technology was not FHSS ...
> >
> >
> It would be 150Khz wide and would have detrimental effects on the
> users of modes who would have no interest in participating in
```

whatever
> the hell ya wanna call it. More specifically it would trash the use
of
> cw within that spectrum space which would just thrill you huh? Talk
> about a "stomp 'em into the dust" mindset, whatta flaming hypocrite.
> The proposal epitomizes your whole attitude, i.e., your lack of
> respect for everyone who doesn't happen to share YOUR particular hot
> buttons and "visions".

You are mistaken ... the modulation schemes proposed would NOT
be 150 kHz wide ... in fact, they would be narrower (by a lot) than
the required bw of the 20 wpm Morse-equivalent they were designed
to replace. What WAS said was that, within the same 150 kHz of
bandwidth (14.000-14.150), 10s of thousands of simultaneous
20 wpm Morse-equivalent QSOs could exist with little or no mutual
interference ... the system would not "trash the use of cw within that
spectrum space" ... it could easily detect and avoid frequencies where
cw QSOs were ongoing ...

> > > Good point Squig, glad you brought it up. TAPR has been futzing
with
> > > some FHSS boards since 1997 in their thrust to get FHSS running
in
> > the
> > > 902-928 Mhz ham band and they still ain't there. Given your
assorted
> > > chunks of bluster about your "leading edge technical
accomplisments"
> > > in this general field and your widely broadcast "thoughts" wrt
to
> > > these kindsa modes being the "future of ham radio" I find it
rawther
> > > odd that nowhere in the TAPR website is there any mention of any
of
> > > your contributions to their effort. Care to comment on this
peculiar
> > > state of affairs??
> > >
> > Frankly, I find the TAPR effort to be an unnecessarily complicated
> > approach to FHSS which will result in significantly higher cost
than
> > necessary
> >
> >
> In these days of $2,000-3,000 xcvrs?? Or is the target user base
those
> with $100 Radio Shack "technology" mentalities? I think the hobby
> already has enough of those.

The point is that the TAPR approach is not cost-effective and
will result in a "product" which will cost much more than necessary

to achieve a reasonable result ... thus discouraging widespread
adoption.

> > with little practical benefit and a lack of adoption by few
> > other than the TAPR development team.
> >
> >
> How could it be anything else on 900Mhz? Without an AT&T cell phone
> type infrastructure which never in this world is gonna happen in ham
> radio.

The 900 MHz band could be very useful .. and nobody is talking
about a "cellphone type infrastructure." (at least I'm not ...)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDn0YZe+N6+q84HiEQLxbgCg4K1tWj9P+3ljMsVUazNbM/P6e34AoMZZ
OgK2gNsIhgNPI5gcVU0LbNlv
=ojrC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

689. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:20:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39F4E0.EBC8F132@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30200

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > > My statements are always narrow even if I
> > > >don't specifically say they are narrow.
> > >
> > > That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.
> >
> > See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> > There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.
>
> It's a pretty big lie, though.

You disagree that "always" has a very narrow definition. Exactly
how can "always" deviate from "at all times"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

690. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:23:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39F5A3.655540A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30201

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> >
> > Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)
>
> Indeed, it is easy to see why you shouldn't be making policy! =)

I rest my case, Dick. You just proved that the FCC should be making
amateur radio policy rather than the amateurs themselves.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

691. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:24:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39F5F7.B0672569@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30202

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> > >
> > Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)
> >
> And I am sure you have discovered there is little payoff in being the only
> sane man in the asylum :-)

Ain't that the truth! Thank God for the Bill of Rights!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

692. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:26:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39F671.D899B7AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30203

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote:
> > Hasn't this objective already been accomplished?...and for over ten
> > years now?
>
> No ... for access to the bands below 30 MHz, Morse
> proficiency is still required.

Awwwwwhhhhhhhh Carl, let them eat cake.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

693. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:30:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C39F73A.5CBE6546@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30204

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
> >'one' or 'zero', it's broke.
>
> Tristate...

Could you copy tristate Morse code, Ed? I hear the Chinese
do that with their language, i.e. the pitch changes the
meaning.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

694. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:40:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39F991.ECFCB849@uci.edu>
Source record: 30206

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...

Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
the government to operate CW?

695. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:41:03 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C39F9CF.F715C3EC@uci.edu>
Source record: 30205

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> > > There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.

> > It's a pretty big lie, though.

> You disagree that "always" has a very narrow definition. Exactly
> how can "always" deviate from "at all times"?

Please refrain from telling me what I disagree with you about. Thanks.

696. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 19:53:17 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <N0n_7.37559$fe1.609445@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30207

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C39F4E0.EBC8F132@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > My statements are always narrow even if I
> > > > >don't specifically say they are narrow.
> > > > >
> > > > That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.
> > > >
> > > See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> > > There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.
> > >
> > It's a pretty big lie, though.
> >
> You disagree that "always" has a very narrow definition. Exactly
> how can "always" deviate from "at all times"?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

But deviation must be restricted to fit into available bandwidth and the
receiver bandpass. :-)

697. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 20:31:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A05B4.303D2DB9@uci.edu>
Source record: 30208

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > > My statements are always narrow even if I
> > > >don't specifically say they are narrow.
> > >
> > > That's a broad, sweeping statement, Cecil.
> >
> > See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> > There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.
>
> It's a pretty big lie, though.

Clarifying for Cecil, the statement "My statements are always narrow
even if I don't specifically say they are narrow", is a pretty 'big' lie
- whether it happens to be narrow or not.

698. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 20:44:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201071244.326fc64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30209

CAM wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
> > If ya read Carl's posts about SS and "modern
> > digital modes" you see a future where most of what is done today is crowded off
> > the bands by "better mdoulations and codings".
>
> Well, spark gap was crowded off the bands by better methods.

Nope, not true.

Spark and arc transmissions were NOT "crowded off the bands". They
were simply abandoned by amateurs who began to use the new "undamped"
mode called "CW". By the time "damped waves" were no longer allowed
for amateurs, there weren't any amateurs still using them.

> There
> seems little doubt that technological progress will continue.

The question is whether existing modes are forced off the air. Shall
we talk about bandwidth limitations?

73 de Jim, N2EY

699. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 21:19:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1d39q0o80@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30210

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020107082649.05502.00000223@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.
>
> Bull, the truth is that Carl and his buddies, were either to Lazy or to
Stupid
> to learn a Basic Operating Mode. And as far as Carl he may have even had
> problems memorizing a BASIC written test, it only took him a Year to
upgrade.
> Thank God for are new Welfare Status Testing.

...and you were probably too stupid to fill out a 610 form properly when you
moved. That's why it took you nearly two years to change your address in
QRZ.

700. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 21:41:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A15C7.7A870384@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30211

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message

> > Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"

> Yes.
>
> To some people it is a barrier in the sense that
> they simply don't have the physical/aural ability.

These folks have my complete sympathy. We really need an equitable
alternative for the few of them in existence--those who are interested
in obtaining an amateur license and who have such disabilities.

> To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so
> disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they
> are unwilling to endure the "jumping through the
> hoop," despite the fact that they are in other ways
> completely qualified and would make good hams.

To this type I give no sympathy. Their case is: I don't wanna.
This is total arrogance on your part and theirs.

Dave K8MN

701. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:00:22 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020107170022.26155.00000113@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30212

>To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so
>disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they
>are unwilling to endure the "jumping through the
>hoop," despite the fact that they are in other ways
>completely qualified and would make good hams.

Now here's an interesting angle. I don't even know how to respond to this?

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

702. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:22:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201071422.657ab5b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30213

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

> > >I *have* stated the personal view that "hard core, stomp-em into
> > >the dust DX/contest types don't present the best amateur practice"
> > >
> > Let's hold it there a second. Who are these folks, exactly?
> >
> I don't have a list of callsigns ... I tend to avoid such folks
> rather than gravitate towards them ... it's the "type" and
> the behavior that I'm talking about, not focusing on specific
> individuals.

Sounds like you're stereotyping, to me.
>
> > >... for example, it's just plain rude when the pileup continues
> calling
> > >long after the DX station has already (tried to) respond to a
> station.
> > >
> > Rude is one reason, but only one. Usually, when you hear that sort
> of thing,
> > those in the pile don't know that the DX station has answered
> someone else. On
> > HF SSB, most stations are either talking or listening.
> >
> That's EXACTLY the problem ...

I don't think you understand.

If some ops get "out of sync" with the DX station, they are listening
at the wrong times. They don't hear the DX station calling somebody
else so they keep on calling.

> too much calling (trying to "drown
> out everyone else") and not enough listening ...

That's what you presume is happening. Very, very few have the power or
antennas to drown out everyone else.

> I frequently hear
> some twit sending his call over and over and over without even
> listening, long after the DX station has (at least tried to) answered
> someone else ... if there was a bit less outright aggression, things
> would work better for everyone ... including the DX station.

You presume "aggression" when what is usually going on is lack of what
pilots call "situational awareness". Remember that because of skip
zone, what YOU hear may be very different from what the DX or the
other stations in the pile hear.
>
> > >(I remember reading in the ARRL operator's guide many years ago
> > >"listen before transmitting," " be courteous," etc.)
> >
> > The problem is that they can't listen WHILE transmitting.
>
> See above ...

There IS a mode where it's possible to "listen while in transmitting
mode", though.

> > >Having said that, I've worked, as of this moment, since upgrading
> > >just about 3weeks ago, 72 countries, 40 states and all but one
> > >Canadian province (Labrador), using 100w and either a multiband
> > >dipole at 20 feet or a ground mounted trap vertical ... all without
> > >EVER calling "CQ" ONCE.
> >
> > Cool. Pretty nice when the spots are up and ya live on top of a
> hill, huh?
>
> I tune around and LISTEN ...

Of course.

And the spots are up and you do live on a hilltop, as I recall you
describing your house. Everything helps.

> in many instances, I was apparently
> the first to notice a station calling ...

That's how I got Albania on 40 meters a couple years back. Also W1BCG
on 160, my one and only 160 contact.

> in other cases, I throw my
> call
> out when the station I'm trying to contact ends a contact and says
> "QRZ?," then wait to see if he heard me ...

I think that's called "tailending"

> I don't keep repeating
> my callsign over and over for 60 seconds ...

People do what seems to work.

> > Just for the record, two months ago I worked 48 states and six
> Canadian
> > provinces in 13 hours using 5 watts output from a homebuilt rig and
> a homebrew
> > trap inverted V at 35 feet. And I didn't call CQ to work any of 'em.

> Good work ...

Thanks, but it wasn't even a fullblown effort.
>
> > btw, what bands/modes didja use for the above?
>
> 80m-6m ... lots on 10m ... yesterday worked Vancouver Is., BC on 6m
> from my E. PA location ...

I note that you tell us the bands but not the mode(s).
Interesting...;-)
>
> >Rig and antenna homebuilt?
>
> Using commercial gear I've had for a while ... my design/building
> is not aimed at the "conventional" modes ...

I do recall a post or two where you had some critical words for
"appliance operators"...

Then again, most race car drivers don't build their own cars, and few
marathon runners sew their own shoes.

> > > (Just to counter previous assertions that
> > >the first thing I'd do upon upgrading would be to start "shouting
> CQ
> > >DX" :-) I'm sure that some will criticize me for having a bit of
> fun
> > >with my new privileges ... tough.
> >
> > Considering your comments about "electronic paintball wars" and such
> in the
> > past, it's kinda surreal to see you counting countries, Carl. ;-)
>
> It's more a curiosity/casual amusement than a passion ... I'm not in
> a huge rush to gather paper or rack up awards ... just playing around
> a bit in my spare time. I never said I wouldn't use conventional
> modes
> or have some fun ... just that my major interest is in new technology
> (which I'm working on at my own pace as I get my lab organized
> in the new house ...)

It's still surreal that you know the exact number of countries, states
and provinces, but don't mention the mode used.
>
> > Waddya think about eQSLs? Should they be accepted for award credit?
>
> PERSONALLY, I think so ... having looked at the measures that
> eQSL is taking (registration process, logon with password, and
> sending a scanned copy of license for verification), I think it's
> secure enough to reasonable insure the integrity of the process.
>
> I also see significant benefit to the ham community in terms of

> cost savings through the use of such technology as an alternative
> to the expense of mailing conventional QSL cards via conventional
> postal means.

Well, there's something we can agree on. While I prefer an actual card from the actual amateur, in practice the cost of postage alone can become a significant burden. If you want nice picture cards, the cost of cards plus envelopes and postage both ways gets up there right quick. Add to this the percentage of folks who don't QSL or QSL slowly and eQSL starts looking REAL good.

73 de Jim, N2EY

703. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:26:30 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <tgp_7.405732$er5.15716191@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30227

"Kim" wrote in part ...

> Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a turn-off for
> enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for anyone who
> might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad side of
> ham radio, that chest thumping.
>

Speaking of "Chest Thumping", I see you still haven't changed that callsign
: -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

704. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:38:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <1sp_7.407023$er5.15733663@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30214

"CAM" wrote ...

> Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?

Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted "good buddy".

However, when I'm on say, 14.012, I just don't ever recall that kinda attitude. Imagine that?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

705. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:51:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A19DB.7BCDBC6A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30215

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> > >
> > > Or maybe, "We don't want the inmates running the asylum". :-)
> >
> > Indeed, it is easy to see why you shouldn't be making policy! =)
>
> I rest my case, Dick. You just proved that the FCC should be making
> amateur radio policy rather than the amateurs themselves.

Tell it to the FCC. They say they want hams to reach a concensus. As
if that were even remotely possible.

706. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:53:51 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C3A26FF.D47D7DFE@spam.me.not>
Source record: 30216
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another fake.

-SSB

Scott Unit-69 wrote:
>
> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<zHOZ7.36564$Tt3.4467119@news02.optonline.net>...
> > FAKE!
> > Train
> >
> > "Moparholic" <moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com...
> > > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > > write to about this at the ARRL?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic~
>
> No that is the real Mopar, you are confused, Train.
>
> Scott Unit-69
> Chesapeake Bay
> --

707. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 22:59:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A1BB7.DBCE39BD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30217

Bert Craig wrote:

> >To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so
> >disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they
> >are unwilling to endure the "jumping through the
> >hoop," despite the fact that they are in other ways
> >completely qualified and would make good hams.
>
> Now here's an interesting angle. I don't even know how to respond to this?

Oh, don't pay too much attention to Carl, Bert, he has always been one of the big "jumping through hoops" types. Can't see the forest for all those danged trees. Has no clue beyond his own narrow interests, and no use for anyone who doesn't consder his view of ham radio as "proper". Most NCI types could have easily learned the code and passed the tests as you and I did, but..... well, the fact that they didn't speaks for itself..

708. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:04:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A1CCF.7508C526@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30219

N2EY wrote:

>
> It's still surreal that you know the exact number of countries, states
> and provinces, but don't mention the mode used.
>

Uh, Jim, to NCI types there's only one mode...

709. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:08:42 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#sLml98lBHA.1292@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30218

N2EY writes:

> Add to this the percentage of folks who don't QSL or QSL slowly
> and eQSL starts looking REAL good.

Which brings up a point. N2EY still owes me a card, as I noticed just finishing up my QSL'ing cycle for CW SS weekend. He'll soon owe me a second one.

I played with one of the eQSL sites awhile back, and decided that eQSLs are impersonal, border on rude, and have no place among real hams. It kind of boils down to "what's the point?". I'm not suggesting everyone wants to send QSLs, but if you do, why would you send an eQSL? It's impersonal, has no value, requires some hassle to "put in the shoebox" at the recipient, and is unwelcome clutter in my email.

A paper QSL, even a very nice one, is cheap (mine cost less than a quarter, and they are very deluxe -- you can design and print your own on your computer if you wish). A paper QSL can reflect your personality, your creative ability, or your personal interests. It is the tangible token of our intangible electronic communication encounter. If it's too expensive for you, then don't do it, but please keep you electronic cards at home.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

710. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:08:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A1DE0.8E39916B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30220

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> > since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
>
> Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
> me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> "good buddy".
>
> However, when I'm on say, 14.012, I just don't ever recall that kinda
> attitude. Imagine that?

Arnie, Cecil knows, he's about as dumb as a fox, but he likes to be a contrarian. The Good Buddies have been gathering here for a long time,largely in the form of no-code techs but some have gone to Extra. I knew one who decided he liked it better as a freebander and abandoned ham radio.

711. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:09:37 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A2A92.9C356D89@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30221

Bert Craig wrote:

> >To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so
> >disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they
> >are unwilling to endure the "jumping through the
> >hoop," despite the fact that they are in other ways
> >completely qualified and would make good hams.
>
> Now here's an interesting angle. I don't even know how to respond to
> this?

Oh, there's several ways...

1) If CW is "distasteful" to someone, that person should stay as far away from the HF bands as possible! Maybe they should retreat to the VHF bands where the noxious dah-dits are in thin 100kHz slivers far, far away from the repeater frequencies. Or at least keep a barf bag handy for those excursions to the low ends of the bands.

2) Try to read "To others it is a barrier in the sense that it is so disinteresting, distasteful, or irrelevant that they are unwilling to endure the *35 question General exam*, despite the fact that they are in other ways completely qualified and would make good hams" with a straight face.

3) Point out that the membership of FISTS (paying $15 a year, no less, with a published membership list) is around *twice* the size of the membership of NCI (who pay no dues, have no public list of members, and may not even represent the current active membership).

joshua h
KF4PZI

712. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:12:45 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u3kao55t65hoae@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 30222
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen. i'm not paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P

713. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:20:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107182021.16307.00000117@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 30223

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> >Cecil was a digital jock before retirement. If it's not a
>> >'one' or 'zero', it's broke.

>> Tristate...

>Could you copy tristate Morse code, Ed? I hear the Chinese
>do that with their language, i.e. the pitch changes the
>meaning.

Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

714. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:28:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A2F2F.9A305BEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30224

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > See, you're doing it again. That is an infinitely narrow statement.
> > > > There is no room for any deviation whatsoever.
>
> > > It's a pretty big lie, though.
>
> > You disagree that "always" has a very narrow definition. Exactly
> > how can "always" deviate from "at all times"?
>
> Please refrain from telling me what I disagree with you about. Thanks.

Both those statement were questions. The lack of a "?" on the first
one is a typo. It should have read, "You disagree that 'always' has
a very narrow definition?" I didn't tell you what you disagree with -
I just asked a question.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

715. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:29:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A2F6E.4A28B487@uci.edu>
Source record: 30228

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> > since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
>
> Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
> me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> "good buddy".

> However, when I'm on say, 14.012, I just don't ever recall that kinda
> attitude. Imagine that?

You might try busting in on a DX QSO sometime with the suggestion that
one of the stations should clean up his signal, just to see how well
that goes over.
I've heard some of the RACES guys using a lot of 10 codes during an
activation. I don't really think they should, but what I think doesn't
really matter when they are conducting their business.

716. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:30:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A2F9E.463EC18B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30225

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Clarifying for Cecil, the statement "My statements are always narrow
> even if I don't specifically say they are narrow", is a pretty 'big' lie
> - whether it happens to be narrow or not.

You're wrong, Jim. I am a very narrow-minded person.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

717. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:35:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A30CD.8A47BB33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30226

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I rest my case, Dick. You just proved that the FCC should be making
> > amateur radio policy rather than the amateurs themselves.
>
> Tell it to the FCC. They say they want hams to reach a concensus. As
> if that were even remotely possible.

It's not possible. Therefore the FCC will do as they please. If hams
like you would only honor "The Amateur's Code", the problem would
go away. Why is so difficult for you guys to have "consideration for
the interests of others"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

718. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:39:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A31B9.EB2D8CB1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30229

N2EY wrote:
> Spark and arc transmissions were NOT "crowded off the bands". They
> were simply abandoned by amateurs who began to use the new "undamped"
> mode called "CW".

The end result was the same. Outdated modes are replaced by more
modern/efficient modes. SSB replaced most of AM. Digital voice
will replace most of SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

719. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:43:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A329E.D2AB9F37@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30230

Joshua Houk wrote:
> 1) If CW is "distasteful" to someone, that person should stay as far
> away from the HF bands as possible!

Do you really think Morse code is as important as everything else in
ham radio combined?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

720. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:50:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A345A.28D85A8E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30231

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> > Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> > since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
>
> Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
> me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> "good buddy".

What's wrong with ten-codes, Arnie? Are they vulgar or obscene? If so,
why do the police use them? If you hear someone talking Spanish on the
repeater, do you also object? Your sphincter muscle is in spasms. How
about live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

721. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:52:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A34A4.EDB48969@uci.edu>
Source record: 30234

CAM wrote:
> Both those statement were questions. The lack of a "?" on the first
> one is a typo. It should have read, "You disagree that 'always' has
> a very narrow definition?" I didn't tell you what you disagree with -
> I just asked a question.

Sure you did. Have you stopped beating xxxxx? is another such question.

722. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:52:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A34BE.72CC0CA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30232

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
>
> Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
> the government to operate CW?

Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

723. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:53:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A350F.8214062D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30233

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Could you copy tristate Morse code, Ed? I hear the Chinese
> >do that with their language, i.e. the pitch changes the
> >meaning.
>
> Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?

Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

724. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:54:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A3547.F9C6C8F9@uci.edu>
Source record: 30235

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> > > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
> >
> > Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
> > the government to operate CW?
>
> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)

Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
test. Don't know about any of the others.
```

725. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-07 23:55:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A3583.DE1A942B@uci.edu>
Source record: 30236

CAM wrote:

> You're wrong, Jim. I am a very narrow-minded person.

I'm not wrong. I never claimed you weren't narrow minded. ;-)

726. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 00:22:45 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A3BB5.1E596AB9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30237

CAM wrote:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
> > 1) If CW is "distasteful" to someone, that person should stay as far
> > away from the HF bands as possible!
>
> Do you really think Morse code is as important as everything else in
> ham radio combined?

No, I think that there's a lot of CW operation on the HF bands. If people get nauseous or are personally offended by the mode, they shouldn't put themselves in a position where they'd be likely to have to deal with it.

...or maybe it was just a flip response to a questionable comment. You decide.

joshua h
KF4PZI

727. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 00:29:57 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <z2r_7.1242$Mt5.75510@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 30238

KC8PMX wrote in message ...
>What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002? Try something new?? Elmer
>someone?? Promote the hobby better?? Build something?? Or ?? Please keep
>the topic somewhat close to Amateur Radio..
>
>May you be blessed with a safe and wonderful 2002!
>
>Ryan KC8PMX
>

1. take my test and get my tech (doing that the first saturday in Feb)
2. become familiar enough with code to go for at least my general ticket
3. build a QRP rig
4. build up a nice shack in the outbuilding behind the house
5. with 1.5 acres of land and no stinking building restrictions, I have
plenty of room to string some wires, and put up a tower or two.
6. attend a few hamfests to dig around for some good rigs
7. do some travelling that is NOT disaster related, maybe to meet some of
the more influential people I have had interesting discussions with in these
forums
8. settle down maybe find myself a woman thats crazy enough to have me
heheheh.

Keith Hosman

728. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 00:54:45 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <trr_7.409235$er5.15886808@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30239

How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them into codes or ciphers). As I recall, it was discussed (10 codes) in several of my licensing manuals from Gordon West. And of course, we all know what a sphincter Gordon West is, right? But then again, you LIKE to bend the rules, don't you Cecil. How about "Live and let live by the rules" They may have reduced the rules about code speed and test questions, but that code and cipher thingy is still in there.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

Cecil wrote ...
>
> What's wrong with ten-codes, Arnie? Are they vulgar or obscene? If so,
> why do the police use them? If you hear someone talking Spanish on the
> repeater, do you also object? Your sphincter muscle is in spasms. How
> about live and let live?

729. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 00:57:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <4ur_7.409253$er5.15889611@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30240

"Jim Kelley" wrote ...

> You might try busting in on a DX QSO sometime with the suggestion that
> one of the stations should clean up his signal, just to see how well
> that goes over.
> I've heard some of the RACES guys using a lot of 10 codes during an
> activation. I don't really think they should, but what I think doesn't
> really matter when they are conducting their business.

It's not so much what you or I think, Jim, but what the FCC thinks. ARES,
RACES, FEMA, it doesn't matter. They should NOT be using ten codes, and
they know it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

730. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 01:09:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020107200949.06877.00001086@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30241

In article <Oei_7.17$xu.2005@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>Thanks Jim, with so much damned negativity, I like to see some positivity
>once in a while.

Just read more of my posts, Ryan ;-) All there in google.
>
>Ryan KC8PMX
>
>My goals?
>
>Pass the Code Test.

Some resources online:

http://primera.tamu.edu/people/TAES/mgautreaux/code1.html

and see what N1IRZ has to say.

Also check out:

http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm

for an excellent online book on the subject, and

http://www.ah0a.org

for code learning shareware

>Explore a new band, (most likely 6 meters due to costs)

A good idea for all of us. I gotta try 30 meters.
>
>Bring at least 2-3 new hams into our ranks. Also working on selling our
>clubs ham radio classes to the law enforcement, fire departments, and EMS
>communities. With the nature of these people, they are perfect candidates
>to add to our ranks. The county fire training officer here where I live is
>a AWESOME supporter of amateur radio, and the thing we can do. I will
>definitely be utilizing him. This effort may get more than 2-3 hopefully.

Now THAT'S a goal!!
>
>Finish my "fire station project" (Goal is to get all of the volunteer fire
>departments set up with a 2m/7cm transciever to create one hell of a backup
>system for when a real disaster comes. This way ARES members can work from
>the fire station that is closest to them.

COOL!
>
>Get my step-brother back into the ham bands. He was licensed almost 20
>years ago, let his license lapse and now is interested again once he found
>out I am licensed. He travels as a "missionary" as I understand it, as a
>doctor providing medical care in some interesting countries. Talk about
>some DXepiditions! Got him the text he needs to refresh his memory and
>hopefully get him to a testing session with the next 30-60 days!
>
Betcha he hasn't forgotten much.

btw, I'm not sure, but I think that if he EVER held a Novice license, and can
prove it (old license, old callbook, etc.) then they will give him 5 wpm
credit, even if it's long expired.

>I am pursuing a ton of training related to the fire department I am with, so
>my time is extremely limited until June, otherwise I would have more to add
>to my list, but need to be realistic.

Any ONE of the above is worthwhile!
>
>I will keep those that care informed of my progress!
>
Same here. Good luck and God bless.

btw, I have another addition to my list:

- get eQSL qualified and functional

73 de Jim, N2EY
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020103080721.02371.00000823@mb-cc.aol.com...
>> In article <aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
><kc8pmx@tm.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?
>>
>> Great question, Ryan.
>>
>> Here are some of mine (in no particular order):
>>
>> - Get workshop and station properly set up and in order.
>> - Fix up antenna system with better materials, new coax, etc.
>> - Add some options and mods to K2 #2084
>> - Build kit or homebrew 100 W amp for same
>> - Sell off about 50% of ham radio parts/material inventory (that's a BIG
>job!)
>> - Set new personal best scores on FD, SS, and other contests.

>> - Attend a local hamfest or two
>> - Get BMI (body mass index) under 23 so I'm in better physical shape for
>all of
>> the above
>>
>> Will they all get done by December 31 2002? We'll see!
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>

731. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 01:36:11 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3A4D0B.409839DD@uci.edu>
Source record: 30242

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" wrote ...
>
> > You might try busting in on a DX QSO sometime with the suggestion that
> > one of the stations should clean up his signal, just to see how well
> > that goes over.
> > I've heard some of the RACES guys using a lot of 10 codes during an
> > activation. I don't really think they should, but what I think doesn't
> > really matter when they are conducting their business.

> It's not so much what you or I think, Jim, but what the FCC thinks. ARES,
> RACES, FEMA, it doesn't matter. They should NOT be using ten codes, and
> they know it.

That's a pretty tough sell, Arnie. Ten codes, like Q codes, are not prohibited by Part 97. They go against amateur tradition, and might be considered by some to be poor amateur practice, but that's about the extent of it. You might check to see what Riley has to say about it. Cringe and bear it?

What'd ya think of my idea about busting in on a dx qso to let the guy know he has a bad cw note? ;-)

73 de ac6xg

732. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:08:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1dk7h01mih@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30243

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106181034.05495.00000135@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >Why did it take you so long to change your address in QRZ when you moved?
> >
>
> What are you talking about? When did I move?

You know - from that nice brick, ranch-style house just east of Gibbs Avenue, and within walking distance of "Historic Ridgewood". You moved to Lousiana, and admitted IN THIS NEWSGROUP that you were active on six meters. QRZ still showed you at a QTH which had a "for sale" sign in front of it, sitting empty for nearly a year.

733. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:31:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a5b7b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30244

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:tgp_7.405732$er5.15716191@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>
> "Kim" wrote in part ...
>
> > Do you DX/Contest types realize how much your attitudes are a turn-off
for
> > enthusiasts of ham radio, and probably a certain turn-away for anyone
who
> > might get interested and then listens to such chest-thumping? Bad side
of
> > ham radio, that chest thumping.
> >
>
> Speaking of "Chest Thumping", I see you still haven't changed that
callsign
> : -))
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

Hellllooooooo Arnie:

Naw, why would I go an do a thing like that...leave me nothing to do
here...LOL ;)

How the heck are ya? Let's be friendly until we start in, K? LOL

Kim W5TIT

734. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:41:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020107214100.15114.00000138@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30245

In article <3C38A849.41B58DD1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> > Yelowbanding is my rite, and u and ur dam FCC cant do nuthing about
>> > it, fukers.
>> >
>> hehehe...yellowbanding sounds so appropo.... ;)
>
>By Jove, I think we are witnessing the coining of a new word -
>Yellowbanders.

What frequency range is the Yellow band? Are there any
amateur allocations there?

73 de Larry, K3LT

735. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:41:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020107214101.15114.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30246

In article <pan.2002.01.06.10.16.39.880182.23651@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>Response #5:
>All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they really
>apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
>only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our great
>hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!
>
>Jon

All these snivelling, drooling, knuckle-dragging, slack-jawed,
miserable people of the blue color are taking the ARS one step
closer to extinction.

BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?

73 de Larry, K3LT

736. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:48:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a5f5f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30248

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3A34BE.72CC0CA1@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> > > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
> >
> > Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
> > the government to operate CW?
>
> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

heh heh heh heh heh....

Kim W5TIT

737. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:48:56 UTC
From: Veverka <wd4oay@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <74t_7.409607$er5.16002722@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30247

What about the "Q" codes, I have been a licensed amateur since the late 70s
and it seems that they have always been an integral part of Ham radio.
Really what's the difference between them and the "10" codes? BTW, I am
also a Fl State Trooper and we use the "10" codes as opposed to the other
local police departments that use the "Q" codes and other signal codes. I
also think that there is an exception for commonly used codes such as the
"10" or "Q" codes in part 97 since they are well-known and not really trying
to hide the meaning of the communication.

73's
Chris-
WD4OAY - Miami, Fl.
"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:trr_7.409235$er5.15886808@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules
> Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications by
> putting them into codes or ciphers). As I recall, it was discussed (10
> codes) in several of my licensing manuals from Gordon West. And of
course,
> we all know what a sphincter Gordon West is, right? But then again, you
> LIKE to bend the rules, don't you Cecil. How about "Live and let live by
> the rules" They may have reduced the rules about code speed and test
> questions, but that code and cipher thingy is still in there.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
> Cecil wrote ...
> >
> > What's wrong with ten-codes, Arnie? Are they vulgar or obscene? If so,
> > why do the police use them? If you hear someone talking Spanish on the
> > repeater, do you also object? Your sphincter muscle is in spasms. How
> > about live and let live?
>
>
>
>
>
>

738. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:52:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a607a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30249

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net...
>
> Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting and
> use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless hams
> are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream. They do
> tend to latch on to one band and one mode.
>

Wow, Carl. I am certainly impressed. Dave *always* wants me using his
standards... :)

Kim W5TIT

739. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:54:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a60fe_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30250

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C39A45E.F57B40F1@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still
irritates
> > me
> > > to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and
called
> > CQ
> > > with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called
me
> > to
> > > tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch
> > traffic
> > > somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if
> > there
> > > was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX)
I'd
> > > have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling
from
> > > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a
doctor,
> > > and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made
about
> > > amateur radio.
> > >
> > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim AA2QA
> > >
> > > ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only
about 5
> > > over a good straight key.
> > >
> >
> > Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> > gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> > DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
>
> We all hear stories, Kim. All you need to do is develop an ability to
> separate the true stories from the fictional accounts. There's an old
> saw which goes, "If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is".

>
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave: would you puhleeze try experimenting with your pompousness on someone else? You are getting to be as boring as watching paint dry.

Kim W5TIT

740. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:57:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a61a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30251

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C39A577.E9F3D7F2@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call
me
> > > gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of
some
> > > DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
> >
> > Some say: Life is too short for QRP. I say: Life is too short for
pileups.
>
> Not if you do it right.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yeah, pileups are a good time to see how well and fast the dial will spin.
(Unless you need the activity to keep yourself awake or occupied in some
way...LOL)

Kim W5TIT

741. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 02:59:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a6222_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30252

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A1DE0.8E39916B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > "CAM" wrote ...
> >
> > > Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> > > since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
> >
> > Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> > heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> > (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely
told
> > me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> > "good buddy".
> >
> > However, when I'm on say, 14.012, I just don't ever recall that kinda
> > attitude. Imagine that?
>
> Arnie, Cecil knows, he's about as dumb as a fox, but he likes to be a
> contrarian. The Good Buddies have been gathering here for a long
time,largely in
> the form of no-code techs but some have gone to Extra. I knew one who
decided he
> liked it better as a freebander and abandoned ham radio.
>

Didya report 'im? It's your duty, you know...

Kim W5TIT

742. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:04:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a632f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30253

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:A%h_7.34966$fe1.582936@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Hans, to be honest, that was the ONLY time that ever happened. The timing
> was just so stinking LOUSY. I've run tons of phone patches from KG6AAY
> myself (I was stationed at the receiver site, working in crypto). We did
> have a typhoon wipe out the coast guard tower on Rota and sent a chief
over
> there. When the guys at the receiver kept telling him he was 'loud, but
> garbbled', likely due to having the rf gain all the way to the right, we
> gave the chief a shout ('sparkplug one, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY').
> Captain Delany showed up at the shack after we were asked to pass all
> traffic to ComNavMar direct - and 3 of us were secured from all other
duties
> untill he directed otherwise. There are, of course, a zillion facets to
> amateur radio, none of which represents exactly what amateur radio is all
> about. Myself, I enjoyed CW a lot - even giving at least one novice his
> first overseas contact (a WN2 out of New Jersey). I used to rag chew a
lot
> on RTTY - especially with Norm, VK2NP, for hours on end. What year were
you
> stationed on Guam?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:uYUp7nzlBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03...
> > AA2QA writes:
> >
> > > What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> > > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. ...blah, blah, blah...
> >
> > Jim,
> >
> > If you have to go back that far in time to dredge up a sob-story,
> > then things must be basically pretty damned good on the
> > ham bands.
> >
> > I ran literally thousands of phone patches from KG6AQI
> > on Guam and *never* had such an incident happen.
> >
> > I also worked tens-of-thousands of contest and DX

> > contacts from KG6AQI and KG6AAY on Guam and
> > *never* heard of an incident like you describe.
> >
> > I also (along with two other Guam hams) flew on our own
> > dime to Saipan after Typhoon Carole and provided the
> > only communications to the world for weeks after the
> > typhoon, moving thousands of pieces of recovery
> > traffic on the amateur bands for the TTPI Commissioner
> > without a single incident like you describe.
> >
> > And, yes Kim, I *am* beating my chest about it! Sorry
> > if that offends you.
> >
> > with all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >

Hans, you misunderstand me. I have no problem with people being extremely proud of *themselves* for their accomplishments. You sound like the kind of guy who would have done such a grand thing whether there was an audience or not.

'Tis the grandstanders (those looking for replenishment from the masses) who really bother me--they generally demand that you know exactly what they do/did and how dare you have any contrary attitude about it, you better respect them for it (even if the feat means not a thing to you). I am one of those "I am real happy for you" people--but don't look for me to gain respect or admiration for you [the figurative you--not *you*] if you're out there looking over your shoulder seeing if anyone noticed...I probably didn't: deliberately.

Kim W5TIT

743. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:06:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a63a6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30254

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C39E4D5.9E66DD95@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
> >
> > >W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > >> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> > >> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...
> >
> > >K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
> > >involved in radio transmission.
> >
> > Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.
>
> But you probably weren't lecturing to people about it on a newsgroup.

Yeah, Dave H. does have that propensity for lecturing, doesn't he?

Kim W5TIT

744. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:14:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a65a2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30258

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020107083833.13146.00000057@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org
>
> >All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they really
> >apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
> >only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our great
> >hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!
>
> You are only saying that because you want to protect your cushy job at
ARRL.
>
> 73,
> Ed, W1RFI

ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! ^^5, Ed

Kim W5TIT

745. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:14:37 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <But_7.409622$er5.16000977@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30255

"Veverka" wrote ...

> What about the "Q" codes, I have been a licensed amateur since the late
70s
> and it seems that they have always been an integral part of Ham radio.
> Really what's the difference between them and the "10" codes? BTW, I am
> also a Fl State Trooper and we use the "10" codes as opposed to the other
> local police departments that use the "Q" codes and other signal codes. I
> also think that there is an exception for commonly used codes such as the
> "10" or "Q" codes in part 97 since they are well-known and not really
trying
> to hide the meaning of the communication.
>

Q codes are *universally* (part 97's word not mine) accepted -- worldwide --
and are not prohibited by part 97 because of that. 10 codes vary *widely*
from state to state and even county to county and city to city. They are
not universally accepted and were designed for use by a very small group of
professionals and I doubt they are known to 90% of persons outside of this
group. If Riley has endorsed their use, he has mis-read the intent of part
97. Send a 10 code to an amateur in Russia and see how universally accepted
they are.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

746. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:15:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a65e0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30259

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >The "handle" here is Kim.
> >
>
> Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT

Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
though. Maybe you like that.

Kim W5TIT

747. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:16:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a660b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30260

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106231102.25512.00000221@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >by your actions on this newsgroup and in your posts, and on the QRZ
website,
>
> I think your just jealous, or maybe just a CB TIT with a Ham License.

I think the only thing they test tits for is breast cancer.

Kim W5TIT

748. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:18:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a6677_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30261

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >The "handle" here is Kim.
> >
>
> Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT

Say, speaking of which...do you keep one hand wrapped around your beer can
while you hunt and peck with your other?

Kim W5TIT

749. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:18:52 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <Ayt_7.409623$er5.16036689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30257

"Kim" wrote ...

>
> Hellllooooooo Arnie:
>
> Naw, why would I go an do a thing like that...leave me nothing to do
> here...LOL ;)
>
> How the heck are ya? Let's be friendly until we start in, K? LOL
>

I'm fine. I took a break from Ham radio for a while, but thought I'd come back and haunt the NG again. I've returned to the air and am having a blast . And ... of course I'll be nice. I always am. :-)) Hey, I see you upgraded, excellent ...

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

750. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:19:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7zt_7.344157$W8.12839621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30256

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020107214101.15114.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2002.01.06.10.16.39.880182.23651@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >
> >Response #5:
> >All of those negative comments about yellow are true, except they
really
> >apply to the color blue, you clueless, yellow-hating loser. We should
> >only allow people who truly understand yellow to participate in our
great
> >hobby. The blue lovers are destroying it!
> >
> >Jon
>
> All these snivelling, drooling, knuckle-dragging, slack-jawed,
> miserable people of the blue color are taking the ARS one step
> closer to extinction.
>
> BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The gospel according to Quiltmaker Magazine is Orange. But if you were
using an additive process like Color TV, it would be yellow.

751. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:55:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a6d5a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30262

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:beb0a48b.0201070528.88eec19@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:<3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> >
> > I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing
issue
> > is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a
barrier
> > to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can
> > certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I am
> > told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.
>
> I can certainly respect that POV. Let me just clarify my position on
> the code issue. I'm neither for nor against a no-code ticket.
>

Me neither, really. Although, if there was *really* something that could be
done to make everyone happy (like that's ever going to happen) I would hope
that it was not CW related. But, there's not...so it doesn't bother me one
way or the other.

>
> I
> absolutely do NOT have any harsh or demeaning words for anybody who
> wants to remain a NCT and enjoy 6m and higher for the duration of
> their amateur radio lives. I can understand the abrasiveness of being
> called a "Lifer No-code Tech," hence you'll not hear me call refer to
> anybody as such.
>

IMNSHO, people who get upset are as likely to act like those doing the
"namecalling." Think about it. I've never been upset at all by the name
"dumbed down" Tech, or whatever other acronym that can be brought up. I
don't "wear" the things people try to throw my way--I know me better than
that.

>
> HOWEVER, having just gone through the current "rite
> of passage," (...and it's perfectly ok to call it that, right?)
>

That's a good name for it, though some resent the "rite of passage" concept.

>
> I have

> a fresh "newbie" kind of perspective that some might be missing. I'd
> imagine that it'd tucker me out more battling to remove every last
> shred of a code requirement in AR than to just sit down (...or
> encourage someone else to) and spend 15 to 20 minutes every other day
> or so and listen to a few dits and dahs.
>

Oh, you and I are right on line with that one. Definitely. I think that's what I mean *most* when I say I don't really care one way or the other--I certainly am not motivated enough either way to fight any battle over it. And, that's been exactly my response to people who whine about it--get over it and do what is required to get the license; or don't.

>
> There's no time limit. I
> imposed a time constraint upon myself, but that's nothing required.
>
> > My opinion is that for a mode I don't personally like to use myself, I
have
> > no desire to learn it--it wastes my valuable time. But, for the Tech+
> > license I was *willing* to learn it at 5wpm.
>
> Perhaps this is what's it's all about? A "willingness" to fulfill the
> requirements to "earn" additional privileges.
>

Yeah, but my position on that "willingness" to learn extends out to be more than willing to learn something I will actually use. See? If they wanted to come up with some way to have a "lab" test (that's what I really think CW is, just a "lab" test), then come up with something *other* than mode testing. *OR*, give the applicants a choice of 2-3 different mode tests and let them decide which they'd rather study for. How 'bout put a packet station together; give a scenario for installation, you know: a pickup truck with no good area for ground, limited antenna mount surface, etc.; stuff like that.

> >
> > I used it once the night I
> > passed to placate an "overzealous" friend who wanted to see me use it on
the
> > air, and have never used it since--have no intention of ever using it
> > again...in fact, I'd be hard pressed to even know it now. I've never
wasted
> > my valuable time learning loads of other modes I have no intention of
using.
> > I've never wasted my time learning things about ham radio that, say, an
> > experimenter might learn--because I am not an experimenter.
>
> Duly noted and once again, POV respected. I personally want my key to
> eventually "beg for mercy" when I use it...but that's just me. My wife
> just shook her head when the three new sets of ARRL 'Increasing Your

> Code Speed' CD's arrived this weekend.
>

CW tones have a strange effect on me. I admire a good fist and love to watch CW being done. However, both when I was studying and whenever I try to watch for any length of time, I literally get very depressed, angry, and anxious. "We" (friends and I) could never put a finger on that until I got to listening one day to a new ham on frequency and he had a very, very monotonous tone to his voice--never changing tone, etc.--and it would be within a few moments and I'd be in the same mental state...so we think it is the monotony of the tone that gets to me. I also cannot *STAND* heavy metal guitar wailing for more than a minute or, preferrably, less.

>
> (The "I married a nerd"
> syndrome.)
>

Hey, if you think your wife would see the humor, tell her I created one. I am a computer geek and turned my very non-technical husband on to computers when we met. He is over there designing his next computer that he will be building (currently has a self-built AMD Athalon 800, with a Creative Anhialator II GTS video card, Soundblaster Live X-gamer, blah, blah, blah). *I* don't even build my own...LOL Then, very shortly after turning him on to computers, I got the bug to get a ham ticket and talked him into it. He knows way, way more than I ever cared to about radio...heh heh heh. Yep, I created a monster.

>
> While I can respect the inclusion of a No-code ticket, the
> cry for it's total elimination is a touch extreme. It's hard for me to
> put it in a politically correct context...it's just kinda "feels" like
> asking for a "free ride." If there were no access to AR without
> knowing the code, (Speed issue set aside.) that'd be one thing.
>

I think there's other things that could be done...as noted above.

>
> But to
> say it's a "barrier," please. An amateur radio license is a privilege,
> not a right. Rights are gauranteed, privileges are earned. I've never
> used plenty of stuff that I've learned in school. I'll bet you have
> too. I sat through three calculus courses, never had to differentiate
> in my life...for pay or pleasure.
>

I never sat through calculus, but used to be in the environmental industry (started out as an Abatement Inspector during the asbestos hey-day); went on to PCM (Phase Contrast Microscopy) and could do PLM (Polarized Light Microscsopy)--though I was never certified in PLM. I am certified in PCM. Hated, hated, hated it...way too much standard deviation stuff...LOL

>
> But I sure am glad it was part of my
> overall "formal" education and you'd better believe it was required.
> Do I think we'll ever actually "NEED" the code. IMHO, we've got folks
> in harms way right now who might have a need for it? I know that if I
> was trapped in an elevator or an "air pocket" in the WTC rubble on
> 9/11 and I banged out .- .-.. .. ...- . ...-.. .--., I'd pray
> that my guardian angel was a "coded" ham before filling his/her
> current position. Do we still need it...I dunno?
>

Hmmmm, please don't take this as contraire, just something to offer in the
way of a challenge. There is no way that you can guarantee someone will be
around who knows CW. No more than you can guarantee that there will be
someone around who knows Spanish, Greek, French, has a way to communicate
with the deaf, etc. See where I am going? In a disaster, simply pounding
will get attention, simply yelling will get attention, and both those modes
are more likely to be *clearly* understood (save from a deaf person, who
would never hear a thing).

Conversely, it would be just as appropriate for you to learn every and any
language you possibly can to attain *fuller* guarantee of having assurance
that *someone* will understand you need help. I think just banging and
yelling will give you far more time to learn other things...like maybe CPR
that might help you help someone in a time of need. *HOWEVER* :) if you
enjoy the mode, any mode, why not?

> >
> > While it goes against the angst of some hams, I am one of those dreaded
> > "light-duty" ham radio enthusiasts (if the term enthusiast can be used
for
> > my type of ham). The "hobby" of ham radio is a distraction for me, not
an
> > avocation. I do enjoy emergency communication, and some public service.
> > What do I mean by that? I mean that I enjoy the storm spotting aspect
of
> > emergency communication because I've always enjoyed observing severe
weather
> > anyway--that I am a ham radio operator fits right in with that. I enjoy
> > public service--but *not* in the middle of summer here in Texas in the
100+
> > degree heat; they can find someone else who wants to do that (I'll
provide
> > radio equipment, logistics, etc., but I ain't sittin' in no heat for
some
> > 'nidiot [said affectionately] bike rider who finds it compelling to push
the
> > physical limitations of mind and body by cycling in this Summer weather
down
> > here).
>
> I was always a bit of a "techno-nerd." I'm easy either way. I'd just

> as soon see folks enjoy AR for what they glean from it.
>

Absolutely. And be it far from me to ever decide that someone *just has* to
experience what *I* think is exciting.

> >
> > But, if pressed, i.e., in a severe or disaster situation, I would
operate as
> > needed for as long as needed, with a smile on my face and knowing that
the
> > time I *have* taken to learn operating skills specific to my
> > needs/want/interests can be of some value to the community. I also
believe
> > that emergency communication and public service is a major consideration
for
> > ham radio's "existence." In my opinion, experimentation would be the
> > second-most point for consideration; however, I am not personally into
> > experimentation (if I build, I build by specification and blueprint--not
> > willing to "play"). There is an exception to that: I do enjoy
experimenting
> > with better portable communicating methods/practices. I used to do it a
> > lot, but haven't now in a couple/few years. These things are not
generally
> > taught to hams in emergency communication. Concepts like remote control
of
> > a mobile radio with a talkie when you are a distance away from your
vehicle;
> > cross-banding; using those bells and whistles we never use on our
VHF/UHF
> > radios: paging, digital tones, encode/decode on simplex, pushing the
limits
> > of simplex by learning the extreme art of communicating and listening in
> > worst case scenarios, (did you know if you key up and say a word or two
at a
> > time, the full message can often be fully understand? Know why?), etc.
>
> Entirely cool! I happen to catch part of the movie 'Contact' last
> night and there's a line where Jodie Foster's character is given a
> cyanide pill "just in case." When asked "why," the commander's
> response seems to fit this discussion to a tee. "There are lots of
> reasons we can think of for having this with you, <cyanide pill> but
> most of all...it's for the reasons we CAN'T think of. Kim, I respect
> and admire your approach toward the disaster/emergency service aspect
> of AR...but I sure hope a Tech+ or above responds when I bang out that
> short message above when my voice is lost due to smoke inhalation
> and/or screaming in terror. (We all know what happened to the local
> cell-phone service during the moments immediately following the second
> strike to the WTC, right? It went the way of the 13 and 20-wpm
> testing.
>

Hey, you never answered the "Know why?" above. It's my theory--completely unexplained--that when you *first* key up your radio outputs the most power. As a few seconds go on the initial draw becomes a lower and constant output. In times of severe operating situations, short two or three word outputs at a time are often more successful than keying up your radio and talking for longer than a few seconds. Remember that, in case you ever need it. It's especially effective in severe weather (lightning burst) conditions. Also, if you're communicating through repeaters...and don't ask me to figure this one out either, it just works...if you've got a really bad signal, key up on the tail end of someone who has a good signal into the repeater, you're signal will be better. Once again, only works for a few seconds at a time. This is where teamwork comes in: if these ideas are discussed as methods, someone will know what you are trying to do and will "put the word out" for people to key up the repeater for you and let you get in at the very end. Don't ask me why it works...have no idea.

One other thing, since you seemed to have a listening ear for this kind of thing. How 'bout the person who has a nice, tall tower in the middle of a county? Eh? Most mobile stations during bad weather can't get to the repeater. Eh? So, the ham with the nice tall tower in the middle of a county puts the fixed station in crossband repeat mode, to a 440 repeater easily held, down to a 2M repeater easily held. Eh? Voila...may not be a "repeater" but works darned nice... Most mobile stations in my county can hit my dual-band antenna on simplex; and my dual band antenna hits a great coverage repeater with assurance every time (we've got a not-so-reliable repeater, so crossband to a great one in Dallas works great--everyone can hear it, but not everyone can hit it). Another thing to be played with is having "fixed mobile" stations (those with excellent operating conditions when mobile) be "fixed" throughout the county and, guess what, be crossband repeating (even on different frequencies for different operations).

> >
> > I think the government has a reasonable expectation to "test" for
> > licenses--but I think it is an unreasonable expectation for our
government,
> > or anyone else, to have people learn something they don't intend to use.
I
> > think the provision of the word "barrier" is probably more severe than
> > reality--it isn't a true barrier in that one cannot learn it (unless
deaf,
> > etc.). But, in the spirit of the game, it is a barrier for those who
don't
> > wish to learn it. I have no problem with learning whatever for a
written
> > test--and I've been a proponent of such strict written testing that I
> > probably wouldn't spend the time to learn for--but I am not in support
of
> > any kind of "mode" testing. It sets the stage for the very kind of
> > attitudes we often see displayed here, and gosh knows that we hear on
the
> > air. Heck, the license itself is enough of an ego-maniacal booster for
> > some!

> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Understood. Take it easy and talk with you later. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Alrighty! Wow, I love a good conversation!

Kim W5TIT

752. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 03:57:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a6dd8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30264

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:Ayt_7.409623$er5.16036689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Kim" wrote ...
>
> >
> > Hellllooooooo Arnie:
> >
> > Naw, why would I go an do a thing like that...leave me nothing to do
> > here...LOL ;)
> >
> > How the heck are ya? Let's be friendly until we start in, K? LOL
> >
>
>
> I'm fine. I took a break from Ham radio for a while, but thought I'd come
> back and haunt the NG again. I've returned to the air and am having a
blast
> . And ... of course I'll be nice. I always am. :-)) Hey, I see you
> upgraded, excellent ...
>
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

No.? Didn't upgrade.? Tech+, same as always.

Kim W5TIT

753. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:04:39 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <rdu_7.344223$W8.12844207@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30263

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote

> And, so it goes... :)

Hey... Kim...

That was the title of Linda Ellerbee's book back in 1986. That was the phrase she used at the end of her broadcasts. The book was great... she's definitely my favorite TV Journalist. If I remember correctly... she was Texan... right???

Rich

754. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:12:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A6511.EE648A27@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30265

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > >Could you copy tristate Morse code, Ed? I hear the Chinese
> > >do that with their language, i.e. the pitch changes the
> > >meaning.
> >
> > Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?
>
> Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?

heh. This guy has been a ham for 50 years???

755. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:43:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A789D.41D07F25@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30266

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting and
> > use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless hams
> > are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream. They do
> > tend to latch on to one band and one mode.
> >
>
> Wow, Carl. I am certainly impressed. Dave *always* wants me using his
> standards... :)

Quite untrue, Kim. I've hoped you'd decide to use the standards of good
taste.

Dave K8MN

756. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:46:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A7955.53E533EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30267

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C39A45E.F57B40F1@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:sM7_7.236970$WW.12784970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Kim, I'd laugh too, but one thing happened years ago that still
> irritates
> > > me
> > > > to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and
> called
> > > CQ
> > > > with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called
> me
> > > to
> > > > tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch
> > > traffic
> > > > somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if
> > > there
> > > > was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX)
> I'd
> > > > have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling
> from
> > > > KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a
> doctor,
> > > > and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made
> about
> > > > amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > Jim AA2QA
> > > >
> > > > ps - who would grease a paddle up for a lousy 30 WPM? That's only
> about 5
> > > > over a good straight key.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call me
> > > gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of some
> > > DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
> >
> > We all hear stories, Kim. All you need to do is develop an ability to

> > separate the true stories from the fictional accounts. There's an old
> > saw which goes, "If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is".
> >
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave: would you puhleeze try experimenting with your pompousness on someone
> else? You are getting to be as boring as watching paint dry.

That's the kind of response one expects from someone who has an opinion
on everything but little knowledge of any particular subject. It seems
to be a specialty of yours.

How many times have you had nothing better to do than watch paint dry?

Dave K8MN

757. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:47:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A79A5.83CBE27A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30268

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C39A577.E9F3D7F2@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > Hi James: Yes, I've heard these types of stories (Dave Heil will call
> me
> > > > gullible now). I have also heard such a story of the bad habits of
> some
> > > > DXers from DXers who try very hard to live the bad reputation down.
> > >
> > > Some say: Life is too short for QRP. I say: Life is too short for
> pileups.
> >
> > Not if you do it right.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yeah, pileups are a good time to see how well and fast the dial will spin.
> (Unless you need the activity to keep yourself awake or occupied in some
> way...LOL)

Same response as my earlier post. You have an opinion but little
knowledge of the subject.

Dave K8MN

758. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:49:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7a1a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30270

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A789D.41D07F25@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting and
> > > use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless
hams
> > > are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream. They
do
> > > tend to latch on to one band and one mode.
> > >
> >
> > Wow, Carl. I am certainly impressed. Dave *always* wants me using his
> > standards... :)
>
> Quite untrue, Kim. I've hoped you'd decide to use the standards of good
> taste.
>
> Dave K8MN

You are nothing but a wolf in sheep's clothing, Dave.

So, the standards of good taste are not yours, huh?

Kim W5TIT

759. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:50:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7a57_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30271

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A7955.53E533EF@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > Dave: would you puhleeze try experimenting with your pompousness on
someone
> > else? You are getting to be as boring as watching paint dry.
>
> That's the kind of response one expects from someone who has an opinion
> on everything but little knowledge of any particular subject. It seems
> to be a specialty of yours.
>
> How many times have you had nothing better to do than watch paint dry?
>
> Dave K8MN

How many of your posts have I read?

Kim W5TIT

760. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:52:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7aa1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30272

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A7ABF.1D588A7B@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > Yeah, Dave H. does have that propensity for lecturing, doesn't he?
>
> You have numerous opinions but little knowledge, Kim. You've now
> regaled us (with some massaging of wording and some back pedaling) on
> how apartment dwellers antennas stack up against "the finest antenna
> farms". Here's a clue: They aren't snickering at me, Kim.
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh you know they, too?

Kim W5TIT

761. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:52:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A7ABF.1D588A7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30269

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C39E4D5.9E66DD95@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
> > >
> > > >W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > >> Be a real ham--do it with QRP, or attic installations, or do
> > > >> some *real* experimentation with rooftop wire configurations...
> > >
> > > >K8MN is right. You simply do not understand the physics
> > > >involved in radio transmission.
> > >
> > > Neither did I for the first few years of my hamming experience.
> >
> > But you probably weren't lecturing to people about it on a newsgroup.
>
> Yeah, Dave H. does have that propensity for lecturing, doesn't he?

You have numerous opinions but little knowledge, Kim. You've now
regaled us (with some massaging of wording and some back pedaling) on
how apartment dwellers antennas stack up against "the finest antenna
farms". Here's a clue: They aren't snickering at me, Kim.

Dave K8MN

762. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:54:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7b44_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30275

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:rdu_7.344223$W8.12844207@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote
>
> > And, so it goes... :)
>
> Hey... Kim...
>
> That was the title of Linda Ellerbee's book back in 1986. That was the
> phrase she used at the end of her broadcasts. The book was great... she's
> definitely my favorite TV Journalist. If I remember correctly... she was
> Texan... right???
>
> Rich
>

Hmmmm, when I first read that I had no idea who you were talking about. Then, I remembered the name Linda Ellerbee and I know I've heard her. Was it...NPR? Heck, can't remember. Anyway, if I've picked that up having heard it from her, I can't remember. I *do* remember the phrase "watch was you wish for because you just might get it." And, now, I can't remember who said that (female on NPR, but I think locally here in Dallas).

Kim W5TIT

763. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:56:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7bb4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30277

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A7CB0.BCE1A84@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > Hey, you never answered the "Know why?" above. It's my
theory--completely
> > unexplained--that when you *first* key up your radio outputs the most
power.
> > As a few seconds go on the initial draw becomes a lower and constant
output.
> > In times of severe operating situations, short two or three word outputs
at
> > a time are often more successful than keying up your radio and talking
for
> > longer than a few seconds. Remember that, in case you ever need it.
It's
> > especially effective in severe weather (lightning burst) conditions.
Also,
> > if you're communicating through repeaters...and don't ask me to figure
this
> > one out either, it just works...if you've got a really bad signal, key
up on
> > the tail end of someone who has a good signal into the repeater, you're
> > signal will be better. Once again, only works for a few seconds at a
time.
> > This is where teamwork comes in: if these ideas are discussed as
methods,
> > someone will know what you are trying to do and will "put the word out"
for
> > people to key up the repeater for you and let you get in at the very
end.
> > Don't ask me why it works...have no idea.
>
> ...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will probably
> put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
> quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot buried
> at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
> increases in gain.
>
> Dave K8MN

You'll have to excuse Dave, Bert. He has nothing better to do but watch
paint dry; paint he probably applied with a silver brush.

Kim W5TIT

764. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:59:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7c41_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30278

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A7D27.992AF51C@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C3A789D.41D07F25@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting
and
> > > > > use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless
> > hams
> > > > > are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream.
They
> > do
> > > > > tend to latch on to one band and one mode.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Wow, Carl. I am certainly impressed. Dave *always* wants me using
his
> > > > standards... :)
> > >
> > > Quite untrue, Kim. I've hoped you'd decide to use the standards of
good
> > > taste.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You are nothing but a wolf in sheep's clothing, Dave.
> >
> > So, the standards of good taste are not yours, huh?
>
> That is correct, Kim. I didn't codify them, I simply subscribe to them.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, demand and badger until others do.

Kim W5TIT

765. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 04:59:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3a7c7b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30279

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A7D67.8FC5D186@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C3A7955.53E533EF@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave: would you puhleeze try experimenting with your pompousness on
> > someone
> > > > else? You are getting to be as boring as watching paint dry.
> > > >
> > > That's the kind of response one expects from someone who has an
opinion
> > > on everything but little knowledge of any particular subject. It
seems
> > > to be a specialty of yours.
> > >
> > > How many times have you had nothing better to do than watch paint dry?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > How many of your posts have I read?
>
> Don't bother reading or responding!
>
> Dave K8MN

I do it when I don't have anything better to do...

Kim W5TIT

766. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:00:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A7CB0.BCE1A84@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30273

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Hey, you never answered the "Know why?" above. It's my theory--completely
> unexplained--that when you *first* key up your radio outputs the most power.
> As a few seconds go on the initial draw becomes a lower and constant output.
> In times of severe operating situations, short two or three word outputs at
> a time are often more successful than keying up your radio and talking for
> longer than a few seconds. Remember that, in case you ever need it. It's
> especially effective in severe weather (lightning burst) conditions. Also,
> if you're communicating through repeaters...and don't ask me to figure this
> one out either, it just works...if you've got a really bad signal, key up on
> the tail end of someone who has a good signal into the repeater, you're
> signal will be better. Once again, only works for a few seconds at a time.
> This is where teamwork comes in: if these ideas are discussed as methods,
> someone will know what you are trying to do and will "put the word out" for
> people to key up the repeater for you and let you get in at the very end.
> Don't ask me why it works...have no idea.

...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will probably
put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot buried
at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
increases in gain.

Dave K8MN

767. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:02:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A7D27.992AF51C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30274

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3A789D.41D07F25@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C39988F.F9363E5D@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Of course I used my standards. Why would I attend a club meeting and
> > > > use *your* standards? I have never stated that I believe codeless
> hams
> > > > are unworthy. They do tend to be cut off from the mainstream. They
> do
> > > > tend to latch on to one band and one mode.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Wow, Carl. I am certainly impressed. Dave *always* wants me using his
> > > standards... :)
> >
> > Quite untrue, Kim. I've hoped you'd decide to use the standards of good
> > taste.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You are nothing but a wolf in sheep's clothing, Dave.
>
> So, the standards of good taste are not yours, huh?

That is correct, Kim. I didn't codify them, I simply subscribe to them.

Dave K8MN

768. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:03:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3A7D67.8FC5D186@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30276

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3A7955.53E533EF@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave: would you puhleeze try experimenting with your pompousness on
> someone
> > > else? You are getting to be as boring as watching paint dry.
> >
> > That's the kind of response one expects from someone who has an opinion
> > on everything but little knowledge of any particular subject. It seems
> > to be a specialty of yours.
> >
> > How many times have you had nothing better to do than watch paint dry?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> How many of your posts have I read?

Don't bother reading or responding!

Dave K8MN

769. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:12:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A7FD6.3D20D537@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30280

Arnie Macy wrote:
> They should NOT be using ten codes, and they know it.

If ten codes are good enough for the police, why aren't they
good enough for hams?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

770. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:16:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30281

Arnie Macy wrote:
> How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules
> Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications by
> putting them into codes or ciphers).

Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

771. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 05:20:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3A81B2.B21B6D9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30282

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?
> > >
> > Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?
>
> heh. This guy has been a ham for 50 years???

Why do you think it's called ON/OFF Keying, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

772. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 06:17:01 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <EE4A4DE1CEA09F92.D7845CC331DDC478.3A847FC479BDDD23@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30283

On 08 Jan 2002 02:41:00 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3C38A849.41B58DD1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>> > Yelowbanding is my rite, and u and ur dam FCC cant do nuthing about
>>> > it, fukers.
>>> >
>>> hehehe...yellowbanding sounds so appropo.... ;)
>>
>>By Jove, I think we are witnessing the coining of a new word -
>>Yellowbanders.
>
>What frequency range is the Yellow band? Are there any
>amateur allocations there?

Depends; I'm pretty sure we're all referring to the 'freeband' here,
which keeps on taking up more and more of 10M.

If you want to know what band yellow actually is, it's something near
570nm, which should be entirely within our 'all above 30GHz'
allocation.

FWIW, the blue band is roughly 475nm.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

773. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 06:23:17 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <79w_7.234017$BX4.13190615@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30284

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.

What does 10-10 mean, 10-95, 10-0, 10-18? Go to different parts of the country and you'll get different answers. In some jurisdictions, go to different police departments and you'll get different answers. The problem is obvious. During an emergency, I could theoretically send a 10 code that tells you I am in serious trouble and need help immediately (according to your "published" chart), when in fact the 10 code *I* am using means prepare to make written copy. Use a 10 code when talking to a Russian Ham and see what kind of response you get. Q- signals are universally accepted (standardized) -- worldwide -- Read part 97 concerning "universally" accepted codes and ciphers, then get back to me.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

774. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 11:59:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108065951.13150.00000345@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30285

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)

>Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
>test. Don't know about any of the others.

They all give the same exam.

If the Morse code test is not related to operating, why should it be given?

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

775. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:02:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108070216.13150.00000346@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30286

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?

>Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?

There are three elements to Morse encoding, Cecil. The dit, the dah and the space. The length of the space determines element separation, character separation and word separation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

776. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:05:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108070506.13150.00000347@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30287

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
>heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
>(politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
>me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
>"good buddy".

QSL, OM.

The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
voice. Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

777. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:06:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108070627.13150.00000348@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30288

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>It's not so much what you or I think, Jim, but what the FCC thinks.

What FCC regulation prohibits the use of 10 codes in Amateur Radio
communications?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

778. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:08:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108070802.13150.00000349@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30289

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules
>Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications by
>putting them into codes or ciphers).

The use of 10 codes does not hinder meaning any more than the use of Q signals.
Neither are illegal, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

779. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:14:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30290

From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust

>Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
>pattern.

How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

780. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:17:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108071709.13150.00000353@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30291

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>To this type I give no sympathy. Their case is: I don't wanna.
>This is total arrogance on your part and theirs.

Is there any part of the current requirements that you consider inappppropriate
or irrelevant to Amateur Radio today?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

781. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:18:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108071817.13150.00000354@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30292

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Most NCI types could have
>easily learned the code and passed the tests as you and I did, but..... well,
>the fact that they didn't speaks for itself..

Carl passed exactly the same tests as Bert did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

782. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 12:19:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108071959.13150.00000355@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30293

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>When 5WPM code is finally gone, there will be those who start talking
>about the barriers of the written exam...

I bet you a lobster dinner that Carl won't be one of them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

783. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 14:08:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3AFCD6.C440C1AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30294

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >To this type I give no sympathy. Their case is: I don't wanna.
> >This is total arrogance on your part and theirs.
>
> Is there any part of the current requirements that you consider inappppropriate
> or irrelevant to Amateur Radio today?

No.

Dave K8MN

784. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 14:40:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B04EB.5A8C24A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30295

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> > Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> > rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
>
> What does 10-10 mean, 10-95, 10-0, 10-18?

Somewhere around here I have a list of the ten codes that I got from
the Texas Highway Patrol whose I45 frequencies I monitor.

> During an emergency, I could theoretically send a 10 code that
> tells you I am in serious trouble and need help immediately (according to
> your "published" chart), when in fact the 10 code *I* am using means prepare
> to make written copy.

You could theoretically send me something in German that I could
misinterpret. Is German prohibited?

> Use a 10 code when talking to a Russian Ham and see
> what kind of response you get.

Use Japanese when talking to a Russian Ham and see what kind of
response you get. Is Japanese prohibited?

> Q- signals are universally accepted
> (standardized) -- worldwide -- Read part 97 concerning "universally"
> accepted codes and ciphers, then get back to me.

Q-signals are NOT "universally" accepted. They are accepted by less
than one percent of the population on only one planet out of billions
in the universe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

785. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 14:45:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B0624.A0ABF6F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30296

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>
> >How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules
> >Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications by
> >putting them into codes or ciphers).
>
> The use of 10 codes does not hinder meaning any more than the use of Q signals.
> Neither are illegal, IMHO.

The 10-codes would be illegal *ONLY* if the purpose of using them is to
obscure the meaning of the transmission. The Q-codes would be illegal
if they were scrambled so the purpose was to obscure the meaning of
the transmission. That 10-codes may not be understood by some receiver
is the receiver's problem akin to not understanding a foreign language.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

786. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:01:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <MQD_7.144$xu.21033@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30297

Kinda like..... SPARK GAP=REAL HAM?? STRAIGH KEY=REAL HAM???

Just kidding.... surprised we have seen the "monthly" postings from that idiot. I would not call him an idiot if he ever responded to responses to his posts eh?

Hope the new year is treating you well there Cecil!

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C39B880.D6B1CCD2@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > If ya read Carl's posts about SS and "modern
> > digital modes" you see a future where most of what is done today is crowded off
> > the bands by "better mdoulations and codings".
>
> Well, spark gap was crowded off the bands by better methods. There
> seems little doubt that technological progress will continue.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

787. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:06:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B0AEF.8F4307D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30298

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?
>
> >Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?
>
> There are three elements to Morse encoding, Cecil. The dit, the dah and the
> space. The length of the space determines element separation, character
> separation and word separation.

When we talk about states of a modulation method, we are not talking
about coded elements. There are only two modulation states involved with
Morse/CW/OOK. The OOK part says it all - ON/OFF. FSK also has two states.

In any case, the Morse code 'dah' and 'space' timings are specified
with respect to the basic 'dit' time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

788. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:07:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B0B3D.6AEBFA71@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30299

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >By Jove, I think we are witnessing the coining of a new word -
> >Yellowbanders.
>
> What frequency range is the Yellow band? Are there any
> amateur allocations there?

Presumably, the Yellow Band is where the cowards congregate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

789. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:13:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B0C9A.DCAFFB0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30300

KC8PMX wrote:
> Hope the new year is treating you well there Cecil!

I'm caring for three sick kinfolk in their 90's. It
doesn't promise to be a good year.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

790. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:31:26 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a1f3bo$pg7$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 30351

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:1sp_7.407023$er5.15733663@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Is that the hordes of CBers who are invading the ham bands
> > since the outdated Morse code requirement has been reduced?
>
> Funny you should mention that, Cecil. I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
> me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> "good buddy".
>

If he had politely said that he could use the '10 codes' because both of
you had your licenses, would that have made a difference?

I hear 10 codes being used around here on 2m from the "I want to be
an emergency ham" types all the time. I don't really like hearing it but I
understand the ones doing it are also fire, police, and emergency management
members who are ALSO ham operators, and just getting their 'lingo' a little
mixed up. I've also used a Q code on the public safety frequencies and
the world didn't come to an end ! :)

> However, when I'm on say, 14.012, I just don't ever recall that kinda
> attitude. Imagine that?

Could it be that the operators on 14.012 have been doing it a little longer
and are more experenced and make fewer mistakes?

But I agree with you in that your 10 code buddy should have been a lot
more polite in his response to you. We ALL need to work on that thing
called "Common Courtsy"

>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

791. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 15:55:43 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a1f4p8pgq1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 30352

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C3B0B3D.6AEBFA71@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >By Jove, I think we are witnessing the coining of a new word -
> > >Yellowbanders.
> >
> > What frequency range is the Yellow band? Are there any
> > amateur allocations there?
>
> Presumably, the Yellow Band is where the cowards congregate.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

OK now, if yellow band is freebanding and blue band is ARS, does
that make sunlight "Broadband"? Or is it all of the light that the FLC
(Federal Light Commission) controls?
Inquiring minds want to know!
--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

792. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 16:33:44 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3C3B1F68.5608@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 30355

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > >The "handle" here is Kim.
> > >
> >
> > Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT
>
> Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
> though. Maybe you like that.
>
> Kim W5TIT
Kim,
This is more information than we really need.
Martin N5PZJ

793. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 16:38:48 UTC
From: Mark <Mark_II@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <3C3B20AB.6F3C6F53@nospam.com>
Source record: 30353
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have the NOAA frequencies programmed into my ht and leave it set to
NOAA radio. Always asked to turn the ht on and that way it works and
should they touch the PTT it will not transmit. Then turn off and they let me
pass.
Never asked to show my fcc ticket.

enjoy the flight(s) mark II

> > >Hi all,> >

> > >I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
> > >carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
> > >having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
> > >situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
> > >them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
> > >
> > >Thanks!
> >

794. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 16:43:19 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OdIr0KGmBHA.668@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30354

KT4ST mashed his "send" button :

> Read part 97 concerning "universally" accepted codes and
> ciphers, then get back to me.

OK, I did that, and now I'm back to you. I looked for "universally"
and "universal" -- the words are not mentioned.

What *is* mentioned is "intended to obscure the meaning".
Since 10-codes are not sent with intent of obscure, then I'm
sure FCC will not mind me using them.

And oh, by the way, Q-codes on voice are also perfectly
acceptable at my house.

With all kind wishes for 2K.002,

de Hans, K0HB

--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

795. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 16:48:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <apF_7.39471$fe1.704846@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30356

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B0AEF.8F4307D3@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >> Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate"
element?
> >
> > >Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?
> >
> > There are three elements to Morse encoding, Cecil. The dit, the dah
and the
> > space. The length of the space determines element separation,
character
> > separation and word separation.
>
> When we talk about states of a modulation method, we are not talking
> about coded elements. There are only two modulation states involved with
> Morse/CW/OOK. The OOK part says it all - ON/OFF. FSK also has two
states.
>
> In any case, the Morse code 'dah' and 'space' timings are specified
> with respect to the basic 'dit' time.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Actually, both of them are tri-state. The case of FSK is mark, space, and
nothing. With OOK, it is on, off by intention, and gone. The OOK
situation requires wetware to discern the diff which is why FSK was
invented to begin with; compooters, even ones that clank, have a hell of a
time with the ambiguity of OOK.

796. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:19:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B1D96.4480A0FE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30357

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > Could you copy Morse code that did not include the "tristate" element?
> > >
> > > Dunno, what is there besides on and off (as in OOK)?
> >
> > heh. This guy has been a ham for 50 years???
>
> Why do you think it's called ON/OFF Keying, Dick?

Surprise!Because it's keyed on and off! So try passing any intelligence by keying a carrier on and off without the third state. Cheez......

797. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:24:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B1EC9.59A07B4C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30358

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>
> >I was on 2mtr FM a while back and
> >heard an operator use a lot of ten-codes on the air. When I mentioned
> >(politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams, he not-so-politely told
> >me that since we both had Ham licenses, he could talk any way he wanted
> >"good buddy".
>
> QSL, OM.
>
> The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
> voice.

Which means you don't undrestand that 10 codes are not universal.

> Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?

No. Because they *are* universal, thus legal.

798. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:33:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B20D6.9EE598F5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30359

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Most NCI types could have
> >easily learned the code and passed the tests as you and I did, but..... well,
> >the fact that they didn't speaks for itself..
>
> Carl passed exactly the same tests as Bert did.

How do you know? It was once almost a given that many Technician tests were given by proctors with a *wink,nudge* "waiver" of the 5wpm code test, since no tech would ever use CW (above 50 mHz), and it was often the case that they, once exposed to the hobby,would get interested in HF, and thus would learn the code to pass tests which gave them HF access, if he was interested enough, and if not, well he'd never need to know it for VHF (in those times) It was viewed by some as a way to "get the numbers up" and initiate hams to the hobby. I personally didn't agree, but I know that many who gave proctored Tech exams did.
I know that Carl has made statements of his testing history, but Carl has made a lot of erroneous statements, so we'll just leave it at that. Maybe he once learned code to 5wpm and maybe he didn't.

799. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:46:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B23ED.7096C984@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30360

CAM wrote:

> Arnie Macy wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" wrote ...
> > > Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> > > rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
> >
> > What does 10-10 mean, 10-95, 10-0, 10-18?
>
> Somewhere around here I have a list of the ten codes that I got from
> the Texas Highway Patrol whose I45 frequencies I monitor.
>
> > During an emergency, I could theoretically send a 10 code that
> > tells you I am in serious trouble and need help immediately (according to
> > your "published" chart), when in fact the 10 code *I* am using means prepare
> > to make written copy.
>
> You could theoretically send me something in German that I could
> misinterpret. Is German prohibited?
>
> > Use a 10 code when talking to a Russian Ham and see
> > what kind of response you get.
>
> Use Japanese when talking to a Russian Ham and see what kind of
> response you get. Is Japanese prohibited?
>
> > Q- signals are universally accepted
> > (standardized) -- worldwide -- Read part 97 concerning "universally"
> > accepted codes and ciphers, then get back to me.
>
> Q-signals are NOT "universally" accepted. They are accepted by less
> than one percent of the population on only one planet out of billions
> in the universe.
> --

Wow! Are you really that uninformed? No wonder you couldn't pass the Extra till the requirements dropped!

You can be sure that any Russian or Japanese who ham who hears a Q signal will, if he is better informed than you, recognize the meaning. It is highly unlikely that he ever heard of a 10 code, and if he had, he would have no way to know which or who's version he was hearing. Thus he could not know the meaning. That's what universal means. Universal among ham radio operators.

The FCC, when making rules for ham radio operators, isn't all that concerned about the knowledge level of the other 99.9% of the world's population.

800. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:57:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B2662.8BA8BABE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30361

KB9TMP wrote:

> Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> -Peer's Law

Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
no wiser than before is a dum$hit. At the least he should have
learned that sometimes you can work your a$$ off for little gain.

His "murderous resentment" is an artifact of his original stupidity which
he has not improved upon.

801. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 17:59:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B26CE.663C5DA8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30362

Martin wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > >The "handle" here is Kim.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT
> >
> > Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
> > though. Maybe you like that.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> Kim,
> This is more information than we really need.
> Martin N5PZJ

It would seem that she really doesn't understand the meaning of her early nickname. She thinks it refers to her bra size, but in reality.....

802. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:26:37 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a1fdk7pqv1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 30375

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3B2662.8BA8BABE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> KB9TMP wrote:
>
> > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > -Peer's Law
>
> Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> no wiser than before is a dum$hit. At the least he should have
> learned that sometimes you can work your a$$ off for little gain.
>
> His "murderous resentment" is an artifact of his original stupidity which
> he has not improved upon.
>

Exactly!

Just like Gallaghar speaking about television "I wish there was a knob
(on the TV) that increased the intelligence level, there's one labeled
brightness.....but it doesn't work." :)

803. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:29:08 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <22611aa6c2786c85265ce473a94747c3.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 30363

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote

> Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> -Peer's Law

I don't know who in hell "Peer" is, but that ain't "Peer's Law".

It a quote from the Prophet Bokonon, and a foundation peice
of the religion of Bokononism. See the the following URL
for more detail.

http://www.cs.uni.edu/~wallingf/personal/bokonon.html

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

--
"All of the true things that I am about to tell you
are shameless lies." -- Bokonon

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

804. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:41:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B3D71.1ADD4862@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30364

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You can be sure that any Russian or Japanese who ham who hears a Q signal will,
> if he is better informed than you, recognize the meaning. It is highly unlikely
> that he ever heard of a 10 code, and if he had, he would have no way to know which
> or who's version he was hearing. Thus he could not know the meaning. That's what
> universal means. Universal among ham radio operators.

Uhhhhhh Dick, If what you say were true, NO language could be used
on the ham bands because there is some ham in the world who doesn't
understand it. Plus Q-signals are not even universal within ham radio.
Plus SS97.113 doesn't say anything about "universal". Therefore, your
entire point is moot. No one would use 10-codes on someone who didn't
understand them anymore than someone would use Swahili on someone
who didn't understand it.

10-codes are perfectly legal on ham radio as long as the intent is
not for the purpose of obscuring the meaning of the transmission.
If I said I was using the Texas Highway Patrol published 10-codes,
then it would be perfectly legal for me to use them. Contrary to
what you believe, 10-codes are not "obscene, indecent, or profane".
In fact, I think it's high time the ARRL published a list of 10-codes
to be used by amateurs on SSB instead of those funky Q-codes not
designed for voice communications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

805. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:44:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B3DF6.3F407F3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30365

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
> > voice.
>
> Which means you don't undrestand that 10 codes are not universal.
>
> > Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?
>
> No. Because they *are* universal, thus legal.

Dick, please quote the sub-section of Part 97 that requires codes to
be "universal". And Q-codes are NOT universal within ham radio by
a long shot. After 52 years as a ham, I don't use them and only know
four of five of them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

806. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:52:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B3FFD.FE06F955@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30366

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why do you think it's called ON/OFF Keying, Dick?
>
> Surprise!Because it's keyed on and off! So try passing any intelligence by
> keying a carrier on and off without the third state. Cheez......

OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine. Exactly
what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration? Note that coding
is an entirely different issue from the possible keying states. ASCII
could use ON/OFF keying but it is usually uses FSK which is also a
two-state method.

A tristate level might be, for instance, OFF/half-power/full-power.
That is possible, but I haven't seen it applied to CW. What would
be the function of that third state?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

807. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:54:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B4064.F310334F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30367

Richard McCollum wrote:
> > In any case, the Morse code 'dah' and 'space' timings are specified
> > with respect to the basic 'dit' time.

> Actually, both of them are tri-state. The case of FSK is mark, space, and
> nothing. With OOK, it is on, off by intention, and gone.

Sorry, I didn't realize you guys were joking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

808. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:55:30 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a1ffadpra1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 30376

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:22611aa6c2786c85265ce473a94747c3.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote
>
> > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > -Peer's Law
>
> I don't know who in hell "Peer" is, but that ain't "Peer's Law".
>

It is from a book called "Murphy's Law plus 1001
other reasons why things go wrong"

> It a quote from the Prophet Bokonon, and a foundation peice
> of the religion of Bokononism. See the the following URL
> for more detail.
>
> http://www.cs.uni.edu/~wallingf/personal/bokonon.html
>

That website is a large Foma! :)

> With all kind regards,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> "All of the true things that I am about to tell you
> are shameless lies." -- Bokonon
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

I can only please one person per day.
Today is not your day.
Tomorrow is not looking good either.
-- Dilbert

809. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:55:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B40B1.E60F9EFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30368

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> KB9TMP wrote:
> > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > -Peer's Law
>
> Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> no wiser than before is a dum$hit.

Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

810. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 18:58:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B4140.E31AA516@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30369

K0HB wrote:
>
> KT4ST mashed his "send" button :
>
> > Read part 97 concerning "universally" accepted codes and
> > ciphers, then get back to me.
>
> OK, I did that, and now I'm back to you. I looked for "universally"
> and "universal" -- the words are not mentioned.

Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't understand.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

811. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 19:16:49 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B4580.5303BDE0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30370

CAM wrote:

> Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
> I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
> is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't
> understand.

From The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:

"You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)]. There are certain exceptions, however. In this context, codes and ciphers refer to text that has been transformed to conceal its meaning. This restriction is consistent with the Commision's obligation, under international regulations, to ensure that amateur communications be made in plain language. Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example."

joshua h
KF4PZI

812. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 19:27:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B4839.8388A832@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30371

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
> > I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
> > is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't
> > understand.
>
> From The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
>
> "You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
> into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)]. There are certain exceptions,
> however. In this context, codes and ciphers refer to text that has been
> transformed to conceal its meaning. This restriction is consistent with
> the Commision's obligation, under international regulations, to ensure
> that amateur communications be made in plain language. Universally
> accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not
> to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example."

Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have quoted
is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says. So I ask you
again. Please quote the sub-section of Part 97 that says codes have to
be "universal".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

813. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 19:36:00 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#bYFUrHmBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30372

Joshua mashed his send key, transmitting to us:

> From The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
>
>"You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
>into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)]. There are certain exceptions,
>however. In this context, codes and ciphers refer to text that has been
>transformed to conceal its meaning. This restriction is consistent with
>the Commission's obligation, under international regulations, to ensure
>that amateur communications be made in plain language. Universally
>accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not
>to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example."

Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
nice book, published by a nice radio club in Newington, but has absolutely
no official standing.

The FCC rules do NOT require "universally accepted abbreviations".
They only require that you do not intend to obscure the meaning.
10-codes are completely legal within [97.113(a)(4)].

Good luck on this one now!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--

"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

814. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 19:45:36 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0201081145.446d0e69@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30373

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org>...
> Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.

Sorry, Cecil, but 10-4 means "understood." QSL means "acknowledge a
contact." I think you mean QSO, which means "understood."

815. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 19:58:10 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <74745fa86dde55be39542e097857f482.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 30374

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
> I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
> is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't understand.

I'd be in favor of hams adopting the expressive old Navy "Falcon
Codes". Below are a few excerpts.

100 Congratulations. You f*cked up.
101 You've gotta be shitting me.
102 Get off my f*cking back.
103 Congratulations. You f*cked up again.
104 Your signal so f*cking bad, I can't believe it.
105 I hate this f*cking place.
106 Beats the shit out of me.
107 f*ck you very much.
114 I feel like I've been f*cked and thrown in the woods.
123 Go pound sand.
142 Read the f*cking manual.
169 You have me confused with someone who gives a shit.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

816. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 20:21:50 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3B54BE.962EA47@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30377

CAM wrote:

> Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have
> quoted is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says.

K0HB wrote:

> Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
> nice book, published by a nice radio club in Newington, but has
> absolutely no official standing.

Again, from The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:

"RULE INTERPRETATIONS

The purpose of this book is to provide you with a complete set of the rules and a commentary on them to help amateurs apply the rules in specific situations. The chapters that follow provide time-tested and FCC-APPROVED INTERPRETATIONS [emphasis mine], and copies of FCC letters and news releases describe the application of the rules."

So, it's not just some guy at the ARRL, neh?

joshua h
KF4PZI

817. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 20:30:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1fpqc$7fr$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30389
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"phil" <phil@phil.com> wrote in message
news:u3kao55t65hoae@corp.supernews.com...
> paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen. i'm
not
> paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P

LOL!!!!

818. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 20:40:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B592A.46817A1B@uci.edu>
Source record: 30378

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)
>
> >Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
> >test. Don't know about any of the others.
>
> They all give the same exam.
>
> If the Morse code test is not related to operating, why should it be given?

You are going to start trying to pull that maneuver on me, are you Ed?
Asking questions based on a false premise? tsk tsk. That's Cecil's
job. You won't get me to buy into the idea that you're unable to
distinguish between operating and testing. For shame.

819. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 20:57:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108155716.12447.00000449@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 30379

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine. Exactly
>what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration?

Morse encoding has three basic states -- on short, on long and off. The off state has 3 separate meanings -- to separate the character elements, to separate characters and to separate words. If you wish, you could view each as a state, thus making Morse code a sex-state mode.

Hey, now I know why I like code so much! :-)

>A tristate level might be, for instance, OFF/half-power/full-power.
>That is possible, but I haven't seen it applied to CW. What would
>be the function of that third state?

In digital circuits, the tri-state mode is high impedance -- it, the circuit is not there. I figured that you, as a digital engineer, would understand the analogy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

820. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:01:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108160130.12447.00000450@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 30380

From: Joshua Houk

>"You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
>into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)].

The use of recognized 10 codes does not hide the meaning of a communication.
If one made up one's own 10 codes, that would be a violation of the rules,
IMHO, but to use one that is in the public domain is just fine.

Look at how lax the FCC is with the rules on unspecified digital codes. The
FCC has clarified that publishing the encoding method for an unspecified
digital code on a web page is suffiicient, so one can make up new digital
encodings and make good use of them on the air. Of course, it the intent of
doing so is to obscure meaning, rather than to do digital experimentation, then
I believe a rules violation would be occuring.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

821. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:03:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108160337.12447.00000451@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 30381

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have quoted
>is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says. So I ask you
>again. Please quote the sub-section of Part 97 that says codes have to
>be "universal".

On/off keyed CW is not universal, either. Both international and continental
morse code are legal to use. Perhaps those who feel that only a "universal"
encoding is legal will now give up OOK CW? Or does that only apply to
"non-universal" things that they don't want to hear?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

822. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:08:00 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QcJ_7.240062$WW.12964834@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30382

Eschew obfuscation!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:OdIr0KGmBHA.668@cpimsnntpa02...
> KT4ST mashed his "send" button :
>
> > Read part 97 concerning "universally" accepted codes and
> > ciphers, then get back to me.
>
> OK, I did that, and now I'm back to you. I looked for "universally"
> and "universal" -- the words are not mentioned.
>
> What *is* mentioned is "intended to obscure the meaning".
> Since 10-codes are not sent with intent of obscure, then I'm
> sure FCC will not mind me using them.
>
> And oh, by the way, Q-codes on voice are also perfectly
> acceptable at my house.
>
> With all kind wishes for 2K.002,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> "Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

823. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:11:37 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <dgJ_7.240067$WW.12963938@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30383

Ed, does this mean I can't call my local drug dealer on the autopatch and
order '10 pizzas' when what I want is 10 bags of crack? ;-)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps - no wonder the FCC is trying to wash it's hands of our mess!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020108160130.12447.00000450@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Joshua Houk
>
> >"You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
> >into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)].
>
> The use of recognized 10 codes does not hide the meaning of a
communication.
> If one made up one's own 10 codes, that would be a violation of the rules,
> IMHO, but to use one that is in the public domain is just fine.
>
> Look at how lax the FCC is with the rules on unspecified digital codes.
The
> FCC has clarified that publishing the encoding method for an unspecified
> digital code on a web page is suffiicient, so one can make up new digital
> encodings and make good use of them on the air. Of course, it the intent
of
> doing so is to obscure meaning, rather than to do digital experimentation,
then
> I believe a rules violation would be occuring.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

824. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:34:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eCzt#uImBHA.1220@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30384

Joshua mashed his send key without thinking and said:

> Again, from The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:

> "RULE INTERPRETATIONS

> The purpose of this book is to provide you with a complete set of the
> rules and a commentary on them to help amateurs apply the rules in
> specific situations. The chapters that follow provide time-tested and
> FCC-APPROVED INTERPRETATIONS [emphasis mine], and
> copies of FCC letters and news releases describe the application
> of the rules."

> So, it's not just some guy at the ARRL, neh?

A classic case of circular self-validation! Absolutely classic!

"This book is true because this book says that this book is true!"

Only the FCC rules, Part 97, have any official standing regulating
Amateur Radio operations in the US. And those rules do not
require (or even hint at requiring) that abbreviations be
universally accepted. The idea is patently ridiculous on it's
face!

Using your logic, if a single licensee does not accept an
abbreviation, then that abbreviation is not "universally" accepted,
and is therefore illegal by your flawed interpretation.

73, de Hans, K0HB

825. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:35:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu>
Source record: 30385
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
free tonight?

- mike -

phil wrote:
>
> paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen. i'm not
> paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P

826. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:39:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B6711.A20A34CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30386

Carl Zager wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org>...
> > Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> > rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
>
> Sorry, Cecil, but 10-4 means "understood." QSL means "acknowledge a
> contact." I think you mean QSO, which means "understood."

Sorry, Carl, but QSL means "acknowledge a receipt" of the information just
sent. "Acknowledge a receipt" means essentially the same thing as "understood".
When an HF ham says, "QSL?", it means "Do you understand?" what was just
transmitted. QSO doesn't mean "understood". It means, "Can you communicate
with _______?", e.g. QSO W5DXP?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

827. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:40:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B675C.7C1706D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30387

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)
> >
> > >Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
> > >test. Don't know about any of the others.
> >
> > They all give the same exam.
> >
> > If the Morse code test is not related to operating, why should it be given?
>
> You are going to start trying to pull that maneuver on me, are you Ed?
> Asking questions based on a false premise? tsk tsk. That's Cecil's
> job. You won't get me to buy into the idea that you're unable to
> distinguish between operating and testing. For shame.

Let's see, that's Diversion #17.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

828. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:50:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B699D.838588A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30388

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine. Exactly
> >what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration?
>
> Morse encoding has three basic states -- on short, on long and off.

For God's sake, Dick, that's not what an engineer means by tristate.
We are talking about the possible states of a continuous wave (not
necessarily Morse code) transmitter. Morse code has absolutely nothing
to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'. Your ignorance
is showing. The output of the average ham transmitter cannot be tristated.
It is either on or off. Try paralleling two HF transmitters and see for
yourself.

> In digital circuits, the tri-state mode is high impedance -- it, the circuit is
> not there. I figured that you, as a digital engineer, would understand the
> analogy.

'Tristate' is the floating state in a logic gate which can assume a logic
'one' or a logic 'zero' or floating. The output of a typical ham transmitter
cannot be tristated, i.e. directly paralleled with another operational
transmitter. Your ignorance is showing. Try studying CMOS transmission
gates as an example of a tristate device.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

829. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:55:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B6AC3.A4B3AA40@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30390

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have
> > quoted is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says.
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
> > nice book, published by a nice radio club in Newington, but has
> > absolutely no official standing.
>
> Again, from The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
>
> "RULE INTERPRETATIONS
>
> The purpose of this book is to provide you with a complete set of the
> rules and a commentary on them to help amateurs apply the rules in
> specific situations. The chapters that follow provide time-tested and
> FCC-APPROVED INTERPRETATIONS [emphasis mine], and copies of FCC letters
> and news releases describe the application of the rules."
>
> So, it's not just some guy at the ARRL, neh?

Of course it is some guy at the ARRL. The authors are listed in the
front of the book. Part 97 is quoted in full in the back of the book.
Again I ask you: Where in Part 97 does the word "universal" appear?

The Q-signals are NOT *universal*. Then must be dropped. English is
NOT *universal*. English must be dropped. There is absolutely nothing
in amateur radio that is universal. Amateur Radio must be dropped.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

830. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 21:59:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B6BD0.DF8A4258@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30392

K0HB wrote:
> The FCC rules do NOT require "universally accepted abbreviations".
> They only require that you do not intend to obscure the meaning.
> 10-codes are completely legal within [97.113(a)(4)].

As an exercise to see if 10-codes are illegal, I suggest that those
of us who believe 10-codes to be legal, use a 10-code in our QSOs.
If it is illegal, the FCC will issue a NAL. 10-4, gud buddies?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

831. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:01:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B6C42.6E1AB751@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30393

K0HB wrote:
> "This book is true because this book says that this book is true!"
>
> Only the FCC rules, Part 97, have any official standing regulating
> Amateur Radio operations in the US. And those rules do not
> require (or even hint at requiring) that abbreviations be
> universally accepted. The idea is patently ridiculous on it's
> face!

Yep, if what Joshua is saying were true, PSK31 couldn't exist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

832. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:02:33 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1fut9kpq0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30301
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu...
> I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> free tonight?
>
> - mike -

LOL!!!!! I'd like to watch one with Penelope Ann Miller or Carmen Electkra.

> phil wrote:
> >
> > paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen. i'm
not
> > paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P

833. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:02:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1fq6804uc@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30394

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020107214101.15114.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com...

> BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Orange.

834. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:03:19 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u3mr1v69tide91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 30391
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

> I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> free tonight?

maybe tomorrow... she's driving a bus tonight. hey sandra, this is a
residential area... why are you going 55?

phil :p

835. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:31:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B7343.ABF7A807@uci.edu>
Source record: 30396

CAM wrote:
> The Q-signals are NOT *universal*. Then must be dropped. English is
> NOT *universal*. English must be dropped. There is absolutely nothing
> in amateur radio that is universal. Amateur Radio must be dropped.

Man. I can't believe you didn't take this opportunity the throw Morse
code in there!

836. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:31:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ei3vhNJmBHA.1272@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30395

Cecil says:

> "Acknowledge a receipt" means essentially the same thing as "understood".

Not at all. It means "I copied your message", and doesn't imply anything
about "understanding your message".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

837. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:40:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B757B.601F7735@uci.edu>
Source record: 30397

K0HB wrote:
>
> Cecil says:
>
> > "Acknowledge a receipt" means essentially the same thing as "understood".

> Not at all. It means "I copied your message", and doesn't imply anything
> about "understanding your message".

Besides, didahdit is much shorter than dahdahdidah dididit didahdidit.

838. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 22:50:47 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <IJK_7.436672$er5.16743270@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30398

"W1RFI" wrote in part ...

> The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
> voice. Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?
>
Where in my post did I say that I berated anybody? As a matter of fact, I said "When I mentioned
(politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams," How does that translate to berating someone? I'm as polite as I can be both on voice and CW; always have been. Ed, you should know that from reading my posts over the past three years.

The use of 10 codes on voice has the potential to create situations that can be quite dangerous. As I mentioned earlier, 10 codes are *not* universal and can therefore be translated incorrectly by the receiver. QSL signals *are* universal. They only have one meaning -- worldwide -- So , if I have my "pink card" handy, I can translate them correctly *every* time. IMHO that assists a qso when two different languages are spoken. In order to do that with 10 codes, I would literally have to have each 10 code card from each jurisdiction in the world (just to make sure I had it right) That's the point I'm trying to make.

A bit of clarification. I was referencing the ARRL book "The FCC Rule Book, Complete guide to the FCC Regulations Governing Amateur Radio" On page 4-6, it states "Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example" The key phrase here is *not* "intended to hide" but "Universally accepted abbreviations" 10 codes are by no means universally accepted and because of this can possibly lead to real problems in an emergency. I would *much* rather hear Q signals on voice. At least there would be no doubt about the meaning of the transmission.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

839. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 23:00:16 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <eSK_7.436698$er5.16750814@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30399

"CAM" wrote in message ...

> Somewhere around here I have a list of the ten codes that I got from
> the Texas Highway Patrol whose I45 frequencies I monitor.
>
And *that* list is not valid for the Georgia State Patrol or the North Carolina State Patrol, or the New York State Police. The codes do not all have the same meanings. And therein lies the problem.

> You could theoretically send me something in German that I could
> misinterpret. Is German prohibited?
>
Of course not, but if I sent a "universally accepted" Q signal, there would be no doubt as to the meaning of the transmission. Q signals are understood in *all* languages. 10 codes vary widely and are subject to mis-interpretation.

> Q-signals are NOT "universally" accepted. They are accepted by less
> than one percent of the population on only one planet out of billions
> in the universe.
>
Q signals are universally accepted within the worldwide Ham community, and *that* is what we are referencing.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

840. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-08 23:16:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C3B7DCB.4375383C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 30400

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> So Kim lives in a no-class, redneck neighborhood. There's a lot of that
> going on here in Delaware, which is one reason why I've been reluctant
> to buy property. I could end up with a nice house planted next door
> to somebody who buys a piece of ground, plants a trailer on it, and
> lets their teen-aged kids run around on 4-wheel ATV's. I have a
> couple of friends who've had their property rendered virtually
> unmarketable based on what's going on next door. The only way
> out of that scenario is to live in a development where the CC&R's tell
> you not only how many times an hour you can sneeze, but which
> hand you have to hold the Kleenex in. All I want is a 48-foot tower,
> a 4-element multi-band Yagi, with a 4-element 6-meter Yagi, and a
> couple of dipoles. There's nothing "unsightly" about that, compared
> to what you'll find on virtually every "county" road in this state.

My hometown in a suburban region of New York City is well kept
up, very nice, and has been around in its present state for 40 or
more years. And we don't have any CCRs or HOAs. And
antennas are allowed. Don't know about the antennas you would
want to put up, but I do see some beams on towers around town.
Though the towers are not as tall as the trees around here.
Oaks, maples and evergreens mostly. It seems that this
town is an unusual condition regarding antennas, though...

841. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:02:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1g19s030k3@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30302
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

She's never free. In fact, she's very expensive.

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu...
> I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> free tonight?
>
> - mike -
>
> phil wrote:
> >
> > paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen. i'm
not
> > paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P

842. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:10:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1g1kv031f5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30304

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3B4580.5303BDE0@worldnet.att.net...
> From The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
>
> "You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
> into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)]. There are certain exceptions,
> however. In this context, codes and ciphers refer to text that has been
> transformed to conceal its meaning. This restriction is consistent with
> the Commision's obligation, under international regulations, to ensure
> that amateur communications be made in plain language. Universally
> accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not
> to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example."
>
> joshua h
> KF4PZI

Now everyone will argue about this being an ARRL interpretation of the rules
and not what the rules themselve state. More fun picking nits. Yeehah!

843. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:12:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1g1po0db@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30305

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B6AC3.A4B3AA40@IEEE.org...
> The Q-signals are NOT *universal*. Then must be dropped. English is
> NOT *universal*. English must be dropped. There is absolutely nothing
> in amateur radio that is universal. Amateur Radio must be dropped.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh, let's don't and say we did.

844. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:24:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1g2fm01is@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30310

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:#bYFUrHmBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03...

> Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a

Apparently the FCC does. In fact, in 1989 they completely re-wrote part 97
based on the ARRL suggestions. It says so in the forward to the 8th edition.
If the FCC finds the League's interpertation valid, why does everyone else
have a problem?

845. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:25:43 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1g2id01nh@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30309

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B6BD0.DF8A4258@IEEE.org...

> As an exercise to see if 10-codes are illegal, I suggest that those
> of us who believe 10-codes to be legal, use a 10-code in our QSOs.
> If it is illegal, the FCC will issue a NAL. 10-4, gud buddies?

Ah heard 'dat!

846. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:26:57 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <I7M_7.345646$W8.12921243@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30303

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B4064.F310334F@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > In any case, the Morse code 'dah' and 'space' timings are specified
> > > with respect to the basic 'dit' time.
>
> > Actually, both of them are tri-state. The case of FSK is mark, space,
and
> > nothing. With OOK, it is on, off by intention, and gone.
>
> Sorry, I didn't realize you guys were joking.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Well aware in broad terms current source, current sink, and open circuit. If FSK is not tristate what in hell is it? Even a model 15 is tristate in that sense -- it does not spill paper all over the floor when no signal is being received so it does have an open circuit mode and what are mark and space if not 1 and 0? That it is carbon-based (smell the burning machine oil) and does its computation thing with sliding bars does not change the argument.

OOK has three states and most compooters have a bitch recognizing them unless one of the states effectively disappears in a solid 30 over nine signal. Such are the limitations of software decoding. Wetware is perfectly capable of distinguishing a fade from the op scratching his butt.

That you spent a lifetime on stuff that did the easy and trivial extremely well is perhaps unfortunate but not grounds for defining things in terms of what these junior bots are capable of doing; leave that to Carl. As a member of the IEEE you are undoubtedly aware that the Hz came about because the compooter jocks were unable to decide whether c.p.s meant cards/sec, characters/sec, or coronaries/session and the famous issue of IBM logic vs the rest of the world. That you are a bit punchy in your Golden Years as a result of dealing with these people is quite understandable but you are going to have to bear some of the responsibility for these ex cathedra pronouncements yourself.

Should you find yourself marooned in the general vicinity of Dodgeville WI, perhaps while picking up a new pair of thinsulate bunny slippers at Lands End, stop in at the Streets of Yesteryear at the House on the Rock there to behold pre-Silicon digital techniques employed for entertainment at the turn of the 20th century before we shot hell out of things in 1914. What these cats did in amusement parks with solenoids and compressed air

rather than silicon junctions, still sounds pretty 1 and 0 digital to me, might give you cause to be a little less dogmatic. That we now put the piano roll on CD in digital form does not make it any more or less a player piano. But I can play the piano -- ain't no good at it but I like being a ham piano operator. When the tones come out of digital reproduction I have to ask permission to play the piano and Bill Gates includes it in Windows and tries to anticipate me.

What if you don't like the easy and trivial???

Dick N&#65533;BK

847. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:40:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B9174.46AAF498@uci.edu>
Source record: 30308

CAM wrote:

> Morse code has absolutely nothing
> to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'.

You mean when it's typed on a page.

How 'bout when it's sent asynchronously by radio?

848. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:43:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108194322.01594.00000244@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30306

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>Now everyone will argue about this being an ARRL interpretation of the rules
>and not what the rules themselve state. More fun picking nits. Yeehah!

The text of the ARRL FCC Rule Book has been reviewed by several people at the
FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

849. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:47:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108194729.01594.00000245@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30307

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>The <10> codes do not all have the same meanings. And therein lies the problem.

The ones in common use on 11 meters are the same in every single example I could find. Can you provide any examples of these variations in meaning of the 10 codes used on 11 meters?

>10 codes vary widely and are subject to
>mis-interpretation.

In all of the lists I have seen, most of the codes have the same meaning. I would not characterize them as "varying widely."

Either way, it is moot. The Part 97 rules prohibit the use of codes and ciphers to obscure meaning. I do not believe that the FCC will bust a guy for saying that his "20" is Burlington, CT. The meaning is not obscured to anyone.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

850. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 00:50:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020108195048.01594.00000246@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30311

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> >> Does the Morse code VE exam count? :-)
>>
>> >Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
>> >test. Don't know about any of the others.
>>
>> They all give the same exam.
>>
>> If the Morse code test is not related to operating, why should it be given?
>
>You are going to start trying to pull that maneuver on me, are you Ed?
>Asking questions based on a false premise? tsk tsk. That's Cecil's
>job. You won't get me to buy into the idea that you're unable to
>distinguish between operating and testing. For shame.

Then I take it that you agree with me that the Morse code test IS an operating test, or at least a test very much related to Morse-code operating. That was not apparent when you said:

>> >Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
>> >test. Don't know about any of the others.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

851. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:02:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B968F.41569871@uci.edu>
Source record: 30313

W1RFI wrote:
> Then I take it that you agree with me that the Morse code test IS an operating
> test, or at least a test very much related to Morse-code operating. That was
> not apparent when you said:

> >> >Not the kind the ARRL VE's give. CW operation is not required for the
> >> >test. Don't know about any of the others.

Perhaps you mean that it isn't apparent to you that the government does
not require operating CW as a condition for granting an amateur radio
license. No one is ever forced to operate - at any time, in any mode.
Maybe you feel that taking a test is the same as operating? That might
explain our misunderstanding.

I only pointed it out because in his zeal, Carl has a tendency to
overstate the truth on occasion.

852. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:06:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9786.50964D19@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30312

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote in message ...
> > Somewhere around here I have a list of the ten codes that I got from
> > the Texas Highway Patrol whose I45 frequencies I monitor.
> >
> And *that* list is not valid for the Georgia State Patrol or the North
> Carolina State Patrol, or the New York State Police.

That's OK Arnie. I don't want to talk to the Georgia State Patrol or the
North Carolina State Patrol or the New York State Police. All the hams on
our local repeater have a copy of the Texas Highway Patrol 10-codes.

> > You could theoretically send me something in German that I could
> > misinterpret. Is German prohibited?
> >
> Of course not, but if I sent a "universally accepted" Q signal, there would
> be no doubt as to the meaning of the transmission.

There would be lots of doubt if you sent it to me. I only know about four
of them.

> Q signals are universally accepted within the worldwide Ham community, and
> *that* is what we are referencing.

No they are not, Arnie. I would bet half of all US hams don't know and/or
don't use Q-signals. I don't know them and the only one I normally use is
'QTH'. Absolutely nothing is universally accepted within the worldwide Ham
community including Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

853. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:10:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B988A.6A0AD63D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30314

Arnie Macy wrote:
> A bit of clarification. I was referencing the ARRL book "The FCC Rule Book,
> Complete guide to the FCC Regulations Governing Amateur Radio" On page 4-6,
> it states "Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the
> intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals,
> for example" The key phrase here is *not* "intended to hide" but
> "Universally accepted abbreviations"...

But that was written by an ARRL wienee, Arnie. Only the text in Part 97 is
relevant. Where in Part 97 does it mention "universally accepted"??? If I
can find another ARRL wienee who disagrees, will you accept his version?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

854. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:11:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3B98B1.F7057835@uci.edu>
Source record: 30316

CAM wrote:
>
> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > A bit of clarification. I was referencing the ARRL book "The FCC Rule Book,
> > Complete guide to the FCC Regulations Governing Amateur Radio" On page 4-6,
> > it states "Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the
> > intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals,
> > for example" The key phrase here is *not* "intended to hide" but
> > "Universally accepted abbreviations"...
>
> But that was written by an ARRL wienee, Arnie. Only the text in Part 97 is
> relevant. Where in Part 97 does it mention "universally accepted"??? If I
> can find another ARRL wienee who disagrees, will you accept his version?

Maybe you could fall back on the dictionary once again, and see if that
sheds any light on the terminology.

855. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:15:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B99B6.FF2696EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30315

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Morse code has absolutely nothing
> > to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'.
>
> You mean when it's typed on a page.
> How 'bout when it's sent asynchronously by radio?

Let me say it a little differently. There is absolutely no reason
that OOK keying has to be Morse code. One can use OOK keying with
any code including ASCII characters, gray codes, prison code, or
any other binary code in the world (or out of this world, for that
matter).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

856. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:24:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3b9b9e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30319

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
>
> >Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
> >pattern.
>
> How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

This whosehewhatsit has all kinds of time to read Google postings. Seems to think he learns from them, too...LOL He thought I was "into" DX!!

Kim W5TIT

857. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:27:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9C77.B2DFE4F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30317

Richard McCollum wrote:
> If FSK is not tristate what in hell is it?

Shirley, you jest. When engineers talk about states, they are talking
about operating states, not power-off states. Normal FSK is a two-state
function, 'mark' and 'space'.

> OOK has three states and most compooters have a bitch recognizing them
> unless one of the states effectively disappears in a solid 30 over nine
> signal.

OOK is a two-state function, 'on' and 'off'. That's what the two 'o's
stand for. If it were a three-state function, there would be another
letter. Perhaps you should invent a new three state function called
OOBK for 'on', 'off', and 'bitch' keying states.

> That you spent a lifetime on stuff that did the easy and trivial extremely
> well is perhaps unfortunate but not grounds for defining things in terms
> of what these junior bots are capable of doing; leave that to Carl.

I am talking about normal engineering terms, Richard. You are trying to
twist those terms in a cutesie way.

Consider CMOS logic. The average CMOS gate has two-states, 'one' and 'zero'.
Some CMOS gates are tristate, 'one', 'zero', and 'float'. But even in the
floated state, the gate still has power applied. To follow your reasoning,
a tristatable CMOS gate has four states. That's just nonsense.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

858. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:28:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9CA9.77DF3259@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30318

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The Q-signals are NOT *universal*. Then must be dropped. English is
> > NOT *universal*. English must be dropped. There is absolutely nothing
> > in amateur radio that is universal. Amateur Radio must be dropped.
>
> Man. I can't believe you didn't take this opportunity the throw Morse
> code in there!

Morse code is NOT universal. It must be dropped.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

859. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:29:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3b9c99_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30322

"Martin" <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com> wrote in message
news:3C3B1F68.5608@mobiletelZ.com...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > >The "handle" here is Kim.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT
> > >
> > > Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
> > > though. Maybe you like that.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > Kim,
> > This is more information than we really need.
> > Martin N5PZJ

Yeah, I agree. But WA8ULX may need it...LOL

Kim W5TIT

860. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:30:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9D27.CE980014@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30320

Krell wrote:
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:#bYFUrHmBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03...
>
> > Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
>
> Apparently the FCC does. In fact, in 1989 they completely re-wrote part 97
> based on the ARRL suggestions. It says so in the forward to the 8th edition.
> If the FCC finds the League's interpertation valid, why does everyone else
> have a problem?

If the FCC finds the League's interpretation valid, why didn't they include
it in the re-write of Part 97?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

861. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:33:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9DD1.D3B1E62F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30321

K0HB wrote:
>
> Cecil says:
> > "Acknowledge a receipt" means essentially the same thing as "understood".
>
> Not at all. It means "I copied your message", and doesn't imply anything
> about "understanding your message".

Typical ham interchange during QRM/QRN:

Ham#1: Your RST is 5 by 6, 5 by 6, 5 by 6. QSL?

Now please don't tell me that Ham#2 doesn't understand RST's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

862. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:34:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3b9db8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30323

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3B26CE.663C5DA8@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Martin wrote:
>
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020106230754.25512.00000219@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > > >The "handle" here is Kim.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Well Im surprized its not BIG TIT
> > >
> > > Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
> > > though. Maybe you like that.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > Kim,
> > This is more information than we really need.
> > Martin N5PZJ
>
> It would seem that she really doesn't understand the meaning of her early
> nickname. She thinks it refers to her bra size, but in reality.......
>

Yeah, and your name is a perfect fit for you...Dick.

Kim W5TIT

863. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:34:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3b9de5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30324

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B40B1.E60F9EFA@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > KB9TMP wrote:
> > > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > > -Peer's Law
> >
> > Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> > no wiser than before is a dum$hit.
>
> Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Man, is that *ever* an understatement! ^^5, Cecil.

Kim W5TIT

864. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:39:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3b9eeb_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30327

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:74745fa86dde55be39542e097857f482.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
> > I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
> > is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't understand.
>
> I'd be in favor of hams adopting the expressive old Navy "Falcon
> Codes". Below are a few excerpts.
>
>
> 100 Congratulations. You f*cked up.
> 101 You've gotta be shitting me.
> 102 Get off my f*cking back.
> 103 Congratulations. You f*cked up again.
> 104 Your signal so f*cking bad, I can't believe it.
> 105 I hate this f*cking place.
> 106 Beats the shit out of me.
> 107 f*ck you very much.
> 114 I feel like I've been f*cked and thrown in the woods.
> 123 Go pound sand.
> 142 Read the f*cking manual.
> 169 You have me confused with someone who gives a shit.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB
>
>

ROFLMAO....I am going to pull a few of these on my dad, USN Ret. I
particularly like 107.

It's a good funny, Hans!

Kim W5TIT

865. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:40:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3B9F7A.9570F802@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30325

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Arnie Macy wrote:
> > > A bit of clarification. I was referencing the ARRL book "The FCC Rule Book,
> > > Complete guide to the FCC Regulations Governing Amateur Radio" On page 4-6,
> > > it states "Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the
> > > intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals,
> > > for example" The key phrase here is *not* "intended to hide" but
> > > "Universally accepted abbreviations"...
> >
> > But that was written by an ARRL wienee, Arnie. Only the text in Part 97 is
> > relevant. Where in Part 97 does it mention "universally accepted"??? If I
> > can find another ARRL wienee who disagrees, will you accept his version?
>
> Maybe you could fall back on the dictionary once again, and see if that
> sheds any light on the terminology.

The dictionary can't help because the word "universal" is completely missing
from Part 97.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

866. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:40:50 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <em9UYKLmBHA.1168@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30332

W1RFI pompously declared:

> The text of the ARRL FCC Rule Book has been reviewed by several
> people at the FCC.

Whoopdy ding!

Did those "several people" agree that only "universally accepted"
abbreviations can be used during Amateur Radio operations on the air?

Will Riley be busting those of us who use an abbreviation which
is less-than-universal in it's acceptance?

73, de Hans, K0HB

867. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:42:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BA01B.3A412A08@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30326

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Maybe you feel that taking a test is the same as operating?

It is the receive half of simulated operation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

868. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:51:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3ba1b3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30330

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:eSK_7.436698$er5.16750814@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "CAM" wrote in message ...
>
> > Somewhere around here I have a list of the ten codes that I got from
> > the Texas Highway Patrol whose I45 frequencies I monitor.
> >
> And *that* list is not valid for the Georgia State Patrol or the North
> Carolina State Patrol, or the New York State Police. The codes do not all
> have the same meanings. And therein lies the problem.
>
> > You could theoretically send me something in German that I could
> > misinterpret. Is German prohibited?
> >
> Of course not, but if I sent a "universally accepted" Q signal, there
would
> be no doubt as to the meaning of the transmission. Q signals are
understood
> in *all* languages. 10 codes vary widely and are subject to
> mis-interpretation.
>
> > Q-signals are NOT "universally" accepted. They are accepted by less
> > than one percent of the population on only one planet out of billions
> > in the universe.
> >
> Q signals are universally accepted within the worldwide Ham community, and
> *that* is what we are referencing.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
>

Uh, hello! Guys? Let me duck in here real quick, and then duck right back out. There's already been quite an exchange on this newsgroup that demonstrates just universally *un*understood the Q-signals are. I mean, one ham says QSL means this, another says it means that.

I think it might be best said that 10-codes *and* Q-signals are both quite legal--at least that is what I've always heard. The difference is that a lot of hams find the use of 10-codes abhorrent on ham radio, due to familiarity with CB.

OK, I'm back out.

Kim W5TIT

869. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:55:25 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a5b36190b8947a989689@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30328

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
> >
> > >Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
> > >pattern.
> >
> > How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI

A tad, althogh the arrogance stills shines like a beacon in the night.
Maybe you can answer Ted...why did Carl state he never had HF privies
before upgrading? Isn't 10 meters considered part opf the HF band? Why
couldn't he yell his LASS TWO over and over on 10? He certainly could
have. I guess the technoloigal elite don;t condiser 10 meters HF??

Oh well. Guess Carl is getting old.

BTW, what's with the refernce to squiggly I read? Just curious.

870. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:55:28 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a5b366edcb922298968a@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30329

In article <3c3b9b9e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
> >
> > >Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
> > >pattern.
> >
> > How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> This whosehewhatsit has all kinds of time to read Google postings. Seems to
> think he learns from them, too...LOL He thought I was "into" DX!!
>
> Kim W5TIT

Actually TITS, it doesn't take a great deal of time if you know how to
define the search area. In Carl's case, about 10 minutes to do the
search and read a few.

It takes a tad longer for you as your posts are much LARGER than most.

And you ARE NOT into DX that's for sure, although you might qualify as a
DXCC entity. You certainly seem to meet the total land mass for a new
DXCC entity ;-)

871. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 01:57:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3ba33b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30331

"krill" <dxiswhereits@boom.bust> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a5b366edcb922298968a@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c3b9b9e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, none@none.net says...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > > From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
> > >
> > > >Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the
above
> > > >pattern.
> > >
> > > How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > This whosehewhatsit has all kinds of time to read Google postings.
Seems to
> > think he learns from them, too...LOL He thought I was "into" DX!!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Actually TITS, it doesn't take a great deal of time if you know how to
> define the search area. In Carl's case, about 10 minutes to do the
> search and read a few.
>
> It takes a tad longer for you as your posts are much LARGER than most.
>
> And you ARE NOT into DX that's for sure, although you might qualify as a
> DXCC entity. You certainly seem to meet the total land mass for a new
> DXCC entity ;-)

How much *more* intelligence have you got locked away?

Kim W5TIT

872. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 02:24:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IRN_7.345894$W8.12934573@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30334

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B9C77.B2DFE4F5@IEEE.org...
>
> I am talking about normal engineering terms, Richard. You are trying to
> twist those terms in a cutesie way.
>
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Where have I heard this complaint before??

873. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 02:25:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O$wG7PLmBHA.1472@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30333

Cecil mashed his send key without thinking very much, and sent:

> Typical ham interchange during QRM/QRN:

> Ham#1: Your RST is 5 by 6, 5 by 6, 5 by 6. QSL?

> Now please don't tell me that Ham#2 doesn't understand RST's.

I have no idea if he does or does not understand RST's, and Ham#1
has not asked if he understood; he's only asked if he received the
message.

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

874. just a few minutes work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 02:39:00 UTC
From: krill <dxiswhereits@boom.bust>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a5bd9b67f4901b98968c@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30335

An oldie but a goodie from 1998

> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote...
> >
> > I said that folks whose only interest is in yacking and playing games that
> > use radio as a playing field really belonged more in "one of the
> > other,non-technical personal radio services" more than in ham radio,
> > which, by its charter in 97.1 and in the ITU regulations, is primarily
> > a technical service for experimentation and self-teaching (along with
> > providing a resource of capable operators and technical experts to
> > provide emergency communications and advance the state of the art.)

Gee Ed, and you think some things change. The tome may be calmer, but the intent is still there, only now he's one of those ditthhpicable types. Funny how he now plays the DX type games and has yet to really prove himself a true student under the tutelage of Part 97.

Well, it's been fun, but there snows of winter have fallen in the Rockie Mountains and I am off to the winter games, not only to spectate, but to participate. I am helping provide comms on several of the Alpine events, GS and downhill. Should be fun, should be cold.

It's been a slice of heaven and I am sure when I get back the same people will be caught in the gravity well that is RRAP and W5TIT

USA USA USA

875. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 02:55:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BA47D.2E36DACD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30336

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
> > > voice.
> >
> > Which means you don't undrestand that 10 codes are not universal.
> >
> > > Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?
> >
> > No. Because they *are* universal, thus legal.
>
> Dick, please quote the sub-section of Part 97 that requires codes to
> be "universal". And Q-codes are NOT universal within ham radio by
> a long shot. After 52 years as a ham, I don't use them and only know
> four of five of them.

Could that be because you're not much of a ham? Just because you don't know them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and thus universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.
They are (or were) on the tests, you know. May not be now, after the Grate Dumdown.

876. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:00:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BA5B6.7441B56A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30337

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Why do you think it's called ON/OFF Keying, Dick?
> >
> > Surprise!Because it's keyed on and off! So try passing any intelligence by
> > keying a carrier on and off without the third state. Cheez......
>
> OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine. Exactly
> what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration? Note that coding
> is an entirely different issue from the possible keying states. ASCII
> could use ON/OFF keying but it is usually uses FSK which is also a
> two-state method.
>
> A tristate level might be, for instance, OFF/half-power/full-power.
> That is possible, but I haven't seen it applied to CW. What would
> be the function of that third state?

Unless you're playing Paul Revere, "On if by land, off if by sea", it's gonna be a real problem for you to communicate by OOK carrier with no further action. The third state, in the case of radiotelegraphy, is obviously the timing of the on-off periods
It seems unlikely that you wouldn't be familiar with that..

877. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:00:36 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <BnO_7.438960$er5.16985226@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30339

"W1RFI" wrote ...
>
> The ones in common use on 11 meters are the same in every single example
I
> could find. Can you provide any examples of these variations in meaning of
the
> 10 codes used on 11 meters?
>

Sorry, (and I'm not being arrogant here) I don't know what codes are used on 11 meters because I don't monitor it. I do know that Law Enforcement 10 codes vary widely, having worked in the field for over 22 years, and seen and heard examples from many different states and jurisdictions. When I worked for local law enforcement the city and county had different 10-codes. We shared common "signals" so that we could talk to each other.

> >10 codes vary widely and are subject to
> >mis-interpretation.
>
> In all of the lists I have seen, most of the codes have the same meaning.
I
> would not characterize them as "varying widely."
>
> Either way, it is moot. The Part 97 rules prohibit the use of codes and
> ciphers to obscure meaning. I do not believe that the FCC will bust a guy
for
> saying that his "20" is Burlington, CT. The meaning is not obscured to
anyone.

I agree with that example, but that's not what I'm referring to. Let's say that we were both involved in RACES and I said that I am 10-23 at the intersection but 10-0 ,10-75 because of power lines down. According to my local jurisdiction, this would mean I have arrived at the intersection but use caution in route because of downed power lines. According to your 10 code card, that could mean something entirely different. As I said, therein lies the problem, and danger. Until the 10 codes become more universal -- worldwide -- I think it just invites problems, not solves them.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

878. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:01:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BA602.6D8BB62E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30338

CAM wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > In any case, the Morse code 'dah' and 'space' timings are specified
> > > with respect to the basic 'dit' time.
>
> > Actually, both of them are tri-state. The case of FSK is mark, space, and
> > nothing. With OOK, it is on, off by intention, and gone.
>
> Sorry, I didn't realize you guys were joking.

The joke, Sir, is on you.

879. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:03:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BA65A.562DCDF7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30340

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > KB9TMP wrote:
> > > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > > -Peer's Law
> >
> > Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> > no wiser than before is a dum$hit.
>
> Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.

Actually I had you in mind. You may be brilliant and educated, but
wise you are not.

880. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:05:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BA6D5.3AC553CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30341

Joshua Houk wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>
> > Maybe the guys who say it is there should tell us exactly where it is.
> > I can't find it either. If "universal" is really there, then ham radio
> > is illegal because there would always be some ham who didn't
> > understand.
>
> From The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
>
> "You may not hide the meaning of your communications by putting them
> into codes or ciphers [97.113(a)(4)]. There are certain exceptions,
> however. In this context, codes and ciphers refer to text that has been
> transformed to conceal its meaning. This restriction is consistent with
> the Commision's obligation, under international regulations, to ensure
> that amateur communications be made in plain language. Universally
> accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the intention is not
> to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals, for example."
>

Thank yew, Joshua. I am not where I can get my hands on my copy.

>
> joshua h
> KF4PZI

881. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:07:25 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <_tO_7.439040$er5.16993592@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30342

"CAM" wrote in message ...
>
> That's OK Arnie. I don't want to talk to the Georgia State Patrol or the
> North Carolina State Patrol or the New York State Police. All the hams on
> our local repeater have a copy of the Texas Highway Patrol 10-codes.
>

But what if you were part of RACES and *needed* to talk with another
jurisdiction that used different codes? Would you just gather up all the
different variations just to make sure you got it right?
>
> No they are not, Arnie. I would bet half of all US hams don't know and/or
> don't use Q-signals. I don't know them and the only one I normally use is
> 'QTH'. Absolutely nothing is universally accepted within the worldwide Ham
> community including Morse code.

Cecil, there is a single source for all Hams to get those signals. It's
called a pink card and is available free of charge from the ARRL. All it
costs is the postage.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

882. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:12:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30343

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020107080949.13187.00000023@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <a1b26aslb1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> (Bert Craig wrote):
> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement is
> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
> >
> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
>
> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"

Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
FCC rules. None of us involved in NCI have seen any
reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.

> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
> >of existing hams heard.
>
> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not.

Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
existing hams?

> The code
> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for
HF/MF
> privileges.

Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).

> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about
> the issue - codetest has gotta go".

NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.
Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have not,
in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as

valid, rational and certainly not compeling.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

883. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:15:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gcjs$r7g$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30344

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3A19DB.7BCDBC6A@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
> > I rest my case, Dick. You just proved that the FCC should be making
> > amateur radio policy rather than the amateurs themselves.
>
> Tell it to the FCC. They say they want hams to reach a concensus. As
> if that were even remotely possible.

The "reach a consensus" was voiced by the FCC well before the NPRM
came out. Clearly (IMHO), the NPRM and the subsequent R&O has
laid that to rest.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

884. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:17:41 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <CDO_7.439139$er5.17006331@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30346

"Kim" wrote ...
>
> Uh, hello! Guys? Let me duck in here real quick, and then duck right
back
> out. There's already been quite an exchange on this newsgroup that
> demonstrates just universally *un*understood the Q-signals are. I mean,
one
> ham says QSL means this, another says it means that.
>
> I think it might be best said that 10-codes *and* Q-signals are both quite
> legal--at least that is what I've always heard. The difference is that a
> lot of hams find the use of 10-codes abhorrent on ham radio, due to
> familiarity with CB.
>
> OK, I'm back out.
>

Kim,

It's not been a problem for as long as I've been working CW, where Q-signals are used quite a bit. (I'm yet to hear a 10-code on CW) It just seems to be a way to make a point here on the NG. I've tried to stress that 10-codes are not universally accepted, and that they can actually create problems in given circumstances. But I guess everyone is just going to stick to their guns on this one.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

885. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:18:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BAA04.65417038@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30345

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have quoted
> >is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says. So I ask you
> >again. Please quote the sub-section of Part 97 that says codes have to
> >be "universal".
>
> On/off keyed CW is not universal, either. Both international and continental
> morse code are legal to use.

OK, so there are two versions of OOK CW that are both legal. But there are a large unknown number of 10 codes in use, limited only by the imagination of anyone who wants to make up his own. I guess then that all are legal for use on the ham bands, particularily since they were brought over from CB. I guess we should have known that anyone who wants to lure all the CBers into ham radio would support them any way they they can.

> Perhaps those who feel that only a "universal"
> encoding is legal will now give up OOK CW? Or does that only apply to
> "non-universal" things that they don't want to hear?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

886. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:22:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BAAE8.C5269C21@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30347

CAM wrote:

>Morse code has absolutely nothing

> to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'. Your ignorance
> is showing.

Morse code has EVERYHING to do with the keyed states which are on and off. It's not HIS ignorance that is showing.

887. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:24:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BAB5F.DC35CC1D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30348

CAM wrote:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Nowhere in [97.113(a)(4)] is "universal" mentioned. What you have
> > > quoted is just some ARRL employee's opinion of what 97.113 says.
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> >
> > > Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
> > > nice book, published by a nice radio club in Newington, but has
> > > absolutely no official standing.
> >
> > Again, from The ARRL's FCC Rule Book, 12th Edition:
> >
> > "RULE INTERPRETATIONS
> >
> > The purpose of this book is to provide you with a complete set of the
> > rules and a commentary on them to help amateurs apply the rules in
> > specific situations. The chapters that follow provide time-tested and
> > FCC-APPROVED INTERPRETATIONS [emphasis mine], and copies of FCC letters
> > and news releases describe the application of the rules."
> >
> > So, it's not just some guy at the ARRL, neh?
>
> Of course it is some guy at the ARRL. The authors are listed in the
> front of the book. Part 97 is quoted in full in the back of the book.
> Again I ask you: Where in Part 97 does the word "universal" appear?
>
> The Q-signals are NOT *universal*. Then must be dropped. English is
> NOT *universal*. English must be dropped. There is absolutely nothing
> in amateur radio that is universal. Amateur Radio must be dropped.

I've got a better idea - Let's dro;p Cecil. On his head. OOps, that has
already been done, by his mother when he was an infant.

888. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:30:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gdl6ncd1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30349

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones you
> >can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
> >responsibility to forsee and fix.
>
> Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.

The "actions" forseen by McCollum are nothing but speculation.

> > They will get it wrong: hell the
> >framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but
> >they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe in
> >blowing things up far more than putting them together again.
>
> Of course. "Not my job, man".

That's just a claim made to try and divert attention of
NCI to other matters. It won't work.

> >The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to have
> >proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang the
> >old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives of
> >the apparatchiks.
>
> Precisely. Yet consider what has actually happened:

Yes, let's do so.

> NCI is an "organization" of a website, some directors and maybe 2000
members.
> Exact numbers are not given out. Note that NCI member numbers started with
> #1000, not #1. Membership consists of signing up online and it's for life
> unless a member specifically requests to be removed. No dues or other
member
> obligations.

Your point? There are many similarly based organizations
today that are devoted to any number of causes. Me thinks
you are more unhappy about the ability to do so, rather than
the fact that we exist at all.

> When I first looked on the NCI website, there was a statement that NCI
existed
> ONLY to eliminate code testing, and that when it was all gone the

organization
> would simply disappear. That statement disappeared at some point, but does
> anybody really think NCI will continue after code testing?

What difference does it make? Are you worried if it didn't disappear?

> FCC first tried to push a nocode ham license in 1975, then again in 1983,
and
> finally succeeded in 1991 - long before NCI existed. FCC's opinion on code
> testing has been "it's only there because of the treaty" for at least a
decade.

That's pretty strong and not consistent with many
of the opinions of the Pro-code Test advocates.

> Way back in 1997 or so, there was a prediction here on rrap (I think it
was by
> W4SCO, but I gotta check google) that the FCC was going to radically
simplify
> the license structure. Three license classes, 5 wpm code test, a done
deal.
> Most of us pooh-poohed it, particularly after the ARRL made its proposal
and
> then the NPRM appeared.

And just how many people might have thought that would be the case?

> Yet after the dust cleared in late 1999 the R&O EXACTLY matched everything
that
> had been predicted 2+ years earlier.

Yep, surprised even me as to the extent of the changes.

> Ever hear the expression "rooster taking credit for the dawn"?

How much of an impact anyone had on the actual result won't
ever be known...unless some FCC staffer publishes their
memoirs of the internal discussions leading to the R&O.
I will note that at least we (NCI) not only encouraged
our members to file comments, but we also made our
own personal ex parte presentation directly to the FCC (as
did the ARRL). Frankly, I don't care about taking
credit for anything. The changes were made and we are
still working towards the final end of all code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

889. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:33:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BAD8B.D80F03ED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30350

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "W1RFI" wrote in part ...
>
> > The use of 10 codes on voice has more validity than the use of Q codes on
> > voice. Do you similarly berate those who use Q codes on voice?
> >
> Where in my post did I say that I berated anybody?

Arnie, it has been made very clear that as far as Ed and HQ are concerned, if you don't bow, scrape and kiss their butts, massage their every paranoia and handle them with the most gentle kid-glove technique you're berating them and destroying their egos en masse, thus depriving them of lifelong avocations as "productive" hams.

> As a matter of fact, I
> said "When I mentioned
> (politely) that plain language is preferred by Hams," How does that
> translate to berating someone? I'm as polite as I can be both on voice and
> CW; always have been. Ed, you should know that from reading my posts over
> the past three years.
>
> The use of 10 codes on voice has the potential to create situations that can
> be quite dangerous. As I mentioned earlier, 10 codes are *not* universal
> and can therefore be translated incorrectly by the receiver. QSL signals
> *are* universal. They only have one meaning -- worldwide -- So , if I have
> my "pink card" handy, I can translate them correctly *every* time. IMHO
> that assists a qso when two different languages are spoken. In order to do
> that with 10 codes, I would literally have to have each 10 code card from
> each jurisdiction in the world (just to make sure I had it right) That's the
> point I'm trying to make.
>
> A bit of clarification. I was referencing the ARRL book "The FCC Rule Book,
> Complete guide to the FCC Regulations Governing Amateur Radio" On page 4-6,
> it states "Universally accepted abbreviations may be used, however, when the
> intention is not to hide the meaning of the transmission; common Q signals,
> for example" The key phrase here is *not* "intended to hide" but
> "Universally accepted abbreviations" 10 codes are by no means universally
> accepted and because of this can possibly lead to real problems in an
> emergency. I would *much* rather hear Q signals on voice. At least there
> would be no doubt about the meaning of the transmission.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web

890. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:35:26 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <QNO_7.251413$BX4.14265786@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30402

"K0HB" wrote ...
>
> Whoopdy ding!
>
> Did those "several people" agree that only "universally accepted"
> abbreviations can be used during Amateur Radio operations on the air?
>
> Will Riley be busting those of us who use an abbreviation which
> is less-than-universal in it's acceptance?
>

Since the text includes the phrase and the FCC reviewed it, it stands to reason that they accept the language. Otherwise the FCC would have asked the ARRL to change it.

What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a point. Universally accepted Q-signals have been around for a long time and have -- worldwide -- acceptance. I don't think Riley cares one way or the other regarding enforcement. It is my understanding that he has said he doesn't think they (10 codes) are illegal, but I haven't seen it quoted anywhere.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

891. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:35:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gdr4miq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30401

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C39A0B1.F058BA94@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote (martial music swells in the background):
>
> > We have and continue to "undeniably" work for the TOTAL
> > elimination of all code TESTING.
> >
> > NOTHING in our efforts, our charter or otherwise exists
> > whereby we (NCI) want to end or eliminate anyone's
> > ability to use Morse as a ham.
>
> > The "war" isn't over until ALL code testing ends...it is
> > that simple.
>
> (fades to the strains of "The Internationale")
>
> Quite the manifesto, Bill. You and your comrades must be proud.
> Dave K8MN

No need to be proud, just pleased that we are getting
the results we set out to obtain. Those that opposed us are clearly
not "happy campers" as they appear (IMHO) to have never
expected the changes that have come about.

How much actual influence we had means little as long as the results
are obtained.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

892. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:39:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ge0uoha1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30403

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020107052404.00755.00000114@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
> >> I will submit a third point: it is time for NCI and its groupies to
fight
> >> the next war and give the last one a rest.
> >
> >NCI was founded for the purpose of eliminating code testing.
>
> Herein lies my error. I always assumed (silly) me that NCI wanted to
eliminate
> the code as an obstacle to obtaining a amateur radio license. The No-code
> Technician license did just that...with a bunch of privies, (They are
still
> considered privileges, correct?) I might add. The code remained solely in
> conjunction with more written tests as a means of "earning" more
"privies."
> It's an interesting plight to observe, nonetheless.

Bert,

You have made the wrong assumtion . Clearly there has existed
a "nocode test" license for over 10 years which, if your assumption
had been correct, would have never lead to the creation of
NCI in the first place.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

893. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:51:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BB1BB.A757217D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30405

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Morse code has absolutely nothing
> > > to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'.
> >
> > You mean when it's typed on a page.
> > How 'bout when it's sent asynchronously by radio?
>
> Let me say it a little differently. There is absolutely no reason
> that OOK keying has to be Morse code. One can use OOK keying with
> any code including ASCII characters, gray codes, prison code, or
> any other binary code in the world (or out of this world, for that
> matter).

You didn't say it a "little" differently, you said it COMPLETELY
differently!

894. Re: what?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:52:18 UTC
From: KA4MUJ <DrunkMike@HerbieMYhero.org>
Message-ID: <a1gend$q7c$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30404
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1fpqj$7fr$9@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Hey, Llllardasssssssss Lllllllllllllloyd, I see some hams you've pissed
off
> waiting for you in the parking lot of the HUD apartment complex by the
> railroad tracks ont he shitty side of Athen, AL.
^^^^^^^^^^^^

Roger, Where is "Athen, AL"? I believe you are trying to say
Athens, Alabama. Also, the abbreviation of Alabama to "AL" is
only acceptable when addressing mail. Errrrr, what discipline is
that "degree" you claim to have? Me thinks your "degree" is a
figment of your already overactive imagination Woger!

895. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 03:56:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gf2b$9dl$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30406

```
"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:beb0a48b.0201070655.5f6496df@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a1ah0s$vob$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c389e4c_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20020106123340.19179.00000010@mb-mg.news.cs.com...
> > > > >And some were victims of the actuarial tables, as they
> > > > >entered ham radio late in life after being kept out by the
> > > > >code barrier for many years (years during which many
> > > > >could have been good, productive hams ...)
> > > >
> > > > Do you really view 5-wpm as a "barrier?"
> > > > 73 de Bert
> > > > KC2HMN
> > >
> > > I'm not going to speak for Carl, Bert, but my view of the CW testing
issue
> > > is this: it is a barrier to some--even though I don't view it as a
barrier
> > > to me. That it is a barrier for some gets my attention, because I can
> > > certainly understand their point of view. I learned CW (at 10wpm, I
am
> > > told) for a 5wpm CW test to get my Tech+ license.
> >
> > In addition to Kim's comments...
> > It is a barier because it is, in this day and age,
> > nothing but an old requirement that causes
> > people to spend considerable (for some) time
> > with no real purpose. You can disagree on that,
> > but that is clearly the mindset of most administrations
> > today and the FCC.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Ok Bill, I cheerfully disagree:
>
> As I pointed out to Kim, I come to the table as a relatively
> "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
> be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
> element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
> equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
```

> remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
> EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
> skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?

If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
have passed the test. Equating the "separate" morse test to
one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
a valid comparison.

> Are not the
> writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
> considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
> questions?

The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.

> Why not just eliminate all testing as it's really kind of
> open to interpretation as to what's "purposeful" and what's not? Do we
> really want to leave it to "most of the administrations and the FCC"
> to decide that for us.

The decision as to what is or isn't purposeful is the FCC's.
If you feel there should be no testing at all, YOU are free to
file comments to that. I have no problem with the written tests
as being requiired and I have no time to waste in arguing for them
because the FCC also believes they should continue. IF
the FCC were to consider otherwise I would get involved
at that point to retain the writtens.

> Sorta smacks of "my big brother says I'm
> right...so there!"

If you think the FCC is being "big brother" that's something
you'll need to discuss with them. NCI filed comments like
everyne else (including ARRL) as to what we thought was
the right thing to do. THE final decision wasn't made by
NCI (or ARRL) but rather by the FCC. If you read other
comments in other posting there are some (N2EY) that
believe the change was pre-ordained by the FCC and that
NCI made no difference as to the actual outcome. If
that is true, we (NCI) sure have enough people wishing
we'd just go away.

> C'mon, let's put it to the vote. A vote every five
> years polling all US licensed amateurs re. whether or not to retain
> element 1.

FCC rules changes are made as a matter of public policy...NOT
simply because a majority of voting licensed hams might want
it one way or the other.

> After all, is it not OUR hobby/service to shape?

No, it is a PUBLIC licensed service. Those that are already
licensed don't get exclusive control of the rules and regs.

> Are we not a microcosm of society as a whole?

Not at all. No more than any unique interest group is
likly to be.

> "By the people, for the people, and
> OF the people?"

I note that you didn't write: "By the HAMS, for
the HAMS, and OF the HAMS."

> Where's the "faith?"

Take it up with the FCC. THEY are the ones that would
have to take such a position.

> Let me be frank, (but call me
> Bert) 5-wpm's not a "barrier."

You are entitled to your opinion.

> It's an inconvenience, particularly if
> you don't plan on using CW. For me, it's the starting line.

You are still entitled to your opinion :-)

> It's far
> easier to cross the starting line rather than try to paint it over and
> argue that it shouldn't have been there in the first place. Just MHO.

Ditto my last two comments.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

896. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:03:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gffe$2h7$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30407

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3B20D6.9EE598F5@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Most NCI types could have
> > >easily learned the code and passed the tests as you and I did, but.....
well,
> > >the fact that they didn't speaks for itself..
> >
> > Carl passed exactly the same tests as Bert did.
>
> How do you know? It was once almost a given that many Technician tests
were
> given by proctors with a *wink,nudge* "waiver" of the 5wpm code test,
since no
> tech would ever use CW (above 50 mHz), and it was often the case that
they, once
> exposed to the hobby,would get interested in HF, and thus would learn the
code to
> pass tests which gave them HF access, if he was interested enough, and if
not,
> well he'd never need to know it for VHF (in those times) It was viewed by
some as
> a way to "get the numbers up" and initiate hams to the hobby. I personally
didn't
> agree, but I know that many who gave proctored Tech exams did.

Yes, let's paint all techs as having "cheated" to get their license.
Of course the absence of any factual data to sustain that claim
seems to mean nothing to Dick.

> I know that Carl has made statements of his testing history, but Carl
has made a
> lot of erroneous statements, so we'll just leave it at that.

You say that and then you postulate...

> Maybe he once learned code to 5wpm and maybe he didn't.

Doesn't seem to me you could "leave it at that" for more
than two seconds.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

897. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:09:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BB5F1.679ECBD4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30408

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3A19DB.7BCDBC6A@worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I rest my case, Dick. You just proved that the FCC should be making
> > > amateur radio policy rather than the amateurs themselves.
> >
> > Tell it to the FCC. They say they want hams to reach a concensus. As
> > if that were even remotely possible.
>
> The "reach a consensus" was voiced by the FCC well before the NPRM
> came out. Clearly (IMHO), the NPRM and the subsequent R&O has
> laid that to rest.

You're not keeping up, Bill. It was AFTER the r&o that statement was made,
ie "We don't intend to make further changes in rules until there is a
consensus
among hams as to what those rules should be" or words to that effect.

898. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:10:46 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <0df46242cb2a2a65b7ea2c4df1fe04bc.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 30409

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:

>
> What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a point.
>

You can't really be that dense. I am not arguing *for* anything.

I am arguing *against* the mistaken assertion that abbreviations must
be "universally accepted" before they are legal to be used on the air.

The ARRL book in question is an excellent book, but it has absolutely
zero regulatory standing, even if every staffer at FCC reviewed it.

I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years, and I don't
notice that I've caused any of this chaos you predict. In fact, I
have been elected to the A-1 Operators Club based on unsolicited
recommendations of other A-1 operators.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

899. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:13:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gg0kpmr1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30410

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:4ur_7.409253$er5.15889611@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Jim Kelley" wrote ...
>
> > You might try busting in on a DX QSO sometime with the suggestion that
> > one of the stations should clean up his signal, just to see how well
> > that goes over.
> > I've heard some of the RACES guys using a lot of 10 codes during an
> > activation. I don't really think they should, but what I think doesn't
> > really matter when they are conducting their business.
>
> It's not so much what you or I think, Jim, but what the FCC thinks. ARES,
> RACES, FEMA, it doesn't matter. They should NOT be using ten codes, and
> they know it.
> Arnie - KT4ST

What is it about 10 codes that suggest "They should NOT be using ten codes,
and they know it." There is certainly no prohibition against doing
so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

900. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:18:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gghq$n1d$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30411

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:But_7.409622$er5.16000977@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Veverka" wrote ...
>
> > What about the "Q" codes, I have been a licensed amateur since the late
> 70s
> > and it seems that they have always been an integral part of Ham radio.
> > Really what's the difference between them and the "10" codes? BTW, I am
> > also a Fl State Trooper and we use the "10" codes as opposed to the
other
> > local police departments that use the "Q" codes and other signal codes.
I
> > also think that there is an exception for commonly used codes such as
the
> > "10" or "Q" codes in part 97 since they are well-known and not really
> trying
> > to hide the meaning of the communication.
> >
>
> Q codes are *universally* (part 97's word not mine) accepted --
worldwide --
> and are not prohibited by part 97 because of that. 10 codes vary *widely*
> from state to state and even county to county and city to city. They are
> not universally accepted and were designed for use by a very small group
of
> professionals and I doubt they are known to 90% of persons outside of this
> group.

Having said all that...it still remains that 10 codes are NOT designed
to HIDE anything anymore than Q codes are.

> If Riley has endorsed their use, he has mis-read the intent of part
> 97.

When/where has Riley made such a ruling/misreading.
As to your claim that the rule means no 10 codes, well you
are entitled to your opinion. Most others seem to disagree.

> Send a 10 code to an amateur in Russia and see how
> universally accepted they are.

Send an English sentence to many other hams and they won't
recognize it either. English isn't universally accepted either.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

901. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:20:13 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <05F8CADDF686A18E.3F9EA5C580779E90.88C61FF4485742B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30412

On Tue, 08 Jan 2002 00:17:01 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
<kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>If you want to know what band yellow actually is, it's something near
>570nm, which should be entirely within our 'all above 30GHz'
>allocation.
>
>FWIW, the blue band is roughly 475nm.

Now that I think about it, anybody want to try to make a dipole with
114nm long elements, and work out the details of a transmitter? :)

A colinear of, say, 10,000 wavelengths would still be a small enough
for portable use, too...what kind of gain should that get?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

902. Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:37:07 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <3c3bc83a$0$59496$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 30413

How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.

KB7ADL
Still an X member.

903. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:40:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BC9A3.B95478E1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30414

Arnie Macy wrote:
> But what if you were part of RACES and *needed* to talk with another
> jurisdiction that used different codes?

I'm not, Arnie. "If is for children, spinning daydreams." Roger Whittaker

> Cecil, there is a single source for all Hams to get those signals. It's
> called a pink card and is available free of charge from the ARRL. All it
> costs is the postage.

After 52 years as a ham doing without that pink card, why do I need it now?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

904. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:44:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCAB3.4739ABB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30416

Arnie Macy wrote:
> It's not been a problem for as long as I've been working CW, where Q-signals
> are used quite a bit. (I'm yet to hear a 10-code on CW)

Q-codes are more efficient on CW. 10-codes are more efficient on voice.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

905. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:45:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCAFB.1FA90C4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30417

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Just because you don't know
> them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and thus
> universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.

How can they be universal if I don't know them?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

906. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:46:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gi84$2tq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30415

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:QNO_7.251413$BX4.14265786@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "K0HB" wrote ...
> > Did those "several people" agree that only "universally accepted"
> > abbreviations can be used during Amateur Radio operations on the air?
> > Will Riley be busting those of us who use an abbreviation which
> > is less-than-universal in it's acceptance?
>
> Since the text includes the phrase and the FCC reviewed it, it stands to
> reason that they accept the language. Otherwise the FCC would have asked
> the ARRL to change it.

Maybe the FCC should incorporate the ARRL book by reference so everyone
that is a ham can benefit from this "official" FCC statements of
interpretation.

> What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a point.
> Universally accepted Q-signals have been around for a long time and
have --
> worldwide -- acceptance.

So I guess you really want/need a "universally accepted language too.

> I don't think Riley cares one way or the other
> regarding enforcement. It is my understanding that he has said he doesn't
> think they (10 codes) are illegal, but I haven't seen it quoted anywhere.

Nor have we seen ANY statement at all from the FCC that
specifically indicates that 10 codes are illegal.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

907. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:48:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCB86.E711C194@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30418

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Morse code has absolutely nothing
> > > > to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'.
> > >
> > > You mean when it's typed on a page.
> > > How 'bout when it's sent asynchronously by radio?
> > >
> > Let me say it a little differently. There is absolutely no reason
> > that OOK keying has to be Morse code. One can use OOK keying with
> > any code including ASCII characters, gray codes, prison code, or
> > any other binary code in the world (or out of this world, for that
> > matter).
>
> You didn't say it a "little" differently, you said it COMPLETELY
> differently!

The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code and
the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
printed in a book without keying anything.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

908. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:50:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCC1C.2F506577@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30419

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >Morse code has absolutely nothing
>
> > to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'. Your ignorance
> > is showing.
>
> Morse code has EVERYHING to do with the keyed states which are on and off. It's not
> HIS ignorance that is showing.

What I am saying, Dick, is that a code and a keying method are
entirely different entities. For instance, OOK can be used for ASCII
completely unrelated to Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

909. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:53:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCCE5.6C309A85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30420

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The third state, in the case of radiotelegraphy, is obviously the
> timing of the on-off periods.

That is not considered part of the state, Dick. What code is being
used is irrelevant to what keying (modulation) method is being used.
ASCII can be sent using OOK with no relationship to Morse code at all.
Morse code can be sent using FSK.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

910. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 04:58:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1gim5qqs1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30421

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3BCAFB.1FA90C4B@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just because you don't know
> > them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and
thus
> > universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.
>
> How can they be universal if I don't know them?

They are listed in one of the other ARRL/FCC reference books :-)

(sorry Ed W1RFI, couldn't resist the opportunity)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

911. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:00:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCE53.CCE46E02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30422

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> > > no wiser than before is a dum$hit.
> >
> > Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.
>
> Actually I had you in mind. You may be brilliant and educated, but
> wise you are not.

Sorry Dick, you are not talking about me. I have never worked hard
for anything in my entire life. Life's too short to work hard.
My motto has always been: "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

912. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:04:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BCF41.BF9B5CFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30423

Arnie Macy wrote:
> Since the text includes the phrase and the FCC reviewed it, it stands to
> reason that they accept the language. Otherwise the FCC would have asked
> the ARRL to change it.

So Arnie, why didn't the FCC put that language in Part 97 when they
revised it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

913. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:07:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3BD020.514407F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30424

K0HB wrote:
> I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
> of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years, and I don't
> notice that I've caused any of this chaos you predict. In fact, I
> have been elected to the A-1 Operators Club based on unsolicited
> recommendations of other A-1 operators.

One time at a hamfest, I hollered at my friend Harold on .405 simplex.
I said, "Hey Harold, y'all got yur ears on?" Some ham standing beside
me said, "We hams don't use that CB lingo. How long have you been
licensed?" I said, "48 years". :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

914. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:15:06 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <IIQ_7.439929$er5.17115726@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30425

"K0HB" wrote in part ...
>
> You can't really be that dense. I am not arguing *for* anything.
>
Nope, just making a point. I guess it gets to the name-calling stage now, huh?

> I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
> of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years, and I don't
> notice that I've caused any of this chaos you predict. In fact, I
> have been elected to the A-1 Operators Club based on unsolicited
> recommendations of other A-1 operators.
>

Not that this applies to you, Hans. But did you ever hear about the guy who had 1 year of experience, 20 times? I suspect that the operators on the other end of your transmissions were familiar with the less-than-universal abbreviations you were using. However, if you say "egg", I would have to presume that you mean that white thing that comes out of the chicken. If my 10-code says it's a fire engine, we could have some serious mis-communication.

I'm quite familiar with the A-1 Operator club. Go to my web page and you'll see a list of all the organizations in which I have membership.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

915. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:19:41 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <AjQ_7.252080$BX4.14365004@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30426

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> So Arnie, why didn't the FCC put that language in Part 97 when they
> revised it?

Don't have a clue, Cecil. I work for a different part of the government,
and as you know, we never speak to each other. :-))

BTW, I checked QRZ.com and noticed that you upgraded to Extra.
Congratulations. Maybe now I'll see ya on 14.058?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

916. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:23:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <3nQ_7.252141$BX4.14369731@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30427

"CAM" wrote ...

> How can they be universal if I don't know them?

Get a pink card, Cecil -- and you will : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

917. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:33:43 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <9DQ_7.440032$er5.17123734@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30428

"Dick Carroll" wrote ...

> Arnie, it has been made very clear that as far as Ed and HQ are
concerned, if
> you don't bow, scrape and kiss their butts, massage their every paranoia
and
> handle them with the most gentle kid-glove technique you're berating them
and
> destroying their egos en masse, thus depriving them of lifelong avocations
as
> "productive" hams.
>

It surprised me a bit when Ed implied that I berated folks. I guess the
Borg, (I mean the ARRL) has assimilated him : -)) Come back, Ed ... you
can still be saved.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

918. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:35:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <KEQ_7.440041$er5.17123576@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30429

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote ...
>
> How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.
>

I can give you an update. They're *still* screwed up.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

919. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 05:55:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BDABC.720E5EC9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30430

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Hey, you never answered the "Know why?" above. It's my theory--completely
> unexplained--that when you *first* key up your radio outputs the most power.
> As a few seconds go on the initial draw becomes a lower and constant output.
> In times of severe operating situations, short two or three word outputs at
> a time are often more successful than keying up your radio and talking for
> longer than a few seconds. Remember that, in case you ever need it. It's
> especially effective in severe weather (lightning burst) conditions. Also,
> if you're communicating through repeaters...and don't ask me to figure this
> one out either, it just works...if you've got a really bad signal, key up on
> the tail end of someone who has a good signal into the repeater, you're
> signal will be better. Once again, only works for a few seconds at a time.
> This is where teamwork comes in: if these ideas are discussed as methods,
> someone will know what you are trying to do and will "put the word out" for
> people to key up the repeater for you and let you get in at the very end.
> Don't ask me why it works...have no idea.

...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will probably
put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot buried
at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
increases in gain.

Dave K8MN

920. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 07:26:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BE40D.119B81AB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30431

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just because you don't know
> > them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and thus
> > universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.
>
> How can they be universal if I don't know them?

Well you can always be guilty of poor amateur practice. FCC can't be responsible
for your avoidance and ignorance.

921. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 07:29:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BE4B8.CD28A092@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30432

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Morse code has absolutely nothing
> > > > > to do with the keyed OOK states which are 'ON' and 'OFF'.
> > > >
> > > > You mean when it's typed on a page.
> > > > How 'bout when it's sent asynchronously by radio?
> > >
> > > Let me say it a little differently. There is absolutely no reason
> > > that OOK keying has to be Morse code. One can use OOK keying with
> > > any code including ASCII characters, gray codes, prison code, or
> > > any other binary code in the world (or out of this world, for that
> > > matter).
> >
> > You didn't say it a "little" differently, you said it COMPLETELY
> > differently!
>
> The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code and
> the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
> printed in a book without keying anything.

Gee, whatta revelation. So try using it to communicate on the air from a
sheet of paper.

922. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 07:31:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BE520.D51ADDE4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30433

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The third state, in the case of radiotelegraphy, is obviously the
> > timing of the on-off periods.
>
> That is not considered part of the state, Dick. What code is being
> used is irrelevant to what keying (modulation) method is being used.
> ASCII can be sent using OOK with no relationship to Morse code at all.
> Morse code can be sent using FSK.

Bullshit Cecil the subject was radiotelegraphy on ham radio and you know
it.

923. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 07:33:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3BE5C0.D0F8F82D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30434

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> > > > no wiser than before is a dum$hit.
> > >
> > > Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.
> >
> > Actually I had you in mind. You may be brilliant and educated, but
> > wise you are not.
>
> Sorry Dick, you are not talking about me. I have never worked hard
> for anything in my entire life.

That's obvious.

924. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 11:34:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1h9p801vo6@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30435

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B9D27.CE980014@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:#bYFUrHmBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03...
> >
> > > Nice quotation, but who cares what an ARRL publication says? It's a
> >
> > Apparently the FCC does. In fact, in 1989 they completely re-wrote part
97
> > based on the ARRL suggestions. It says so in the forward to the 8th
edition.
> > If the FCC finds the League's interpertation valid, why does everyone
else
> > have a problem?
>
> If the FCC finds the League's interpretation valid, why didn't they
include
> it in the re-write of Part 97?

Budget cuts?
```

925. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 11:41:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ha640203o@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30436

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B9786.50964D19@IEEE.org...
> Arnie Macy wrote:

> No they are not, Arnie. I would bet half of all US hams don't know and/or
> don't use Q-signals. I don't know them and the only one I normally use is
> 'QTH'. Absolutely nothing is universally accepted within the worldwide Ham
> community including Morse code.

If by "universally" you mean that hams living on other planets don't accept
things, then I have no argument.

926. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 11:45:16 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1hach0209r@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30437

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3BCAFB.1FA90C4B@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just because you don't know
> > them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and
thus
> > universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.
>
> How can they be universal if I don't know them?

Because the FCC is universal. We're not.

927. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:20:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109072006.09750.00000411@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 30438

From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.

I am not paid for my participation on rec.radio.amateur.policy, Vince. After all, I was off this forum for about 6 months, and I still have my job.You know that, so you are obviously just trolling. I thought you were better than that.

If you want a policy update, you will have to ask your ARRL Division Director.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

928. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:21:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109072113.09750.00000412@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 30439

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>> How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.

>I can give you an update. They're *still* screwed up.

In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For balance, can you
also tell us what you think they are doing right?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

929. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:25:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109072545.09750.00000413@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 30440

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> OK, so there are two versions of OOK CW that are both legal. But there are a
>large unknown number of 10 codes in use, limited only by the imagination of
>anyone who wants to make up his own.

If one makes up his own to obscure meaning, that would be a violation of the rules. Can you cite any examples of on-the-use of unknown 10 codes?

I disagree that there are a "large unknown" number of 10 codes in use. The ones I have heard in common use are all the same.

Can you provide any examples of instances where 10-20 does not mean "My location is..."?

>I guess then that all are legal for use on
>the ham bands, ...

Those that are not intended to obscure meaning are, IMHO, legal for use on the ham bands.

> I guess we should have known that anyone who wants to lure all the CBers
> into ham radio would support them any way they they can.

Do I infer from this that you believe that CB should no longer be a major source of new hams, as it has been for decades? Are you trying to fulfill your prophecy that ham radio is doomed by ensuring that no one wants to become a ham?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

930. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:30:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109073053.09750.00000414@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 30441

From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net

>W1RFI pompously declared:

What was pompous, Hans? You sure seem to be enjoying the gratuitous insults in your quotes. It detracts from your message.

>Will Riley be busting those of us who use an abbreviation which
>is less-than-universal in it's acceptance?

Not unless the intent of that abbreviation is to obscure meaning. I don't think that Riley will bust anyone for using the 10 codes that are in common use on 11 meters.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

931. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:38:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109073820.09750.00000417@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 30442

From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust

>> How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?

>A tad . . .

Having been on the other side of many of Carl's barbs about five or six years ago (or was it longer), I think that his approach to life has changed more than a tad. Take a look at some of his discussions with me.

> althogh the arrogance stills shines like a beacon in the night.

That can be said for many here, can it not? Are you going to go after them all equally? :-)

>Maybe you can answer Ted...why did Carl state he never had HF privies
>before upgrading? Isn't 10 meters considered part opf the HF band?

In my years of discussing things with Carl, I never understood him to be anything except a Tech+. And his priveleges used to include 15M, 40M and 80M, too. He did say that he did not have any significant HF priveleges, and I would agree with that.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

932. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:46:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1hkl6$v8d$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30450
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a1g19s030k3@enews2.newsguy.com...
> She's never free. In fact, she's very expensive.

Get a lesser-known starlet, then. LOL!

> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu...
> > I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> > free tonight?
> >
> > - mike -
> >
> > phil wrote:
> > >
> > > paranoid? i watched that movie with sandra bullock. it could happen.
i'm
> not
> > > paranoid... AAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHH THEY'RE AFTER ME :P
>
>

933. Re: what?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 12:55:47 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1hkl8$v8d$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30601
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KA4MUJ" <DrunkMike@HerbieMYhero.org> wrote in message
news:a1gend$q7c$0@pita.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1fpqj$7fr$9@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > Hey, Llllardasssssssss Lllllllllllllloyd, I see some hams you've pissed
> off
> > waiting for you in the parking lot of the HUD apartment complex by the
> > railroad tracks ont he shitty side of Athens, AL.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^
>
> Roger, Where is "Athen, AL"?

Wherfe you fuck pumpkins and got arrested. Where you slurp nutsacks behind
the castration clinic and got arrested for that.

> I believe you are trying to say Athens, Alabama.

I believe you have your oblong, malformed head up your ass on a permanent
basis.

> Also, the abbreviation of Alabama to "AL" is
> only acceptable when addressing mail.

Dumbfuck "AL" IS the abbreviation I used. Learn to read, dumbfuck. And
speaking of abbreviations, you keeping your hairy palms off that pathetic
excuse of a pecker this winter?

> Errrrr, what discipline is
> that "degree" you claim to have? Me thinks your "degree" is a
> figment of your already overactive imagination Woger!

"Me thinks"....bwhahahahahahahahaahahahahahaha since when did you ever
think, Lllllardasssssssss Llllllloyd the chickenshit?

934. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 13:51:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <HVX_7.77$7d.7356@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30445

The only 10-code I feel that is okay to occaisionaly use, as it is widely known, is 10-100, i.e. for a bathroom break. :)

Sounds a little bit better that "gotta go see a man about a horse" or "water the lillies" or any other cute euphimism to explain the same meaning.....

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C3B6BD0.DF8A4258@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> > The FCC rules do NOT require "universally accepted abbreviations".
> > They only require that you do not intend to obscure the meaning.
> > 10-codes are completely legal within [97.113(a)(4)].
>
> As an exercise to see if 10-codes are illegal, I suggest that those
> of us who believe 10-codes to be legal, use a 10-code in our QSOs.
> If it is illegal, the FCC will issue a NAL. 10-4, gud buddies?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

935. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 13:51:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <HVX_7.76$7d.7356@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30446

10-3 vs. 10-4 in APCO..... (Acknowledge versus Affirmative, may be the other way around) Gee, isn't an acknowledgement about the same as an affirmation?

Slipped up and used QSL on our fire departments radio when responding to a question from Central Dispatch here. The problem I have, is I am a Campus Safety Officer by night, On-call Firefighter by day and a ham too. Verbage and codes etc sometimes cross-over for me! I have accidentally used the ITU phonetics at work instead of APCO, and that caused a problem.....

Cecil, checked out your callsign on Qrz.com and almost freaked! Put a thick, bushy grey mustache like B.J. Hunnicut had in M.A.S.H. under your nose, and you would look just like my dad..... Gee... can I start calling you Dad??? Just joking!

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org...
> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > How about, it's not good amateur practice, and it VIOLATES amateur rules
> > Part 97.113(a)(4) (you may not hide the meaning of your communications
by
> > putting them into codes or ciphers).
>
> Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

936. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 13:51:37 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <JVX_7.78$7d.7356@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30444

I have created a presentation for the project for getting firefighters, EMS and L. E. people interested in ham, and of course some other groups (civic groups), and am looking for some good sources for disaster images with hams or no hams in the picture to include in the presentation.

I have found all of the other images I would like to use though....

Ryan

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020107200949.06877.00001086@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <Oei_7.17$xu.2005@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
> writes:
>
> >Thanks Jim, with so much damned negativity, I like to see some positivity
> >once in a while.
>
> Just read more of my posts, Ryan ;-) All there in google.
> >
> >Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >My goals?
> >
> >Pass the Code Test.
>
> Some resources online:
>
> http://primera.tamu.edu/people/TAES/mgautreaux/code1.html
>
> and see what N1IRZ has to say.
>
> Also check out:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm
>
> for an excellent online book on the subject, and
>
> http://www.ah0a.org
>
> for code learning shareware
>
> >Explore a new band, (most likely 6 meters due to costs)
>
> A good idea for all of us. I gotta try 30 meters.

> >
> >Bring at least 2-3 new hams into our ranks. Also working on selling our
> >clubs ham radio classes to the law enforcement, fire departments, and EMS
> >communities. With the nature of these people, they are perfect
candidates
> >to add to our ranks. The county fire training officer here where I live
is
> >a AWESOME supporter of amateur radio, and the thing we can do. I will
> >definitely be utilizing him. This effort may get more than 2-3
hopefully.
>
> Now THAT'S a goal!!
> >
> >Finish my "fire station project" (Goal is to get all of the volunteer
fire
> >departments set up with a 2m/7cm transciever to create one hell of a
backup
> >system for when a real disaster comes. This way ARES members can work
from
> >the fire station that is closest to them.
>
> COOL!
> >
> >Get my step-brother back into the ham bands. He was licensed almost 20
> >years ago, let his license lapse and now is interested again once he
found
> >out I am licensed. He travels as a "missionary" as I understand it, as
a
> >doctor providing medical care in some interesting countries. Talk about
> >some DXepiditions! Got him the text he needs to refresh his memory and
> >hopefully get him to a testing session with the next 30-60 days!
> >
> Betcha he hasn't forgotten much.
>
> btw, I'm not sure, but I think that if he EVER held a Novice license, and
can
> prove it (old license, old callbook, etc.) then they will give him 5 wpm
> credit, even if it's long expired.
>
> >I am pursuing a ton of training related to the fire department I am with,
so
> >my time is extremely limited until June, otherwise I would have more to
add
> >to my list, but need to be realistic.
>
> Any ONE of the above is worthwhile!
> >
> >I will keep those that care informed of my progress!
> >
> Same here. Good luck and God bless.

>
> btw, I have another addition to my list:
>
> - get eQSL qualified and functional
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >Ryan, KC8PMX
> >FF/MFR
> >
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020103080721.02371.00000823@mb-cc.aol.com...
> >> In article <aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> ><kc8pmx@tm.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?
> >>
> >> Great question, Ryan.
> >>
> >> Here are some of mine (in no particular order):
> >>
> >> - Get workshop and station properly set up and in order.
> >> - Fix up antenna system with better materials, new coax, etc.
> >> - Add some options and mods to K2 #2084
> >> - Build kit or homebrew 100 W amp for same
> >> - Sell off about 50% of ham radio parts/material inventory (that's a
BIG
> >job!)
> >> - Set new personal best scores on FD, SS, and other contests.
> >> - Attend a local hamfest or two
> >> - Get BMI (body mass index) under 23 so I'm in better physical shape
for
> >all of
> >> the above
> >>
> >> Will they all get done by December 31 2002? We'll see!
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
>
>

937. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 13:51:38 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <KVX_7.79$7d.7356@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 30443

Well.... I can understand that, and relate. My best wishes to you and them
for a good 2002!

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3B0C9A.DCAFFB0E@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Hope the new year is treating you well there Cecil!
>
> I'm caring for three sick kinfolk in their 90's. It
> doesn't promise to be a good year.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

938. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:21:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C5204.B5EFC7F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30447

KC8PMX wrote:
> Cecil, checked out your callsign on Qrz.com and almost freaked! Put a
> thick, bushy grey mustache like B.J. Hunnicut had in M.A.S.H. under your
> nose, and you would look just like my dad..... Gee... can I start calling
> you Dad???

I am a Dad and I've been called worse. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

939. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:30:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C5414.75475CB5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30448

Arnie Macy wrote:
> BTW, I checked QRZ.com and noticed that you upgraded to Extra.
> Congratulations. Maybe now I'll see ya on 14.058?

I can't recall ever having a CW QSO on 20m, Arnie. 40m is
my CW band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

940. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:34:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C54F6.70943D8A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30449

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> > How can they be universal if I don't know them?
>
> Get a pink card, Cecil -- and you will : -))

I've had them in my ARRL Handbook for 50 years and I still
don't know them. Five or so Q-signals are all that I have
ever needed to know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

941. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:38:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C55D0.DCD64AFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30602

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Just because you don't know
> > > them doesn't mean the FCC doesn't intend for them to be the accepted and thus
> > > universal abbreviation codes in ham radio.
> > >
> > How can they be universal if I don't know them?
>
> Well you can always be guilty of poor amateur practice. FCC can't be responsible
> for your avoidance and ignorance.

Dick, I have only ever needed to know about five Q-signals. Why should
I waste my time learning the rest of them? Ham radio is a minuscule part
of reality. It is NOT all there is to reality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

942. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:42:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C56DD.38BA56E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30603

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code and
> > the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
> > printed in a book without keying anything.
>
> Gee, whatta revelation. So try using it to communicate on the air from a
> sheet of paper.

That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two different
things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any way to
Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

943. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 14:46:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C57AA.41C22A78@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30604

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Bullshit Cecil the subject was radiotelegraphy on ham radio and you know
> it.

Nope, you missed it again, Dick. The subject was the meaning of
"tristate" as used in electronics. You continue to confuse the
keying method with the coding method. OOK doesn't necessarily
have anything to do with Morse code. You can use OOK to report
the state of the last coin toss.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

944. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 16:00:39 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <HOZ_7.346729$W8.12989921@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30605

Larry Roll, K3LT asked:

> BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?

"Have a blue free of charge with our compliments, sir!"

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

945. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 16:45:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109114513.02985.00000508@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30606

>Subject: Re: K1MAN sending this letter.
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 1/8/2002 3:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu>
>
> I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
>free tonight?

"Watching a movie" is NOT what I'd like to do on a date with Sandra
Bullock!

=)

Steve

946. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 16:49:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109114900.02985.00000510@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30607

>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020107082649.05502.00000223@mb-mq.aol.com...

>> Bull, the truth is that Carl and his buddies, were either to Lazy or to
>Stupid
>> to learn....(SNIP)

This scalding abuse from a punk who can't seem to get HIS grammar squared
away.

Nice job, slime ball. Nothing we don't expect...just glad you keep
reminding us how badly DNA can let us down sometimes.

947. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 16:54:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109115410.02985.00000511@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30608

>Nope, just Kim...my nickname all through Jr and High school was Booby,
>though. Maybe you like that.

Hey Kim,

You wouldn't believe how nice the NG's been to read since I KF'd Brucie (altho I can "see" him when quoted in others posts) and since Lennie the Liar left us...

Hope you and yours had a good Christmas. We moved just after the attacks. Don't know how wise it was, other than it put me in a bigger house with a seperate shack...But done is done...

Stay in touch

73/88

Steve, K4YZ

948. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 17:45:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3C7538.603F85F1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30609

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code and
> > > the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
> > > printed in a book without keying anything.
> >
> > Gee, whatta revelation. So try using it to communicate on the air from a
> > sheet of paper.
>
> That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two different
> things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any way to
> Morse code.

What is proves is more attempts at obfuscation by you. The subject is and has always been radiotelegraphy on ham radio.

949. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:06:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3c9422_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30613

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C39F991.ECFCB849@uci.edu...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
>
> Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
> the government to operate CW?

When I was a novice CW was the only option.

After "novice enhancement" as tech+ if I wanted
to use 80m, 40m, or 15m ...

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

950. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:19:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3C89A5.DD649D10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30610

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two different
> > things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any way to
> > Morse code.
>
> What is proves is more attempts at obfuscation by you. The subject is and has
> always been radiotelegraphy on ham radio.

I know you feel that the one and only subject in the world is
radiotelegraphy, Dick, but some of us discuss different topics.
There is simply no way that OOK can be tristated. If it can be
tristated, it is not OnOffKeying, by definition. Morse code can
be gated through a two-state gate or a tristate gate. It is the
electronics that determines the electronic state, not the code,
and no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

951. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:23:40 UTC
From: eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e9af79fa.0201091023.5c25bd02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That's an insult, how dare they not post such articles. I remember in the late 70's and the early 80's 73 magazine carried mods for just about every single chicken band radio of any significance.

The average ham sits around with his mike in one hand, his cock in the other, and kerchunks the local repeater all day while jacking off.

Sorry, that's just the way it is. The tests are so easy, they're meaningless, the hobby is going down the tubes, fast.

The freebanders will become the real hams within a few years.

The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The cell phone user actually gets quality communications.

These new no coders are nothing but cellular phone user wanna bees. They can't afford the monthly rate of a cell phone, and their trailer park doesn't allow external antennas so they use their little two meter hand held jackoff box.

moparho1ic@hotmail.com (Moparholic) wrote in message news:<b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>...
> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

952. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:28:21 UTC
From: eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e9af79fa.0201091028.14c4c766@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30612
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

We've got to get those damned truck drivers off the cb. Trucks suck,
and truckers suck even worse.

The average truck driver is even dumber than a no-code technician, and
I didn't think that was possible.

The average trucker smells like a pile of crap because he bathes maybe
once a year at most.

We need to pass a law making it illegal for truckers to use two way
radio's of any kind. No antenna on the trucks, no radios in the
trucks.

Trucks and truckers are a menace.

> Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> Truckers are leading the way....
>
> Scott, Unit-69
> Chesapeake Bay

953. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:29:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3c99b9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30617

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020108155716.12447.00000449@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine.
Exactly
> >what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration?
>
> Morse encoding has three basic states -- on short, on long and off.
The off
> state has 3 separate meanings -- to separate the character elements,
to
> separate characters and to separate words. If you wish, you could
view each as
> a state, thus making Morse code a sex-state mode.

Actually, as you alude, there are ALSO different lengths of the "off"
state, but there are still REALLY only 2 states ... "On" and "Off"
...
all the length variables do is screw up the performance by meaning
that the symbols are not uniform and therefore optimum detection is
not possible as with, for (a very simple) example, BFSK RTTY
with uniform symbols.

As has been pointed out previously, simple BFSK, at equal data
rates, has a 9 and change dB weak signal advantage over OOK
CW (despite your attempts at tongue-in-cheek humor :-) and there
are a number of much better-performing alternatives which are
well within the reach of amateurs.

> In digital circuits, the tri-state mode is high impedance -- it, the
circuit is
> not there. I figured that you, as a digital engineer, would
understand the
> analogy.

In CW, the addition of additional "states" (which I don't agree are
REALLY there, but will grant for the purpose of this argument),
generates a situation where the PERFORMANCE is "not there,"
compared to better techniques :-)

(but, despite the fact that he LIKES Morse, Ed is technically astute
enough to know that that's how the math/reality work out ...)

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDyL2pe+N6+q84HiEQLuXQCgnvzqJndp0S/JmjBC3FgFKt+41jwAnAr3
eD4pDyH0WNrVghKHN/I8U9/+
=fjE5
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

954. The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:42:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3c9d48_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30621

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3C7538.603F85F1@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code
and
> > > > the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
> > > > printed in a book without keying anything.
> > >
> > > Gee, whatta revelation. So try using it to communicate on the
air from a
> > > sheet of paper.
> >
> > That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two
different
> > things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any
way to
> > Morse code.
>
> What is proves is more attempts at obfuscation by you. The subject
is and has
> always been radiotelegraphy on ham radio.

Problem is that Dick either doesn't realize (or can't/won't accept)
that OOK Morse is NOT the ONLY means of "radiotelegraphy on
ham radio." RTTY, the various "TORs," and other techniques
are ALSO "radiotelegraphy on am radio." Dick just doesn't (or
won't) recognize that and therefore he can't separate modulation
from coding because for him, apparently, "There's only ONE way."

Sad that an extra apparenty can't comprehend the distinction ...
maybe the tests were "dumbed down" when Dick took his? :-)

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

```
iQA/AwUBPDyPEpe+N6+q84HiEQKSugCdFjQtxYdBbfHPwAXwnHJiVsgb1UYAn25w
nJ+Pt08Mq4i/ykkgqo81oM7B
=lGjG
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

955. The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 18:48:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3c9ec1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30622

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3BA5B6.7441B56A@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Why do you think it's called ON/OFF Keying, Dick?
> > >
> > > Surprise!Because it's keyed on and off! So try passing any
intelligence by
> > > keying a carrier on and off without the third state. Cheez......
> >
> > OK Dick, your technical expertise is obviously far above mine.
Exactly
> > what is the third state in an ON/OFF configuration? Note that
coding
> > is an entirely different issue from the possible keying states.
ASCII
> > could use ON/OFF keying but it is usually uses FSK which is also a
> > two-state method.
> >
> > A tristate level might be, for instance,
OFF/half-power/full-power.
> > That is possible, but I haven't seen it applied to CW. What would
> > be the function of that third state?
>
> Unless you're playing Paul Revere, "On if by land, off if by sea",
it's gonna be
> a real problem for you to communicate by OOK carrier with no further
action. The
> third state, in the case of radiotelegraphy, is obviously the timing
of the on-off
> periods
> It seems unlikely that you wouldn't be familiar with that..

The states are "on" and "off" ... period ... the timing does not
change the number of states ... but I guess Dick still doesn't
"get it ..."
```

Give up Cecil ... I don't think that Dick is EVER going to
understand the basic principles.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDyQe5e+N6+q84HiEQIiHwCg6UROjAj1b1NUSPYuHKFAewBJFJMAn0hx
YEPLQHzHGxSL+iEhqMtZdHaQ
=DHRv
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

956. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:10:26 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3C95A2.985FD300@psu.edu>
Source record: 30615

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: K1MAN sending this letter.
> >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 1/8/2002 3:35 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu>
> >
> > I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> >free tonight?
>
> "Watching a movie" is NOT what I'd like to do on a date with Sandra
> Bullock!

Yer right, Steve. I need to have higher expectations. BTW, she might be an inexpensive date. I saw her on tv describing her favorite meal - Kentucky fried chicken three piece meal!

- Mike - KB3EIA

957. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:13:10 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3C9646.BF2692B4@psu.edu>
Source record: 30614
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

```
KC8JBO wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu...
> > I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> > free tonight?
> >
> > - mike -
>
> LOL!!!!! I'd like to watch one with Penelope Ann Miller or Carmen Electkra.
^^

Was that an "or" or a "and"??? heh, heh. ;^)
```

958. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:22:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3C9874.6A81CACA@uci.edu>
Source record: 30618

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Maybe you could fall back on the dictionary once again, and see if that
> > sheds any light on the terminology.

> The dictionary can't help because the word "universal" is completely missing
> from Part 97.

But so is the expression 'Part 97'.

959. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:25:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3C9920.433D35C7@uci.edu>
Source record: 30620

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Maybe you feel that taking a test is the same as operating?
>
> It is the receive half of simulated operation.

So, maybe I need to type my original comment again, so you can see if I
was talking about simulated operating.

"Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
by
the government to operate CW?"

960. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:27:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201091127.5ac252c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30616

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c39f4b8_1@news7.fast.net>...>
>
>
> I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
>
>
How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
test?
>
>
Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested for
having any competence with the mode?
>
>
>> your "brilliant concept" went over like the proverbial lead
balloon.
>
> The major objections were that it wasn't a purely manual skill.
> Also, it was objected that something that worked well with
> no QRM/QRN/QSB would "take the fun out of it."
>
There's a whole litany of valid objections cw users have with any such
scheme, those are only two and I at least partially agree with both. I
prefer cw mostly because of it's utter simplicity and superior
effectiveness given the usual ERPs vs. propagation/noise level
conditions and investments and for no other real reasons. I don't
"love" cw any more than I "love" any particular screwdriver in my
toolbox. CW is just the tool of choice I usually use to get the dxing
and contesting job done for demonstrably logical reasons based in
timeless physics. One difference between thee and me Sweetums is that
I have one helluva power tool in my toolbox YOU don't know how to use.
Which is YOUR loss. Don't believe for one second that the PCTA bunch
is gonna sit still while you work at pulling the cw mode any further
down toward your level.
>
>
Sure, ya can get deeper into the noise keyboarding with the likes of
PSK31 and Pactor but there goes the simplicity and cost advantages of
cw. Might as well dial up my ISP and jump into a chat room.

>
>
> (To which
> I responded that it would be easy to program all kinds of
> hellish channel impairments ...
>
>
"Channel." Boink: There it is again. You'll never get it. 'Nother Tech
cum HF The Easy Way.
>
>
> in the receiver ... without having
> to trash the underlying communications channel.) I even pointed
> out that this could be a "feature" for contesters, wherein the
> paying field would be leveled in terms of impariments and the
> result would truly be a matter of skill, rather that "who can afford
> the biggest amp/tower/etc."
>
>
It's absolutely gonna happen Squiggy, we're quickly closing in on the
day when we get enough bandwidth via the fiber optic networks to bash
each other in all kinds of contests with our Sony Playstations and
those only cost $200 now. And without a need for federal licenses and
sure as hell without any code tests or problems with cc&rs, towers,
amps or objections from the PCTA contingent. But I expect we'll have
to pay somebody mightily for the license to have a decent NFL
quarterback loaded into our Playstations. Zzzzzz . . .
>
>
See Squiggy that's not RADIO any more than your digital "simulated
contesting enviornment" is radio the way hams do real radio including
the contests. All you're proposing is a particularly lame shadow of
Internet Playstation interconnectivity using the HF radio spectrum
instead of the fiber optic network. Lead balloon.
>
>
> You are mistaken ... the modulation schemes proposed would NOT
> be 150 kHz wide ... in fact, they would be narrower (by a lot) than
> the required bw of the 20 wpm Morse-equivalent they were designed
> to replace.
> What WAS said was that, within the same 150 kHz of
> bandwidth (14.000-14.150), 10s of thousands of simultaneous
> 20 wpm Morse-equivalent QSOs
>
>
We've had thousands doing it simultaneously mostly in the lower 50 Khz
for decades with the oldest modulation scheme on the planet. Tune
14.000-14.050 on Sunday morning during the upcoming ARRL cw dx test.
>
>

> could exist with little or no mutual
> interference ... the system would not "trash the use of cw within that
> spectrum space" ... it could easily detect and avoid frequencies where
> cw QSOs were ongoing ...
>
>
Including the four second split freq qsos with the dxpeditions? Yeah,
right. Or perchance do you also propose creating virtual dxpeditions
too? Your "concept" can be taken anywhere ya wanna take it Squig, just
depends on the limits of yer inanity. Which, the way I see it,
apparently have no limits.
>
>
You're a troll who has tossed out enough techo razzle-dazzle bullshit
to collect some witless groupies. Now go play with yer RADIO and best
of luck with the dxing.
>
>
> The point is that the TAPR approach is not cost-effective and
> will result in a "product" which will cost much more than necessary
> to achieve a reasonable result ... thus discouraging widespread
> adoption.
>
>
You already stated that but with a different group of words.
>
>
> > How could it be anything else on 900Mhz? Without an AT&T cell phone
> > type infrastructure which never in this world is gonna happen in ham
> > radio.
>
> The 900 MHz band could be very useful .. and nobody is talking
> about a "cellphone type infrastructure." (at least I'm not ...)
>
>
Certainly, the 900Mhz band is wide open and available for the
development of the fast digital modes we've been assured by people
like yourself are the wave of the future in ham radio. You haven't
done a thing about it despite yer bluster of yore in this NG, you're
out sniping new ones on ssb. And TAPR is already five years into two
lousy FHSS boards they still don't have working. And you don't think
much of their efforts. Either the future of ham radio is in deep
doo-doo or all the smoke & mirrors you digigeeks have been pumping is
exactly that.
>
>>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

961. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:27:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3C99B2.4C2E59A1@uci.edu>
Source record: 30619

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
> > the government to operate CW?
>
> When I was a novice CW was the only option.
>
> After "novice enhancement" as tech+ if I wanted
> to use 80m, 40m, or 15m ...

So your definition of the word 'privileges' is 'force'?

962. Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 19:53:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3caf6b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30631

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:#sLml98lBHA.1292@cpimsnntpa03...
> N2EY writes:
>
> > Add to this the percentage of folks who don't QSL or QSL slowly
> > and eQSL starts looking REAL good.
>
> Which brings up a point. N2EY still owes me a card, as I noticed
just
> finishing up my QSL'ing cycle for CW SS weekend. He'll soon owe me
a second
> one.

Thats' between you and N2EY ... (however, have you checked? ...
maybe they're waiting for you at eQSL :-)

> I played with one of the eQSL sites awhile back, and decided that
eQSLs are
> impersonal

Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
effective method of delivery ...

>border on rude

Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
effective method of delivery ...

>and have no place among real hams.

Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
effective method of delivery ...

> It kind of boils down to "what's the point?". I'm not suggesting
everyone wants to
> send QSLs, but if you do, why would you send an eQSL?

To confirm a contact ... same as a piece of paper sent through
old-fashioned mail.

> It's impersonal

Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
effective method of delivery ... while eQSL has some "stock
card" formats (like many conventional QSL card printers),

you can also upload your own graphic to make your card as
personal and unique as you want ...

> has no value

According to the ARRL's current anticompetitive policy,
based on their desire to spend a lot of member $$$
reinventing the wheel with their "Logbook of the World"
program ... solely for the purpose of maintaining a
stranglehold control over things.

> requires some hassle to "put in the shoebox" at the recipient

What hassle would that be ... are you talking about the act
of printing the electronic card vs. the act of going the the
mailbox, opening the envelope, etc. ??? (BFD "hassle")

> and is unwelcome clutter in my email.

If you want the confirmation of a contact, why would it be
"unwelcome clutter in your e-mail" ???

> A paper QSL, even a very nice one, is cheap (mine cost
> less than a quarter,

Plus postage, plus envelope if you want it to stay nice,
plus SAE, plus IRC or "green stamp" ... etc. if you want to
maximize your chances of a reply ... it adds up to a LOT
more than "less than a quarter" ... the eQSL is MUCH more
cost effective and far more timely as well.

> and they are very deluxe

I'm impressed and I haven't even seen one (not!) ...

> -- you can design and print your own on your
> computer if you wish). A paper QSL can reflect your personality,
your
> creative ability, or your personal interests.

And so can the electronic version ... the ONLY difference is
where it gets printed and whether it's delivered by electronic
means or old fashioned postal means ...

> It is the tangible token of
> our intangible electronic communication encounter.

Once printed, an eQSL is JUST as tangible ...

> If it's too expensive for you, then don't do it,

"Do it Hans' way, or don't do it!" (baloney ...)

> but please keep you electronic cards at home.

Not to worry ... I won't "darken your (electronic)
mailbox" ...

> With all kind wishes,

Sounds much more like a big batch of grumbly to me :-p

> de Hans, K0HB

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDyfn5e+N6+q84HiEQLjBQCeNsOruSBnna2zCZilrcerxfWJNEUAnjqe
85NA1NuzDdETtLg9o9gHdhzp
=dcem
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

963. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:01:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3CA1B6.B50E13D9@uci.edu>
Source record: 30623

CAM wrote:
> One time at a hamfest, I hollered at my friend Harold on .405 simplex.
> I said, "Hey Harold, y'all got yur ears on?" Some ham standing beside
> me said, "We hams don't use that CB lingo. How long have you been
> licensed?" I said, "48 years". :-)

Guess mebee he reckoned most fellers were a little quicker on the
up-take than that. :-)

964. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:38:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3CAA47.4A292C8F@uci.edu>
Source record: 30626

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > Maybe you feel that taking a test is the same as operating?
> > >
> > > It is the receive half of simulated operation.
> >
> > So, maybe I need to type my original comment again, so you can see if I
> > was talking about simulated operating.
> >
> > "Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
> > by the government to operate CW?"
>
> Does the Morse code exam count?

As operating? Toward what? DXCC?
```

965. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:39:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3CAA9B.24618CC1@uci.edu>
Source record: 30627

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The dictionary can't help because the word "universal" is completely missing
> > > from Part 97.
> >
> > But so is the expression 'Part 97'.
>
> It's there in my copy of Part 97.

I don't find it in mine.

Is ICOM or Yeasu in there? If not, maybe they don't exist.

966. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:42:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CAB42.884DC929@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30624

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The dictionary can't help because the word "universal" is completely missing
> > from Part 97.
>
> But so is the expression 'Part 97'.

It's there in my copy of Part 97.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

967. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:43:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CAB7E.2D6C50D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30625

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Maybe you feel that taking a test is the same as operating?
> >
> > It is the receive half of simulated operation.
>
> So, maybe I need to type my original comment again, so you can see if I
> was talking about simulated operating.
>
> "Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
> by the government to operate CW?"

Does the Morse code exam count?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

968. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:51:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CAD3C.3C8F6C84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30628

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> The states are "on" and "off" ... period ... the timing does not
> change the number of states ... but I guess Dick still doesn't
> "get it ..."
>
> Give up Cecil ... I don't think that Dick is EVER going to
> understand the basic principles.

I have reviewed every text that I have on CW and Morse code and none
of them talk about more "states" than two (on/off). Dick has
obviously confused "states with "elements" and, as usual, is all
output and no input.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

969. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:54:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CAE1A.DAD592B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30629

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > One time at a hamfest, I hollered at my friend Harold on .405 simplex.
> > I said, "Hey Harold, y'all got yur ears on?" Some ham standing beside
> > me said, "We hams don't use that CB lingo. How long have you been
> > licensed?" I said, "48 years". :-)
>
> Guess mebee he reckoned most fellers were a little quicker on the
> up-take than that. :-)

Guess maybe he didn't recognize the humor.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

970. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 20:59:52 UTC
From: Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com>
Message-ID: <cb2%7.19353$dG.10418141@news1.rdc1.sdca.home.com>
Source record: 30630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

lol

a pair of 25,000s eh?

What socket you usin with them? And chimney? What is the value of your plate blocking cap, as well as the physical dimensions of your plate coil?

Lets see whose full of shit today.....

Toll_Free

"One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in message news:3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net...
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
> >Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
>
>
> like they'd take the time to do that....
>
> if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> just for someone saying they would get real
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

971. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 21:11:27 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3CB1FE.C430FD5A@psu.edu>
Source record: 30633

AGGGGGHHH, NOOOOOOOOOoooo! You said the bad "F" word Jim! Now Cecil's going to start up the dreaded "forced" thread again.

- Mike -

Jim Kelley wrote:

> So your definition of the word 'privileges' is 'force'?

972. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 21:13:04 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3CB260.FCD8F732@psu.edu>
Source record: 30632

I thought it was on, off, and don't care.
- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > The states are "on" and "off" ... period ... the timing does not
> > change the number of states ... but I guess Dick still doesn't
> > "get it ..."
> >
> > Give up Cecil ... I don't think that Dick is EVER going to
> > understand the basic principles.
>
> I have reviewed every text that I have on CW and Morse code and none
> of them talk about more "states" than two (on/off). Dick has
> obviously confused "states with "elements" and, as usual, is all
> output and no input.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

973. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 22:13:51 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a6d0ecfd2142eb98968f@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30634

In article <3c3caf6b_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> According to the ARRL's current anticompetitive policy,
> based on their desire to spend a lot of member $$$
> reinventing the wheel with their "Logbook of the World"
> program ... solely for the purpose of maintaining a
> stranglehold control over things.

Actually, it's because the "owners" of e-qsl will not allow their software to interface with any of the logging programs on the market today without a substantial fee. The range tossed about was anywhere from 5 cents to 15 cents per card downloaded into a logging program.

Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit off an idea that allows so blatant forgeries to occur, despite their authenticated formats

I seriously doubt the ARRL wants to maintain a stranglehold due to the fact they freely allowed the software people to have the necessary means to incorporate the downloading of eqsls into their programs. This fact alone disproves anything you just made mention of.

BTW, according to the eqsl site, the name eqsl is supposedly their registered trademark.

I take it Carl, you dislike the ARRL? Are you a member and if so, why? I don't meet to many people who support organizations that they dislike so much.

Just a curious lurker here. Seems so many people have Giant Sequoia sized chips on their shoulders here.

974. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 22:33:26 UTC
From: middlefanger <middlfinger4@home.comspam>
Message-ID: <Wy3%7.365382$5A3.138794545@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 30635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Toll, he is full of shit he had tubes listed a few weeks back that were not even produced.

"Toll Free" <tollfree@bigradios.com> wrote in message news:cb2%7.19353$dG.10418141@news1.rdc1.sdca.home.com...
> lol
>
>
> a pair of 25,000s eh?
>
> What socket you usin with them? And chimney? What is the value of your
> plate blocking cap, as well as the physical dimensions of your plate coil?
>
> Lets see whose full of shit today........
>
>
> Toll_Free
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> "One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in
> message news:3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net...
> > On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> > <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
> >
> > >Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
> >
> >
> > like they'd take the time to do that....
> >
> > if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> > just for someone saying they would get real
> >
> >
> > one high powered mutha
> > powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> > i don't play
> > i drop da maul
>

>

975. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 23:51:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cd91d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30636

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:CDO_7.439139$er5.17006331@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Kim" wrote ...
> >
> > Uh, hello! Guys? Let me duck in here real quick, and then duck right
> back
> > out. There's already been quite an exchange on this newsgroup that
> > demonstrates just universally *un*understood the Q-signals are. I mean,
> one
> > ham says QSL means this, another says it means that.
> >
> > I think it might be best said that 10-codes *and* Q-signals are both
quite
> > legal--at least that is what I've always heard. The difference is that
a
> > lot of hams find the use of 10-codes abhorrent on ham radio, due to
> > familiarity with CB.
> >
> > OK, I'm back out.
> >
>
> Kim,
>
> It's not been a problem for as long as I've been working CW, where
Q-signals
> are used quite a bit. (I'm yet to hear a 10-code on CW) It just seems to
> be a way to make a point here on the NG. I've tried to stress that
10-codes
> are not universally accepted, and that they can actually create problems
in
> given circumstances. But I guess everyone is just going to stick to
their
> guns on this one.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

You know what's really cool? That last line in your post "but I guess
everyone is just going to stick to their guns on this one." Man, I like
that. No name-calling, no presumptions about personality, no crap.

Thanks, Arnie.

Kim W5TIT

976. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-09 23:58:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cdacf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30637

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:0df46242cb2a2a65b7ea2c4df1fe04bc.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:
>
> >
> > What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a point.
> >
>
> You can't really be that dense. I am not arguing *for* anything.
>
> I am arguing *against* the mistaken assertion that abbreviations must
> be "universally accepted" before they are legal to be used on the air.
>
> The ARRL book in question is an excellent book, but it has absolutely
> zero regulatory standing, even if every staffer at FCC reviewed it.
>
> I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
> of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years, and I don't
> notice that I've caused any of this chaos you predict. In fact, I
> have been elected to the A-1 Operators Club based on unsolicited
> recommendations of other A-1 operators.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --

My husband used to be a big PSK31 fan. On that mode, the same "codes" used on the internet are used. Things like: FWIW, LOL, IMHO, etc.

Kim W5TIT

977. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:06:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CDAF6.33914A67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30638

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > The dictionary can't help because the word "universal" is completely missing
> > > > from Part 97.
> > >
> > > But so is the expression 'Part 97'.
> >
> > It's there in my copy of Part 97.
>
> I don't find it in mine.

Mine says: "Part 97 - Amateur Radio Service"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

978. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:07:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CDB41.DB4618A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30639

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > "Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
> > > by the government to operate CW?"
> >
> > Does the Morse code exam count?
>
> As operating? Toward what? DXCC?

Towards an Amateur Radio License
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

979. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:08:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CDB9B.BA000BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30640

mike coslo wrote:
> I thought it was on, off, and don't care.

Which description of CW/Morse/OOK says that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

980. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:34:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3CE18B.DCB5D69C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30641

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> My husband used to be a big PSK31 fan. On that mode, the same "codes" used
> on the internet are used. Things like: FWIW, LOL, IMHO, etc.

That brings up a question. If you sent .-.. --- .-.. during a CW QSO,
Would the FCC send you a -. .- .-.. ..--..
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

981. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:52:21 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <6v5%7.265471$BX4.15119570@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30642

"Kim" wrote ...
>
> You know what's really cool? That last line in your post "but I guess
> everyone is just going to stick to their guns on this one." Man, I like
> that. No name-calling, no presumptions about personality, no crap.
>

Well, I figure you can only debate something to a certain point, then it
becomes circular. When that happens, we should just call it a night.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

982. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 00:59:53 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <9C5%7.265489$BX4.15126136@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30643

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> That brings up a question. If you sent .-.. --- .-.. during a CW QSO,
> Would the FCC send you a -. .- .-.. ..--..

-. --- - .. -. - ....-. .-- .. .-.. -.. . ... - -.. .-. .
.- -- ...

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

983. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:01:09 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <mD5%7.265493$BX4.15127948@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30644

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> I can't recall ever having a CW QSO on 20m, Arnie. 40m is
> my CW band.

Okay, make it 7.058, then.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

984. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:05:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cea66$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30646

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3BCE53.CCE46E02@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Any man who works hard to learn someting and finds himself
> > > > no wiser than before is a dum$hit.
> > >
> > > Dick, you just wrote your autobiography.
> >
> > Actually I had you in mind. You may be brilliant and educated, but
> > wise you are not.
>
> Sorry Dick, you are not talking about me. I have never worked hard
> for anything in my entire life. Life's too short to work hard.
> My motto has always been: "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

heh heh heh, yeah. I'd say that Dick worked a lot *too* hard (and fast)
when he "read all about" the faith of Islam...eh?

LOL

Kim W5TIT

985. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:17:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ucWLtOXmBHA.1684@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30645

WA6VSE says:

>> It's impersonal

> Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
> effective method of delivery ...

Sort of like an internet "chat site" attempts to be "an easier,
more effective method of delivery..." of an intimate encounter
with a loved one.

>> and they are very deluxe

>I'm impressed and I haven't even seen one (not!) ...

Then I'll send you one. The front is one of my photographs
depicting a central theme in my lifestyle, and the rear is a
graphic representing one of my amateur radio interests.
When you see it you'll understand why it would be diminished
by electronic delivery at e-QSL or ARRL LOTW. Hopefully
a recipient remembers me and understands my personality
better after receiving the card.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

http://u2.qrz.com/database?callsign=k0hb

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

986. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:18:22 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1isdnqse2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30649
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C3C9646.BF2692B4@psu.edu...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C3B6633.60EF9B5A@psu.edu...
> > > I'd like to watch a movie with Sandra bullock too. I wonder if she's
> > > free tonight?
> > >
> > > - mike -
> >
> > LOL!!!!! I'd like to watch one with Penelope Ann Miller or Carmen
Electkra.
> ^^
>
> Was that an "or" or a "and"??? heh, heh. ;^)

Hehehe... maybe a both! Not much film would be seen though!

987. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:18:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3ced75_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30648

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3CE18B.DCB5D69C@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > My husband used to be a big PSK31 fan. On that mode, the same "codes"
used
> > on the internet are used. Things like: FWIW, LOL, IMHO, etc.
>
> That brings up a question. If you sent .-.. --- .-.. during a CW QSO,
> Would the FCC send you a -. .- .-.. ..--..
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh, hell, I'd have to drag the chart back out to tell what the heck that
says, Cecil...LOL

(PS--never mind, I asked Cliff and he deciphered...) Er, LOL

Kim W5TIT

988. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 01:23:15 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <v26%7.452805$er5.17641051@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30647

"W1RFI" wrote ...
>
> In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For balance, can
you
> also tell us what you think they are doing right?
>

For the sake of brevity, I'll give one example of each ... (well, maybe two)

How have they screwed up? An example of this can be seen in their current position as it relates to the re-farming of the Novice bands. Although they haven't made it official, it is quite clear that they are in favor of expanding phone privileges down into the what was Novice CW/digital. If they were indeed looking toward the *future* of Amateur Radio, they would be fighting to retain these bands for CW/digital use. SSB is old and quite the bandwidth hog; hardly the future of Amateur radio. Emerging technologies like PSK31 should be encouraged. It seems to me that the ARRL is just encouraging more SSB use at the expense of the new digital modes. I guess all those new Generals and Extras need somewhere to go, huh?

What are they doing right? They are continuing to fight the battle to expand PRB1 to include CC&Rs that restrict antennas and equipment designed for Amateur use. Although I think one should always check out the restrictions before building (I did when I had my house built a few years ago) some CC&Rs go well beyond what would commonly be deemed reasonable.

and, (most importantly) they still will send you a pink card, free of charge.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

989. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:08:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3CF6F2.50A871AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30650

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Hey, you never answered the "Know why?" above. It's my theory--completely
> unexplained--that when you *first* key up your radio outputs the most power.
> As a few seconds go on the initial draw becomes a lower and constant output.
> In times of severe operating situations, short two or three word outputs at
> a time are often more successful than keying up your radio and talking for
> longer than a few seconds. Remember that, in case you ever need it. It's
> especially effective in severe weather (lightning burst) conditions. Also,
> if you're communicating through repeaters...and don't ask me to figure this
> one out either, it just works...if you've got a really bad signal, key up on
> the tail end of someone who has a good signal into the repeater, you're
> signal will be better. Once again, only works for a few seconds at a time.
> This is where teamwork comes in: if these ideas are discussed as methods,
> someone will know what you are trying to do and will "put the word out" for
> people to key up the repeater for you and let you get in at the very end.
> Don't ask me why it works...have no idea.

...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will probably
put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot buried
at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
increases in gain.

Dave K8MN

990. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:09:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cf7d6_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30551

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a6d0ecfd2142eb98968f@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c3caf6b_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net
says...
> > According to the ARRL's current anticompetitive policy,
> > based on their desire to spend a lot of member $$$
> > reinventing the wheel with their "Logbook of the World"
> > program ... solely for the purpose of maintaining a
> > stranglehold control over things.
>
> Actually, it's because the "owners" of e-qsl will not allow their
> software to interface with any of the logging programs on the market

> today without a substantial fee. The range tossed about was
anywhere
> from 5 cents to 15 cents per card downloaded into a logging program.

Where'd you get that idea? There are a slew of logging
programs that import and export the "adif" format ... that's
all that seems to be required to upload logs to eQSL ...

> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit

Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
PLEASE ...

> off an
> idea that allows so blatant forgeries to occur, despite their
> authenticated formats

I'm satisfied that the system can provide reasonable
integrity ... I have a login name and a password, which
were issued through a reasonably secure process,
and I sent in a scanned copy of my license, which a
person reviews (and can compare with FCC records
which are available on the internet) ... I don't see the
big "security issue."

> I seriously doubt the ARRL wants to maintain a stranglehold due to
the
> fact they freely allowed the software people to have the necessary
means

> to incorporate the downloading of eqsls into their programs. This
fact
> alone disproves anything you just made mention of.

My understanding (and I'll stand corrected if I'm proven
wrong) is that the ARRL's (proposed) LOTW system
will require that everyone obtain a secure digital ID
(for a price) and that all logging software will have to
be updated (at a price) to comply with the "standards"
being set for LOTW ...

> BTW, according to the eqsl site, the name eqsl is supposedly their
> registered trademark.

And the problem with that is? (Do you have a problem with
people protecting their intellectual property or trademarks?)

> I take it Carl, you dislike the ARRL?

I take issue with SOME of the ARRL's policies and practices.

In this case, according to the information I've seen, the ARRL
refuses to cooperate with eQSL, stating that ONLY their LOTW
system will be acceptable. (though I understand it may be some
time before LOTW and compatible logging software are available).
Seems to me that the ARRL is needlessly spending a lot of
members' $$$ to build a system which duplicates an existing
system which is available for FREE - NOW ... and for which
there exists quite a bit of compatible logging software ... some
commercial, some shareware, and some totally free.

That to me is a waste of members' money and, perhaps could
even be construed as "anti-competitive" or monopolistic ... as
a member, I object.

> Are you a member
Yes, have been for 25 years or so ...

> and if so, why?

Because, despite the fact that I disagree strongly with SOME of
their policies and practices, the ARRL does do SOME good things.

I hope this answers your questions to your satisfaction.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDz3eJe+N6+q84HiEQLO1gCg4clBdsTUlZOR22V0feNRWWhOJ5gAn3CM
D97BACYaI7ZUO9iBV1LrlmeW
=Uysc
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

991. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:25:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cfb88_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30552

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:v26%7.452805$er5.17641051@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "W1RFI" wrote ...
> >
> > In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For
balance, can
> you
> > also tell us what you think they are doing right?
> >
>
> For the sake of brevity, I'll give one example of each ... (well,
maybe two)
>
> How have they screwed up? An example of this can be seen in their
current
> position as it relates to the re-farming of the Novice bands.
Although they
> haven't made it official, it is quite clear that they are in favor
of
> expanding phone privileges down into the what was Novice CW/digital.
If
> they were indeed looking toward the *future* of Amateur Radio, they
would be
> fighting to retain these bands for CW/digital use.

Surprise, surprise, Arnie ... we agree on this part of the issue
(I sincerely hope that doesn't scare the hell out of you :-)

> SSB is old

Yes, SSB is getting old ...

> and quite the bandwidth hog

Actually, SSB is pretty spectrally efficient as a voice mode,
requiring only the same bandwidth as the baseband signal
being transmitted. To get the same audio quality in the
same bandwidth with digital modulation takes some pretty
powerful processing.

> hardly the future of Amateur radio.

Like cw (surprise), SSB has a place in the future of ham
radio ... but other modes will emerge as well.

> Emerging technologies like PSK31 should be encouraged.

I agree ... (again, don't be frightened :-)

> It seems to me that the ARRL is just encouraging more
> SSB use at the expense of the new digital modes.

My gosh ... again, we agree ... I also think that space should
be preserved for "digital expansion" and that the amount
of spectrum devoted to SSB need not be expanded.

> I guess all those new Generals and Extras need somewhere
> to go, huh?

Don't spread it around in the wrong circles, but our bands
aren't really overcrowded ... and a little pressure on spectrum
occupancy would be a good (and probably needed) motivator
towards the adoption of more spectrally-efficient techniques.

> What are they doing right? They are continuing to fight the battle
to
> expand PRB1 to include CC&Rs that restrict antennas and equipment
designed
> for Amateur use. Although I think one should always check out the
> restrictions before building (I did when I had my house built a few
years
> ago) some CC&Rs go well beyond what would commonly be deemed
reasonable.

Wow!!! I also agree that the battle against CC&Rs and other
unreasonable antenna/operating restrictions is VERY important.
In fact, I wrote NCI's comments FULLY SUPPORTING the ARRL's
petition to the FCC on the matter ...

> and, (most importantly) they still will send you a pink card, free
of
> charge.

Well, Arnie, I guess, we have to disagree on something ...
I don't really give a damn about the pink card :-)

I think that some of Ed's work at the ARRL lab on interference
issues is more important than the pink cards ... (seriously).

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDz7gZe+N6+q84HiEQIORgCgtXsx67GiWmjCEBR2yVG5xrhxBXMAnjl0
AfylXNoSDT9shFuYTqs7BoH3
=A9d6
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

992. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:27:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3cfc2a$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30553

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3CF6F2.50A871AC@earthlink.net...
>
[snipped Kim's text for brevity]
>
> ...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will
probably
> put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
> quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot
buried
> at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
> increases in gain.
>
> Dave K8MN

Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
keep posting them over and over again? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPDz8J5e+N6+q84HiEQJgNgCfYXTS6BwbxvGxzfx91QIqX/tiUJEAoPqO
fkkBzUwlWXoVKGs4sZHaYKPx
=Rb+K
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

993. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:32:29 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <3c3cf6ae$0$12417$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 30554

Just listening to the ham bands I can see the League is still screwed up big-time. Guess I didn't need to ask the question in the first place. Maybe I just wanted to hear insider info that they were going to update their corporate policy to start improving ham radio again and ham operators rather than line their pocket books and bank accounts.

And I'm not going to ask a division director anything. They ignored the membership before, I don't need to hear them say they'll do it again.

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
news:20020109072006.09750.00000411@mb-cq.aol.com:

> From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)
>
>>How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.
>
> I am not paid for my participation on rec.radio.amateur.policy, Vince.
> After all, I was off this forum for about 6 months, and I still have my
> job.You know that, so you are obviously just trolling. I thought you
> were better than that.
>
> If you want a policy update, you will have to ask your ARRL Division
> Director.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

994. An Apology to W1RFI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:46:20 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uOYraAYmBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30555

In a previous message, I implied that W1RFI was pompous.
I have no evidence that this is true, so I am obliged to
apologize in public.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
We pass the word around; we ponder how the case is
put by different people, we read the poetry; we
meditate over the literature; we play the music; we
change our minds; we reach an understanding. Society
evolves this way, not by shouting each other down,
but by the capacity of unique, individual human beings
to comprehend each other.
--Lewis Thomas, The Medusa and the Snail (1979)

995. Re: I pushed the wrong button

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 02:59:56 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@HalTurnerHerbie.net>
Message-ID: <a1j00ckoj0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30556
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1isdv$qse$4@pita.alt.net...
>
> "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a1hvns$np$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Query...query...question....no kapish......
> > Regarding this baby:
> >
>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> > _______________
> > > Received: from hotmail.com ([64.4.32.110]) by [Censored] ; Thu, 02 Nov
> > > 2000 20:54:49 -0600
> > > Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft
> > > SMTPSVC;
> > > Thu, 2 Nov 2000 18:55:22 -0800
> > > X-Originating-IP: [63.16.138.144]
> > > From: "Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > To: "W1WCR"<WIKK@aol.com>, <WIKK@netzero.net>,
<wlauterbach@ziplip.com>,
> > > "Kevin Alfred Strom" <kevin.strom@innocent.com>, "N2SAG"
> > > <AlParkHam@aol.com>"jgw13_1", <jgw13@gateway.net>, "KV4FZ"
> > > <herbs@vitelcom.net >
> > > Subject: New E-mail Address
> > > Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 20:56:00 -0700
> > > MIME-Version: 1.0
> > > X-Mailer: MSN Explorer 6.00.0009.1102
> > > Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> > > boundary="----=_NextPart_001_0000_01C0450F.4E445160"
> > > Message-ID: <OE30LuSbh29cM3oryKF0000011e@hotmail.com>
> > > X-OriginalArrivalTime: 03 Nov 2000 02:55:22.0751 (UTC)
> > > FILETIME=[824AE0F0:01C04541]
> > > Return-Path: <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > X-Rcpt-To: [CENSORED]
> > > X-DPOP: DPOP Version 2.8z5
> > > Status: U
> > >
> > > This is my new e-mail address. I still have my AOL address for dark
> > > purposes. But will use this as my primary one to avoid suspection.
> > >
> > > Thanks.
> > >
> > > Lloyd
> > > http://novfp.tripod.com
```

> >
>

> > _____
> > Isn't this like an interoffice memo between Toidy Lloydie and his weird
> > sieg heilers? If so, how are you privy to it? You have to be the
smartest,
> > most investigative, alert and most resourceful ham to ever hold a
ticket.
> > Best,
> > Doc,AF2Y
>
> It is. And I told the recpient that I would not reveal his name, etc. That
> recipient forwarded it to me. He told Llllardasssssss Lllllloyd to
remove
> him from his mailing list and asked the question does Llloyd have a life,
> is interested in girls or anything like that.
> Guess we're not the only ones to pose that question, unfortunately, I had
to
> answer truthfully, in the negative.
> LOL!!!!!!!!!
> Poor Lllllllllardasssssssssss Llllloyd.
>
>
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a1hp9v$8it$5@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a1hikv$e80$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > Gee, here I sit on this NG and after 2.5 years still don't know the
> > right
> > > > button to click on. How embarrassing. By accident I sent this to
Toidy
> > > > Lloydie instead of this NG and he got upset. He'll never know how
> sorry
> > I
> > > am
> > > > for upsetting him. I guess my illuminati got the best of me. By the
> way
> > > > here's a question to mull over. Isn't Lloyd's posting SPAM? Is it
not
> a
> > > > solicitation for bucks on behalf of halfwit "Turnip?" If so, since
> when
> > is
> > > > SPAM allowed on a newsgroup?
> > > > Doc,AF2Y(Jewish world banker, Rothschild relative, raconteur of fine
> > > wines,
> > > > elegant restaurants and sophisticated women. B.A.R.F. hater and TR
> > > > destroyer)

> > >
> > > Well, Lllllllllllardasssssssss
> Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd
> > is
> > > such a fucking whining pussy.
> > > It's fun to "upset" Llllllardasssssssss Lllllllloyd and so easy, too.
> That's
> > > why he's been posting anonymously in here using trhe BARF call
clubsign
> > and
> > > MUJ and the AGM sockpuppet. Guess he's using them for "dark purposes"
> > >
> > > Received: from hotmail.com ([64.4.32.110]) by [Censored] ; Thu, 02 Nov
> > > 2000 20:54:49 -0600
> > > Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft
> > > SMTPSVC;
> > > Thu, 2 Nov 2000 18:55:22 -0800
> > > X-Originating-IP: [63.16.138.144]
> > > From: "Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > To: "W1WCR"<WIKK@aol.com>, <WIKK@netzero.net>,
<wlauterbach@ziplip.com>,
> > > "Kevin Alfred Strom" <kevin.strom@innocent.com>, "N2SAG"
> > > <AlParkHam@aol.com>"jgw13_1", <jgw13@gateway.net>, "KV4FZ"
> > > <herbs@vitelcom.net >
> > > Subject: New E-mail Address
> > > Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 20:56:00 -0700
> > > MIME-Version: 1.0
> > > X-Mailer: MSN Explorer 6.00.0009.1102
> > > Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> > > boundary="----=_NextPart_001_0000_01C0450F.4E445160"
> > > Message-ID: <OE30LuSbh29cM3oryKF0000011e@hotmail.com>
> > > X-OriginalArrivalTime: 03 Nov 2000 02:55:22.0751 (UTC)
> > > FILETIME=[824AE0F0:01C04541]
> > > Return-Path: <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > X-Rcpt-To: [CENSORED]
> > > X-DPOP: DPOP Version 2.8z5
> > > Status: U
> > >
> > > This is my new e-mail address. I still have my AOL address for dark
> > > purposes. But will use this as my primary one to avoid suspection.
> > >
> > > Thanks.
> > >
> > > Lloyd
> > > http://novfp.tripod.com
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > ____
> > > Get more from your time online. FREE MSN Explorer download :

> > > http://explorer.msn.com
> > > [nd repost]
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
>
> ---
> > > --
> > > > ---
> > > > get out of my mailbox.
> > >
> > >
> > > Poor Llllardasssssssssss Llllllloyd, he's got no room to talk since
he's
> > the
> > > one that's been subscribing people to junk and spam e-mail for their
> > > mailboxes.
> > >
> > >
> > > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > > From: radiosigs
> > > > To: Lloyd Davies
> > > > Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2002 4:16 PM
> > > > Subject: Re: Is your computer secure?????
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > If I were anti-government, an espionage agent, a saboteur,
> pornographer,
> > > > hacker, troublemaking bigot, child molester, murderer, rapist and
> thief,
> > > I'd
> > > > be quite worried about the implications inherent in your post. On
the
> > > other
> > > > hand I fear nothing about the security of my computer because I'm a
> > plain
> > > > Joe living in a great country and mind my own business.
> > > > Now Lloyd if I were you I'd go over those ten characteristics I just
> > > > outlined and if any fit you, then worry. If not, then move your ass
> down
> > > the
> > > > road.
> > > > Doc,AF2Y
> > > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > > From: Lloyd Davies
> > > > Newsgroups: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest
> > > > Sent: Saturday, January 05, 2002 2:06 PM
> > > > Subject: Is your computer secure?????
> > > > [Lardassss' cut-and-paste monstorsity]

> > >
> > > --
> > > Lllllllllllaaaaaaardasssssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd
> > > "Friends of Hal Turner" <we.will@get.by.com> confessed his fatassed
> status
> > > in message news:3c388ad7$1_3@news.teranews.com...
> > > "SO WHAT IF I'M A LARDASS??<...> DOESNT IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?
> > > SO WHAT IF I WEAR A SIZE 38-40 PANTS AND SIZE 18 DRESS SHIRTS?
> > > IS THAT A CRIME? I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE ALOT BIGGER THAN
ME....."
> > >
> > >
> > >

Oh it's not hard at all Roger, figuring out who forwarded that
email to you, but to do so would compromise my sources of
information. I will tell you this much so you know that I know
who forwarded you that email. The rat is located in Georgia,
need I say more? Of course we expect you to respond to
this posting with your usual lies, denials, and filth, but that doesn't
change the fact that my email correspondents informed me as to
who and where the leak was.

Tiny Tenna

996. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 03:09:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109220955.16311.00000094@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 30558

In article <77f1797e.0201081145.446d0e69@posting.google.com>, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org>...
>> Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
>> rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.
>
>Sorry, Cecil, but 10-4 means "understood." QSL means "acknowledge a
>contact." I think you mean QSO, which means "understood."
>
Why not just use "Roger" or "Understood" on voice? All it takes on Cw is "R" (which is where "Roger" came from, by the way).

73 de Jim, N2EY

997. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 03:09:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109220956.16311.00000095@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 30557

In article <20020108160337.12447.00000451@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>On/off keyed CW is not universal, either. Both international and continental
>morse code are legal to use.

I think you mean "American Morse code" and "international morse code".

Is it legal to ID with American Morse?

73 de Jim, N2EY

998. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 03:13:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109221348.25530.00000789@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30559

>What I have a problem with are blowhards who insist that
>there is no place in amateur radio for anyone who isn't
>a clone of them ... and that such people are dirt.
>

This sure sounds like NCI

999. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 03:43:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109224345.25530.00000798@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30560

>You know - from that nice brick, ranch-style house just east of Gibbs
>Avenue, and within walking distance of "Historic Ridgewood". You moved to
>Lousiana, and admitted IN THIS NEWSGROUP that you were active on six meters.
>QRZ still showed you at a QTH which had a "for sale" sign in front of it,
>sitting empty for nearly a year.
>

Boy your not to swift are you? Just for your Info the Brick house you are speaking of sold in 7 days, the people that bought it have been living in for over 2 Years the house has not been sitting Empty at all, next time get your facts straight. As a matter of fact, I was in Canton and Cleveland over the Christmas week and stopped at the neighbors who live next door to the house you are talking about, guess what there was no For Sale sign, and the same People are still living there.
Before I sold the House in Ohio I still claimed Ohio has residence, now let me explain something else you might not be aware of. Some people own more than 1 Home at a time, even though they may not be in the same State, boy your not very swift. As a matter of fact I presently own 4 Homes, 1 of them is on Lake Cable which I have owned for many years.
You should have told me you were in Canton, when I was there at Christmas worked some good freinds on 79,12 and a couple of the 440 Repeaters

1000. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 03:56:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109225601.25530.00000801@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30561

>For balance, can you
>also tell us what you think they are doing right?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Thats an easy one, NOTHING

1001. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:03:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109230342.25530.00000802@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30562

>.and you were probably too stupid to fill out a 610 form properly when you
>moved. That's why it took you nearly two years to change your address in
>QRZ.
>
>

No Dumb Ass, I already told you I was still Claiming Ohio as Residence, God you are Stupid!!!!!!

1002. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:05:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109230503.25530.00000804@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30563

> Nice job, slime ball. Nothing we don't expect...just glad you keep
>reminding us how badly DNA can let us down sometimes.
>

Bite it little Stevie, are you still licking Bed Pans Clean

1003. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:09:25 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1j43u0ik1@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30574
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1hkl6$v8d$2@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:a1g19s030k3@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > She's never free. In fact, she's very expensive.
>
> Get a lesser-known starlet, then. LOL!

Hmmm...there's Roxanna Zal.

1004. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:09:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109230933.25530.00000807@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30564

>Say, speaking of which...do you keep one hand wrapped around your beer can
>while you hunt and peck with your other?
>
>Kim W5TIT

NO

1005. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:11:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020109231149.25530.00000809@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30565

>I bet you a lobster dinner that Carl won't be one of them.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

I dont know ED, Karl sure took along time to Memorize enough to pass the EXTRA

1006. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:12:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1j48g0j7u@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30576

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:HVX_7.77$7d.7356@newshog.newsread.com...
> The only 10-code I feel that is okay to occaisionaly use, as it is widely
> known, is 10-100, i.e. for a bathroom break. :)
>
> Sounds a little bit better that "gotta go see a man about a horse" or
"water
> the lillies" or any other cute euphimism to explain the same meaning.....
>
> Ryan

I like the phrase "I gotta roll a load".

1007. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:15:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d16ee_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30567

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3cfc2a$1_2@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3CF6F2.50A871AC@earthlink.net...
> >
> [snipped Kim's text for brevity]
> >
> > ...and if you put your radio under a pyramid at night, it will
> probably
> > put out even MORE power. Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
> > quartz crystal will improve frequency stability. A rabbit's foot
> buried
> > at the base of an apartment dwellers antennas can impart magical
> > increases in gain.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> keep posting them over and over again? :-)
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>

Shhhhh!!! It's the downswing of his snore--he's fallen asleep at the
keyboard.

Kim W5TIT

1008. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:17:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d1775_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30568

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:3c3cf6ae$0$12417$45beb828@newscene.com...
> Just listening to the ham bands I can see the League is still screwed up
> big-time.
>

Oh, this is funny. And, just seeing you post as a ham leads me to believe
that you *still* persist in a hobby you find so very loathsome.

Kim W5TIT

1009. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:17:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1j4h70jnk@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30577

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:6v5%7.265471$BX4.15119570@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...

> Well, I figure you can only debate something to a certain point, then it
> becomes circular. When that happens, we should just call it a night.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

True, but there's always that one person who absolutely *must* get the last
word in.

1010. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:17:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1j4lhjbd1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30566

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c3cdacf_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:0df46242cb2a2a65b7ea2c4df1fe04bc.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:
> > > What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a point.
> >
> > You can't really be that dense. I am not arguing *for* anything.
> > I am arguing *against* the mistaken assertion that abbreviations must
> > be "universally accepted" before they are legal to be used on the air.
> >
<SNIP>
> >
> > I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
> > of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years,
<SNIP>
>
> My husband used to be a big PSK31 fan. On that mode, the same "codes"
used
> on the internet are used. Things like: FWIW, LOL, IMHO, etc.
> Kim W5TIT

The best is still... ROTFLMAO!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1011. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:23:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d18d7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30571

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109230503.25530.00000804@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > Nice job, slime ball. Nothing we don't expect...just glad you keep
> >reminding us how badly DNA can let us down sometimes.
> >
>
> Bite it little Stevie, are you still licking Bed Pans Clean

Hmmm, 10:05PM. Last post from you this evening. Out of five posted, you're still holding back, there. How much *more* intelligence are you going to starve us of?

Kim W5TIT

1012. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:25:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30569

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> keep posting them over and over again? :-)

He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1013. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:26:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D1802.667852FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30570

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >When 5WPM code is finally gone, there will be those who start talking
> >about the barriers of the written exam...
>
> I bet you a lobster dinner that Carl won't be one of them.

Hey Ed, y'all going to Ft. Tuthill this year? I still owe
you a lobster dinner.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1014. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:26:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d19a2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30573

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109230933.25530.00000807@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Say, speaking of which...do you keep one hand wrapped around your beer
can
> >while you hunt and peck with your other?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> NO

Then, what *is* it you keep your one hand wrapped around? :o Ya walked
right into that one...

Kim W5TIT

1015. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:28:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d19f7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30575

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a1j4lh$jbd$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c3cdacf_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:0df46242cb2a2a65b7ea2c4df1fe04bc.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:
> > > > What you are arguing for is chaos on the air in order to make a
point.
> > >
> > > You can't really be that dense. I am not arguing *for* anything.
> > > I am arguing *against* the mistaken assertion that abbreviations must
> > > be "universally accepted" before they are legal to be used on the air.
> > >
> <SNIP>
> > >
> > > I've been active on the air for 40 years, have been using all sorts
> > > of less-than-universal abbreviations for all those years,
> <SNIP>
> >
> > My husband used to be a big PSK31 fan. On that mode, the same "codes"
> used
> > on the internet are used. Things like: FWIW, LOL, IMHO, etc.
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> The best is still... ROTFLMAO!
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

Aw, doggone it, Bill. I didn't want to wake Larry up...we've already got
Dave asleep. ;)

Kim W5TIT
```

1016. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:29:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D18C3.3049443E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30572

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >What I have a problem with are blowhards who insist that
> >there is no place in amateur radio for anyone who isn't
> >a clone of them ... and that such people are dirt.
> >
> This sure sounds like NCI

NCI people are dirt?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1017. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:31:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3d1a8f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30578

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
>
> He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|

Kim W5TIT

1018. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:37:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D1A86.C210B90B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30579

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> > I can't recall ever having a CW QSO on 20m, Arnie. 40m is
> > my CW band.
>
> Okay, make it 7.058, then.

I'm monitoring it right now. (I'm most comfortable at 10wpm.)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1019. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:52:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D1E18.42538572@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30580

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> Just listening to the ham bands I can see the League is still screwed up
> big-time.

Are the ARRL members misbehaving or what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1020. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 04:59:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3D1FB1.B2FCE63A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30581

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> >
> > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|

Well, he did once say that he was against smallpox.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1021. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:09:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3D1584.8AD71FDB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30582

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two different
> > > things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any way to
> > > Morse code.
> >
> > What is proves is more attempts at obfuscation by you. The subject is and has
> > always been radiotelegraphy on ham radio.
>
> I know you feel that the one and only subject in the world is
> radiotelegraphy, Dick, but some of us discuss different topics.

No, klass klown, THE subject is radiotelegraphy, much as you try to sidetrack it,

>
> There is simply no way that OOK can be tristated.

I know it chaps your digital ass but there's no way it can avoid it.

> ,
> no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.
>

So you don't know much about radiotelegraph transmitters, then? Of course it's the operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device) which adds the third state.

1022. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:14:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3D1697.B5266F77@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30583

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3C7538.603F85F1@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > The meaning is the same, Dick. Sorry you missed it. The code
> and
> > > > > the keying method are two different animals. The code can be
> > > > > printed in a book without keying anything.
> > > >
> > > > Gee, whatta revelation. So try using it to communicate on the
> air from a
> > > > sheet of paper.
> > >
> > > That just proves that the code and the modulation method are two
> different
> > > things. OOK is a modulation method not necessarily related in any
> way to
> > > Morse code.
> >
> > What is proves is more attempts at obfuscation by you. The subject
> is and has
> > always been radiotelegraphy on ham radio.
>
> Problem is that Dick either doesn't realize (or can't/won't accept)
> that OOK Morse is NOT the ONLY means of "radiotelegraphy on
> ham radio." RTTY, the various "TORs," and other techniques
> are ALSO "radiotelegraphy on am radio." Dick just doesn't (or
> won't) recognize that and therefore he can't separate modulation
> from coding because for him, apparently, "There's only ONE way."
>
> Sad that an extra apparenty can't comprehend the distinction ...
> maybe the tests were "dumbed down" when Dick took his? :-)

Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et al
are radiotelegraphy!

We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case of it!

1023. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:17:19 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <Zt9%7.457563$er5.17806081@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30585

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> I'm monitoring it right now. (I'm most comfortable at 10wpm.)

That's perfectly fine with me. I'll call for ya from time to time and we'll have a QSO. Ya might want to get out that pink card. Oh, and be careful, that's the FISTS calling frequency, they might try and recruit you : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1024. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:18:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3D1790.B3CEE42A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30584

Jim Kelley wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> > One time at a hamfest, I hollered at my friend Harold on .405 simplex.
> > I said, "Hey Harold, y'all got yur ears on?" Some ham standing beside
> > me said, "We hams don't use that CB lingo. How long have you been
> > licensed?" I said, "48 years". :-)
>
> Guess mebee he reckoned most fellers were a little quicker on the
> up-take than that. :-)

Right after thinking "that clown must be one of the original CBers."

1025. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:23:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3D2517.8E7CBA6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30586

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> >
> > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|

That you could have posted the idiotic statements you made and then make any comment about another's rational thoughts is the ultimate in sheer gall. What a Jeter.

Dave K8MN

1026. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 05:23:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3D18B8.AD3DB683@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30587

CAM wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > The states are "on" and "off" ... period ... the timing does not
> > change the number of states ... but I guess Dick still doesn't
> > "get it ..."
> >
> > Give up Cecil ... I don't think that Dick is EVER going to
> > understand the basic principles.
>
> I have reviewed every text that I have on CW and Morse code and none
> of them talk about more "states" than two (on/off). Dick has
> obviously confused "states with "elements" and, as usual, is all
> output and no input.

You two stupes can take it up with Ed Hare, as that was his original discription, which *I* knew instantly what he meant. Too bad you ignoramouses do not.

1027. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 07:11:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110021115.02071.00000653@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 30588

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/9/2002 10:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C3D18C3.3049443E@IEEE.org>

>NCI people are dirt?

Aren't we all when you add up the minerals?

Steve

1028. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:03:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110060300.14260.00000516@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30589

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Hey Ed, y'all going to Ft. Tuthill this year? I still owe
>you a lobster dinner.

Doesn't look real likely. :-(Besides, as I learned with Rick Tannehill,
lobster in AZ is an EXPENSIVE proposition. Do you have any plans to be in New
England in the next few years? I may also get to TX at some point.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1029. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:04:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110060420.14260.00000517@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30590

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>I dont know ED, Karl sure took along time to Memorize enough to pass the
>EXTRA

Actually, with the code test reduced to 5 wpm, Carl didn't have to pass the memory test -- he had already passed the 5 wpm exam. Are you saying that the Morse code memory test should be eliminated?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1030. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:06:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110060639.14260.00000518@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30591

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>For balance, can you
>>also tell us what you think they are doing right?

>Thats an easy one, NOTHING

We all keep living in the expectation that you will get real someday, Bruce. It is a rapidly fading hope.

How about the ARRL's RFI program?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1031. Re: An Apology to W1RFI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:10:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110061002.14260.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30592

From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net

>In a previous message, I implied that W1RFI was pompous.
>I have no evidence that this is true, so I am obliged to
>apologize in public.

Thank you, Hans. I hope I can be as gracious if I ever need to apologize to you. I, too, have offered more than my fair share of apologies on rrap. I am sure I will have to do so again. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1032. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:24:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110062412.14260.00000521@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30593

From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>Just listening to the ham bands I can see the League is still screwed up
>big-time. Guess I didn't need to ask the question in the first place. Maybe
>I just wanted to hear insider info that they were going to update their
>corporate policy to start improving ham radio again and ham operators rather
>than line their pocket books and bank accounts.

I have watched Riley Hollingsworth give a few "enforcement" PEP talks. In each of them, he notes that the persistence of the ARRL in keeping at the FCC to take up Amateur enforcment was an important part of what brought the FCC back into the enforcment business. That stemmed from a real desire by all hams, including those who are ARRL Board members, to see ham radio be a better place for all. IMHO, that is part of improving ham radio, no?

My own work for ARRL HQ is also intending to improve ham radio. Is ham radio improved when I go to RFI industry meetings, to work with manufacturers and industry groups to try to mitigate RFI problems before they happen? The notches that have been put into the industry specifications for VDSL, Home Phone Networking and HomePlug products are a direct result of the work of the ARRL.

What "pockets" and bank accounts are you imagining, Vince? Mine? I am paid an unfair salary for a lot of work. :-) The ARRL Board and officers? Other than the 3 officers who also have to show up at work everyday like every other working stiff, by policy, the entire ARRL Board and slate of officers are unpaid volunteers. The only significant bank account I know of represents the investment of life membership dues -- to do otherwise would be fiscally irresponsible.

If you are talking about the ARRL policy wrt code tests, I disagree with you if you say that the Board did not listen to its members. There was no majority in the formal surveys the League did. In those surveys, 50% of the members wanted a maximum code speed of 12/13 wpm or more; 50% of the members wanted a maximum code speed of 12/13 wpm or less. The ARRL's proposal to the FCC was for 12 wpm.

Vince, I am sure that you have disagreements with ARRL policy. I do from time to time. But couching those disagreements in terms of lining pockets and bank accounts detracts from the real discussion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1033. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:26:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110062641.14260.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30594

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>>Stroking your microphone with a chunk of
>> quartz crystal will improve frequency stability.

>Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
>so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
>these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
>keep posting them over and over again? :-)

A friend of mine used to work in a "new age" bookstore. When the store computerized, he had a horrible time with the computers. One day, I pointed out that the ICs in the computer were all made of silicon crystals and told him he should tune in to the crystals. His problems vanished overnight.

You tell me... :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1034. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:32:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110063206.14260.00000523@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30595

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> If they were indeed looking toward the *future* of Amateur Radio, they
>> would be fighting to retain these bands for CW/digital use.

>Surprise, surprise, Arnie ... we agree on this part of the issue
>(I sincerely hope that doesn't scare the hell out of you :-)

It shouldn't scare anyone, Carl. If we have learned anything from each other over years of discussions, it is that there is always common ground.

I will let the stated opinions on SSB expansion stand on their own, but will point out that ARRL's digital voice committee is working toward seeing HF digital voice come into use in ham radio.

>Like cw (surprise), SSB has a place in the future of ham
>radio ... but other modes will emerge as well.

Hmmm, with your renewed interest in ham radio since your upgrade, what percentage of your QSOs have been SSB? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1035. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:33:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110063331.14260.00000524@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30596

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> I thought it was on, off, and don't care.

>Which description of CW/Morse/OOK says that?

None. I still like my theory that Morse code is sex-state. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1036. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:35:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110063555.14260.00000525@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30597

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>True, but there's always that one person who absolutely *must* get the last
>word in.

And that is usually Cecil. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1037. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 11:38:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30598

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
>
>Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
>of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
>how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
>PLEASE ...

ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading) of an LOTW confirmation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1038. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 12:36:56 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bWf%7.463014$er5.17932354@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30599

Cecil,

I went to 7.058 and gave you a call. Guess you had left your monitoring status : -)) That's okay, I spun over to 7.008 and worked Nik (YU1WN) from Yugoslavia, so all was not lost.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1039. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:02:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Uhg%7.259$rU.59880@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30600

Only trying to spread a little humor there Cecil! Hopefully not to start a whole new thread here! :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C3C5204.B5EFC7F6@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Cecil, checked out your callsign on Qrz.com and almost freaked! Put a
> > thick, bushy grey mustache like B.J. Hunnicut had in M.A.S.H. under your
> > nose, and you would look just like my dad..... Gee... can I start calling
> > you Dad???
>
> I am a Dad and I've been called worse. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1040. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:02:48 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Yhg%7.260$rU.59797@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30451

Well Ed, I can say I most likely will never submit to the ARRL for one main reason, and I quote from the person I talked to about even getting the ARRL to send me a order form in order to pay for membership via snail mail. The statement given to me when I asked for a form, was

"We don't do that here, can I have your credit card number please?"

I responded with

"I do not have a credit card, I just want you to send me a form to so that I can mail payment in."

She responded with

"I'm sorry but we don't do that here, but when you get a better job and get a credit card like the rest of the normal world, call us back." And then she hung up.

I am so offended by that. What if the situation was that I chose not to have a credit card because of personal choice? (aside from other reasons of not having a credit card)

If this is the level of professionalism by the ARRL, I may as well hand in my license, as apparently they "run" amateur radio more than the FCC.

As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they? (I can read a listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong to, I have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because she (KA8YKK) had a position with the club also. These are clubs that are ARRL affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may have a larger geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a year.

The District 3 net organization fell on its face when one person from Genesee County, MI "stoked the coals" and now there is not a net for message traffic or District business and information. Is the strength in the ARRL?

As far as defense of Amateur Radio, I guess the ARRL may be doing a good job in that regard, although some hams may beg to differ with that, what the hell is the ARRL doing in offense, (to use the sports term)?? Positively promotion of amateur radio and education of the general public will get greater yields, as opposed to constantly having to defend itself. As a person, I find it is easier to educate someone about myself, or my activities as opposed to having to be in a defensive mode. Where is the P.S.A.'s for example??? Broadcasters are obligated run P.S.A. spots for a certain percentage of their broadcast day. Lets see the ARRL create a spot to run. Seems like a smart investment. What about promotional material? I have had to resort to creating my own phamplets to pass out to prospective

new hams. I just have created a really nice Microsoft Powerpoint presentation, and am searching for .jpg/.gif/.bmp images to utilize in this presentation, such as some disaster scenes with hams involved in some aspect or another, some scenes involving ham activities from field day to other activities similar and cannot seem to seem to locate any on the arrl.org site or get any response via email.

Maybe once sometime in the future, I may join, but in the meantime, I would be "tickled pink" if some organization was formed to give the ARRL a run for their money. Competition is a good thing, and keeps from becoming complacent. I know the question was not directed towards me in the original post, but I have been keeping this bottled in for so long, and needed to vent.

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109072113.09750.00000412@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>
> >> How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.
>
> >I can give you an update. They're *still* screwed up.
>
> In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For balance, can
you
> also tell us what you think they are doing right?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

1041. Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:02:52 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <0ig%7.261$rU.59886@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30452

This was found on the QRZ.COM website and I found that this could be very scary for us. Since there is a Chippewa tribe/reservation about 15-20 miles away from where I live, this could impact my area also.

Dave Estrada writes "Greetings to all,
I was reading an article in the January 2002 edition of "WIRED" magazine. On page 54 I found an article about DeWayne Hendricks, the Broadband Cowboy.

The article written by Brent Hurtig details the passion that DeWayne has for the power of wireless networks. DeWayne is currently working on a wireless network project for the Chippewa Indian reservation. In exchange for a state of the art wireless network, the Chippewa are willing to assert their sovereignty over the air and sky above the reservation. What this means is that they are willing to use software defined radios to accomplish the goal. Software defined radios can transmit on several frequencies, including those authorized by the U.S. government for use by licensed amateurs. Although DeWayne says that these radios would transmit at very low power and noise levels, they may still decide to use some amatuer frequencies to operate the wireless network.
I believe he is hoping that someone will complain about this, when that happens and the FCC is made aware, the Chippewa will assert their sovereignty in a court of law if needed.

I have read articles that our amateur bands are at risk of being sold off to the highest commercial bidders. DeWayne clearly points out the zeal the government has for trying to protect transmissions from interfering with each other. He said that the government reserves the vast majority of frequencies for public agencies, corporations and groups like ham radio enthusiasts. I thought for a moment to myself, I wonder if DeWayne is a ham.

A quick name search of the QRZ database revealed that DeWayne Hendricks is one of our own. Callsign WA8DZP.

It appears that he is trying to challenge the FCC into loosening its grip on spectrum. What he wants is the FCC to try and stop the networks from either forming or operating at all. Thats when the Chippewa will stand up and claim the right to the air and skies above their reservations. For this to happen, someone has to complain to the FCC about interference.

If our spectrum is at risk of being sold to the highest bidders, then maybe he will play this hand in order to get the ball rolling. If that does not work, he might be able to play some colorful tapes recorded from 2 meters or old timers acting silly on 40 meters. Either way the clock is ticking. Please watch what you say on the air. Someone is always listening. All we need is to lose one band and then the flood gates will open. Money talks and Bull#@%* walks.

If you happen to live near the Chippewa reservation,(N Dakota?) or not, watch out for the Broadband Cowboy. Reports of interference could just be what DeWayne wants. He lives in Fremont California near San Francisco. He also sits on the FCC's Technological Advisory Council. Sounds like he has his finger on the pulse of ham radio for sure.

Please know I am not out to get the Native Americans. My lovely wife was born in New Mexico, and she knows that Fry Bread RULES.

I am only trying to point out the reality of losing spectrum someday, even to one of our own...a ham radio enthusiast, the Broadband Cowboy.

Happy New Year and 73 from Southern California

Dave KD6HDX"

1042. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080954.07935.00000095@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30456

In article <3C3AFCD6.C440C1AA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>
>> >To this type I give no sympathy. Their case is: I don't wanna.
>> >This is total arrogance on your part and theirs.
>>
>> Is there any part of the current requirements that you consider
>inappropriate
>> or irrelevant to Amateur Radio today?
>
>No.

How about "inadequate for the privileges granted"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1043. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080954.07935.00000094@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30457

In article <20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
>
>>Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
>>pattern.
>
>How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
>
He's toned down the animosity a bit, but he still exudes attitudes of disdain for many radio amateurs and their activities. Phrases like "beep real fast" and "CW Olde Fartz" are still common in Carl's posts.

And a few nice posts do not immediately erase the memory of years of nasty ones.

The thing to watch in anyone's postings is not how they behave when someone agrees with them, but how they behave when someone disagrees.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1044. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080956.07935.00000097@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30458

In article <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> "Bill Sohl"<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> (Bert Craig wrote):
>> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
>> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement is
>> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"

>> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
>> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
>> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
>>
>> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
>
>Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
>any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
>FCC rules.

So NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue.

Note that Bert proposes a vote of all hams, not just those who have passed a
code test. Note also that those who comment to the FCC on amateur radio matters
are overwhelmingly licensed radio amateurs.

>None of us involved in NCI have seen any
>reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.

Which means that even if the vast majority of hams of all license classes
disagree, it doesn't matter.

>> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
>> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
>> >of existing hams heard.
>>
>> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not.
>
>Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
>existing hams?

Aren't all US hams listed in the databases?
>
>> The code
>> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for
>HF/MF

>> privileges.
>
>Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
>makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
>current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).

Your opinion noted. Mine's different. If it's an opinion question, why not put it to a vote?

>> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about
>> the issue - codetest has gotta go".
>
>NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.

Sure - NCI just isn;t going to listen to it.

>Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
>as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have not,
>in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as
>valid, rational and certainly not compeling.

That's a given.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1045. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080956.07935.00000096@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30459

In article <a1gdl6ncd1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> >Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones you
>> >can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
>> >responsibility to forsee and fix.
>>
>> Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.
>
>The "actions" forseen by McCollum are nothing but speculation.

I'd call them experienced, knowledgeable possibilities. They are quite
possible.
>
>> > They will get it wrong: hell the
>> >framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but
>> >they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe in
>> >blowing things up far more than putting them together again.
>>
>> Of course. "Not my job, man".
>
>That's just a claim made to try and divert attention of
>NCI to other matters. It won't work.

Which confirms what I'm saying: Don't expect leadership from NCI on other
changes.
>
>> >The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to have
>> >proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang the
>> >old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives of
>> >the apparatchiks.
>>
>> Precisely. Yet consider what has actually happened:
>
>Yes, let's do so.
>
>> NCI is an "organization" of a website, some directors and maybe 2000
>members.
>> Exact numbers are not given out. Note that NCI member numbers started with
>> #1000, not #1. Membership consists of signing up online and it's for life

>> unless a member specifically requests to be removed. No dues or other
>member
>> obligations.
>
>Your point?

The methods of assigning membership numbers and the lack of expiration grossly overstates the size of the organization.

> There are many similarly based organizations
>today that are devoted to any number of causes.

So? Are they trying to change the FCC rules for ham radio?

>Me thinks
>you are more unhappy about the ability to do so, rather than
>the fact that we exist at all.

Is anything I wrote in the previous post not true?

>> When I first looked on the NCI website, there was a statement that NCI
>existed
>> ONLY to eliminate code testing, and that when it was all gone the
>organization
>> would simply disappear. That statement disappeared at some point, but does
>> anybody really think NCI will continue after code testing?
>
>What difference does it make?

When an organization says it exists for a single purpose but behaves differently, I wonder about the unstated purposes.

> Are you worried if it didn't disappear?

Not worried. Concerned.

>> FCC first tried to push a nocode ham license in 1975, then again in 1983,
>and
>> finally succeeded in 1991 - long before NCI existed. FCC's opinion on code
>> testing has been "it's only there because of the treaty" for at least a
>decade.
>
>That's pretty strong

Is any of it untrue? Did not the FCC propose a nocode license in 1975 and again in 1983, even though the vast majority of those who had an opinion on the subject were against it? Did not the FCC make it clear in their statements about the Technician license in 1990-1991 that they didn't see the code test as necessary for ANY reason other than S25.5?

It's all true, Bill. FCC wants out of code testing for a variety of reasons.

>and not consistent with many
>of the opinions of the Pro-code Test advocates.

So? Those who support code testing are not a monolithic group who agree on anyhting. I don't speak for any group - I just present my facts and opinions.
>
>> Way back in 1997 or so, there was a prediction here on rrap (I think it
>was by
>> W4SCO, but I gotta check google) that the FCC was going to radically
>simplify
>> the license structure. Three license classes, 5 wpm code test, a done
>deal.
>> Most of us pooh-poohed it, particularly after the ARRL made its proposal
>and
>> then the NPRM appeared.
>
>And just how many people might have thought that would be the case?

Some. Most people thought it was too radical a change. The point is that he was right on the money.
>
>> Yet after the dust cleared in late 1999 the R&O EXACTLY matched everything
>that
>> had been predicted 2+ years earlier.
>
>Yep, surprised even me as to the extent of the changes.

But there were some who were not surprised at all.
>
>> Ever hear the expression "rooster taking credit for the dawn"?
>
>How much of an impact anyone had on the actual result won't
>ever be known...unless some FCC staffer publishes their
>memoirs of the internal discussions leading to the R&O.

Maybe the FCC had its mind made up before the NPRM even appeared.

>I will note that at least we (NCI) not only encouraged
>our members to file comments, but we also made our
>own personal ex parte presentation directly to the FCC (as
>did the ARRL). Frankly, I don't care about taking
>credit for anything. The changes were made and we are
>still working towards the final end of all code testing.

My point is simply that the FCC seems to have formed its opinion long before 1998.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1046. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080957.07935.00000099@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30453

In article <a1j43u0ik1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Get a lesser-known starlet, then. LOL!
>
>Hmmm...there's Roxanna Zal.
>
Busty Hart?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1047. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080957.07935.00000098@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30454

In article <20020110021115.02071.00000653@mb-ct.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>NCI people are dirt?
>
> Aren't we all when you add up the minerals?
>
Actually we're all mostly water.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1048. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110080958.07935.00000100@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30455

In article <20020110060420.14260.00000517@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Actually, with the code test reduced to 5 wpm, Carl didn't have to pass the
>memory test -- he had already passed the 5 wpm exam.

So [assing the written test doesn't require memory?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1049. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:43:45 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a1k5pl$428$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 30463

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C3CDB9B.BA000BB@IEEE.org...
> mike coslo wrote:
> > I thought it was on, off, and don't care.
>
> Which description of CW/Morse/OOK says that?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cam
I thought there were three states here as well;

1. The state of ON
2. The state of OFF
and
3. The state of CONFUSION!

:^)

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Man will occasionally stumble over the truth,
but most of the time he will pick himself up
and continue on.
-Churchill's commentary on man

1050. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:48:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110084806.08620.00001330@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 30460

>Are you saying that the
>Morse code memory test should be eliminated?
>

No Ed, he already had that Tough 5 WPM down, I was speaking of the Tough Written Test that he had to take for his Extra.

1051. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:49:16 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <BTg%7.280638$BX4.15710981@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30462

"W1RFI" wrote in part ...
>
> I would not have progressed very far in ham radio without the help of my
Elmer,
> W1BNB. When the large influx of codeless techs occured, there were a lot
more
> hams entering ham radio than available (or willing) Elmers.
>

I entered as a No-code Tech and was *very* lucky to have NC5S as my Elmer.
He is a very experienced operator and taught me how to do things the right
way, including how to manually tune my radio and build my own dipole
antennas. These may seem like trivial things, but they were very important
to me. I think we need more like him in Amateur Radio. Unfortunately, I
believe the ranks of the truly experienced elmers are starting to thin out.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1052. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 13:50:28 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.10.08.50.28.402876.8011@arrl.org>
Source record: 30461

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 08:02:48 -0500, wrote:
> Well Ed, I can say I most likely will never submit to the ARRL for one
> main reason, and I quote from the person I talked to about even getting
> the ARRL to send me a order form in order to pay for membership via
> snail mail. The statement given to me when I asked for a form, was
>
> "We don't do that here, can I have your credit card number please?"
>
> I responded with
>
> "I do not have a credit card, I just want you to send me a form to so
> that I can mail payment in."
>
> She responded with
>
> "I'm sorry but we don't do that here, but when you get a better job and
> get a credit card like the rest of the normal world, call us back." And
> then she hung up.

I've never before heard any reports of a Circulation staffer treating a potential member like that. If one did, and the Circulation supervisor or manager found out about it, that staffer would be toast.

In any case, we certainly do accept membership applications by mail. You can find a form at: http://www.arrl.org/member.pdf Or I'll be happy to mail one to you if you want.

> As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they?

http://www.arrl.org/sections/index.html?sect=MI
http://www.arrl.org/divisions/#Great_Lakes

> (I can read
> a listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong
> to, I have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because
> she (KA8YKK) had a position with the club also. These are clubs that
> are ARRL affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may
> have a larger geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a
> year.

Not being in Michigan, I don't know what's happening there. But the folks listed at the above links do.

> The District 3 net organization fell on its face when one person from
> Genesee County, MI "stoked the coals" and now there is not a net for
> message traffic or District business and information. Is the strength

> in the ARRL?

Sometimes in clubs, nets and other local organizations personalities get
in the way of results. In 30+ years in ham radio, I've been in a few such
situations. That's unfortunate, but I'm not sure what the ARRL can do to
change human nature.

> As far as defense of Amateur Radio, I guess the ARRL may be doing a good
> job in that regard, although some hams may beg to differ with that, what
> the hell is the ARRL doing in offense, (to use the sports term)??
> Positively promotion of amateur radio and education of the general
> public will get greater yields, as opposed to constantly having to
> defend itself.

ARRL devotes a fair amount of resources to promoting ham radio. For example,
see: http://www.arrl.org/pio/ and http://www.arrl.org/govrelations/

But I disagree with your premise. It is absolutely imperative that we
defend against the threats to ham radio as they arise. The biggest "bang
for the buck" comes from targeting the problems, not from generalized
promotion. Both offense and defense (to use your metaphor) are important,
but the balance should be weighted toward defending against the known and
potential threats.

> As a person, I find it is easier to educate someone about myself, or my
> activities as opposed to having to be in a defensive mode. Where is the
> P.S.A.'s for example???

http://www.arrl.org/pio/pr.html#psa

> What
> about promotional material?

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/ead/materials/
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/ead/hrshow.html

> I have had to resort to creating my own phamplets to pass out to
> prospective new hams. I just have created a really nice Microsoft
> Powerpoint presentation, and am searching for .jpg/.gif/.bmp images to
> utilize in this presentation, such as some disaster scenes with hams
> involved in some aspect or another, some scenes involving ham activities
> from field day to other activities similar and cannot seem to seem to
> locate any on the arrl.org site

There are hundreds of such photos in the news stories and elsewhere on the
ARRL site. (E.g., http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html) You do have to ask
permission to republish them, but that's not generally a problem.

> or
> get any response via email.

Where did you send it?

> Maybe once sometime in the future, I may join, but in the meantime, I
> would be "tickled pink" if some organization was formed to give the ARRL
> a run for their money. Competition is a good thing, and keeps from
> becoming complacent. I know the question was not directed towards me in
> the original post, but I have been keeping this bottled in for so long,
> and needed to vent.

That's good, Ryan. Believe it or not, we at ARRL really want to hear from those who are disaffected. In some cases, there's not much we can do to address their disaffection. (Those who are still angry about incentive licensing, which happened nearly 40 years ago, for example.) Sometimes it's because they aren't aware that their complaints are already being addressed by ARRL. Sometimes it's because we need to do a better job. And sometimes we just need to be slapped upside the head so we'll fix the problem.

Jon, KE3Z
ARRL Web/Software Development Manager
jbloom@arrl.org

1053. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 14:08:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wfh%7.243317$WW.13132375@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30464

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110080956.07935.00000096@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a1gdl6ncd1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article
<P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> >> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> >Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones
you
> >> >can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
> >> >responsibility to forsee and fix.
> >>
> >> Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.
> >
> >The "actions" forseen by McCollum are nothing but speculation.
>
> I'd call them experienced, knowledgeable possibilities. They are quite
> possible.

To reiterate the subject of my concern. Whether one believes the code test to be necessary or not the 20 wpm did take some time and did have the effect of insuring that VEs had some time and with any luck some respect for the hobby. Both the effort and respect had the effect of allowing the VE program to have remarkable success and for the most part no real pattern of scamming that the FCCs audit program could not handle.

It should also be noted as Burton said to Taylor, "Truth or Illusion. Is there really a difference".

So the possibility, probability I will leave to you, that it is possible for three reasonably intelligent souls to gun up on the Extra, become VEs, and ease the entry of the Velvet Jockstrap, Unit 199, and Loud and Proud, exists. And in fact it is reasonable to assume that there would be some pressure on our heros to do precisely that. The illusion is as bad as the reality.

So I would propose a requirement for a VE that he be an Extra for two years first. It is a simple decoupling move. Has exactly nada to do with code testing. It is simply a way to maintain the present situation in the face of elimination of Element 1. And something that a responsible organization, if indeed NCI qualifies as an organization, would do as a

matter of course.

How probable? There are any number of organizations, your church very likely among them and not too unlikely your radio club -- in fact any organization with substantial assets -- that have anti-hijacking provisions in their charter. It is not like I am proposing something really new, novel, and revolutionary.

Here again, the major effect is to take a little pressure off the newbie. This continues to be my major concern in this whole enchilada.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1054. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 14:27:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1k8900pcb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30465

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110062641.14260.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com...
> A friend of mine used to work in a "new age" bookstore. When the store
> computerized, he had a horrible time with the computers. One day, I
pointed
> out that the ICs in the computer were all made of silicon crystals and
told him
> he should tune in to the crystals. His problems vanished overnight.
>
> You tell me... :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

That reminds me of the "Carlos" hoax that James Randi and a friend pulled
off several years ago.

1055. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 14:35:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1k8n70q49@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30466

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109230933.25530.00000807@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Say, speaking of which...do you keep one hand wrapped around your beer
can
> >while you hunt and peck with your other?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> NO

1056. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 14:36:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1k8pk0q93@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30467

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109230933.25530.00000807@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Say, speaking of which...do you keep one hand wrapped around your beer
can
> >while you hunt and peck with your other?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> NO

True. It's actually a bottle of Wild Turkey.

1057. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:10:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DAF02.84F0789D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30468

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Hey Ed, y'all going to Ft. Tuthill this year? I still owe
> >you a lobster dinner.
>
> Doesn't look real likely. :-(Besides, as I learned with Rick Tannehill,
> lobster in AZ is an EXPENSIVE proposition. Do you have any plans to be in New
> England in the next few years? I may also get to TX at some point.

How about mountain oysters? :-) I might be able to make it to Dayton.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1058. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:17:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB084.670F217B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30469

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > There is simply no way that OOK can be tristated.
>
> I know it chaps your digital ass but there's no way it can avoid it.

Dick, if it can be tristated, it's not OOK, by definition.

> > no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.
>
> So you don't know much about radiotelegraph transmitters, then? Of course it's the
> operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device) which adds the third
> state.

Please furnish a reference to back up your assertion, Dick.
There simply is no third state for ON/OFF Keying. If there
existed a third state, it would be called ON/OFF/FLOAT Keying
or ON/HALF-ON/OFF Keying or some such.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1059. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:36:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110103620.23524.00001077@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30470

>True. It's actually a bottle of Wild Turkey.
>
>

No, its a Female you are related to

1060. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:38:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB570.507FF806@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30471

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et al
> are radiotelegraphy!
> We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case of
> it!

From the IEEE Dictionary:

"telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the transmission of graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a signal code."

RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".

"telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for the exchange of information in the form of speech."

Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the meanings of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical comprehension.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1061. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:40:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB609.F2FBF60@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30472

KB9TMP wrote:
> I thought there were three states here as well;
>
> 1. The state of ON
> 2. The state of OFF
> and
> 3. The state of CONFUSION!

Don't forget the state of Missouri where most of the confusion exists.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1062. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:43:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB691.62C57C19@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30473

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You two stupes can take it up with Ed Hare, as that was his original
> discription, which *I* knew instantly what he meant. Too bad you
> ignoramouses do not.

Dick, Dick, Dick, Ed quipped in with a question which was a joke.
You swallowed it hook, line, and sinker. Did you also swallow his
sex-state joke?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1063. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:45:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB72C.4B660DD9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30474

Arnie Macy wrote:
> That's perfectly fine with me. I'll call for ya from time to time and we'll
> have a QSO. Ya might want to get out that pink card.

You can't use Q-signals with me, Arnie. I don't know them so they
are not universal and therefore are illegal. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1064. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:47:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB79E.61989AEA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30476

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I went to 7.058 and gave you a call. Guess you had left your monitoring
> status : -)) That's okay, I spun over to 7.008 and worked Nik (YU1WN)
> from Yugoslavia, so all was not lost.

I went to bed shortly thereafter. I did copy WB6LRV, K6TN, KL7CC, & KB9II.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1065. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:49:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB7F6.516E5DB8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30477

W1RFI wrote:
> If we have learned anything from each other
> over years of discussions, it is that there is always common ground.

Yep, even Dave admitted that he is against smallpox.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1066. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:49:15 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <%Ji%7.348035$W8.13098853@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30475

> CAM wrote:

> > no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Of course it's the
> operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device)
> which adds the third state.

Dick...

There is NO THIRD STATE!!! The operator adds the change of states (on to off... or off to on...) at certain times. A state is a condition at some POINT in time.

OOK IS BINARY!!!!

Rich

1067. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 15:57:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DB9D9.5599F872@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30478

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you don't know much about radiotelegraph transmitters, then? Of course it's the
> operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device) which adds the third
> state.

From the IEEE Dictionary: "ON-OFF Keying - A ***BINARY*** form of amplitude modulation in which one of the states of the modulated wave is the absence of energy in the keying interval." Emphasis is mine, Dick, so you can't miss it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1068. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 16:13:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3DBD75.CB7E7E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30479

CAM wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > If we have learned anything from each other
> > over years of discussions, it is that there is always common ground.
>
> Yep, even Dave admitted that he is against smallpox.

I'm also against Okra, so called "Rap music" and restrictive covenants.

I'm for jazz and blues, beeping fast, real QSL cards and PBS among other
things.

Dave K8MN

1069. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 16:56:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201100856.6830f1dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30480

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> >

> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote > news:#sLml98lBHA.1292@cpimsnntpa03...
> > N2EY writes:
> >
> > > Add to this the percentage of folks who don't QSL or QSL slowly
> > > and eQSL starts looking REAL good.
> >
> > Which brings up a point. N2EY still owes me a card, as I noticed
> just
> > finishing up my QSL'ing cycle for CW SS weekend. He'll soon owe me
> a second
> > one.

Sorry about that, Hans. I'm workin' on it.
>
> Thats' between you and N2EY ... (however, have you checked? ...
> maybe they're waiting for you at eQSL :-)

Hans is punctual about such things. I'm not. That's why it's on my
goals list.
>
> > I played with one of the eQSL sites awhile back, and decided that
> eQSLs are
> > impersonal
>
> Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
> effective method of delivery ...

Same info but not the same feel. I don't know if ARRL and others will
accept them for awards.

> >border on rude

Ahhhh - Hans, you sent me more than one. Maybe there's a message
there. ;-)
>
> Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
> effective method of delivery ...
>
> >and have no place among real hams.
>
> Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
> effective method of delivery ...

Carl misses the point. And the joke. Again.
>
> > It kind of boils down to "what's the point?". I'm not suggesting
> everyone wants to
> > send QSLs, but if you do, why would you send an eQSL?

All depends on why ya send them. I've worked WAS many times but still
haven't confirmed all 50. eqsl could change that.
>
> To confirm a contact ... same as a piece of paper sent through
> old-fashioned mail.

That's one reason, but not the only reason.
>
> > It's impersonal
>
> Why? How so? Same information, simply an easier, more
> effective method of delivery ... while eQSL has some "stock
> card" formats (like many conventional QSL card printers),
> you can also upload your own graphic to make your card as
> personal and unique as you want ...
>
> > has no value

Ya mean they don't accept 'em? Shucks.
>
> According to the ARRL's current anticompetitive policy,
> based on their desire to spend a lot of member $$$
> reinventing the wheel with their "Logbook of the World"
> program ... solely for the purpose of maintaining a
> stranglehold control over things.
>
> > requires some hassle to "put in the shoebox" at the recipient
>
> What hassle would that be ... are you talking about the act
> of printing the electronic card vs. the act of going the the
> mailbox, opening the envelope, etc. ??? (BFD "hassle")
>
> > and is unwelcome clutter in my email.
>
> If you want the confirmation of a contact, why would it be
> "unwelcome clutter in your e-mail" ???
>
> > A paper QSL, even a very nice one, is cheap (mine cost
> > less than a quarter,
>
> Plus postage, plus envelope if you want it to stay nice,
> plus SAE, plus IRC or "green stamp" ... etc. if you want to
> maximize your chances of a reply ... it adds up to a LOT
> more than "less than a quarter" ... the eQSL is MUCH more
> cost effective and far more timely as well.
>

> > and they are very deluxe
>
> I'm impressed and I haven't even seen one (not!) ...
>
> > -- you can design and print your own on your
> > computer if you wish). A paper QSL can reflect your personality,
> your
> > creative ability, or your personal interests.
>
> And so can the electronic version ... the ONLY difference is
> where it gets printed and whether it's delivered by electronic
> means or old fashioned postal means ...
>
> > It is the tangible token of
> > our intangible electronic communication encounter.
>
> Once printed, an eQSL is JUST as tangible ...
>
> > If it's too expensive for you, then don't do it,
>
> "Do it Hans' way, or don't do it!" (baloney ...)

Hold that mirror a little higher, Hans. Carl can't see himself in it
yet.
>
> > but please keep you electronic cards at home.
>
> Not to worry ... I won't "darken your (electronic)
> mailbox" ...

Ya gotta WORK him first, Carl. N2EY and K0HB have many QSOs, going
back many years. MN is one of the sections I can count on in SS.
>
> > With all kind wishes,
>
> Sounds much more like a big batch of grumbly to me :-p
>
From whom? ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

How about WB8RCR's QSL Maker?

1070. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:07:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201100907.2c61358@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30481

KC2HMN wrote:

> > I come to the table as a relatively
> > "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
> > be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
> > element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
> > equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
> > remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
> > EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
> > skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?
>
K2UNK wrote:

> If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
> have passed the test.

Or they could have been the ones that made him flunk it.

> Equating the "separate" morse test to
> one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
> a valid comparison.

But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
are as "necessary" as the Morse test.

> > Are not the
> > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
> > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
> > questions?

That depends on one's background.

Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
current amateur exams is not very high.

Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
a bit of radio.
>
> The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
> some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
> send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.

In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1071. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:18:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3DCCED.E9CFDA12@uci.edu>
Source record: 30482

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > "Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
> > > > by the government to operate CW?"
> > >
> > > Does the Morse code exam count?
> >
> > As operating? Toward what? DXCC?
>
> Towards an Amateur Radio License

The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
that had to be explained to you.

1072. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:28:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3DCF27.7E001809@uci.edu>
Source record: 30483

WA8ULX wrote:
> Boy your not to swift are you?

Yikes.

1073. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:32:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3DC3B7.90E25E95@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30484

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et al
> > are radiotelegraphy!
> > We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case of
> > it!
>
> From the IEEE Dictionary:
>
> "telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the transmission of
> graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a signal
> code."
>
> RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".
>
> "telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for the
> exchange of information in the form of speech."
>
> Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the meanings
> of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical
> comprehension.

Poor Cecil, you really do have problems, don't you? I guess it's really a
bummer
being holed up with your geriatric relatives, trying to find ways to amuse
yourself.
You can start by tucking the IEEE dictionary where the sun doesh't shine.

1074. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:33:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3DD059.31B5F91D@uci.edu>
Source record: 30487

W1RFI wrote:
> None. I still like my theory that Morse code is sex-state. :-)

Cecil describes it as police-state.

1075. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:36:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3DC4AA.B0216F35@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30485

Richard Plourde wrote:

> > CAM wrote:
>
> > > no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > Of course it's the
> > operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device)
> > which adds the third state.
>
> Dick...
>
> There is NO THIRD STATE!!! The operator adds the change of states (on to
> off... or off to on...) at certain times. A state is a condition at some
> POINT in time.
>
> OOK IS BINARY!!!!

Of course it is, you dolt!!! But radiotelegraphy is not! That's why it's
called
'OOK radiotelegraphy' by those hams too unexperienced to recognize it as
just "CW".

1076. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:40:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3DC576.81299AC3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30486

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you don't know much about radiotelegraph transmitters, then? Of course it's the
> > operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device) which adds the third
> > state.
>
> From the IEEE Dictionary: "ON-OFF Keying - A ***BINARY*** form of amplitude modulation
> in which one of the states of the modulated wave is the absence of energy in the
> keying interval." Emphasis is mine, Dick, so you can't miss it.

Cecil, you poor busturd, you missed it 50 years ago and haven't found it yet.

1077. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 17:53:29 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3DD518.AB8D332@psu.edu>
Source record: 30488

the one that was a joke.

But! Definitions aside, I must agree with Dick that there is something in the spaces between the dits and dahs. I am a slow CW operator. My dits sound like a good op's dahs.

So the human operator, who is a distinctly non-digital entity, must pick up information from the spacing between characters in order to translate from the received signals. We do not have an internal method of determining the timing of the signal, we take it from the spacing.

Digital is either 0 or 1

let us take a dit for "0"
let us take a Dah for "1"

What next? if there is only the possibility of sending 0 or one, then we have nothing else to send. If the system is binary, then there can only be long or short and nothing else. We gotta have the space, and that is the other thing we take information from. If you are truly talking digital, the space should be the "0"

Both of the CW pulses are in fact a logical "1". One is just longer in duration than the other.

People calling CW a digital mode are often trying to make it sound like something it isn't.

So rather than relying on a definition, tell me which is the 0, and which is the one.

Then build a "digital" morse sentence for me consisting of ONLY the long and short pulses. There can be no space between the pulses, because that is another piece of information. You can't do it, because the pulses would all run together and sound like one continuous sound.

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > I thought it was on, off, and don't care.
>
> Which description of CW/Morse/OOK says that?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1078. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:14:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DDA11.C00FEEF0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30489

Jim Kelley wrote:
> The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
> that had to be explained to you.

From Webster's: "operate - to perform a function" "operator - one that operates"
The function performed by the Morse code test is obvious. Sorry that had to
be explained to you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1079. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:17:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DDAAA.B4AE6F52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30490

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's why it's called
> 'OOK radiotelegraphy' by those hams too unexperienced to recognize it as
> just "CW".

One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave. If it contains
information, it is not a continuous wave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1080. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:18:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DDAEF.F9205A66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30491

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So you don't know much about radiotelegraph transmitters, then? Of course it's the
> > > operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device) which adds the third
> > > state.
> >
> > From the IEEE Dictionary: "ON-OFF Keying - A ***BINARY*** form of amplitude modulation
> > in which one of the states of the modulated wave is the absence of energy in the
> > keying interval." Emphasis is mine, Dick, so you can't miss it.
>
> Cecil, you poor busturd, you missed it 50 years ago and haven't found it yet.

Yes, we know Dick, that the IEEE Dictionary is wrong and you are right.
(Somebody get the net!)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1081. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:20:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DDB81.1A9746EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30492

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > From the IEEE Dictionary:
> >
> > "telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the transmission of
> > graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a signal
> > code."
> >
> > RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".
> >
> > "telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for the
> > exchange of information in the form of speech."
> >
> > Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the meanings
> > of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical
> > comprehension.
>
> You can start by tucking the IEEE dictionary where the sun doesh't shine.

Dick, we have pointed you to technical books and all you do is tear off
the covers. One would think that before showing the world exactly how
technically ignorant you are, you would at least crack open a book.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1082. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:30:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3DDDD4.7D005C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30493

mike coslo wrote:
> But! Definitions aside, I must agree with Dick that there is something
> in the spaces between the dits and dahs. I am a slow CW operator. My
> dits sound like a good op's dahs.

By definition, there is 'space' in the spaces. OOK Morse spaces are multiples of the 'dit' timing, according to the ARRL Handbook. 'Dits' and Dahs' are elements which are marks in OOK.

> So the human operator, who is a distinctly non-digital entity, must
> pick up information from the spacing between characters in order to
> translate from the received signals. We do not have an internal method
> of determining the timing of the signal, we take it from the spacing.
>
> Digital is either 0 or 1
>
> let us take a dit for "0"
> let us take a Dah for "1"

Nope, that's not right. 'Dit' is 010 and 'Dah' is 01110 with leading and/or trailing space-times as necessary. The intra-character 'space' is 0. The inter-character space is 000. The space between words is 0000000. 'Dit's and 'Dah's are elements and both elements are in the 'mark' OOK state. Everything except 'dits' and 'dahs' are in the 'space' OOK state.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1083. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:36:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201101036.603e1339@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30494

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<a1k8900pcb@enews1.newsguy.com>...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020110062641.14260.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > A friend of mine used to work in a "new age" bookstore. When the store
> > computerized, he had a horrible time with the computers. One day, I
> pointed
> > out that the ICs in the computer were all made of silicon crystals and
> told him
> > he should tune in to the crystals. His problems vanished overnight.
> >
> > You tell me... :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> That reminds me of the "Carlos" hoax that James Randi and a friend pulled
> off several years ago.

How did that work? The Amazing Randi is one of my heroes.

Typical Randi trick:

Gets a psychology class to volunteer for an astrology experiment.
Members of the class (usually several dozen) are given detailed
confidential questionaires which they fill out and put in double
envelopes. Questionaires ask all about the person's birthplace, birth
method and date/time but almost nothing else. In a few weeks sealed
envelopes are distributed to the class, each containing a sealed
personalized description of that person's personality traits, based on
the person's horoscope. All through the experiment the subjects are
cautioned to discuss keep everything confidential.

Once the results are distributed, the volunteers are told to open
their envelopes and read their personality descriptions (but not share
them). They are then asked to rate, by a show of hands, the accuracy
of the descriptions. Invariably most of the descriptions are rated
"very accurate" or "accurate", with only a few "inaccurate" and almost
no "very inaccurate".

Looks pretty good for astrology, huh?

Then the subjects are told to exchange their descriptions. Turns out
that EVERYONE was given the SAME personality description, which is
vague enough and flattering enough that most people would like to be
described that way. The detailed questionaires are then produced,
unopened. The description was written long before "experiment" even

started.

Randi has done lots of other debunking. Great stuff.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1084. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 18:39:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201101039.d71c206@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30495

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
> > >
> > >Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
> > >of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
> > >how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
> > >PLEASE ...
> >
> > ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading) of an LOTW
> > confirmation.
> >
> >
This is gonna be another interesting RRAP traditionalists vs.
"new-wavers" brawl. Looks like it already is . . .
>
>
I think in the case of qsling contacts made in the big contests the
e-version qsls are gonna enable a huge boost in the response rates and
volume of qsls swapped. Which is good for those who care about
sending/getting qsls.
>
>
I'll take this opportunity thankew for the bandwidth to illustrate how
I think this is gonna work: I have a bunch of Huge Gun dx
contesters/buddies in The Club in this neighborhood to which many of
us Much Lesser Guns also belong going back decades. Been there seen it
all up close.
>
>
The Huge Guns have a massive problem with qsling. These are the guys
who make maybe 3,000 contacts per major dx contest single op times
four of those per year minimum. So in the limit they have up to 12,000
freaking qsls per year to deal with. IF they only get into four 'tests
per year. Several do 6-8 contests. They simply don't qsl, in virtually
all cases they gave it up years ago, there's no way they'll deal with
the work involved. It's not that they don't care, it's just an
overwhelming time-consuming clerical chore which nets them nothing in
particular. So the ignored incomimg cards pile up by the shopping bag
full in their shacks.
>
>

The expeditions and multi-multis have the same problem except much worse depending on how many people dig into the job. The expeditions do it, the domestic multi-multis usually don't. All of these guys are running logging software and if it's not too much of a pain in the ass and it doesn't cost and arm and a leg to upload their logs it's gonna happen and a lotta dx is finally gonna squeeze qsls outta these guys. This should be good if it's done right.
>
>
But there are a bunch of obvious exceptions. The mutitude of folk who still do paper logs and don't care if the ARRL doesn't accept paper logs or not. The dx which runs with paper logs because computers are unaffordable where they are, long list. So there's no way qsling can even approach 100% electronic processing & delivery even for casual ragchews within the U.S. and Canada. Paper qsls are not gonna be over by a long shot.
>
>
If in a contest or otherwise I snag a new one you bet I'm not about to depend on an e-qsl to get the confirmation. He's gonna get my paper card and an SASE or an IRC and I'll ship it direct first class mail. Plus a green stamp if he's on an expedition. (Hey Ed; will the ARRL system ship green stamps for me??) I have very close to a 100% return rate with this method and I'm not about to give it up just because there's some logs in some websites somewhere. Plus I get a kick when the mailman drops a real card for some piece of exotica thru the slot and I add it to my dxcc albums. Some ancient ham radio realities are NOT about to become "obsolete".
>
>
Dit-DIT.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

1085. Re: K1MAN sending this letter.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 19:23:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1l0bs$74f$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30504
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

```
"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a1j43u0ik1@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1hkl6$v8d$2@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:a1g19s030k3@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > She's never free. In fact, she's very expensive.
> >
> > Get a lesser-known starlet, then. LOL!
>
> Hmmm...there's Roxanna Zal.

LOL!!!!!
```

1086. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 19:33:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3DECA4.FEBC49D@uci.edu>
Source record: 30496

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
> > that had to be explained to you.
>
> From Webster's: "operate - to perform a function" "operator - one that operates"
> The function performed by the Morse code test is obvious. Sorry that had to
> be explained to you.

It's not the definition that I picked, Cecil, but obviously that's the
one Carl did - come to find out, thanks to Cecil and good ol websters.

1087. Re: I pushed the wrong button

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 19:38:49 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1l0c4$74f$8@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30505
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lllllllardasssssssslloyd" <Lloyd@HalTurnerHerbie.net> wrote in message
news:a1j00ckoj0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1isdvqse4@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a1hvnsnp1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Query...query...question....no kapish......
> > > Regarding this baby:
> > >
> >
>

> > > _____
> > > > Received: from hotmail.com ([64.4.32.110]) by [Censored] ; Thu, 02
Nov
> > > > 2000 20:54:49 -0600
> > > > Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft
> > > > SMTPSVC;
> > > > Thu, 2 Nov 2000 18:55:22 -0800
> > > > X-Originating-IP: [63.16.138.144]
> > > > From: "Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > > To: "W1WCR"<WIKK@aol.com>, <WIKK@netzero.net>,
> <wlauterbach@ziplip.com>,
> > > > "Kevin Alfred Strom" <kevin.strom@innocent.com>, "N2SAG"
> > > > <AlParkHam@aol.com>"jgw13_1", <jgw13@gateway.net>, "KV4FZ"
> > > > <herbs@vitelcom.net >
> > > > Subject: New E-mail Address
> > > > Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 20:56:00 -0700
> > > > MIME-Version: 1.0
> > > > X-Mailer: MSN Explorer 6.00.0009.1102
> > > > Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> > > > boundary="----=_NextPart_001_0000_01C0450F.4E445160"
> > > > Message-ID: <OE30LuSbh29cM3oryKF0000011e@hotmail.com>
> > > > X-OriginalArrivalTime: 03 Nov 2000 02:55:22.0751 (UTC)
> > > > FILETIME=[824AE0F0:01C04541]
> > > > Return-Path: <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > > X-Rcpt-To: [CENSORED]
> > > > X-DPOP: DPOP Version 2.8z5
> > > > Status: U
> > > >
> > > > This is my new e-mail address. I still have my AOL address for dark

> > > > purposes. But will use this as my primary one to avoid suspection.
> > > >
> > > > Thanks.
> > > >
> > > > Lloyd
> > > > http://novfp.tripod.com
> > >
> >
>

> > > _____
> > > Isn't this like an interoffice memo between Toidy Lloydie and his
weird
> > > sieg heilers? If so, how are you privy to it? You have to be the
> smartest,
> > > most investigative, alert and most resourceful ham to ever hold a
> ticket.
> > > Best,
> > > Doc,AF2Y
> >
> > It is. And I told the recpient that I would not reveal his name, etc.
That
> > recipient forwarded it to me. He told Llllardasssssss Lllllloyd to
> remove
> > him from his mailing list and asked the question does Llloyd have a
life,
> > is interested in girls or anything like that.
> > Guess we're not the only ones to pose that question, unfortunately, I
had
> to
> > answer truthfully, in the negative.
> > LOL!!!!!!!!!
> > Poor Lllllllllllardasssssssssss Llllloyd.
> >
> >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:a1hp9v$8it$5@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:a1hikv$e80$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > > > Gee, here I sit on this NG and after 2.5 years still don't know
the
> > > right
> > > > > > button to click on. How embarrassing. By accident I sent this to
> Toidy
> > > > > > Lloydie instead of this NG and he got upset. He'll never know how
> > sorry
> > > I
> > > > > am
> > > > > > for upsetting him. I guess my illuminati got the best of me. By

the
> > way
> > > > > here's a question to mull over. Isn't Lloyd's posting SPAM? Is it
> not
> > a
> > > > > solicitation for bucks on behalf of halfwit "Turnip?" If so, since
> > when
> > > is
> > > > > SPAM allowed on a newsgroup?
> > > > > Doc,AF2Y(Jewish world banker, Rothschild relative, raconteur of
fine
> > > > wines,
> > > > > elegant restaurants and sophisticated women. B.A.R.F. hater and TR
> > > > > destroyer)
> > > >
> > > > Well, Lllllllllllardasssssssss
> > Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd
> > > is
> > > > such a fucking whining pussy.
> > > > It's fun to "upset" Llllardasssssss Llllllloyd and so easy, too.
> > That's
> > > > why he's been posting anonymously in here using trhe BARF call
> clubsign
> > > and
> > > > MUJ and the AGM sockpuppet. Guess he's using them for "dark
purposes"
> > > >
> > > > Received: from hotmail.com ([64.4.32.110]) by [Censored] ; Thu, 02
Nov
> > > > 2000 20:54:49 -0600
> > > > Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft
> > > > SMTPSVC;
> > > > Thu, 2 Nov 2000 18:55:22 -0800
> > > > X-Originating-IP: [63.16.138.144]
> > > > From: "Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
> > > > To: "W1WCR"<WIKK@aol.com>, <WIKK@netzero.net>,
> <wlauterbach@ziplip.com>,
> > > > "Kevin Alfred Strom" <kevin.strom@innocent.com>, "N2SAG"
> > > > <AlParkHam@aol.com>"jgw13_1", <jgw13@gateway.net>, "KV4FZ"
> > > > <herbs@vitelcom.net >
> > > > Subject: New E-mail Address
> > > > Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 20:56:00 -0700
> > > > MIME-Version: 1.0
> > > > X-Mailer: MSN Explorer 6.00.0009.1102
> > > > Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> > > > boundary="----=_NextPart_001_0000_01C0450F.4E445160"
> > > > Message-ID: <OE30LuSbh29cM3oryKF0000011e@hotmail.com>
> > > > X-OriginalArrivalTime: 03 Nov 2000 02:55:22.0751 (UTC)
> > > > FILETIME=[824AE0F0:01C04541]
> > > > Return-Path: <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>

> > > > X-Rcpt-To: [CENSORED]
> > > > X-DPOP: DPOP Version 2.8z5
> > > > Status: U
> > > >
> > > > This is my new e-mail address. I still have my AOL address for dark
> > > > purposes. But will use this as my primary one to avoid suspection.
> > > >
> > > > Thanks.
> > > >
> > > > Lloyd
> > > > http://novfp.tripod.com
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > ____
> > > > Get more from your time online. FREE MSN Explorer download :
> > > > http://explorer.msn.com
> > > > [nd repost]
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>
> ---
> > > > --
> > > > > --
> > > > > get out of my mailbox.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Poor Llllardasssssssssss Llllllloyd, he's got no room to talk since
> he's
> > > the
> > > > one that's been subscribing people to junk and spam e-mail for their
> > > > mailboxes.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > > > From: radiosigs
> > > > > To: Lloyd Davies
> > > > > Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2002 4:16 PM
> > > > > Subject: Re: Is your computer secure?????
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > If I were anti-government, an espionage agent, a saboteur,
> > pornographer,
> > > > > hacker, troublemaking bigot, child molester, murderer, rapist and
> > thief,
> > > > I'd
> > > > > be quite worried about the implications inherent in your post. On

> the
> > > > other
> > > > > hand I fear nothing about the security of my computer because I'm
a
> > > plain
> > > > > Joe living in a great country and mind my own business.
> > > > > Now Lloyd if I were you I'd go over those ten characteristics I
just
> > > > > outlined and if any fit you, then worry. If not, then move your
ass
> > down
> > > > the
> > > > > road.
> > > > > Doc,AF2Y
> > > > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > > > From: Lloyd Davies
> > > > > Newsgroups: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest
> > > > > Sent: Saturday, January 05, 2002 2:06 PM
> > > > > Subject: Is your computer secure?????
> > > > > [Lardassss' cut-and-paste monstorsity]
> > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > > Lllllllllllaaaaaaardasssssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd
> > > > > "Friends of Hal Turner" <we.will@get.by.com> confessed his fatassed
> > status
> > > > > in message news:3c388ad7$1_3@news.teranews.com...
> > > > > "SO WHAT IF I'M A LARDASS??<...> DOESNT IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?
> > > > > SO WHAT IF I WEAR A SIZE 38-40 PANTS AND SIZE 18 DRESS SHIRTS?
> > > > > IS THAT A CRIME? I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE ALOT BIGGER THAN
> ME....."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
>
> Oh it's not hard at all Roger, figuring out who forwarded that
> email to you, but to do so would compromise my sources of
> information. I will tell you this much so you know that I know
> who forwarded you that email. The rat is located in Georgia,
> need I say more?

Wrong again, you ill-educated LARDASS.

> Of course we expect you to respond to
> this posting with your usual lies, denials, and filth, but that doesn't
> change the fact that my email correspondents informed me as to
> who and where the leak was.

You'd be surprised who it was, Llllardasssssssssssss. Bwhahahahahahaha!!
You don't have many friends left in BARF....

> Tiny Pricked Lllardassss Llllloyd.

1088. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 19:47:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1kr1a0edg@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30498

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110103620.23524.00001077@mb-md.aol.com...
> >True. It's actually a bottle of Wild Turkey.
> >
> >
>
> No, its a Female you are related to

Couldn't be. I don't have any relatives by the name of Rosey Palms.

1089. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 19:58:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#kKyFBhmBHA.668@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30497

Cecil got all huffy, mashed his send key without thinking, and said:

> One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
> it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave. If it
contains
> information, it is not a continuous wave.

Apparently the ITU disagrees with Cecil. In their "Radio Regulations",
Article 4, they designate "25WPM Morse Code Continuous Wave
Telegraphy" as emission type "100HA1AAN".

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1090. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 20:13:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpqf4ih.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30499

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 13:02:52 GMT, KC8PMX wrote:

>A quick name search of the QRZ database revealed that DeWayne Hendricks is
>one of our own. Callsign WA8DZP.
>
>It appears that he is trying to challenge the FCC into loosening its grip on
>spectrum. What he wants is the FCC to try and stop the networks from either
>forming or operating at all. Thats when the Chippewa will stand up and claim
>the right to the air and skies above their reservations. For this to happen,
>someone has to complain to the FCC about interference.

Dewayne is a long-time friend and well-respected colleague and he is
on the FCC's Technical Advisory panel. A good portion, if not all,
of his project is being funded by the U S Government, and it is the
FCC itself that is advocating tribal responsibility for spectrum
utilization on tribal lands. Lots of US bucks are going into that
project.

Dewayne was selected to head that project because he is an
international EXPERT - in capital letters - on deployment of Part 15
networks on a non-interference basis.

Y'all do know that Part 15 devices can - and do - operate in the
various amateur bands on a non-interference basis. That's been a
done deal for many years.

No, the sky is not falling. A little knowledge is a dangerous
thing.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1091. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 20:36:49 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0201101236.7a3c72bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30500

\According to three ARRL documents:
1. The Operating Manual
2. Message Handling -- FSD 218
3. ARRL Scout Handbook
"A Q signal followed by a ? asks a question. A Q signal without the ?
answers the question affirmatively, unless otherwise indicated."

Therefore, QSO means "Can you communicate with ____?" only when
followed by a question mark. Without the question mark, it means "I
can communicate with....," "I am communicating with...." To
communicate with implies understanding. The purpose of the ARS is
effective communication -- understanding.

QSL, on the other hand, with a ? -- QSL? -- means "Can you acknowledge
receipt?" The ARRL Scout Handbook indicates that a QSL (card, without
the ?) is to be exchanged to acknowledge a contact.

Further, the ARRL Handbook, in the chapter on operating, pretty
clearly states those distinctions and seems to lament the erosion of
QSL to a substitute for QSO -- that is, indicating that what was just
sent was received and understood. It seems that ARRL sees QSO as a CW
descriptor of whether or not communication is taking place or can take
place. Is "understanding" occurring? While QSL is a mechanical
confirmation of the receipt of the message -- not the understanding or
communication.

Is there a linguistic reason for this erosion? Veterans have indicated
to me that it probably stems from using Q signals on phone. That is,
did he/she say, "QSL" or "QSO?" "Sounded like QSL. QSL must mean 'I
received your message.'"

If this analysis is incorrect, ARRL should clear up the confusion. If
you and I disagree, I'm sure there are others who use them
interchangeably, or use them as I do or as you do (and one of us is
incorrect -- I'm willing to back down). Once they lose whatever
meaning they should have, they become ineffective abbreviations.

73
KB9RVB

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3B6711.A20A34CC@IEEE.org>...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3A8092.A08DAC25@IEEE.org>...
> > > Q-signals are codes, Arnie. Published codes do not violate amateur
> > > rules. 10-4 means approximately the same thing as QSL.

> >
> > Sorry, Cecil, but 10-4 means "understood." QSL means "acknowledge a
> > contact." I think you mean QSO, which means "understood."
>
> Sorry, Carl, but QSL means "acknowledge a receipt" of the information just
> sent. "Acknowledge a receipt" means essentially the same thing as "understood".
> When an HF ham says, "QSL?", it means "Do you understand?" what was just
> transmitted. QSO doesn't mean "understood". It means, "Can you communicate
> with _______?", e.g. QSO W5DXP?

1092. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 20:55:35 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bdn%7.59253$fe1.923208@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30501

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> posted:

> I have reviewed every text that I have on CW and Morse code and none
> of them talk about more "states" than two (on/off). Dick has
> obviously confused "states with "elements" and, as usual, is all
> output and no input.

You and Dick are both right: You're right -- the RF medium,
the "physical layer" if you will, only has two states. Morse
code is meaningless on this level. Interpose a state machine
with memory in the process, thereby defining a higher layer,
and Morse code (or ASCII, or Baudot, or...) becomes meaningful
and Dick becomes 'right'. Also, the "states" of Morse code
become those of the state machine used to decode it.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1093. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 20:58:59 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <948f7dc0a21350f03871c60190c9a7d1.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 30502

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:0ig%7.261$rU.59886@monger.newsread.com...

> This was found on the QRZ.COM website and I found that this could be very
> scary for us. Since there is a Chippewa tribe/reservation about 15-20 miles
> away from where I live, this could impact my area also.
>
>
> Dave Estrada writes "Greetings to all,
> I was reading an article in the January 2002 edition of "WIRED" magazine. On
> page 54 I found an article about DeWayne Hendricks, the Broadband Cowboy.

Mr. Estrada is missing "the rest of the story". The hardware in question
consists of various "Part 15" devices, which already share our amateur
radio spectrum.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1094. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:01:54 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3E0142.E9CCA6F8@psu.edu>
Source record: 30503

Well no wonder I'm not that good at CW, Cecil! All this time I've been reading dit's as a short character, dahs as long, and inter character spacing as a short paues, and word spacing as slightly longer pause. I put 'em all together and I understand it.

Pretty amazing that the people who developed Morse code knew that Dit was 010, dah 01110, etc.

Anything can be digital under your definition. A digital processing system might use your method to determine translation from Morse to text or even voice.

Humans most definitely don't process Morse code in digital fashion.

What is 000 in binary? or 000000? or do you mean that three 0's (or however many) are sent? Right there is a problem as as I figure it, nothing is sent during a pause, and I interpret the length of the pause and take it from there.

Can you send your message in 1's and 0's so that I can digitally process it in my mind?

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:

> > Digital is either 0 or 1
> >
> > let us take a dit for "0"
> > let us take a Dah for "1"
>
> Nope, that's not right. 'Dit' is 010 and 'Dah' is 01110 with leading
> and/or trailing space-times as necessary. The intra-character 'space'
> is 0. The inter-character space is 000. The space between words is
> 0000000. 'Dit's and 'Dah's are elements and both elements are in
> the 'mark' OOK state. Everything except 'dits' and 'dahs' are in
> the 'space' OOK state.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1095. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:29:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110162953.11131.00000681@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30506

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>W1RFI wrote:

>> None. I still like my theory that Morse code is sex-state. :-)

>Cecil describes it as police-state.

All I know is that when I use it, I find my operating to be a state of
happiness. I can't think of any other mode I find nearly so enjoyable.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1096. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:35:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110163534.11131.00000683@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30507

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick, if it can be tristated, it's not OOK, by definition.

Would you call a device that either put out a logic 1 or was high-impedance a tristate device? What if a "tri-state" gate were used in such a way that it never went to a logic low?

>Please furnish a reference to back up your assertion, Dick.
>There simply is no third state for ON/OFF Keying.

In every reference I have seen, a "tri-state" device counts the high-impedance state as being tri-state. By definition, OOK has high-impedance as one of its modes. Can you provide any references to logic tri-state that uses anything other than high-Z as the third state? Is it called tri-state in any of its references?

>If there existed a third state, it would be called ON/OFF/FLOAT

Aren't we counting angels dancing on the head of a pin here?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
If the output of an OOK CW rig is not floating when off, what is it?

1097. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:38:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110163850.11131.00000685@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30508

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>How about mountain oysters? :-) I might be able to make it to Dayton.

I think I have enough "oysters" to get the job done, but I would settle for a decent meal of any type. I am expecting to be at the QRP "Four Days in May" event in Dayton this year. Fortunately, I won't even be a speaker (unless I get to fill in for someone MIA at that last minute), so I can concentrate on having fun!

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1098. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:42:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110164224.11131.00000686@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30509

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Actually we're all mostly water.

Some are mostly hot air! And I bet we all have a different list! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1099. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:45:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110164520.11131.00000687@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30510

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net

>DeWayne is currently working on a wireless network project
> for the Chippewa Indian reservation.

<snippage>

>Software defined radios can transmit on several frequencies,
>including those authorized by the U.S. government for use by licensed
>amateurs.

Under Part 15 rules, ALL amateur frequencies can be used for unlicensed devices. In some cases, power of up to 1 watt and unlimited gain antennas can be used.

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1100. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:47:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3E0BE6.1BDE0FFA@uci.edu>
Source record: 30511

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >Cecil describes it as police-state.

> All I know is that when I use it, I find my operating to be a state of
> happiness.

Ahh, come on Ed. You know A LOT more than that. ;-)

> I can't think of any other mode I find nearly so enjoyable.

I think you may have been on to something better when you were talking
the "sex-state" thing however.

1101. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:58:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110165840.11131.00000690@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30512

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net

>Well Ed, I can say I most likely will never submit to the ARRL for one main
>reason, and I quote from the person I talked to about even getting the ARRL
>to send me a order form in order to pay for membership via snail mail. The
>statement given to me when I asked for a form, was
>
>"We don't do that here, can I have your credit card number please?"
>
>I responded with
>
>"I do not have a credit card, I just want you to send me a form to so that I
>can mail payment in."
>
>She responded with
>
>"I'm sorry but we don't do that here, but when you get a better job and get
>a credit card like the rest of the normal world, call us back." And then
>she hung up.

If that was told to you by anyone on the ARRL staff, that statement was dead wrong! Saying that to a potential member would get a staffer in big trouble quickly.

>If this is the level of professionalism by the ARRL, I may as well hand in
>my license, as apparently they "run" amateur radio more than the FCC.

Not as far as I am concerned. The FCC, not the ARRL, should remain the ultimate regulator of the Amateur Radio Service.

>As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they? (I can read a
>listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong to, I
>have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because she (KA8YKK)
>had a position with the club also. These are clubs that are ARRL
>affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may have a larger
>geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a year.

Remember that the ARRL Directors typically have "territories" that cover a few states. These people are volunteers and I don't think there is enough time in a year for a Director to visit every club.

>As far as defense of Amateur Radio, I guess the ARRL may be doing a good job
>in that regard, although some hams may beg to differ with that, what the
>hell is the ARRL doing in offense, (to use the sports term)??

The League has brought a number of petitions before the FCC over the years. Some were even successful. They have managed to keep spectrum protection bills

before Congress for as long as I can remember. They are about to try to get Congress to move on CC&Rs, in the wake of the FCC's last refusal to do so. In my own work, I regularly work with manufacturers on RFI matters as "offense." The spectral notches in the HF ham bands in the VDSL standard, the Home Phone Networking specification and the HomePlug specification are due, in part, to the work done by ARRL.

> Positively promotion of amateur radio and education of the general public will get
>greater yields, as opposed to constantly having to defend itself. As a
>person, I find it is easier to educate someone about myself, or my
>activities as opposed to having to be in a defensive mode. Where is the
>P.S.A.'s for example??? Broadcasters are obligated run P.S.A. spots for a
>certain percentage of their broadcast day. Lets see the ARRL create a spot
>to run. Seems like a smart investment.

See http://www.arrl.org/pio/. QST regularly features about a half page of "media hits," many of which appeared with some help from ARRL.

> What about promotional material? I
>have had to resort to creating my own phamplets to pass out to prospective
>new hams. I just have created a really nice Microsoft Powerpoint
>presentation, and am searching for .jpg/.gif/.bmp images to utilize in this
>presentation, such as some disaster scenes with hams involved in some aspect
>or another, some scenes involving ham activities from field day to other
>activities similar and cannot seem to seem to locate any on the arrl.org
>site or get any response via email.

To whom did you send the email? I will personally follow up and get you some of ARRL's available printed PR material.

I am a bit confused about your not finding any material on the ARRL Web site. The page at:

http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

Is featured as a top link from the ARRL site!

>Maybe once sometime in the future, I may join, but in the meantime, I would
>be "tickled pink" if some organization was formed to give the ARRL a run for
>their money. Competition is a good thing, and keeps from becoming
>complacent. I know the question was not directed towards me in the original
>post, but I have been keeping this bottled in for so long, and needed to
>vent.

IMHO, the League is less complacent than it has been in years. Although I think there is still a lot of room to improve, I am, overall, pleased to see some of the things ARRL has done over the past couple of years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020109072113.09750.00000412@mb-cq.aol.com...

>> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>>
>> >> How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.
>>
>> >I can give you an update. They're *still* screwed up.
>>
>> In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For balance, can
>you
>> also tell us what you think they are doing right?
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1102. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 21:59:51 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3E0ED7.2B9D427A@uci.edu>
Source record: 30514

W1RFI wrote:
> In some cases, power of up to 1 watt and unlimited gain antennas can
> be used.

I bet those are expensive. :-)

1103. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:01:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110170136.11131.00000691@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30513

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>I think you mean "American Morse code" and "international morse code".

>Is it legal to ID with American Morse?

I asked the folks in ARRL's Regulatory Information Branch. They tell me that it is legal to ID with American Morse.

As a minimum, perhaps American Morse could be an "unspecified digital code," permitted for use with certain restrictions that the modulation method be legal for the frequency in use and that the encoding method be publically documented. (That is how PSK-31 was released for use in ham radio.)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1104. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:13:27 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <tgo%7.1970$du.41870@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30515

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote in part ...
>
> My opinion is that for a mode I don't personally like to use myself, I
have
> no desire to learn it--it wastes my valuable time. But, for the Tech+
> license I was *willing* to learn it at 5wpm.
>
> While it goes against the angst of some hams, I am one of those dreaded
> "light-duty" ham radio enthusiasts (if the term enthusiast can be used for
> my type of ham). The "hobby" of ham radio is a distraction for me, not an
> avocation. I do enjoy emergency communication, and some public service.
> What do I mean by that? I mean that I enjoy the storm spotting aspect of
> emergency communication because I've always enjoyed observing severe
weather
> anyway--that I am a ham radio operator fits right in with that.
>
> But, if pressed, i.e., in a severe or disaster situation, I would operate
as
> needed for as long as needed, with a smile on my face and knowing that the
> time I *have* taken to learn operating skills specific to my
> needs/want/interests can be of some value to the community. >

Sorry, had to snip this bad-boy for space : -))

I was running Morse-Academy a little while ago and set it 25 wpm. Since I've been working a lot of DX lately, it seemed a little slow. This got me to thinking after I had read Kim's post. We all have our little niches in Ham radio. I love CW, Kim hates it (or doesn't like it a lot). Kim loves emergency communication, I tolerate it because I think we should all give back to the ARS for the privilege of having a license. The idea of standing around with a 2mtr handheld and spotting WX is not exactly my concept of fun. I have a buddy who just loves to build QRP units. I would probably fall into a deep depression trying to solder those tiny components onto a board. I like to build wire antennas, he tolerates it. This is a wonderful hobby, full of exciting things to do with a wide variety to choose from. I guess sometimes we fail to see the beautiful trees because of the forrest.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1105. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:21:14 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C3EADCA.7EAF7A2C@mailcity.net>
Source record: 30516

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net
>
> >Well Ed, I can say I most likely will never submit to the ARRL for one main
> >reason, and I quote from the person I talked to about even getting the ARRL
> >to send me a order form in order to pay for membership via snail mail. The
> >statement given to me when I asked for a form, was
> >
> >"We don't do that here, can I have your credit card number please?"
> >
> >I responded with
> >
> >"I do not have a credit card, I just want you to send me a form to so that I
> >can mail payment in."
> >
> >She responded with
> >
> >"I'm sorry but we don't do that here, but when you get a better job and get
> >a credit card like the rest of the normal world, call us back." And then
> >she hung up.
>
> If that was told to you by anyone on the ARRL staff, that statement was dead
> wrong! Saying that to a potential member would get a staffer in big trouble
> quickly.
>
> >If this is the level of professionalism by the ARRL, I may as well hand in
> >my license, as apparently they "run" amateur radio more than the FCC.
>
> Not as far as I am concerned. The FCC, not the ARRL, should remain the ultimate
> regulator of the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> >As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they? (I can read a
> >listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong to, I
> >have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because she (KA8YKK)
> >had a position with the club also. These are clubs that are ARRL
> >affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may have a larger
> >geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a year.
>
> Remember that the ARRL Directors typically have "territories" that cover a few
> states. These people are volunteers and I don't think there is enough time in a
> year for a Director to visit every club.
>
> >As far as defense of Amateur Radio, I guess the ARRL may be doing a good job

> >in that regard, although some hams may beg to differ with that, what the
> >hell is the ARRL doing in offense, (to use the sports term)??
>
> The League has brought a number of petitions before the FCC over the years.
> Some were even successful. They have managed to keep spectrum protection bills
> before Congress for as long as I can remember. They are about to try to get
> Congress to move on CC&Rs, in the wake of the FCC's last refusal to do so. In
> my own work, I regularly work with manufacturers on RFI matters as "offense."
> The spectral notches in the HF ham bands in the VDSL standard, the Home Phone
> Networking specification and the HomePlug specification are due, in part, to
> the work done by ARRL.
>
> > Positively promotion of amateur radio and education of the general public
> will get
> >greater yields, as opposed to constantly having to defend itself. As a
> >person, I find it is easier to educate someone about myself, or my
> >activities as opposed to having to be in a defensive mode. Where is the
> >P.S.A.'s for example??? Broadcasters are obligated run P.S.A. spots for a
> >certain percentage of their broadcast day. Lets see the ARRL create a spot
> >to run. Seems like a smart investment.
>
> See http://www.arrl.org/pio/. QST regularly features about a half page of
> "media hits," many of which appeared with some help from ARRL.
>
> > What about promotional material? I
> >have had to resort to creating my own phamplets to pass out to prospective
> >new hams. I just have created a really nice Microsoft Powerpoint
> >presentation, and am searching for .jpg/.gif/.bmp images to utilize in this
> >presentation, such as some disaster scenes with hams involved in some aspect
> >or another, some scenes involving ham activities from field day to other
> >activities similar and cannot seem to seem to locate any on the arrl.org
> >site or get any response via email.
>
> To whom did you send the email? I will personally follow up and get you some
> of ARRL's available printed PR material.
>
> I am a bit confused about your not finding any material on the ARRL Web site.
> The page at:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html
>
> Is featured as a top link from the ARRL site!
>
> >Maybe once sometime in the future, I may join, but in the meantime, I would
> >be "tickled pink" if some organization was formed to give the ARRL a run for
> >their money. Competition is a good thing, and keeps from becoming
> >complacent. I know the question was not directed towards me in the original
> >post, but I have been keeping this bottled in for so long, and needed to
> >vent.
>

> IMHO, the League is less complacent than it has been in years. Although I
> think there is still a lot of room to improve, I am, overall, pleased to see
> some of the things ARRL has done over the past couple of years.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020109072113.09750.00000412@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> >>
> >> >> How about a corporate policy update, Ed. Earn your bonus pay this week.
> >>
> >> >I can give you an update. They're *still* screwed up.
> >>
> >> In what way do you feel that ARRL is screwed up, Arnie? For balance, can
> >you
> >> also tell us what you think they are doing right?
> >>
> >> 73,
> >> Ed Hare, W1RFI

What, if anything, is the ARRL doing about trying to rid the 10
meter band of the cb truckers who are taking over that band?

1106. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:29:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110172933.23533.00001186@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30517

>Couldn't be. I don't have any relatives by the name of Rosey Palms.

Im not talking about your only Lover

1107. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:43:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E18FE.2C1DF217@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30518

K0HB wrote:
>
> Cecil got all huffy, mashed his send key without thinking, and said:
>
> > One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
> > it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave. If it
> contains
> > information, it is not a continuous wave.
>
> Apparently the ITU disagrees with Cecil. In their "Radio Regulations",
> Article 4, they designate "25WPM Morse Code Continuous Wave
> Telegraphy" as emission type "100HA1AAN".

Just shows they are not very careful with their language. In reality,
there is no such thing as "25WPM Morse Code Continuous Wave Telegraphy".
To be technically correct, they should have said, "25WPM Morse Code OOK
Telegraphy".
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1108. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:47:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E19FC.5C769FD0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30519

mike coslo wrote:
> What is 000 in binary? or 000000? or do you mean that three 0's (or
> however many) are sent? Right there is a problem as as I figure it,
> nothing is sent during a pause, and I interpret the length of the pause
> and take it from there.
>
> Can you send your message in 1's and 0's so that I can digitally
> process it in my mind?

The easiest way to visualize it is to look at the EPROM code in
repeater identifier electronics - all ones and zeros.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1109. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 22:49:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E1A75.79BA98AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30520

W1RFI wrote:
> Aren't we counting angels dancing on the head of a pin here?

Of course, that's what we do on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1110. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 23:33:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpqp0pi.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30521

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 22:21:14 GMT, JR wrote:

>What, if anything, is the ARRL doing about trying to rid the 10
>meter band of the cb truckers who are taking over that band?

I'm not going to answer in the ARRL's name but the FCC is quite aware
of the problem and it's out of the ARRL's hands.

How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?

It's that simple.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1111. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 23:40:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e26f9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30522

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3DB570.507FF806@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY,
PSK31 et al
> > are radiotelegraphy!
> > We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real
case of
> > it!
>
> From the IEEE Dictionary:
>
> "telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the transmission of

> graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a signal

> code."
>
> RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".
>
> "telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for the
> exchange of information in the form of speech."
>
> Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the meanings

> of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical
> comprehension.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

As I said, Cecil ... perhaps the tests were "dumbed down"
when Dick took his Extra ... or was it the applicant? Something
was clearly missing when an "Extra" doesn't understand the
most basic fundamentals, like "OOK" has two states, the
definition of "telegraphy" (equating it only to manual Morse), etc.

I always said there was too much emphasis on Morse proficency
and not enough on technical proficiency and knowledge.

73,
Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPD4mZpe+N6+q84HiEQJDbQCfSUezuFcXsWgBYJLDBboAA4CuVKwAoMLd
Vqq/aQmo9H8rc/gMeosHx2nM
=pASd
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1112. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 23:41:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e2727$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30523

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3DC3B7.90E25E95@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et
al
> > > are radiotelegraphy!
> > > We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case
of
> > > it!
> >
> > From the IEEE Dictionary:
> >
> > "telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the transmission of
> > graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a signal
> > code."
> >
> > RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".
> >
> > "telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for the
> > exchange of information in the form of speech."
> >
> > Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the meanings
> > of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical
> > comprehension.
>
> Poor Cecil, you really do have problems, don't you? I guess it's really a
> bummer
> being holed up with your geriatric relatives, trying to find ways to amuse
> yourself.
> You can start by tucking the IEEE dictionary where the sun doesh't shine.
>
```

1113. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 23:51:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3E2911.B676D75D@uci.edu>
Source record: 30525

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
> > that had to be explained to you.
>
> From Webster's: "operate - to perform a function" "operator - one that operates"
> The function performed by the Morse code test is obvious. Sorry that had to
> be explained to you.

So you're saying that anyone who even just takes a code test can
consider himself a CW operator. Interesting point of view.

1114. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-10 23:57:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e2b04_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30524

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
> > >
> > >Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
> > >of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
> > >how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
> > >PLEASE ...
> >
> > ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading)
of an LOTW
> > confirmation.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI

But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should
REALLY appeal to most hams.)

Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.

It's perfectly free to go and pick up an eQSL that someone
has left there for you ... and there's no charge to register
so you can place them there either ...

I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody
is forcing me to pay them a dime.

So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
essentially duplicate a system that already exists
and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
charge for it and to maintain control???)

As a dues-paying member, I still have a problem
with the ARRL wasting my dues like that ...

(but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
good things ... so I remain a member)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD4qY5e+N6+q84HiEQKYLQCghX3w8ynQgBLrFEijUhIY3QIp3TEAn1vK
bdksY7HOAdJbYYlrIEAYawcy
=6tcU
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1115. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:19:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e302b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30526

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3DDB81.1A9746EF@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > From the IEEE Dictionary:
> > >
> > > "telegraphy - A system of telecommunications for the
transmission of
> > > graphic symbols, usually letters or numerals, by the use of a
signal
> > > code."
> > >
> > > RTTY and PSK31 certainly satisfy the definition of "telegraphy".
> > >
> > > "telephony - A form of telecommunications primarily intended for
the
> > > exchange of information in the form of speech."
> > >
> > > Dick, one would think an extra class amateur would know the
meanings
> > > of "telegraphy" and "telephony" and show a modicum of technical
> > > comprehension.
> >
> > You can start by tucking the IEEE dictionary where the sun doesh't
shine.
>
> Dick, we have pointed you to technical books and all you do is tear
off
> the covers. One would think that before showing the world exactly
how
> technically ignorant you are, you would at least crack open a book.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Wasn't it Einstein who said "To the uninitiated, any sufficently
advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." ?

Dick rejects reference works (and the work of great pioneers
in communications like Claude Shannon) ... therefore, I would
submit that he is "uninitiated" ... (ignorant, actually ... I was
trying to go out of my way to try to be polite, but "uninitiated"

doesn't convey the lack of understanding that Dick exhibits)
... thus, it doesn't take very advanced technology before Dick
can't distinguish it from magic ... and most people know how
a display of "magic" can strike terror into the hearts of those
who can't understand it ... :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD4vfZe+N6+q84HiEQIl4QCeIY+4pMuF6UHqk/UqSobn7yrnpqQAn37l
hE9Bgyd7eKZVyZYrKY6vUJ1v
=8ZAB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1116. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:23:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e310c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30527

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpqp0pi.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 22:21:14 GMT, JR wrote:
>
> >What, if anything, is the ARRL doing about trying to rid the 10
> >meter band of the cb truckers who are taking over that band?
>
> I'm not going to answer in the ARRL's name but the FCC is quite
aware
> of the problem and it's out of the ARRL's hands.
>
> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>
> It's that simple.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

If Congress wouldn't suck all the spectrum auction $$$
into the general fund, but just give a small percentage
of it to the FCC, they'd be in "fat city."

It's actually THAT simple ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD4wbpe+N6+q84HiEQLN6gCg9BMKiKGH8I3aWP/nBw97xaMuCzwAn18D
eovxD0mbPplv0WsZKWQZCV4F
=CWXl
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1117. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:24:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e324b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30529

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3D2517.8E7CBA6A@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> > >
> > > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|
>
> That you could have posted the idiotic statements you made and then make
> any comment about another's rational thoughts is the ultimate in sheer
> gall. What a Jeter.
>
> Dave K8MN

What idiotic statements are you speaking of, Dave?

Kim W5TIT

1118. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:30:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110193024.01576.00000818@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30528

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
>essentially duplicate a system that already exists
>and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
>charge for it and to maintain control???)

I don't know much about it, so you would really have to ask Wayne Mills and/or Bernie Fuller that question.

I do know that the League will probably not make a lot of money at it, so it sure isn't the money. If the League was looking to control Amateur Radio, it could certainly do better than to try to do it via the LOTW. As I recall the few brief conversations that I had with Wayne about this, there are issues about security and verificatibility, but I really don't want to speculate on what those are. Bernie or Wayne may know.

>(but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
>good things ... so I remain a member)

That is the reason I remain a member, too, Carl. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1119. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:36:04 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Urq%7.348356$W8.13136042@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30530

Ed, some impressive things have happened with the RFI program. Everyone will have a different opinion as to what the ARRL should or should not be doing. Just ask about CW - that should get a thread at least 50 deep! So, amongst all of us with our opinions, how many are actually doing something - other than complaining? Well, I let my membership drop for a while - and missed the QSTs, not to mention some of the news. So, I signed up for a couple of years. Too bad I'm no longer anywhere near being a teenager or I'd sign up for life membership.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020110060639.14260.00000518@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>
> >>For balance, can you
> >>also tell us what you think they are doing right?
>
> >Thats an easy one, NOTHING
>
> We all keep living in the expectation that you will get real someday, Bruce. It
> is a rapidly fading hope.
>
> How about the ARRL's RFI program?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1120. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:55:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e3986_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30532

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:Yhg%7.260$rU.59797@monger.newsread.com...
>
> As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they? (I can read a
> listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong to,
I
> have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because she
(KA8YKK)
> had a position with the club also. These are clubs that are ARRL
> affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may have a larger
> geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a year.
>

Here! Here! Ed may become dismayed by my wholehearted agreement, but you hit the nail on the head with that one!

The ARRL Organization in this area is in just as bad a shape. At least, I consider it not-so-desirable. Our local hams (new *and* old) have no idea about local ARRL leadership, activities, goals, objectives, long-term plans; and there are no local information nets, etc. Maybe this isn't stuff that is generally done on a local basis--but it darned well should be in my opinion. And, whenever I have mentioned it--there's lots of resistance. The resistance may be valid: can't get enough people involved, too much politics, etc., etc. But, as an outgoing ARRL Field Representative, I can say that it is very frustrating when most of the questions I "fielded" were those of a general nature and not even all that specific to my specialty: emergency communication.

I don't submit this in the same light as a Vince Fiscus, or probably not even whomever KC8PMX is, but more as a true agreement that the local ARRL also suffers in this area. Heck, to ask anyone "in the know" around here why upcoming elections are never discussed and pushed on the air, it is because "we can't have ARRL Section leadership outside the Dallas area!" Goodness, how lame is that? Then, when you go out into the field, as I have many, many times, those in the rural area dread getting involved in Dallas area politics!

Anyway...

Kim W5TIT

1121. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:57:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e39d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30533

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110080954.07935.00000094@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
> >
> >>Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
> >>pattern.
> >
> >How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
> >
> He's toned down the animosity a bit, but he still exudes attitudes of
disdain
> for many radio amateurs and their activities. Phrases like "beep real
fast" and
> "CW Olde Fartz" are still common in Carl's posts.
>
> And a few nice posts do not immediately erase the memory of years of nasty
> ones.
>
> The thing to watch in anyone's postings is not how they behave when
someone
> agrees with them, but how they behave when someone disagrees.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Kind of like when you disagree, too, Jim.

Kim W5TIT

1122. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 00:58:27 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a848d9150f0ebf989690@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30531

In article <3c3e2b04_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> > >> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
> > >
> > >Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
> > >of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
> > >how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
> > >PLEASE ...
> >
> > ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading)
> of an LOTW
> > confirmation.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should
> REALLY appeal to most hams.)

Free does not necessarily equate to good or for that matter even decent. And it's not free when you factor in the costs associated..internet connections, printer, printer ink cartridges, paper, etc. I remember on one of the qsl reflectors some did a study and it comes out almost a wash ALMOST

Besides those who like to participate in collecting wallpaper (another one of your bug-a-boos) can't use eqsls for anything. I realize that you personally don't care, but there are many more that do.

>
> Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
> main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.
>

For now, but wait till eqsls are accepted, then the fun begins as well as the subscriber fees

>
> I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
> I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody

> is forcing me to pay them a dime.

Any no one is forcing you to, yet :-)

>
> So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
> essentially duplicate a system that already exists
> and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
> charge for it and to maintain control???)

For one reason is that the Eqsl people will not share their codes (if that be the proper term) so that the logging software people can incorporate a download feature. Instead, at least according to several LOG EQF and DX4WIN guru's, they are being asked for donations of several 1000's of dollars for the privilege of being allowed to download direct off the site as well and a "donation" per downloaded card. Certainly doesn't seem free to me, especially if I have to pay several times for a poor quality looking piece of ink jet piece of paper.

Besides Carl, you don;t seem like the DXCC type, at least from reading your posts about fast beeping crush em type things. The DXCC program is attempting to be self sufficient so what does it matter to you whether or not the ARRL charges for this program. It already does so now, all you need to do is look and you'll find the schedule of fees. Seems to me they are trying NOT to use members $$$$'s to run this program.

Do you complain about the costs of the incoming and outgoing bureaus as well?

>
> As a dues-paying member, I still have a problem
> with the ARRL wasting my dues like that ...

see above. I have a problem with the government wasting my taxes on billion dollar bombers that can't fly in wet weather (B2) :-)

>
> (but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
> good things ... so I remain a member)

I'm not sure, but seems like a backhanded compliment to me. But Ed is pretty funny at hamfest, especially when he sets his tie on fire showing "proper" soldering techniques

Besides why is the ARRL spending some much of its members $$$'s on running these technical labs and such. There are many people outside the league that could certainly do alot of this work for far less (no offense Ed, making a point) Why spend so many dollars trying to allow hams to raise towers wherever they want. My community has no problem with towers..waste of ARRL $$$'s if you ask me.

See, the point is, you state opinion as fact when in fact it's just opinion.

BTW, I have a great EQSL card, for 160meters with amnateur station P5/WA6VSE when he was QRV North Korea. Beautiful colors and everything. No problem whatsoever in downloading it and printing it on nice card stock. Copies are available.

1123. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:05:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e3bb2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30537

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110080956.07935.00000097@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >> "Bill Sohl"<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> (Bert Craig wrote):
> >> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
> >> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement
is
> >> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
>

I'd go for that. (Imagine the fun while trying to convince everyone to vote
your way?!). :)

> >> >
> >> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
> >> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
> >> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
> >>
> >> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> >

Hey, the squeaky wheel gets the grease. I may be wrong, but it seems to me
that most of the ham community isn't all that involved in the
"what-will-bes" of ham radio. If there's a group of highly actionable
people who have a common interest who get together and want to see their
ideas come to be, why should they be interested in being sure they also
"help" the silent majority? Maybe more people ought to perk up and get
involved. If they don't, *why* would one care?

> >
> >Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
> >any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
> >FCC rules.
>
> So NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue.
>

See above.

>
> Note that Bert proposes a vote of all hams, not just those who have passed

a
> code test. Note also that those who comment to the FCC on amateur radio
matters
> are overwhelmingly licensed radio amateurs.
>

I'd go along with an idea like that...but I wonder how many hams would get
involved?

> >
> >None of us involved in NCI have seen any
> >reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.
>
> Which means that even if the vast majority of hams of all license classes
> disagree, it doesn't matter.
>

If the vast majority of "hams of all licenses classes disagree" then they'd
best start disagreeing with an effort--*if* there are actionable people out
there moving in the opposite direction.

> >> >
> >> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
> >> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
> >> >of existing hams heard.
> >>
> >> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not.
> >
> >Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
> >existing hams?
>
> Aren't all US hams listed in the databases?
>

Are you now inferring that NCI should spend its own resources to contact the
sleeping opposition?!!!!!!

> >
> >> The code
> >> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for
> >HF/MF
> >> privileges.
> >
> >Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
> >makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
> >current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).
>
> Your opinion noted. Mine's different. If it's an opinion question, why not
put
> it to a vote?
>
> >> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about

> >> the issue - codetest has gotta go".
> >
> >NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.
>
> Sure - NCI just isn;t going to listen to it.
>

It isn't NCI's job to listen to it. NCI is a group of people who are of like mind, working on a project for ham radio that *they* see as worthy. If there is opposition, then the opposite side needs to get busy.

> >
> >Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
> >as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have not,
> >in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as
> >valid, rational and certainly not compeling.
>
> That's a given.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Not speaking for policy on NCI...my membership has probably expired long ago.

Kim W5TIT

1124. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:09:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e3cd6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30538

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110103620.23524.00001077@mb-md.aol.com...
> >True. It's actually a bottle of Wild Turkey.
> >
> >
>
> No, its a Female you are related to

Yeegads, you aren't even outta school yet are you!? Krell, this is supposed to *really* piss you off...you know, kinda like when someone says "yo mama." LOL

Kim W5TIT

1125. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110200958.06877.00001170@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30534

In article <3C3CAB7E.2D6C50D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> "Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced
>> by the government to operate CW?"
>
>Does the Morse code exam count?
>--
No.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1126. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110200958.06877.00001169@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30535

In article <a1fdk7pqv1@dagobah.blueriver.net>, "KB9TMP"
<NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> writes:

>Just like Gallaghar speaking about television "I wish there was a knob
>(on the TV) that increased the intelligence level, there's one labeled
>brightness.....but it doesn't work." :)
>
I am reminded of Marge Simpson asking Homer to fix the TV. He walks over to it
and pounds on the top with his fist, saying loudly "BE MORE FUNNY!!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1127. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110200958.06877.00001171@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30536

In article <3C3DDAAA.B4AE6F52@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
>it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave.

Just the opposite. It's quite possible to do so. I know a station that does it all the time, and it's paid for by tax dollars.

>If it contains
>information, it is not a continuous wave.

Not true! But you gotta define "information". I say it's "that which is not known at one end of a communications link". For example, if I don't know the exact Dow closing number at today, and you somehow transfer the number to me via a communications channel, then information was sent from you to me that I did not know beforehand.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1128. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:21:31 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <5A5D9C6AC0679BD3.B15E0F319524AD24.1FDE33EDFAE86834@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 30544

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 23:33:48 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?

Take it out of the funds they're gathering for new rectal probe
devices for airline security.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

1129. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:26:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e40d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30540

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:tgo%7.1970$du.41870@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote in part ...
> >
> > My opinion is that for a mode I don't personally like to use myself, I
> have
> > no desire to learn it--it wastes my valuable time. But, for the Tech+
> > license I was *willing* to learn it at 5wpm.
> >
> > While it goes against the angst of some hams, I am one of those dreaded
> > "light-duty" ham radio enthusiasts (if the term enthusiast can be used
for
> > my type of ham). The "hobby" of ham radio is a distraction for me, not
an
> > avocation. I do enjoy emergency communication, and some public service.
> > What do I mean by that? I mean that I enjoy the storm spotting aspect
of
> > emergency communication because I've always enjoyed observing severe
> weather
> > anyway--that I am a ham radio operator fits right in with that.
> >
> > But, if pressed, i.e., in a severe or disaster situation, I would
operate
> as
> > needed for as long as needed, with a smile on my face and knowing that
the
> > time I *have* taken to learn operating skills specific to my
> > needs/want/interests can be of some value to the community. >
>
>
> Sorry, had to snip this bad-boy for space : -))
>

I know, I got going on emergency communications...my passion. (My true
passion about it is helping people feel quite confident about doing it!).

>
> I was running Morse-Academy a little while ago and set it 25 wpm. Since
> I've been working a lot of DX lately, it seemed a little slow. This got
me
> to thinking after I had read Kim's post. We all have our little niches in
> Ham radio. I love CW, Kim hates it (or doesn't like it a lot).
>

I like the latter. I definitely don't "hate" CW. I enjoy listening and watching a good fist--it's fascinating stuff. But, I can't listen for long, and I just don't find it so fascinating that I myself wish to use it.

> Kim loves
> emergency communication, I tolerate it because I think we should all give
> back to the ARS for the privilege of having a license.

May I add, give back to the community for the privilege?

> The idea of standing
> around with a 2mtr handheld and spotting WX is not exactly my concept of
> fun.

Heh heh. Mine neither. It's when you've got your hand on the steering wheel, three radios and a scanner going, in the pouring down rain/hail, and the challenge is to stay the Hell on the road, in the dark, with your headlights reflecting back the light that won't penetrate that sheet of light in front of you...LOL...what a rush...and ham radio gives me perfect reason to be out there. (Prior to ham radio it was always difficult to say just *why* I was out the night before in that awful [beautiful] storm). :)

> I have a buddy who just loves to build QRP units. I would probably
> fall into a deep depression trying to solder those tiny components onto a
> board.

Oh man, you and me both! AND, have you seen the new rave among QRPers? That K2M radio (think it is)? The damned thing is, what, $440-$500 and you *have to build it* excuse me? If I am going to pay that much money, the darned thing is going to work coming in the door and it's going to be under warranty...LOL

> I like to build wire antennas, he tolerates it.

Ah, see? I built my first 2M quad antenna. I don't "build" I bake (have recipe, directions, etc.) But, I really do like doing it! I can solder, too...believe it or not!

> This is a wonderful
> hobby, full of exciting things to do with a wide variety to choose from.
I
> guess sometimes we fail to see the beautiful trees because of the forrest.
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over some of the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work, hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave Heil be damned....

Kim W5TIT

1130. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:34:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3e4295_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30542

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a1lfh9$2ab$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
> decision of each administration. You can then ask the FCC
> for a vote. Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
> because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
> only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
> the jurisdiction of the FCC. I suspect (IMHO) that you
> and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
> regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
> and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the
> future rules changes. IF we (NCI) were truly of
> no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> back off.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

EGGSACKLY!!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

1131. eqsl vs lotw

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:34:33 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a85167f1968bc1989691@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30539

Very simple. One is for the exchange of qsl cards the other allows the downloading of logs for the purposes of DXCC submissions and such.

from their website...Our position is that there is room in the amateur community for both LOTW and eQSL.cc to coexist. We believe that the systems will be used as follows:
eQSL.cc: Hams and SWLs, as a method of exchanging QSL cards and to participate in our awards and contests,
LOTW: A subset of hams who are primarily interested in helping others earn DXCC

Since Carl is not a dx'er, by his own admission, the DXCC program is of no interest to him and it is doubtful that the ARRL software will serve any useful purpose to him. The costs incurred are for the most part carried by those that participate. Carl is not one of them

Since eqsls won't be allowed, in the conceivable further, for submission for ANY type of awards (since Carl doesn't seem to think they fit in the ARS, they are non existent anyway ;-)), then most DX types won;t use them for DXCC and award purposes.

From their website..(Note that, again, we do not believe award-granting organizations will be willing to accept eQSLs electronically in the foreseeable future,

As stated by the eqsl website

Patent Pending on most aspects of the eQSL.cc technology. If you find another on-line QSL card exchange similar to ours, let us know. It is probably infringing on our patents.

so that precludes any other types of eqsl retrieval. In fact there was another formed and they were sued out of existence by the eqsl people.

Some have said live and let live, there is room for everyone. I would humbly suggest that the most outspoken person here realize that and quit your grousing humbly requested

1132. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:35:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1lfh9$2ab$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30541

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110080956.07935.00000097@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >> "Bill Sohl"<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> (Bert Craig wrote):
> >> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
> >> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement
is
> >> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
>
> >> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
> >> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
> >> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
> >>
> >> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> >
> >Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
> >any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
> >FCC rules.
>
> So NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue.
>
> Note that Bert proposes a vote of all hams, not just those who have passed
a
> code test. Note also that those who comment to the FCC on amateur radio
matters
> are overwhelmingly licensed radio amateurs.
>
> >None of us involved in NCI have seen any
> >reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.
>
> Which means that even if the vast majority of hams of all license classes
> disagree, it doesn't matter.
>
> >> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
> >> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
> >> >of existing hams heard.
> >>
> >> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not.
> >

> >Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
> >existing hams?
>
> Aren't all US hams listed in the databases?
> >
> >> The code
> >> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for
> >HF/MF
> >> privileges.
> >
> >Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
> >makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
> >current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).
>
> Your opinion noted. Mine's different. If it's an opinion question, why not
put
> it to a vote?
>
> >> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about
> >> the issue - codetest has gotta go".
> >
> >NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.
>
> Sure - NCI just isn;t going to listen to it.
>
> >Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
> >as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have not,
> >in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as
> >valid, rational and certainly not compeling.
>
> That's a given.> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

All your comments and efforts (along with a number
of other people's efforts) are directed (IMHO)
at trying to do anything to get NCI to back off.
The idea of a VOTE is nuts because if such was even
thought to hold merit, the FCC would have followed
such a path. Code testing as a part of international
regs is going...even the ARRL supports that now.

Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
decision of each administration. You can then ask the FCC
for a vote. Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
the jurisdiction of the FCC. I suspect (IMHO) that you
and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the

future rules changes. IF we (NCI) were truly of
no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
back off.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1133. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 01:48:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1lgegcsd1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30543

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110080956.07935.00000096@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a1gdl6ncd1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020107080950.13187.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article
<P_8_7.237059$WW.12795568@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> >> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> >Actions have consequences not all of which are forseeable. The ones
you
> >> >can forsee, you fix. It would be nice if NCI, et al, took some
> >> >responsibility to forsee and fix.
> >>
> >> Not gonna happen. It's the classic narrow focus.
> >
> >The "actions" forseen by McCollum are nothing but speculation.
>
> I'd call them experienced, knowledgeable possibilities. They are quite
> possible.

Still speculative regardless of the thought that
may go into them.

> >> > They will get it wrong: hell the
> >> >framers of the Constitution would not recognize their baby by 1805 but
> >> >they got enough right to make it happen. This bunch seems to believe
in
> >> >blowing things up far more than putting them together again.
> >>
> >> Of course. "Not my job, man".
> >
> >That's just a claim made to try and divert attention of
> >NCI to other matters. It won't work.
>
> Which confirms what I'm saying: Don't expect leadership from NCI on other
> changes.

THE purpose of NCI is to end code test requirements.
Interesting that in the few occasions that NCI also commented
on an issue that didn't involve code, you'd think we were
guilty of heresey to see some of the anti-NCI comments.
Damned if you do, damned if you don't. The NCI "prime

directive" remains the same.

> >> >The VE thing is only one of many. About all Carl and Bill seem to
have
> >> >proven is why the first act of sucessful revolutionaries is to hang
the
> >> >old regime and a good part of the new one. Another day in the lives
of
> >> >the apparatchiks.
> >>
> >> Precisely. Yet consider what has actually happened:
> >
> >Yes, let's do so.
> >
> >> NCI is an "organization" of a website, some directors and maybe 2000
> >members.
> >> Exact numbers are not given out. Note that NCI member numbers started
with
> >> #1000, not #1. Membership consists of signing up online and it's for
life
> >> unless a member specifically requests to be removed. No dues or other
> >member
> >> obligations.
> >
> >Your point?
>
> The methods of assigning membership numbers and the lack of expiration
grossly
> overstates the size of the organization.

Then for such an "overstated" organization, why do you care?

> > There are many similarly based organizations
> >today that are devoted to any number of causes.
>
> So? Are they trying to change the FCC rules for ham radio?

There are many similar organizations trying to do all
sorts of things. What specifically do you want NCI
to do or to tell you?

> >Me thinks
> >you are more unhappy about the ability to do so, rather than
> >the fact that we exist at all.
>
> Is anything I wrote in the previous post not true?

Nope, but none of it should be of any concern to those
that believe NCI is of no importance and/or holds
no crdibility as to our comments when we give comments
to the FCC.

> >> When I first looked on the NCI website, there was a statement that NCI
> >existed
> >> ONLY to eliminate code testing, and that when it was all gone the
> >organization
> >> would simply disappear. That statement disappeared at some point, but
does
> >> anybody really think NCI will continue after code testing?
> >
> >What difference does it make?
>
> When an organization says it exists for a single purpose but behaves
> differently, I wonder about the unstated purposes.

Well...there he goes again, worrying about NCI which
he stated before had no impact on the ham regs anyway.

> > Are you worried if it didn't disappear?
>
> Not worried. Concerned.
>
> >> FCC first tried to push a nocode ham license in 1975, then again in
1983,
> >and
> >> finally succeeded in 1991 - long before NCI existed. FCC's opinion on
code
> >> testing has been "it's only there because of the treaty" for at least a
> >decade.
> >
> >That's pretty strong
>
> Is any of it untrue? Did not the FCC propose a nocode license in 1975 and
again
> in 1983, even though the vast majority of those who had an opinion on the
> subject were against it? Did not the FCC make it clear in their statements
> about the Technician license in 1990-1991 that they didn't see the code
test as
> necessary for ANY reason other than S25.5?
>
> It's all true, Bill. FCC wants out of code testing for a variety of
reasons.

Then the FCC is aligned with NCI. That's great!

> >and not consistent with many
> >of the opinions of the Pro-code Test advocates.
>
> So? Those who support code testing are not a monolithic group who agree on
> anyhting. I don't speak for any group - I just present my facts and
opinions.

Those that oppose code testing are also not a monolithic group
that agrees on everything either.

> >> Way back in 1997 or so, there was a prediction here on rrap (I think
it
> >was by
> >> W4SCO, but I gotta check google) that the FCC was going to radically
> >simplify
> >> the license structure. Three license classes, 5 wpm code test, a done
> >deal.
> >> Most of us pooh-poohed it, particularly after the ARRL made its
proposal
> >and
> >> then the NPRM appeared.
> >
> >And just how many people might have thought that would be the case?
>
> Some. Most people thought it was too radical a change. The point is that
he was
> right on the money.

That's no problem or cause for concern in my book.

> >> Yet after the dust cleared in late 1999 the R&O EXACTLY matched
everything
> >> that had been predicted 2+ years earlier.
> >
> >Yep, surprised even me as to the extent of the changes.
>
> But there were some who were not surprised at all.

Ditto my last comment.

> >> Ever hear the expression "rooster taking credit for the dawn"?
> >
> >How much of an impact anyone had on the actual result won't
> >ever be known...unless some FCC staffer publishes their
> >memoirs of the internal discussions leading to the R&O.
>
> Maybe the FCC had its mind made up before the NPRM even appeared.

Fine by me.

> >I will note that at least we (NCI) not only encouraged
> >our members to file comments, but we also made our
> >own personal ex parte presentation directly to the FCC (as
> >did the ARRL). Frankly, I don't care about taking
> >credit for anything. The changes were made and we are
> >still working towards the final end of all code testing.
>
> My point is simply that the FCC seems to have formed its opinion long
before
> 1998.

Again, fine by me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1134. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 02:07:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1lhbb01eso@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30547

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpqp0pi.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 22:21:14 GMT, JR wrote:
>
> >What, if anything, is the ARRL doing about trying to rid the 10
> >meter band of the cb truckers who are taking over that band?
>
> I'm not going to answer in the ARRL's name but the FCC is quite aware
> of the problem and it's out of the ARRL's hands.
>
> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>
> It's that simple.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

How about getting congress to cut the "pork" spending first, and apply the
savings to an increased enforcement budget?

1135. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 02:10:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1lhep01fd1@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30548

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110172933.23533.00001186@mb-md.aol.com...
> >Couldn't be. I don't have any relatives by the name of Rosey Palms.
>
> Im not talking about your only Lover

Sorry, Bruce. Switching hands doesn't count.

1136. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 02:11:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1lhk4asv1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30545

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020109221348.25530.00000789@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >What I have a problem with are blowhards who insist that
> >there is no place in amateur radio for anyone who isn't
> >a clone of them ... and that such people are dirt.
>
> This sure sounds like NCI

Bull!

NCI has NO problem with a vast array of different
ways people use and enjoy amateur radio. NCI is
an organization with a purpose. YOU are free to join or not.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1137. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 02:12:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1lhmi$ck8$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30546

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020110021115.02071.00000653@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 1/9/2002 10:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C3D18C3.3049443E@IEEE.org>
>
> >NCI people are dirt?
>
> Aren't we all when you add up the minerals?> Steve

Ashes to ashes, dust to dust...if that's true, then there's
someone either comin' or goin' under my couch.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1138. Re: I shoulda known

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 02:13:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1lhkd01fo0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30549

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c3e3cd6_1@newsa.ev1.net...

> Yeegads, you aren't even outta school yet are you!? Krell, this is
supposed
> to *really* piss you off...you know, kinda like when someone says "yo
mama."
> LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT

Don't worry, Kim. Babbling Bruce is trying to engage in one-upmanship.
However, at his age, it's probably been awhile since he's gotten one up.

1139. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110220958.17580.00000165@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 30550

In article <3c3c9422_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> Can you cite an occasion (by log entry) when you were actually forced by
>> the government to operate CW?
>
>When I was a novice CW was the only option.

Same was true when I was a Novice (1967-68).

But no amateur is forced to operate.
>
>After "novice enhancement" as tech+ if I wanted
>to use 80m, 40m, or 15m ...

Yet Techs have had all privileges above 50 MHz for many years. The code test
for Tech has never been more than 5 wpm.

If any US ham wants to use 160, 20, 17 or 12 meters, he/she must take more
written tests than are required to use 6 meters and above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1140. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020110221000.17580.00000166@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 30651

In article <Yhg%7.260$rU.59797@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>Well Ed, I can say I most likely will never submit to the ARRL for one main
>reason, and I quote from the person I talked to about even getting the ARRL
>to send me a order form in order to pay for membership via snail mail. The
>statement given to me when I asked for a form, was
>
>"We don't do that here, can I have your credit card number please?"
>
>I responded with
>
>"I do not have a credit card, I just want you to send me a form to so that I
>can mail payment in."
>
>She responded with
>
>"I'm sorry but we don't do that here, but when you get a better job and get
>a credit card like the rest of the normal world, call us back." And then
>she hung up.
>
>I am so offended by that. What if the situation was that I chose not to
>have a credit card because of personal choice? (aside from other reasons of
>not having a credit card)

Ryan,

Please don't let that one bad experience turn you off to the ARRL. Yes, that
sort of behavior by a person who is supposed to be in customer service is
inexcusable.

I've been an ARRL member for 34 years now, visited HQ, held field appointments,
been published in QST, met both Hq staff and field personnel, and I can tell
you that sort of thing is contrary to all League policies.
>
>If this is the level of professionalism by the ARRL, I may as well hand in
>my license, as apparently they "run" amateur radio more than the FCC.

Try again and see what happens. ;-)
>
>As far as the staff in the district, who the hell are they? (I can read a
>listings of names in older QST's) In the multiple clubs that I belong to, I
>have only met/seen ONE of these people and that is only because she (KA8YKK)
>had a position with the club also. These are clubs that are ARRL
>affiliated. Seems to me these people, although that they may have a larger
>geographical area to cover, should be seen at least once a year.

In EPA they are mostly seen at the hamfests. They are all accessible by email.
>
>The District 3 net organization fell on its face when one person from
>Genesee County, MI "stoked the coals" and now there is not a net for message
>traffic or District business and information. Is the strength in the ARRL?

Ya gotta remember that the field personnel are all unpaid volunteers. Most have huge territiories.

>Maybe once sometime in the future, I may join, but in the meantime, I would
>be "tickled pink" if some organization was formed to give the ARRL a run for
>their money.

Several organizations have come and gone. They never get very large or organized because of enormous amount of work and expertise required to be a general-purpose amateur radio organization.

>Competition is a good thing, and keeps from becoming
>complacent. I know the question was not directed towards me in the original
>post, but I have been keeping this bottled in for so long, and needed to
>vent.
>
Hope it helps.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1141. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:14:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E58A5.B9CE0EEA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30652

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
> > > that had to be explained to you.
> >
> > From Webster's: "operate - to perform a function" "operator - one that operates"
> > The function performed by the Morse code test is obvious. Sorry that had to
> > be explained to you.
>
> So you're saying that anyone who even just takes a code test can
> consider himself a CW operator. Interesting point of view.

Being a CW operator requires RF. A person taking the exam is
performing a Morse code operation (decoding) using audio
frequencies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1142. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:18:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E597B.A4744CBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30654

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
> >it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave.
>
> Just the opposite. It's quite possible to do so. I know a station that does it
> all the time, and it's paid for by tax dollars.

A continuous wave has unchanging amplitude and phase, i.e. no modulation.
The only bit of information available from such a wave is that it exists.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1143. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:18:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E4D11.DE13623B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30653

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That's why it's called
> > 'OOK radiotelegraphy' by those hams too unexperienced to recognize it as
> > just "CW".
>
> One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
> it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave. If it contains
> information, it is not a continuous wave.

You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50 years, an extra lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.

1144. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 03:41:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3E5EE6.91326583@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30655

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50 years, an extra
> lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.

Oh, I know why it has always been known as CW, Dick, because it
doesn't decay like the original spark gap. But CW was misnamed.

From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
modulated or switched."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1145. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 04:05:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.10.23.05.58.372624.22659@arrl.org>
Source record: 30656

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 18:57:42 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
>> ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading)
> of an LOTW
>> confirmation.
>
> But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should REALLY appeal
> to most hams.)

What Ed means is that the charge will be for the award that results from the QSL records, not for the keeping of QSL data on the system. So, no, eQSL.cc is not providing the same thing at all because they aren't providing the awards.

> It's perfectly free to go and pick up an eQSL that someone has left
> there for you ... and there's no charge to register so you can place
> them there either ...

And nothing ARRL is doing will prevent you from continuing to do that.

> So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to essentially duplicate a
> system that already exists

What ARRL is implementing is not a duplicate of eQSL.cc at all.

> and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can charge for it and to
> maintain control???)

Yes, oddly enough, ARRL intends to maintain control of its own awards program. The participants in DXCC have made it perfectly clear that they expect ARRL to maintain the integrity of the program. And that's what will be done.

> As a dues-paying member, I still have a problem with the ARRL wasting my
> dues like that ...

The expectation is that the system will pay its own way.

Jon

1146. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 04:22:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpr25ej.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30657

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 19:21:31 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 23:33:48 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
>wrote:
>
>> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
>> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>
>Take it out of the funds they're gathering for new rectal probe
>devices for airline security.

Mention equating CB enforcement and airline security to any
professional in the latter field and watch the ROTFLAO start....

Priorities, my man......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1147. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 04:22:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpr27jk.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30658

On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 21:07:26 -0500, Krell wrote:

>How about getting congress to cut the "pork" spending first, and apply the
>savings to an increased enforcement budget?

We've been saying this for decades....do you see it happening?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1148. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 04:22:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpr2c6l.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30659

On Fri, 11 Jan 2002 00:23:17 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
>> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>>
>If Congress wouldn't suck all the spectrum auction $$$
>into the general fund, but just give a small percentage
>of it to the FCC, they'd be in "fat city."

We've been saying that ever since the bidding wars started. You see
how much we were/are listened to.
>
>It's actually THAT simple ...

The Congress couldn't care as long as the moolah rolls in.

Thank you Reed Hundt.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1149. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 04:29:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eWG5qhlmBHA.1168@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30660

Carl asked:

> Wasn't it Einstein who said "To the uninitiated, any sufficently
> advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." ?

No, it wasn't.

It was Sir Arthur Clarke, author of "Childhoods End", and inventor
of the communications satellite.

But I like my version better..... "Any technology distinguishable
from magic is insufficiently advanced."

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

1150. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111000953.06877.00001175@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30661

In article <a1lfh9$2ab$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020110080956.07935.00000097@mb-mw.aol.com...
>> In article <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >> "Bill Sohl"<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> (Bert Craig wrote):
>> >> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
>> >> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm requirement
>is
>> >> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
>>
>> >> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
>> >> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
>> >> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
>> >>
>> >> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
>> >
>> >Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
>> >any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
>> >FCC rules.
>>
>> So NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue.
>>
>> Note that Bert proposes a vote of all hams, not just those who have passed
>a
>> code test. Note also that those who comment to the FCC on amateur radio
>matters
>> are overwhelmingly licensed radio amateurs.
>>
>> >None of us involved in NCI have seen any
>> >reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.
>>
>> Which means that even if the vast majority of hams of all license classes
>> disagree, it doesn't matter.
>>
>> >> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
>> >> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
>> >> >of existing hams heard.

>> >>
>> >> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or not.
>> >
>> >Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
>> >existing hams?
>>
>> Aren't all US hams listed in the databases?
>> >
>> >> The code
>> >> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement for
>> >HF/MF
>> >> privileges.
>> >
>> >Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
>> >makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
>> >current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).
>>
>> Your opinion noted. Mine's different. If it's an opinion question, why not
>put
>> it to a vote?
>>
>> >> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about
>> >> the issue - codetest has gotta go".
>> >
>> >NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.
>>
>> Sure - NCI just isn;t going to listen to it.
>>
>> >Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
>> >as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have not,
>> >in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as
>> >valid, rational and certainly not compeling.
>>
>> That's a given.> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim,
>
>All your comments and efforts (along with a number
>of other people's efforts) are directed (IMHO)
>at trying to do anything to get NCI to back off.

They are devoted to pointing out the facts in this matter. Have I posted
anything in this thread that is not true?

>The idea of a VOTE is nuts because if such was even
>thought to hold merit, the FCC would have followed
>such a path.

NO. WRONG.

The idea of a vote or poll is simply to indicate what people's opinins really are. The FCC is not required to follow majority opinion. Saying that the idea of a vote is "nuts" sure looks like you don;t want to know what the opinion of the amateur community really is.

> Code testing as a part of international
>regs is going...even the ARRL supports that now.

They don't oppose it. Neither did the ARRL BoD survey the membership or the amateur radio community on the issue.

Back in 1975, when the idea of a nocodetest license was first proposed by the FCC, ARRL sent out a detailed questionnaire to all members, then posted the results in QST. Nobody has done anything like that since.
>
>Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
>decision of each administration.

It's pretty clear what the FCC will do.

>You can then ask the FCC
>for a vote.

Won't make any difference to them.

> Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
>because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
>only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
>the jurisdiction of the FCC.

"The amateur community" includes all who are interested, not just licensed hams.

> I suspect (IMHO) that you
>and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
>regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
>and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the
>future rules changes.

I am not pleased at what I see as something that is not in the best interests of the ARS. I don't think the NCI folks are pleased that hams like me presented our views to the FCC and in this public forum.

Whether NCI or any group is really influencing the FCC on license test matters is a matter of pure speculation. Heck, the FCC quoted KENWOOD'S comments 11 times in the R&O.

> IF we (NCI) were truly of
>no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
>at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
>back off.

What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.

If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off, just produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1151. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:11:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E737E.26070987@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30662

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> > >> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
> > >
> > >Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
> > >of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
> > >how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
> > >PLEASE ...
> >
> > ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading)
> of an LOTW
> > confirmation.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should
> REALLY appeal to most hams.)

The cards are not accepted for awards credit.

> Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
> main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.

The cards are not accepted for awards credit.

> It's perfectly free to go and pick up an eQSL that someone
> has left there for you ... and there's no charge to register
> so you can place them there either ...

The cards are not accepted for awards credit.

> I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
> I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody
> is forcing me to pay them a dime.

T h e c a r d s a r e n o t a c c e p t e d f o r

a w a r d s c r e d i t.

> So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
> essentially duplicate a system that already exists
> and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can

> charge for it and to maintain control???)

The cards are accepted for awards credit?

> As a dues-paying member, I still have a problem
> with the ARRL wasting my dues like that ...

Which is it--the ARRL is wasting your dues by developing or the ARRL is charging for use?

> (but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
> good things ... so I remain a member)

Dave K8MN

1152. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:14:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E7411.C4CC7F40@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30663

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3D2517.8E7CBA6A@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> > > >
> > > > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|
> >
> > That you could have posted the idiotic statements you made and then make
> > any comment about another's rational thoughts is the ultimate in sheer
> > gall. What a Jeter.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> What idiotic statements are you speaking of, Dave?

Kim Walker's Secrets Of 2m FM Sucess in one difficult to swallow post,
of course.

Dave K8MN

1153. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:23:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E763D.56F226EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30664

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over some of
> the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave Heil
> be damned....

I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.

Dave K8MN

1154. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:31:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E77FC.7E03470C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30665

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over some of
> > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave Heil
> > be damned....
>
> I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.

Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
yourself with 'em.

Dave K8MN

1155. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:33:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E6CB0.BF1CE930@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30666

N2EY wrote:

> > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> >back off.
>
> What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
>
> If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off, just
> produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.

Looks like he's trying to intimidate you into backing off from posting so many embarassing facts. The one thing that NCI can't tolerate if bare fact.

1156. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 05:36:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E6D6B.EDB3BC2F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30667

Dave Heil wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over some of
> > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave Heil
> > > be damned....
> >
> > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
>
> Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> yourself with 'em.

Dave, be nice to Miss Piggy, she may turn out to be the Rodney Dangerfield of rrap.

1157. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 06:18:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C3E8306.85F98013@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30668

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over some of
> > > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> > > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> > > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave Heil
> > > > be damned....
> > >
> > > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> > > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
> >
> > Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> > yourself with 'em.
>
> Dave, be nice to Miss Piggy, she may turn out to be the Rodney Dangerfield of
> rrap.

Well, there's the part where Rodney Dangerfield is intentionally funny.
The grins we get from Kim are entirely unintentional on her part.
At the moment, she is more like the Yuri Geller of rrap. Her junk
science is moronic.

Dave K8MN

1158. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 10:48:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020111054813.23507.00000588@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30669

In article <a1fq6804uc@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020107214101.15114.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com...
>
>> BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Orange.

I always thought it was Yellow. I learned during my years doing my
own color print making that the complimentary colors of Red, Blue,
and Green were Cyan, Yellow, and Magenta -- in that order. The
mnemomic I devised to remember this was Really Bad Girls Call
Young Men.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1159. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 11:24:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111062448.20970.00000748@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30670

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>This is gonna be another interesting RRAP traditionalists vs.
>"new-wavers" brawl. Looks like it already is . . .

It doesn't need to be. Those that want to issue eqsls can and will do so.
Those that want to issue paper QSLs can and will do so. Those that choose to
work only eqsling stations, or only paper qsling stations can do so. Those that
choose to use only eqsls or only paper qsls in pursuit of awards can do so.

Should there really be a brawl over complete freedom?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1160. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 11:44:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111064417.20970.00000749@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30671

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
>order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
>test?

Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.

>Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested for
>having any competence with the mode?

You can get every one of the SSB questions on all of the exams wrong and still be issued an Extra class license. You can get every one of the safety questions wrong and still be issued an Extra Class license. If you get 4 out of 10 of the Morse-code-content questions wrong, you cannot obtain any license past Technician.

I don't want to argue the definition of "forced" again, but I can clearly see the difference between the way Morse code is treated vis a vis the other operating/mode questions.

>Sure, ya can get deeper into the noise keyboarding with the likes of
>PSK31 and Pactor but there goes the simplicity and cost advantages of
>cw. Might as well dial up my ISP and jump into a chat room.

If the code test were removed at some future point, the above statement would continue to be true. It appears that you do not believe that the advantages of CW are enough to continue its use in the Amateur Radio Service. If the code test is removed at some future time, will you continue to tell people that no one will learn it unless it is part of Amateur testing, or will you start saying different things to encourage its continued use on the ham bands?

>See Squiggy that's not RADIO any more than your digital "simulated
>contesting enviornment" is radio the way hams do real radio including
>the contests.

You are right that Carl doesn't understand that the mode is the message when it comes to CW operation and that the difference between "real" Morse CW and what he proposes would be like the difference between a real love affair and a Star Trek Holideck fling.

However, developing such a system on HF WOULD be radio -- perhaps just the kind of technological development that we need more of in ham radio.

>We've had thousands doing it simultaneously mostly in the lower 50 Khz
>for decades with the oldest modulation scheme on the planet. Tune

>14.000-14.050 on Sunday morning during the upcoming ARRL cw dx test.

You would find stations stacked in there about 400 Hz apart, on average. That is about 125 simultaneous QSOs being heard at any given location.

>You're a troll who has tossed out enough techo razzle-dazzle bullshit
>to collect some witless groupies. Now go play with yer RADIO and best
>of luck with the dxing.

I know Carl personally, and although he and I do not see eye to eye on every issue, we both believe the other to be sincere. Carl may be wrong on some issues (heh!), but he does not post views just to stir the pot -- a conventional definition of troll.

Now, as to the razzle-dazzle, I have always been a bit disappointed that Carl has not found the time (made the time?) to get more done to bring some of that razzle dazzle into ham radio. I believe that he has the talent and knowledge to do so, and it is unfortunate that he has not. He has confidentially shared a few ideas with me, and, IMHO, they are good ones. I really hope that he can make them happen someday soon...

>Either the future of ham radio is in deep doo-doo or all the
>smoke & mirrors you digigeeks have been pumping is
>exactly that.

The technology being discussed is not smoke and mirrors outside of ham radio. IMHO, "real" radio technology is leaving ham radio in the dust, and that is very unfortunate. In the 1960s, I was a dumb new ham, but if I had taken the back off of a commercial transmitter of the day, I would have recognized what I saw. Could we say that today? Could we draw the block diagram of a spread-spectrum system such as the Nextel or any of hte other "razzle dazzle" high-tech devices that are being used by the general public? Some of the unlicensed devices operate on ham bands, and, for the most part, hams aren't using them. If all this doesn't tell us that something is wrong, what will?

>Which, the way I see it, apparently have no limits.

I quoted this a bit out of order, but only to finish by saying that I believe that ham radio has no limits. We can do virtually anything our unlimited imaginations can dream up. Let's let Carl have some fun with his new priveleges -- after all, he is in it for the fun of it, too, but a year from now, let's ask him what improvements he has brought to technology by virtue of those priveleges.

I will go so far as to put a lobster dinner on the plate (so to speak) that he will accomplish something by 1/1/03 that you feel warrants the lobster dinner. :-) (And Carl, if you cost me another lobster dinner, I will never stick up for you again.)

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

1161. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 11:48:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111064857.20970.00000750@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30672

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>A continuous wave has unchanging amplitude and phase, i.e. no modulation.
>The only bit of information available from such a wave is that it exists.

And to really meet the definition, it must have existed for all time, and continue to do so. By that definition, there is no such thing as a continuous wave, because all such signals came into being at some point. It its coming into being communicates information, as in "I will send a CW if the Dow goes above 12,000," then it is not a CW signal.

What good is a definition if it defines something that cannot exist?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1162. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 11:50:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111065042.20970.00000751@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30673

From: "JAMES HAMPTON" j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net

>Too bad I'm no longer anywhere near being a teenager or
>I'd sign up for life membership.

I sign up a few years at a time, so I can decide every few years whether doing so is in my, and Amateur Radio's, best interests. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1163. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 12:02:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111070253.20970.00000752@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30674

From: "W5TIT - Kim" none@none.net

>The ARRL Organization in this area is in just as bad a shape.

I didn't mean to imply that things are always rosy, because they are not. I don't know which areas of the country are in good shape, and which are not, and I am sure there are others in your area that hold a view exactly opposite to yours.

I do know that in many areas, the Section Manager, or even Director/Vice Director positions, run unopposed. Maybe you could consider giving it a go! :-)

>Our local hams (new *and* old) have no idea
>about local ARRL leadership, activities, goals, objectives, long-term plans;
>and there are no local information nets, etc.

It sounds like you have some good ideas for improvement, Kim. You have every right to ask your Director and SM about his/her plans and objectives for the Division and Section, then to make their answers quite public.

> Maybe this isn't stuff that is generally done on a local basis--but it
> darned well should be in my opinion.

I agree, it should be done more than it is.

> And, whenever I have mentioned it--there's lots of resistance.

Have you mentioned it and offered to help?

>The resistance may be valid: can't get enough people involved, too much
>politics, etc., etc. But, as an outgoing ARRL Field Representative, I can
>say that it is very frustrating when most of the questions I "fielded" were
>those of a general nature and not even all that specific to my specialty:
>emergency communication.

Unfortunately, the staff in Newington (about 120 folks) cannot do it all from Newington, nor should they. I do not want to see all good things in ham radio coming from Newington, CT. There is a lot of good talent in ham radio and the fact that our ~650,000 numbers can get a lot more done than a handful of paid staff in Connecticut is one of its strengths. But those folks are all volunteers, and in my experience, although some volunteers have given so much of themselves that it brings tears to my eyes, there have to be limits. I don't know what the answers are to this one, Kim -- that is why I stick with RFI. At least I have a vision of how to make things better in that area. :-)

> Heck, to ask anyone "in the know" around here
>why upcoming elections are never discussed and pushed on the air, it is

>because "we can't have ARRL Section leadership outside the Dallas area!"

There is nothing in Part 97 that prohibits the discussion of ARRL section politics on the air. There is nothing in the ARRL bylaws that stipulates that your SM can only come from Dallas. The SM must be a resident of the section, meeting some age and membership requirements.

>Goodness, how lame is that? Then, when you go out into the field, as I have
>many, many times, those in the rural area dread getting involved in Dallas
>area politics!

That may be the crux of the problem, Kim. If no one is willing to step forth other than the folks from the Dallas area, I can assure you that the SM will always come from the Dallas area. . .

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1164. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 12:39:45 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mmcc$1ai$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30675

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:
>
> Y'all do know that Part 15 devices can - and do - operate in the
> various amateur bands on a non-interference basis. That's been a
> done deal for many years.

If "Y'all" is an attempt to sound southern, forget it. It is not
becoming at all in your particular case.

Pork

1165. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 12:56:43 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mnc5$2rc$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30676

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpqp0pi.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 22:21:14 GMT, JR wrote:
>
> >What, if anything, is the ARRL doing about trying to rid the 10
> >meter band of the cb truckers who are taking over that band?
>
> I'm not going to answer in the ARRL's name but the FCC is quite aware
> of the problem and it's out of the ARRL's hands.
>
> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>
> It's that simple.
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

No, it's even simpler yet. The FCC can put money from its budget
into enforcement activities by eliminating its fat-assed
employees who have been sitting around for years doing absolutely
nothing. Examples? GS-11 "Public Service Reps" translate that
to Phone Secretaries. GS-13/14 Engineers who play with software
all day that was purchased with public funds and has no relation
whatsoever to the commission's mission. GS-14 Economists who
are still trying to figure out what their job is. GS-12/13 Enforcement
Specialists whose only "enforcement" activity is working all year to
enforce the security of their own position that it will not be abolished.
GS-12/13 "Software Developers" who buy commercial software, then
pass it off as their own creation in the name of job security.

The frickin' commission has so much pork in it that federal budget
cutters would slip on the grease all day everytime they tried to slash a
position.

1166. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:05:27 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mnsg$3r9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30677

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >>
>
> Thank you Reed Hundt.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Yes, thank you Uncle Reed! enemy of the entrenched
bureauacracy and the bureaucrats that infest it. Too bad he didn't
stay on. For all his faults, he did know how to cut and slash useless
pork! At least during his tenure, the entrenched old guard actually
did something, even if it was just spending all their time fending off
Uncle Reed from slashing their sacred positions out of the commission's
budget. Hail Reed, bring him back! The old guard FCC fossils
still have nightmares about Uncle Reed. LOL

Pork

1167. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:09:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111080939.22158.00000080@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 30678

In article <3c3e2b04_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >> Seems to me the eqsl people are attempting to seriously profit
>> >
>> >Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
>> >of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
>> >how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
>> >PLEASE ...

Hold that thought.....
>>
>> ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the uploading)
>of an LOTW
>> confirmation.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should
>REALLY appeal to most hams.)

The free nature of most internet stuff appeals to most people. How much
popularity do you think the internet would have in the USA if everyone had to
pay for each email, ng post, and website visited?
>
>Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
>main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.
>
Just like most websites.

>It's perfectly free to go and pick up an eQSL that someone
>has left there for you ... and there's no charge to register
>so you can place them there either ...
>
>I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
>I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody
>is forcing me to pay them a dime.

Not yet.
>
>So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to

>essentially duplicate a system that already exists
>and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
>charge for it and to maintain control???)

"Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
PLEASE ..."

Why is it not OK for the ARRL to recover their costs? Note that the only time users are charged by LOTW is when an award is claimed.

>As a dues-paying member, I still have a problem
>with the ARRL wasting my dues like that ...

"Oh, not the "Nobody should EVER make a buck or two off
of amateur radio, no matter how much work they put in or
how useful their product or service is." philosophy again ...
PLEASE ..."

I don't think it's a waste at all. And I've been paying dues a lot longer than you ;-)

>(but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
>good things ... so I remain a member)

Most members don't realize just how much ARRL does. Heck, if a Product Review saves a ham from just one bad purchase every couple years, membership pays for itself.

The key to the whole electronic QSL thingie is what it's used for. A confirmation that is not acceptable for an award is NOT the same thing as one that is accepted - if the recipient cares about awards.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1168. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:09:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111080939.22158.00000081@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 30679

In article <3C3E597B.A4744CBD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >One would think that the holder of an extra class license would know that
>> >it is impossible to send information over a continuous wave.
>>
>> Just the opposite. It's quite possible to do so. I know a station that does
>it
>> all the time, and it's paid for by tax dollars.
>
>A continuous wave has unchanging amplitude and phase, i.e. no modulation.
>The only bit of information available from such a wave is that it exists.

No. More information can be extracted than just the existence of the wave. I do
it quite often, and have done so for more than 30 years.

Remember that in an earlier post I defined what I mean by "information".

73 de Jim, N2EY.

1169. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:09:56 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mo4u$468$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30682

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:
> Priorities, my man......
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

The commission's priority one is protecting one's own position
from the budget ax. Where's Uncle Reed? I wanna see him make
the old fossils at the commission sweat again!

Pork

1170. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:13:23 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mobc$4gk$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30680

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpr27jk.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 21:07:26 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >How about getting congress to cut the "pork" spending first, and apply
the
> >savings to an increased enforcement budget?
>
> We've been saying this for decades....do you see it happening?
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
Pork? See earlier posting. The commission has enough internal
pork in dysfunctional personnel positions to start the world's largest
Hot Dog factory! LOL

Pork

1171. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:31:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110531.3f037820@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30681

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020110170136.11131.00000691@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >I think you mean "American Morse code" and "international morse code".

Well?
>
> >Is it legal to ID with American Morse?
>
> I asked the folks in ARRL's Regulatory Information Branch. They tell me that it
> is legal to ID with American Morse.

Even with a call like W8FXJ? Send it in American Morse and it's the
same pattern as W6RLC in International Morse. Lots of other possible
combinations.
>
> As a minimum, perhaps American Morse could be an "unspecified digital code,"
> permitted for use with certain restrictions that the modulation method be legal
> for the frequency in use and that the encoding method be publically documented.
> (That is how PSK-31 was released for use in ham radio.)

Yup.

Historic note: After WW2, when the 0 call area was added, FCC
specifically cautioned against using the American Morse long dash for
zero.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1172. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:53:33 UTC
From: Pork <Slim@WheresTheBeef.edu>
Message-ID: <a1mqmq$8j5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30683

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message

> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Hmmmm, something doesn't ring right here? especially when
one FCC field office recently spent $thousands$ of public funds
tracking down an offending pager co. that was interfering a local
ham radio repeater. When questioned by the local Congress
critter, the FCC hams, err, employees said The whole affair was
necessary and rationalized off spending all the tax by saying they
needed to check out some new equipment in a real world environment.
Ho HO, yeah, later, the FCC hams, err, employees, one of which is
local ham radio club El Presidente, were treated to some "environment"
at the local Hooters! Government vehicles, ham vehicles with six
ants. on each car, and the local Hooters as a backdrop, made for
several great photos! ROTFLMAO, another great photo for the
Album of Pork!

Pork

1173. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 13:57:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111085758.13131.00000686@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 30684

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> >Is it legal to ID with American Morse?

>> I asked the folks in ARRL's Regulatory Information Branch. They tell me
>>that it is legal to ID with American Morse.

>Even with a call like W8FXJ? Send it in American Morse and it's the
>same pattern as W6RLC in International Morse. Lots of other possible
>combinations.

I would assume that if one is transmitting in International Morse, then IDs in American Morse, there would be a lot of confusion. Perhaps the converse it true. I only repeated what the guys in reginfo@arrl.org told me. Let's see how they deal with the nuance of your follow-up question. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1174. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 14:09:50 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C3EF22F.611D98E3@psu.edu>
Source record: 30685

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > What is 000 in binary? or 000000? or do you mean that three 0's (or
> > however many) are sent? Right there is a problem as as I figure it,
> > nothing is sent during a pause, and I interpret the length of the pause
> > and take it from there.
> >
> > Can you send your message in 1's and 0's so that I can digitally
> > process it in my mind?
>
> The easiest way to visualize it is to look at the EPROM code in
> repeater identifier electronics - all ones and zeros.

Sure, in that case, but I'm not going to visualize it in that manner to interpret Morse. Do You? Music and photograph can be represented the same way.

I cam in late on this thread, and would like a clarification. Are you talking about Morse code being digital by virtue of how it would be processed by a digital machine?

Or are you saying that it is digital because it just is?

- Mike -

1175. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 14:50:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <FYC%7.397$rU.95048@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30686

> Remember that the ARRL Directors typically have "territories" that cover a
few
> states. These people are volunteers and I don't think there is enough time
in a
> year for a Director to visit every club.
>

I was not necessarily referring to the director themselves. But the Section managers listed in the back of some of the old QST's that I have (pre-1999) for the state of Michigan is more of who I though we should see.

> >As far as defense of Amateur Radio, I guess the ARRL may be doing a good
job
> >in that regard, although some hams may beg to differ with that, what the
> >hell is the ARRL doing in offense, (to use the sports term)??
>
> The League has brought a number of petitions before the FCC over the
years.
> Some were even successful. They have managed to keep spectrum protection
bills
> before Congress for as long as I can remember. They are about to try to
get
> Congress to move on CC&Rs, in the wake of the FCC's last refusal to do so.
In
> my own work, I regularly work with manufacturers on RFI matters as
"offense."
> The spectral notches in the HF ham bands in the VDSL standard, the Home
Phone
> Networking specification and the HomePlug specification are due, in part,
to
> the work done by ARRL.
>
CC&R's. Big deal. Only does anything for homeowners. What about the many thousands of people that are not in a home ownership situation. There are alot of other residential options that are not home ownership, but renting, leasing etc.

> To whom did you send the email? I will personally follow up and get you
some
> of ARRL's available printed PR material.
>

> I am a bit confused about your not finding any material on the ARRL Web
site.
> The page at:

>
> http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html
>
Not for me, but for me to hand out to others to encourage them to consider
the hobby.

Ryan

1176. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 14:52:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <C_C%7.398$rU.95206@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30687

What about all the fines paid by other people/entities as it stands right now? And of course the fines that would be created by the time they catch these fools?

> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?

1177. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:00:34 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <m6D%7.399$rU.95399@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 30688

Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some confusion.

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3DB609.F2FBF60@IEEE.org...
> KB9TMP wrote:
> > I thought there were three states here as well;
> >
> > 1. The state of ON
> > 2. The state of OFF
> > and
> > 3. The state of CONFUSION!
>
> Don't forget the state of Missouri where most of the confusion exists.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1178. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:25:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1n01m02u46@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30691

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201101036.603e1339@posting.google.com...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<a1k8900pcb@enews1.newsguy.com>...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020110062641.14260.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > > A friend of mine used to work in a "new age" bookstore. When the
store
> > > computerized, he had a horrible time with the computers. One day, I
> > pointed
> > > out that the ICs in the computer were all made of silicon crystals and
> > told him
> > > he should tune in to the crystals. His problems vanished overnight.
> > >
> > > You tell me... :-)
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > That reminds me of the "Carlos" hoax that James Randi and a friend
pulled
> > off several years ago.
>
> How did that work? The Amazing Randi is one of my heroes.
>
> Typical Randi trick:
>
> Gets a psychology class to volunteer for an astrology experiment.
> Members of the class (usually several dozen) are given detailed
> confidential questionaires which they fill out and put in double
> envelopes. Questionaires ask all about the person's birthplace, birth
> method and date/time but almost nothing else. In a few weeks sealed
> envelopes are distributed to the class, each containing a sealed
> personalized description of that person's personality traits, based on
> the person's horoscope. All through the experiment the subjects are
> cautioned to discuss keep everything confidential.
>
> Once the results are distributed, the volunteers are told to open
> their envelopes and read their personality descriptions (but not share
> them). They are then asked to rate, by a show of hands, the accuracy
> of the descriptions. Invariably most of the descriptions are rated
> "very accurate" or "accurate", with only a few "inaccurate" and almost
> no "very inaccurate".
>

> Looks pretty good for astrology, huh?
>
> Then the subjects are told to exchange their descriptions. Turns out
> that EVERYONE was given the SAME personality description, which is
> vague enough and flattering enough that most people would like to be
> described that way. The detailed questionaires are then produced,
> unopened. The description was written long before "experiment" even
> started.
>
> Randi has done lots of other debunking. Great stuff.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1179. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:33:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1n0gh02us1@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30692

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201101036.603e1339@posting.google.com...

> >
> > That reminds me of the "Carlos" hoax that James Randi and a friend
pulled
> > off several years ago.
>
> How did that work? The Amazing Randi is one of my heroes.

As best as I can remember, Randi talked a friend into writting a book that was "channeled" through some spirit entity named Carlos. It was basically a rewrite what of Edgar Cayce had written years before, slightly changed so that it wasn't a complete plagerism (call it reverse engineering, if you want) The book was published and became a best seller. Randi then announced that the whole thing was a hoax. Yet, thousands of people still believed these "spiritual revelations" even after the hoax was made public.

1180. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:36:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F0670.E26C813D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30689

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >A continuous wave has unchanging amplitude and phase, i.e. no modulation.
> >The only bit of information available from such a wave is that it exists.

> What good is a definition if it defines something that cannot exist?

There's nothing wrong with the definition. The point is that the wrong
words were picked for CW. Morse code modulation is not continuous. The
background radiation left over from the Big Bang meets the definition
of continuous waves, IMO. Another wave that meets the definition, IMO,
is a continuous wave that someone encounters and doesn't know when it
started or when it is going to end, e.g. light from the sun.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1181. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:36:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1n0mq02v2s@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30696

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpr27jk.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 21:07:26 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >How about getting congress to cut the "pork" spending first, and apply
the
> >savings to an increased enforcement budget?
>
> We've been saying this for decades....do you see it happening?
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

No, and it won't happen as long as voters keep electing incumbents.

1182. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:43:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F0821.B7625E99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30690

N2EY wrote:
> No. More information can be extracted than just the existence of the wave. I do
> it quite often, and have done so for more than 30 years.

Any information you extract from a continuous wave is going
to cause it to be discontinuous.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1183. Re: ARS Newsgroup Conversation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:50:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1n1ha030cv@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30699

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020111054813.23507.00000588@mb-md.aol.com...
> >> BTW -- what is the complimentary color of blue?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Orange.
>
> I always thought it was Yellow. I learned during my years doing my
> own color print making that the complimentary colors of Red, Blue,
> and Green were Cyan, Yellow, and Magenta -- in that order. The
> mnemomic I devised to remember this was Really Bad Girls Call
> Young Men.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

My memories of high school art class are a little vague, but I seem to
recall the teacher saying that if you combine colors directly across from
each other on a standard color wheel, you get the neutral color brown. These
two colors are complimentary of each other.

1184. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:53:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F0A78.648AFBBF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30693

mike coslo wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The easiest way to visualize it is to look at the EPROM code in
> > repeater identifier electronics - all ones and zeros.
>
> Sure, in that case, but I'm not going to visualize it in that manner to
> interpret Morse. Do You?

Of course.

> I came in late on this thread, and would like a clarification. Are you
> talking about Morse code being digital by virtue of how it would be
> processed by a digital machine?

Nope, I am looking at the definition of Morse code in the ARRL Handbook.
Everything is defined with respect to one 'dit' time, i.e. one bit time
in the same way that ASCII is defined with respect to one bit time.

A 'dit' equals one mark bit with a preceding and succeeding space bit.
A 'dah' equals three mark bits with a preceding and succeeding space bit.
An intra character space equals one space bit.
An inter character space equals three space bits.
The space between words equals seven space bits.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1185. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:57:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F0B4D.11377314@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30694

KC8PMX wrote:
> Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some confusion.

It usually is but in Dick's case it's "Don't show-me cuz I don't
wanna hear it". :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1186. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 15:59:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110759.383df833@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30695

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020111065042.20970.00000751@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: "JAMES HAMPTON" j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Too bad I'm no longer anywhere near being a teenager or
> >I'd sign up for life membership.
>
> I sign up a few years at a time, so I can decide every few years whether doing
> so is in my, and Amateur Radio's, best interests. :-)

When I was a teenager, the price of a life membership was way more
than I could afford. I also subscribed to Ed's philosophy way back
then.

So far I've spent more than a life membership would have cost!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Licensed since 1967
ARRL member since 1968
"I'm the ARRL"

1187. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 16:05:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f0e9c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30697

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201091127.5ac252c5@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c39f4b8_1@news7.fast.net>...>
> >
> >
> > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain
totally
> > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
> >
> >
> How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw
in
> order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
> test?

The point is that a demonstration of manual proficiency is
unnecessary as a condition of licensure ... those who want
to use the mode will learn it ... in fact, back in my novice
days, I remember quite a few folks with REALLY bad "fists"
and who asked for LOTs of repeats ... they learned by
doing ... what did they hurt? No difference today ...

> Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested
for
> having any competence with the mode?

There is NO test of operating proficiency for SSB or
any other mode ... only a requirement, in the written
tests for some technical understanding of the principles
of the various other modes ... why should Morse be
any different? Answer: "It shouldn't."

> >> your "brilliant concept" went over like the proverbial lead
> balloon.
> >
> > The major objections were that it wasn't a purely manual skill.
> > Also, it was objected that something that worked well with
> > no QRM/QRN/QSB would "take the fun out of it."
> >
> There's a whole litany of valid objections cw users have with any
```

such
> scheme, those are only two and I at least partially agree with both.
I
> prefer cw mostly because of it's utter simplicity and superior
> effectiveness given the usual ERPs vs. propagation/noise level
> conditions

More "Morse gets through where nothing else will." myth ...

> and investments and for no other real reasons. I don't
> "love" cw any more than I "love" any particular screwdriver in my
> toolbox. CW is just the tool of choice I usually use to get the
dxing
> and contesting job done for demonstrably logical reasons based in
> timeless physics. One difference between thee and me Sweetums is
that
> I have one helluva power tool in my toolbox YOU don't know how to
use.

I certainly DO know how to use Morse ... I'm not very fast because
I choose not to use it because it's not my thing, but I do know how.

> Which is YOUR loss. Don't believe for one second that the PCTA bunch
> is gonna sit still while you work at pulling the cw mode any further
> down toward your level.

Huff and puff ... the "PCTA bunch" have already lost the war.
Morse testing will go the way of the dinosaur at WRC-03.

> Sure, ya can get deeper into the noise keyboarding with the likes of
> PSK31 and Pactor but there goes the simplicity and cost advantages
of
> cw.

Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
(easily built) and some free software you can download.

Where's the (alleged) "cost penalty" in that???

>> Might as well dial up my ISP and jump into a chat room.

Can't you see the advantage in being able to do it with
RADIO and enjoy the freedom of being untethered from
the telephone network (and the survivability of not being
dependent on that infrastructure when disasters strike ...

> > (To which
> > I responded that it would be easy to program all kinds of
> > hellish channel impairments ...
> >
> >
> "Channel." Boink: There it is again. You'll never get it. 'Nother
Tech

> cum HF The Easy Way.

"channel impairments" is a technical term relating to things
like multipath, selective fading, etc. which degrade the
propagation "channel" ... if you had a clue (or knew where to
borrow one) you'd know that it has nothing to do with "channels"
as in, for example 2m FM, where "fixed channelization" is the
normal practice ...

[snipped some irrelevant ranting about Sony PlayStations]

> See Squiggy that's not RADIO any more than your digital "simulated
> contesting enviornment" is radio the way hams do real radio
including
> the contests. All you're proposing is a particularly lame shadow of
> Internet Playstation interconnectivity using the HF radio spectrum
> instead of the fiber optic network. Lead balloon.

No ... you still don't "get it" ... and probably won't, but Gary
and I were tring to stimulate some thought on how things
could be done better and more spectrally-efficiently, so that
out bands would be better utilized, have less interference,
and be even more capable of supporting the increased
numbers of hams that will likely be needed to hold on to the
large amounts of spectrum we currently have allocated to us.

[deleted the rest of the "don't get it" rants ... it's clear that
Mr. Kelly will forever be unwilling to accept or recognize
any advantages in anything more modern than manual
Morse ... I wish him all the enjoyment of his beeping]

Carl - wa6vse

modern than
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8NVZe+N6+q84HiEQKPsgCgylcYmCZryM8lCJquMoMjpF4UBZsAn0Rz
YlEfXBlRbfytDAoWqe6nmC7N
=fOuB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1188. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 16:11:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f1006_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30698

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3E5EE6.91326583@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50
years, an extra
> > lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.
>
> Oh, I know why it has always been known as CW, Dick, because it
> doesn't decay like the original spark gap. But CW was misnamed.
>
> From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
> modulated or switched."
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
propagated forever through all generations of hams in the
name of "tradition."

73,
Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8Ovpe+N6+q84HiEQJOUACgji3YqXPg8u47e3ZUcRKNGbx8oAwAnRH7
f4sPp3YffdLiRg/f5wlvUPRJ
=A3Pu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1189. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 16:38:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f163d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30700

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16a848d9150f0ebf989690@news.earthlink.net...
>
> Free does not necessarily equate to good or for that matter
> even decent.

Agreed ... but I've received some really nice looking eQSLs.

> And it's not free when you factor in the costs associated..internet
> connections, printer, printer ink cartridges, paper, etc. I
remember on
> one of the qsl reflectors some did a study and it comes out almost a

> wash ALMOST

Most already have the internet connection, printer, etc. So,
the only cost involved is the cost of the consumables (paper
and printer cartridges ... I think that pales by comparison to
the cost of printed cards, plus postage, envelope, SAE,
green stamp, etc.

> Besides those who like to participate in collecting wallpaper
(another
> one of your bug-a-boos) can't use eqsls for anything. I realize
that
> you personally don't care, but there are many more that do.

As I said, I've already received some very nice looking
eQSLs ... printed on a reasonable quality printer, they
would look just as good on the wall or in a scrapbook
as any "conventional" QSL card ...

> > Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
> > main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.
> >
>
> For now, but wait till eqsls are accepted, then the fun begins as
well
> as the subscriber fees
>
> >
> > I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
> > I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody
> > is forcing me to pay them a dime.
```

>
> Any no one is forcing you to, yet :-)

Let's not speculate on future events ... right now it's
free ... and the ARRL info is that they will be charging
something to use LOTW ...

> > So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
> > essentially duplicate a system that already exists
> > and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
> > charge for it and to maintain control???)
>
> For one reason is that the Eqsl people will not share their codes
(if
> that be the proper term) so that the logging software people can
> incorporate a download feature.

That doesn't seem to align with the facts as I know them.
eQSL uses the "adif" file format for data exchange. Many
logging programs (commercial, shareware, and totally free)
already have this import/export format supported (the one
I'm using does, and there's a fairly large list of others on the
eQSL site if you look.

(BTW ... remember ... I have NO interest in eQSL of any
sort, other than being (at least at tentative) user ...)

> Instead, at least according to several
> LOG EQF and DX4WIN guru's, they are being asked for donations of
several
> 1000's of dollars for the privilege of being allowed to download
direct
> off the site as well and a "donation" per downloaded card.
Certainly
> doesn't seem free to me, especially if I have to pay several times
for a
> poor quality looking piece of ink jet piece of paper.

I don't know what printer/paper you're using, but I routinely print
photo-quality stuff on mine (pictures from digital camera, for one
example) ...

[snip]

> > (but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
> > good things ... so I remain a member)
>
> I'm not sure, but seems like a backhanded compliment to me. But Ed
is
> pretty funny at hamfest, especially when he sets his tie on fire
showing
> "proper" soldering techniques

Nothing backhanded about the compliment to Ed and
others at ARRL ... the compliment, for the good things
is sincere ... for the things I don't like, coal in the Christmas
stocking to those responsible ... :-)

> Besides why is the ARRL spending some much of its members $$$'s on
> running these technical labs and such. There are many people
outside
> the league that could certainly do alot of this work for far less
(no
> offense Ed, making a point) Why spend so many dollars trying to
allow
> hams to raise towers wherever they want. My community has no
problem
> with towers..waste of ARRL $$$'s if you ask me.

The examples you attempt to poke holes in are EXACTLY
the sort of thing that member funds SHOULD be spend on
because they benefit the vast majority of the amateur community.

> BTW, I have a great EQSL card, for 160meters with amnateur station
> P5/WA6VSE when he was QRV North Korea. Beautiful colors and
everything.
> No problem whatsoever in downloading it and printing it on nice card

> stock. Copies are available.

Ridiculous ... I won't comment further on your alleged forgery.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8U55e+N6+q84HiEQKg6QCfdCqqb5lEaY+fRLUUnAcwtD6+cEUAnjpi
kKOJantr6JM/JW7yrIoEZdwF
=fCOb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1190. FA: Uniden President Lincoln HR2510

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 16:43:58 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a1n59301qla@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30756

http://s1.amazon.com/exec/varzea/ts/exchange-glance/Y02X4072837X5222360/102-0338300-0710545

1191. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 16:47:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f185d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30751

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.10.23.05.58.372624.22659@arrl.org...
> On Thu, 10 Jan 2002 18:57:42 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020110063840.14260.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >> ARRL intends to charge a small fee for the *use* (not the
uploading)
> > of an LOTW
> >> confirmation.
> >
> > But the eQSL folks are offering it for FREE (that should REALLY
appeal
> > to most hams.)
>
> What Ed means is that the charge will be for the award that results
from
> the QSL records, not for the keeping of QSL data on the system. So,
no,
> eQSL.cc is not providing the same thing at all because they aren't
> providing the awards.

But the intent is to NOT accept eQSLs from those who choose
to use that service ... with what appears to me to be a trumped
up "concern for security" excuse to maintain control over the
electronic QSL distribution process at the ARRL by using,
what could be viewed as "monopoly power" over the awards
process ...

> > It's perfectly free to go and pick up an eQSL that someone has
left
> > there for you ... and there's no charge to register so you can
place
> > them there either ...
>
> And nothing ARRL is doing will prevent you from continuing to do
that.

No .. the ARRL just refuses to acknowledge eQSLs as "valid" QSLs.

> > So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to essentially duplicate
a
> > system that already exists
>

> What ARRL is implementing is not a duplicate of eQSL.cc at all.

And just how is it so strikingly different? (Seriously, educate me
...)
>
> > and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can charge for it and
to
> > maintain control???)
>
> Yes, oddly enough, ARRL intends to maintain control of its own
awards
> program.

I'm not taking issue with ARRL maintaining control over the DXCC program, as an example ... what I'm taking issue with is the apparent intention to use that awards program as "leverage" to create some sort of "monopoly dominance" over the electronic distribution of QSLs.

> The participants in DXCC have made it perfectly clear that they
> expect ARRL to maintain the integrity of the program. And that's
what will
> be done.

And the "integrity" of the program could, IMNSHO, be maintained just fine, while still copperating with and not "shutting out" the eQSL folks.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

p.s. Please DO educate me on any missunderstandings I may have and I'll gladly reconsider my opinion to date.

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8XB5e+N6+q84HiEQL38QCglvKchZ1O70p1SoxpRo/IToFpx0gAn2Vq
Hnw0aZyJVTAuP8vGREasHmus
=EJHr
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1192. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:06:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f1cd1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30752

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020111062448.20970.00000748@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >This is gonna be another interesting RRAP traditionalists vs.
> >"new-wavers" brawl. Looks like it already is . . .
>
> It doesn't need to be. Those that want to issue eqsls can and will
do so.
> Those that want to issue paper QSLs can and will do so. Those that
choose to
> work only eqsling stations, or only paper qsling stations can do so.
Those that
> choose to use only eqsls or only paper qsls in pursuit of awards can
do so.
>
> Should there really be a brawl over complete freedom?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed ... that's the issue as I see it ... "freedom" (of choice) ...

I'm not suggesting AT ALL, that either electronic QSLs
or paper ones should be the ONLY way ... all I'm questioning
is the ARRL's apparent attempt to "muscle out" the eQSL
folks by not cooperating with them and refusing to accept
any electronic QSL form other than one run by the ARRL
as being "valid."

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8bepe+N6+q84HiEQI08gCeKHNj8S1zDCzhl5QFNmRvYuYm4YAAn0GT
Ugp2ejd9z/+4r4CPpgCh7uqY
=BdBx
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1193. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:11:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f1dff_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30755

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020111080939.22158.00000080@mb-mr.aol.com...
>
> The key to the whole electronic QSL thingie is what it's used for. A
> confirmation that is not acceptable for an award is NOT the same
thing as one
> that is accepted - if the recipient cares about awards.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That's where I have a problem ... philosophically
and as a member, since I'm not that interested
in awards ...

It's the idea that the ARRL appears to be attempting
to "freeze out" the eQSL folks (who have a working
system now) by refusing to acknowledge anything
but LOTW as being a "valid" QSL ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8cqpe+N6+q84HiEQILYwCdGvxvu+1kzRTketHPCl6IsJnE3DwAoIdb
apzBKesr98xgqFrAgjLOeyKT
=TJJY
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1194. ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:15:55 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <f5F%7.349506$W8.13212759@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30753

* * * A R S P R O P O S A L P R O P O S A L * * *

When S25.5 is deleted the FCC will most likely drop any requirement for Element 1, so here is the framework, I believe, we will have to work in for proposals in the future.

First, a list of 'virtual' facts; these will be the basic guidelines for all future proposals...

Rule 1) Existing licensed operators will not lose, and not gain, any operating privileges without earning the change.

Rule 2) When there is any ambiguity in proposing changes to the Amateur Radio Service refer to Rule 1.

Therefore, all existing operator privileges can forever remain, and will always have the option of renewal, with the privileges presently in effect. This implies that everyone and everything is grandfathered.

In order to build a consensus for a proposal the preceding should be bought by the proponents.

Going forward... proposing a new structure, with new qualifications, for obtaining new privileges is fair game. Although, leaving the existing structure untouched is imperative for realizing a successful proposal.

I think, three license classes is fine; reorganizing and even totally revamping the three examinations is well within these parameters. We have discussed this back in 1999 and is well worth revisiting here.

This is only to demonstrate where the emphasis should be.

Element 2 should have at least,(and I want all of)the FCC rules, operating procedures, Amateur Radio practices, and RF safety. The emphasis is safe proper operation.

Element 3 should have at least antennas and feed lines, signals and emissions, radio wave propagation, and circuit components. The emphasis is safe MF/HF worldwide operation.

Element 4 should have at least electrical principles, practical circuits, and VE procedures. The emphasis is highly competent to safely 'Elmer and/or pursue the full hobby.

Also, we restrict power for any new licensees with Power Endorsements. Power Endorsements given when General or Amateur Extra privileges are granted rated for medium or high power respectively. This implies Technician privileges include a Power endorsement of low power. Existing licensees

would be granted High Power endorsement.

Lastly, the VE questions could be broken out to a separate examination which would allow Element 4 to be more technically oriented.

What say you????

Rich

1195. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:16:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <k5F%7.245893$WW.13246210@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30754

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3F0821.B7625E99@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > No. More information can be extracted than just the existence of the
wave. I do
> > it quite often, and have done so for more than 30 years.
>
> Any information you extract from a continuous wave is going
> to cause it to be discontinuous.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

I thought your name was Cecil, not Walter Heisenberg.

1196. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:24:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c3f2142_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30757

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:eWG5qhlmBHA.1168@cpimsnntpa03...
> Carl asked:
>
> > Wasn't it Einstein who said "To the uninitiated, any sufficently
> > advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." ?
>
> No, it wasn't.
>
> It was Sir Arthur Clarke, author of "Childhoods End", and inventor
> of the communications satellite.

I stand corrected ... Clarke was my 2nd guess and I didn't
bother to check, figuring that someone would know for sure.

>
> But I like my version better..... "Any technology distinguishable
> from magic is insufficiently advanced."

The only part that leaves out is the part about someone
having enough knowledge to know the difference ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPD8f35e+N6+q84HiEQLWRACgr1PjS7IZdDtYzNt5VEGKiLNhscwAn3f7
t3lkNuz/wr3PHJDb7KfvX0e/
=CjJy
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1197. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:31:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110931.6e0d31e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30758

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C3E6CB0.BF1CE930@worldnet.att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:

(K2UNK wrote):
>
> > > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> > >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> > >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> > >back off.
> >
> > What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
> >
> > If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off, just
> > produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.
>
> Looks like he's trying to intimidate you into backing off from posting so many
> embarassing facts.

I dunno, Dick. Hasn't worked, has it?

> The one thing that NCI can't tolerate if bare fact.

I dunno about that, either. What I do know is that I'll keep on
posting relevant facts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1198. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:35:09 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <hnF%7.349523$W8.13213862@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30759

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote

> Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some
confusion.

Nope... if you sit around saying 'show me' all the time... that implies confusion and thereby signaling to people in more progressive States (as is Massachusetts) to lead you to a better way. ;-)

Rich

1199. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:38:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110938.273576c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30760

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> one thing happened years ago that still irritates me
> to this day. I found an open spot (several KHz worth of open) and called CQ
> with stateside phone patch traffic. Some character from Hawaii called me to
> tell me there was an important DX contest on and take my phone patch traffic
> somewhere else. I was on Guam Island, surrounded by salt water and if there
> was a station on frequency (there wasn't - this idiot only wanted DX) I'd
> have heard him. What really got me that day was that I was calling from
> KG6NAC - the US Naval Hospital on Guam. There were two nurses, a doctor,
> and a wounded vet in the shack. Yep, great impression that guy made about
> amateur radio.

Yep. But a few observations:

- If you found several kHz of open space it wasn't much of a DX
contest
- You remember that incident in part because it was unusual
- The dummy who told you to go somewhere else obviously assumed nobody
else was listening. BAD assumption.
- One incident like that can make the whole ARS look bad to nonhams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1200. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:51:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110951.631e3dd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30761

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<a1n0gh02us1@enews1.newsguy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0201101036.603e1339@posting.google.com...
>
> > >
> > > That reminds me of the "Carlos" hoax that James Randi and a friend
> pulled
> > > off several years ago.
> >
> > How did that work? The Amazing Randi is one of my heroes.
>
> As best as I can remember, Randi talked a friend into writting a book that
> was "channeled" through some spirit entity named Carlos. It was basically a
> rewrite what of Edgar Cayce had written years before, slightly changed so
> that it wasn't a complete plagerism (call it reverse engineering, if you
> want) The book was published and became a best seller. Randi then announced
> that the whole thing was a hoax. Yet, thousands of people still believed
> these "spiritual revelations" even after the hoax was made public.

I looked it up.

http://www.snopes.com

search on "randi carlos" and it should come up

Briefly, Randi trained a 19 year old man to "channel" the alleged 2000
year old spirit of "Carlos". Taught him a few tricks like how to make
it look like your pulse has stopped. "Carlos" had all sorts of public
appearances and was welcomed by the media. Finally Randi and the young
man admitted it was all a fake and a hoax.

One of the things I find interesting is that at every appearance and
interview, "Carlos" handed out information and references that, if
checked, would have quickly revealed the hoax. But the media folks
NEVER checked any of it, they just accepted what they saw as real. In
addition, as you say, amny continued to believe after the hoax had
been announced!

Of course people believe all sorts of things. Consider "creationism"
or "creation science" (that's an oxymoron if ever there was).

73 de Jim, N2EY

1201. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:56:44 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#kTNNvtmBHA.1816@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30786

I said:

>> But I like my version better..... "Any technology distinguishable
>> from magic is insufficiently advanced."

Carl responds:

> The only part that leaves out is the part about someone
> having enough knowledge to know the difference ...

Although I've made my fortune in "knowing the difference", I wanted
to bring out the notion of "awe and wonder". That's what ultimately
brings "human-ness" into the equation. You really should read
Clarke's "Childhoods End" and "The 9-Billion Names of God".
Maybe it will soften the technocrat side of you.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

1202. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:57:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3F1AE8.6B8B9CE7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30762

Pork wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:
> >
> > Y'all do know that Part 15 devices can - and do - operate in the
> > various amateur bands on a non-interference basis. That's been a
> > done deal for many years.
>
> If "Y'all" is an attempt to sound southern, forget it. It is not
> becoming at all in your particular case.

"Y'all" is one of the (few) Southern contractions that is useful
anywhere.

1203. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 17:57:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201110957.5561739f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30763

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020111085758.13131.00000686@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >> >Is it legal to ID with American Morse?
>
> >> I asked the folks in ARRL's Regulatory Information Branch. They tell me
> >>that it is legal to ID with American Morse.
>
> >Even with a call like W8FXJ? Send it in American Morse and it's the
> >same pattern as W6RLC in International Morse. Lots of other possible
> >combinations.
>
> I would assume that if one is transmitting in International Morse, then IDs in
> American Morse, there would be a lot of confusion.

Sure.

The point is that if all one hears/decodes is the ID, and it's in
American Morse, it may not be clear that it really IS American Morse.

If it's legal, repeater IDs could be in American Morse.

> Perhaps the converse it
> true.

If everybody IDs in Continental there's no problem.

> I only repeated what the guys in reginfo@arrl.org told me. Let's see
> how they deal with the nuance of your follow-up question. :-)

Maybe you guys need a resident amateur radio historian at Hq. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1204. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:08:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201111008.174944a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30764

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3F0821.B7625E99@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > No. More information can be extracted than just the existence of the wave. I do
> > it quite often, and have done so for more than 30 years.
>
> Any information you extract from a continuous wave is going
> to cause it to be discontinuous.

Not at all.

Consider WWV. Most of its transmission is simply an unmodulated carrier. Yet from that carrier I have frequently obtained standard frequency information by
zero beating an oscillator at my station with the carrier from WWV. That's how I adjusted my 100 kHz standard, BC-221/LM freq meters, and do drift runs on VFOs under development.

The information transmitted from Fort Collins/Boulder to my station is the exact frequency, to a higher degree of accuracy than is available here.

There are other uses:

- By counting an unmodulated carrier of known frequency, standard time intervals can be determined.

- Several widely separated transmitters and/or receivers can be synchronized in time and frequency by means of an unmodulated carrier on a different frequency than that of the synchronized equipment.

Now before you start quoting dictionary verbiage, Cecil, recall that several posts back I defined what "information" means in this context. I have demonstrated that information can be transmitted by an unmodulated carrier.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1205. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:13:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3F1ECA.D85629C6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30765

mike coslo wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > mike coslo wrote:
> > > What is 000 in binary? or 000000? or do you mean that three 0's (or
> > > however many) are sent? Right there is a problem as as I figure it,
> > > nothing is sent during a pause, and I interpret the length of the pause
> > > and take it from there.
> > >
> > > Can you send your message in 1's and 0's so that I can digitally
> > > process it in my mind?
> >
> > The easiest way to visualize it is to look at the EPROM code in
> > repeater identifier electronics - all ones and zeros.
>
> Sure, in that case, but I'm not going to visualize it in that manner to
> interpret Morse. Do You? Music and photograph can be represented the
> same way.
>
> I cam in late on this thread, and would like a clarification. Are you
> talking about Morse code being digital by virtue of how it would be
> processed by a digital machine?
>
> Or are you saying that it is digital because it just is?

Cecikl liks to twist things to fit his Agenda du Jour. He knows there are metods of operating a repeater IDer which have nothing to do with binary encoding of EPROMs. I built one over 25 years ago which used diode programmng that was strobed with a decoder which turned an oscillator on when it "saw" a diode and back off when there was none. By no stretch of his very active imagination could this device be considered "binary code programming" but I have no doubt he'll try. Of course the output was binary - bi-state, but not binary coded. He deliberately fails to note the difference. And of course the "third state" involved in radiotelegraphy is the intelligence transferred.

Side note: There are many electrical engineers, IEEE members, who strongly disagree with many difinitions found in the IEEE dictionary. Cecil bought his copy strictly to use to bolster his trolls here on rrap.

1206. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:23:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3F210D.5D9CE7F4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30766

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >A continuous wave has unchanging amplitude and phase, i.e. no modulation.
> > >The only bit of information available from such a wave is that it exists.
>
> > What good is a definition if it defines something that cannot exist?
>
> There's nothing wrong with the definition. The point is that the wrong
> words were picked for CW. Morse code modulation is not continuous.

Balderdash, you dippy IEEE troll. The term Continuous Wave was chosen because when keyed an oscillator circuit supplies RF waves of continuous amplitude, unlike the fast diminishing "damped" waves of the previous spark transmitters. You know that fully as well as I, you just use dictionary definitions to try to confuse the poorly informed. Shame on you, you digigeek troll extriordinaire.

1207. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:26:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gps4j3n.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30767

On 11 Jan 2002 07:59:14 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>When I was a teenager, the price of a life membership was way more
>than I could afford. I also subscribed to Ed's philosophy way back
>then.
>
>So far I've spent more than a life membership would have cost!

A life membership (used to) cost 20 years' current membership.
Invested properly, the interest pays the "annual dues".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1208. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:26:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gps52qo.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30768

On Fri, 11 Jan 2002 14:52:18 GMT, KC8PMX wrote:

>> How much more taxes are you willing to pay to hire and train
>> sufficient FCC enforcement agents to get the job done right?
>
>What about all the fines paid by other people/entities as it stands right
>now? And of course the fines that would be created by the time they catch
>these fools?

The worst practice in the enforcement business is to use penalty
money ("fines") to fund the activity. That leads to sloppiness and
corruption - look at "the war on drugs" for an example. Much as I
hate to see the money go there, the "general fund" is still the
most honest place to put it.

For real numbers, each enforcement agent runs about $100,000
annually (salary, support staff, equipment). That's not spare
change.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1209. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:29:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3F22A1.FAEF8467@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30769

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C3E5EE6.91326583@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50
> years, an extra
> > > lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.
> >
> > Oh, I know why it has always been known as CW, Dick, because it
> > doesn't decay like the original spark gap. But CW was misnamed.
> >
> > From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
> > modulated or switched."
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
> hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
> their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
> propagated forever

And you're the poster boy for just that.

1210. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:37:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3F245B.25F65748@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30770

Richard Plourde wrote:

> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote
>
> > Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some
> confusion.
>
> Nope... if you sit around saying 'show me' all the time... that implies
> confusion

So you just suck up everything the trolls on rrap feed you, eh? That explains quite a lot of your many misapprehensions.

1211. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 18:55:05 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <dyG%7.349572$W8.13220261@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30771

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Cecikl liks to twist things to fit his Agenda du Jour. He knows there
are metods
> of operating a repeater IDer which have nothing to do with binary encoding
of
> EPROMs. I built one over 25 years ago which used diode programmng that was
strobed
> with a decoder which turned an oscillator on when it "saw" a diode and
back off
> when there was none. By no stretch of his very active imagination could
this device
> be considered "binary code programming" but I have no doubt he'll try. Of
course
> the output was binary - bi-state, but not binary coded. He deliberately
fails to
> note the difference. And of course the "third state" involved in
radiotelegraphy is
> the intelligence transferred.

Wrong, Dick...

You've programmed the circuit with diodes and that, Carroll, is binary. How can "binary - bi-state" not be binary coding.

What you call you decoder was, in fact, the encoder. The strobe was defining the state (on or off) for the predefined time period. The information going, from your encoder, to your oscillator was binary encoded serial data. Some binary representations follow for your edification...

1/0
on/off
true/false
high/low
diode/empty

Calling radiotelegraphy the third state doesn't make any sense at all... could you explain that one to me, please?

Rich

1212. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:04:40 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16a947822c16e372989693@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30772

In article <3c3f163d_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16a848d9150f0ebf989690@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Free does not necessarily equate to good or for that matter
> > even decent.
>
> Agreed ... but I've received some really nice looking eQSLs.
>
> > And it's not free when you factor in the costs associated..internet
> > connections, printer, printer ink cartridges, paper, etc. I
> remember on
> > one of the qsl reflectors some did a study and it comes out almost a
>
> > wash ALMOST
>
> Most already have the internet connection, printer, etc. So,
> the only cost involved is the cost of the consumables (paper
> and printer cartridges ... I think that pales by comparison to
> the cost of printed cards, plus postage, envelope, SAE,
> green stamp, etc.

I don;t think most have Internet connections or for that matter
computers. Printed cards are less per 1000 than 1 months internet
service, and most hams utilize the buro so the cost for shipping is
pennies per card, certainly less than the cost of ink and quality glossy
paper. Like I said, it's close

>
> > Besides those who like to participate in collecting wallpaper
> (another
> > one of your bug-a-boos) can't use eqsls for anything. I realize
> that
> > you personally don't care, but there are many more that do.
>
> As I said, I've already received some very nice looking
> eQSLs ... printed on a reasonable quality printer, they
> would look just as good on the wall or in a scrapbook
> as any "conventional" QSL card ...

BUT for the people who collect wallpaper, they're worthless except as pretty pieces of paper. The people who collect wallpaper aren't concerned that they are pretty as long as they are accepted by the award entity that they submitting to and so far, unless I am wrong, there isn't one major award that accepts the DXCC, WAS, VUCC, WAZ, WAC, IOTA, etc etc all do not accept so having a reasonable quality printer is moot.

> > > > Yes, they do accept donations, but it would appear that their
> > > > main source of revenue right now is from sponsors.
> > > >
> > >
> > > For now, but wait till eqsls are accepted, then the fun begins as
> > well
> > > as the subscriber fees
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I fully intend to send a donation to eQSL ... because
> > > > I will use their service. But if I didn't want to, nobody
> > > > is forcing me to pay them a dime.
> > >
> > > Any no one is forcing you to, yet :-)
> >
> > Let's not speculate on future events ... right now it's
> > free ... and the ARRL info is that they will be charging
> > *something* to use LOTW ...

The same that they charge for submitting for DXCC programs. Nothing different, it allows the program to exist without pulling $$$'s away from the rest of the programs. Something you seem to care about. If the program is virtually self suffcient and you are not part of that program, why all the hub bub BUB?? I don;t recall..did you gripe like this when the DXCC program upgraded their computer system several years ago? They started charging increased fees for submissions to help cover the costs. There's no difference now, so why all the hand wringing?

> > > > So why *IS* the ARRL spending member $$$ to
> > > > essentially duplicate a system that already exists
> > > > and is essentially free (other than so ARRL can
> > > > charge for it and to maintain control???)
> > >
> > > For one reason is that the Eqsl people will not share their codes
> > (if
> > > that be the proper term) so that the logging software people can
> > > incorporate a download feature.
> >
> > That doesn't seem to align with the facts as I know them.

Then I am afraid you are not getting all the facts.

> eQSL uses the "adif" file format for data exchange. Many
> logging programs (commercial, shareware, and totally free)
> already have this import/export format supported (the one
> I'm using does, and there's a fairly large list of others on the
> eQSL site if you look.
>
> (BTW ... remember ... I have NO interest in eQSL of any
> sort, other than being (at least at tentative) user ...)
>
> > Instead, at least according to several
> > LOG EQF and DX4WIN guru's, they are being asked for donations of
> several
> > 1000's of dollars for the privilege of being allowed to download
> direct
> > off the site as well and a "donation" per downloaded card.
> Certainly
> > doesn't seem free to me, especially if I have to pay several times
> for a
> > poor quality looking piece of ink jet piece of paper.
>
> I don't know what printer/paper you're using, but I routinely print
> photo-quality stuff on mine (pictures from digital camera, for one
> example) ...

I have a common inexpensive Epson. So what you're saying here is that I need to spend more money upgrading my printer to download qsl cards that look pretty but have no intrinsic value to my wanting t use them for various awards programs? hmmmmm interesting concept

>
> [snip]
>
> > > (but Ed and some of the other ARRL folks do
> > > good things ... so I remain a member)
> >
> > I'm not sure, but seems like a backhanded compliment to me. But Ed
> is
> > pretty funny at hamfest, especially when he sets his tie on fire
> showing
> > "proper" soldering techniques
>
> Nothing backhanded about the compliment to Ed and
> others at ARRL ... the compliment, for the good things
> is sincere ... for the things I don't like, coal in the Christmas
> stocking to those responsible ... :-)

I feel the same why about a couple of posters here and the organization that they represent

>
> > Besides why is the ARRL spending some much of its members $$$'s on
> > running these technical labs and such. There are many people

> outside
> > the league that could certainly do alot of this work for far less
> (no
> > offense Ed, making a point) Why spend so many dollars trying to
> allow
> > hams to raise towers wherever they want. My community has no
> problem
> > with towers..waste of ARRL $$$'s if you ask me.
>
> The examples you attempt to poke holes in are EXACTLY
> the sort of thing that member funds SHOULD be spend on
> because they benefit the vast majority of the amateur community.

I was making a point. I benefit from none of these so why waste members money on them. You seem to say the same thing about the DXCC program LOTW and yet when I say the same thing I am wrong?? Not quite sure about the logic in that

>
> > BTW, I have a great EQSL card, for 160meters with amnateur station
> > P5/WA6VSE when he was QRV North Korea. Beautiful colors and
> everything.
> > No problem whatsoever in downloading it and printing it on nice card
>
> > stock. Copies are available.
>
> Ridiculous ... I won't comment further on your alleged forgery.

Of course it is, and it's not alleged it's very much real. You are sitting there operating the SSB station and in the background is Romeo, operating the CW station. A very nice qsl card if I do say so myself. A complete and utter forgery, but if I submit to Eqsl, I can input a bunch of amateurs callsigns and they can all have a P5 contact confirmed.

1213. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:08:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F383D.5DD9A1A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30773

Dave Heil wrote:
> Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> yourself with 'em.

Dave, please aquatint yourself, i.e. paint yourself blue-green.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1214. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:12:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F3932.B0523857@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30774

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >This is gonna be another interesting RRAP traditionalists vs.
> >"new-wavers" brawl. Looks like it already is . . .
>
> It doesn't need to be. Those that want to issue eqsls can and will do so.
> Those that want to issue paper QSLs can and will do so. Those that choose to
> work only eqsling stations, or only paper qsling stations can do so. Those that
> choose to use only eqsls or only paper qsls in pursuit of awards can do so.
>
> Should there really be a brawl over complete freedom?

Some hams have gone on record as being against freedom of
choice of modes. Don't you know, "If it wasn't done that
way 50 years ago, it's no damn good."? What good are
traditions if they can't be fought over? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1215. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:19:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <5VG%7.50$T87.158098@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 30775

On Fri, 11 Jan 2002 11:47:14 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2002.01.10.23.05.58.372624.22659@arrl.org...
>> What Ed means is that the charge will be for the award that results
>> from the QSL records, not for the keeping of QSL data on the system.
>> So, no, eQSL.cc is not providing the same thing at all because they
>> aren't providing the awards.
>
> But the intent is to NOT accept eQSLs from those who choose to use that
> service ... with what appears to me to be a trumped up "concern for
> security" excuse to maintain control over the electronic QSL
> distribution process at the ARRL by using, what could be viewed as
> "monopoly power" over the awards process ...

Why do you simply dismiss the stated purposes of Logbook of the World
(e.g., the concern for security and integrity) and make up a motive
("maintain control over the electronic QSL distribution process") that
doesn't exist?

You may not agree that the process needs a better level of security.
Others do, including many if not most active participants in DXCC.

>> And nothing ARRL is doing will prevent you from continuing to do that.
>
> No .. the ARRL just refuses to acknowledge eQSLs as "valid" QSLs.

So? You can get a lovely QSL image from eQSL.cc and an award credit from
LOTW. What's the problem?

>> What ARRL is implementing is not a duplicate of eQSL.cc at all.
>
> And just how is it so strikingly different? (Seriously, educate me
...)

Wait a minute... you mean you're making all this hooraw without first even
bothering to find out how the systems are different? That makes it kind of
hard to take you seriously, Carl! Anyway, one significant difference is
the use of cryptographic techniques to validate the source of QSL
information. (I would think that someone who PGP-signs his Usenet postings
would understand the value of digital signatures.) Another difference is
that the system will eventually be tied directly into the back-end awards
system.

> I'm not taking issue with ARRL maintaining control over the DXCC
> program, as an example ... what I'm taking issue with is the apparent
> intention to use that awards program as "leverage" to create some sort

> of "monopoly dominance" over the electronic distribution of QSLs.

The ability to validate the source of QSL information is fundamental to control of DXCC. It has nothing to do with "leverage." So, yes, you ARE taking issue with ARRL maintaining control over DXCC, even if you don't realize you are.

And as for "monopoly dominance," that's absurd. LOTW is not eQSL.cc. Those who want traditional QSLs electronically will no doubt use eQSL.cc to get them. (I suspect, though, that Hans' point of view is fairly widespread. As keepsakes, eQSLs are probably unappealing to a lot of people.) The only thing ARRL has "monopoly dominance" over is its own awards program. Just like CQ has "monopoly dominance" over its awards program. Just like RSGB has "monopoly dominance" over its awards program. (BTW, neither of them accept eQSLs either, AFAIK.)

>> The participants in DXCC have made it perfectly clear that they expect
>> ARRL to maintain the integrity of the program. And that's what will be
>> done.
>
> And the "integrity" of the program could, IMNSHO, be maintained just
> fine, while still copperating with and not "shutting out" the eQSL
> folks.

Carl, you seem to have little understanding of the history or the present state of electronic confirmations and awards progams. In short, your NSHO is based on sheer ignorance of the subject. Sorry to be so blunt.

Jon

1216. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:20:21 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <VVG%7.349602$W8.13221867@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30776

> > CAM wrote:
>
> > > no CW transmitter I know of tristates the output.
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > Of course it's the
> > operator who (or which, in the case of a mechanical device)
> > which adds the third state.
>
> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net> wrote:
> Dick...
>
> There is NO THIRD STATE!!! The operator adds the change of states (on to
> off... or off to on...) at certain times. A state is a condition at some
> POINT in time.
>
> OOK IS BINARY!!!!
>
> Rich

This discussion makes me appreciate the wide applicability of my
favorite third logic state.....

DON'T CARE X

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1217. KV4FZ tries, then fails to get back on the air

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:23:54 UTC
From: King Cookies <ldonnegles3@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eZG%7.22727$zw3.2249792@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30777
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Schoenbohm Effort to Obtain New Amateur License Prompts FCC Hearing Order

NEWINGTON, CT, Jan 11, 2002

Former Amateur Radio licensee Herb Schoenbohm, ex-KV4FZ, apparently is eager to return to his
favorite pastime. The FCC this week suggested that Schoenbohm, who lives in Kingshill, Virgin
Islands, won't get his wish easily. Last April, only a few months after losing his battle to renew
his ham ticket and his operating authority had expired, Schoenbohm applied for a new Amateur Radio
license and passed the General exam. The FCC now has designated that pending application for
hearing, to determine, in part, if Schoenbohm is rehabilitated and deserves to be a Commission
licensee.

The FCC didn't mince words in its Hearing Designation Order, released January 6 in WT Docket No
01-352. Schoenbohm's "previous criminal behavior, misrepresentation and lack of candor warranted
denial of his renewal application," the Order said. "Mr. Schoenbohm is a convicted felon and was
found to have misrepresented facts and lacked candor in his testimony in that hearing."

The FCC said, however, that what's past is past, and it does not intend to rehash Schoenbohm's
earlier case in the current proceeding. Now, the Commission says, it must determine whether
Schoenbohm "has been sufficiently rehabilitated" since his earlier "disqualifying behavior." The
Commission said it needs to know if Schoenbohm "could be relied upon to observe our rules and
policies and deal with the Commission in an honest and forthright manner."

The FCC said that since it has "no facts now before us that would support a finding of
rehabilitation," it cannot make a ready determination that granting Schoenbohm's application
"would serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity." So, it's designating his
application for hearing.

"Absent a demonstration by Mr. Schoenbohm that he now possesses the requisite character
qualifications to be a Commission licensee, his pending applications may not be granted," the FCC
added. Schoenbohm vowed last year to return to Amateur Radio.

Meanwhile, the FCC is continuing to investigate whether a South Carolina amateur broke any rules
when he let Schoenbohm operate during a recent contest. Stephen S. Reichlyn, AA4V, rented and
operated from Schoenbohm's station during the CQ World Wide SSB Contest last October.

After the FCC was alerted to the operation, Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth wrote Reichlyn
requesting clarification of Schoenbohm's role. FCC rules consider an unlicensed individual who
communicates via Amateur Radio to be a third party and require that a licensed control operator be
present at the control point, "continuously monitoring and supervising the third party's
participation." Such a third party also may not exchange messages with stations in countries with
which the US does not have a third-party traffic agreement. That list includes the UK and most of
Europe.

The FCC also may consider how its refusal to renew Schoenbohm's license affects his legal status
as a third party. An individual whose license was revoked or suspended or surrendered for
cancellation following revocation, suspension or fine--or who is under a cease-and-desist order
relating to amateur operation--may not serve as a third party at an Amateur Radio station.

Reichlyn confirmed that he had asked Schoenbohm to fill in briefly as an operator on two
occasions. He said he fully supervised Schoenbohm's operation, but conceded in his response to the
FCC that he may have exercised poor judgment in asking Schoenbohm to operate.

The FCC said this week Schoenbohm would bear the burden of proof in the new license application
proceeding before an administrative law judge to determine whether he now possesses the requisite
character qualifications to be a Commission licensee and whether his pending application should be
granted.

------------------ CUT -------------

(Let me give you an "inside peek". The FCC knows that if
KV4FZ were *ever* to get back on the air, it would ignite an
RF firestorm on 20 meters that would make the "old days"
of the infamous 14.313 War look like a church cake and
tea party. Better hope that Herb never get's his US Callsign
back - that will make the top half of 20 meters look ten times
worse than the most vile CB channel you can imagine in
very short order. Rest asssured, they do know this too.....)

1218. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:25:55 UTC
From: Richard Dalton <rsdalton1@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7%G%7.22731$zw3.2250108@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30778
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Don't be so bitter about not passing the electronics test
the world needs cbers too!
"Eustis Cornhauser" <eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:e9af79fa.0201091023.5c25bd02@posting.google.com...
> That's an insult, how dare they not post such articles. I remember in
> the late 70's and the early 80's 73 magazine carried mods for just
> about every single chicken band radio of any significance.
>
> The average ham sits around with his mike in one hand, his cock in the
> other, and kerchunks the local repeater all day while jacking off.
>
> Sorry, that's just the way it is. The tests are so easy, they're
> meaningless, the hobby is going down the tubes, fast.
>
> The freebanders will become the real hams within a few years.
>
> The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys
> his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A
> cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The
> cell phone user actually gets quality communications.
>
> These new no coders are nothing but cellular phone user wanna bees.
> They can't afford the monthly rate of a cell phone, and their trailer
> park doesn't allow external antennas so they use their little two
> meter hand held jackoff box.
>
>
>
>
>
> moparho1ic@hotmail.com (Moparholic) wrote in message
news:<b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>...
> > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't
> > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > write to about this at the ARRL?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic~
>

1219. Re: Hey Carl . . ./Hey But, here's one for ya!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:31:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F3D90.171607D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30779

Carl Zager wrote:
> QSL, on the other hand, with a ? -- QSL? -- means "Can you acknowledge
> receipt?" The ARRL Scout Handbook indicates that a QSL (card, without
> the ?) is to be exchanged to acknowledge a contact.

"QSL?" doesn't necessarily have anything to do with a QSL card. It
can mean, "Can you acknowledge receipt? (of the information that I
just sent to you)" What does QSO mean in:?
- -. -..- ..-. . .-. ..-. -... --.- ... ---
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1220. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:35:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F3E9B.70F1C9E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30781

Brian Kelly wrote:
> How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
> order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
> test?

The only CW-only frequencies are available to nocode techs. The
FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence there. In
fact, the FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence
in ANY mode except CW below 30 MHz.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1221. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:37:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <H9H%7.80004$fe1.1018398@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard, lemme give you a clue. You will note that Google is the source for both of these posts and google is a well-known public urinal.

You will note that it is cross-posted to two groups that have little in common.

So it is a pretty fair bet they are the same guy. They are also ancient history.

Everyone is a rookie once. You have had your once. Then you can fall into the barrel as I have been known to and it will be twice.

OK?

Dick N&#65533;BK

"Richard Dalton" <rsdalton1@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:7%G%7.22731$zw3.2250108@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Don't be so bitter about not passing the electronics test
> the world needs cbers too!
> "Eustis Cornhauser" <eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:e9af79fa.0201091023.5c25bd02@posting.google.com...
> > That's an insult, how dare they not post such articles. I remember in
> > the late 70's and the early 80's 73 magazine carried mods for just
> > about every single chicken band radio of any significance.
> >
> > The average ham sits around with his mike in one hand, his cock in the
> > other, and kerchunks the local repeater all day while jacking off.
> >
> > Sorry, that's just the way it is. The tests are so easy, they're
> > meaningless, the hobby is going down the tubes, fast.
> >
> > The freebanders will become the real hams within a few years.
> >
> > The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys
> > his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A
> > cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The
> > cell phone user actually gets quality communications.
> >
> > These new no coders are nothing but cellular phone user wanna bees.
> > They can't afford the monthly rate of a cell phone, and their trailer
> > park doesn't allow external antennas so they use their little two
> > meter hand held jackoff box.
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> > moparho1ic@hotmail.com (Moparholic) wrote in message
> news:<b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>...
> > > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage.
Don't
> > > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > > write to about this at the ARRL?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic~
> >
>
>

1222. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:54:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F42F4.28C2034F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30782

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The point is that the wrong
> > words were picked for CW. Morse code modulation is not continuous.
>
> Balderdash, you dippy IEEE troll. The term Continuous Wave was chosen because
> when keyed an oscillator circuit supplies RF waves of continuous amplitude,
> unlike the fast diminishing "damped" waves of the previous spark transmitters.

Yep, just as I said in an earlier posting.

> You know that fully as well as I, you just use dictionary definitions to try to
> confuse the poorly informed. Shame on you, you digigeek troll extriordinaire.

Dick, here's the IEEE definition of "continuous wave" again for your benefit.
When amateurs disagree with professionals, it's time for the amateurs to change.

"continuous wave - A carrier that is not modulated or switched"

CW uses a switched carrier. Therefore, CW is not a continuous wave.
Seems that CW must stand for Commutated Wave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1223. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 19:56:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F4363.50BD972@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30783

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Any information you extract from a continuous wave is going
> > to cause it to be discontinuous.
>
> I thought your name was Cecil, not Walter Heisenberg.

Is the demodulated wave in that black box dead or alive?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1224. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:04:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F4556.9B238ABD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30784

N2EY wrote:
> Consider WWV. Most of its transmission is simply an unmodulated
> carrier. Yet from that carrier I have frequently obtained standard
> frequency information by
> zero beating an oscillator at my station with the carrier from WWV.
> That's how I adjusted my 100 kHz standard, BC-221/LM freq meters, and
> do drift runs on VFOs under development.

I don't doubt that you have done that, Jim, but in the process you disturbed
the energy in that wave and caused it to be discontinuous. And you necessarily
must be uncertain of the content of the part of the wave that you didn't disturb.

> Now before you start quoting dictionary verbiage, Cecil, recall that
> several posts back I defined what "information" means in this context.
> I have demonstrated that information can be transmitted by an
> unmodulated carrier.

But you have NOT demonstrated that information can be collected from
an undisturbed unmodulated carrier. How can you prove that the discontinuity
caused by your gathering of the information has not disturbed the wave and
the information gathered?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1225. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:07:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F4618.1F8497B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30785

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
> > modulated or switched."
>
> That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
> hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
> their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
> propagated forever through all generations of hams in the
> name of "tradition."

Well, just between you and me, from now on when a ham says "CW",
we will know that he is talking about a morsely Commutated Wave. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1226. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:09:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F465E.7308038F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30787

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
> > hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
> > their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
> > propagated forever
>
> And you're the poster boy for just that.

It's all OK now, Dick. We have decided that CW stands for
"Commutated Wave".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1227. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:19:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F48E5.22AB63A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30788

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil likes to twist things to fit his Agenda du Jour. He knows there are metods
> of operating a repeater IDer which have nothing to do with binary encoding of
> EPROMs. I built one over 25 years ago which used diode programmng that was strobed
> with a decoder which turned an oscillator on when it "saw" a diode and back off
> when there was none. By no stretch of his very active imagination could this device
> be considered "binary code programming" but I have no doubt he'll try.

You've got to be kidding, Dick. You have just described the original
binary memory made out of diodes. So the oscillator is turned on when
it sees a diode and turned off when it doesn't see a diode. You no
doubt have a bit clock that steps through the diodes. That is exactly
binary code programming, Dick. How many states does a diode have?

> And of course the "third state" involved in radiotelegraphy is
> the intelligence transferred.

To bad you don't have any to transfer. Please produce a reference that
indicates that the intelligence transferred in radiotelegraphy is some
"third state". You are so full of it I have type with one hand while
holding my nose with the other.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1228. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:21:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F4950.F8A58682@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30789

```
Richard Plourde wrote:
> 1/0
> on/off
> true/false
> high/low
> diode/empty

brains/empty-space (Guess who?)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1229. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 20:36:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201112023070.24637-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 30790

On Fri, 11 Jan 2002, Richard Plourde wrote:
>* * * A R S P R O P O S A L P R O P O S A L * * *
>
>When S25.5 is deleted the FCC will most likely drop any requirement for
>Element 1, so here is the framework, I believe, we will have to work in for
>proposals in the future.
>
>First, a list of 'virtual' facts; these will be the basic guidelines for all
>future proposals...
>
>Rule 1) Existing licensed operators will not lose, and not gain, any
>operating privileges without earning the change.
>
>Rule 2) When there is any ambiguity in proposing changes to the Amateur
>Radio Service refer to Rule 1.
>
>Therefore, all existing operator privileges can forever remain, and will
>always have the option of renewal, with the privileges presently in effect.
>This implies that everyone and everything is grandfathered.
>
>In order to build a consensus for a proposal the preceding should be bought
>by the proponents.
>
>Going forward... proposing a new structure, with new qualifications, for
>obtaining new privileges is fair game. Although, leaving the existing
>structure untouched is imperative for realizing a successful proposal.
>
>I think, three license classes is fine; reorganizing and even totally
>revamping the three examinations is well within these parameters. We have
>discussed this back in 1999 and is well worth revisiting here.
>
>This is only to demonstrate where the emphasis should be.
>
>Element 2 should have at least,(and I want all of)the FCC rules, operating
>procedures, Amateur Radio practices, and RF safety. The emphasis is safe
>proper operation.
>
>Element 3 should have at least antennas and feed lines, signals and
>emissions, radio wave propagation, and circuit components. The emphasis is
>safe MF/HF worldwide operation.
>
>Element 4 should have at least electrical principles, practical circuits,
>and VE procedures. The emphasis is highly competent to safely 'Elmer and/or
>pursue the full hobby.

>
>Also, we restrict power for any new licensees with Power Endorsements. Power
>Endorsements given when General or Amateur Extra privileges are granted
>rated for medium or high power respectively. This implies Technician
>privileges include a Power endorsement of low power. Existing licensees
>would be granted High Power endorsement.
>
>Lastly, the VE questions could be broken out to a separate examination which
>would allow Element 4 to be more technically oriented.
>
>What say you????

I think that there should be 3 license classes but split them up differently:

- VHF only (maps to the current technician w/o HF class).
- HF only (based on the general theory)

These two can be combined to have a HF+VHF (mapping to the current general class). These two together would have all spectral privileges.

- Extra: For those who want to do things such as satellites (remember that only Extra's can have transmitters more than 50km up) and VE testing.

So, if one were to call these: A = VHF, B= HF, & C = Extra(satellite/VE), then the possible ALLOWABLE combinations would be:

A, B, A+B, and C. C would require both A & B, but A & B would NOT require the other. A+C and B+C would not be allowed on licenses.

Novice => Nothing (if no loss, then A-limited + B-limited)
Technician (no code) => A
Technician (w/ HF) => A (if no loss of priv's: A+B-limited)
General => A+B
Advanced => A+B
Extra => C (includes A+B, effectively = A+B+C)

The "A-limited" is the current 1.25cm + 23cm novice bands.
The "B-limited" is the current novice HF bands.

This assumes that these "novice" bands aren't removed from the rules. Since this thread started out with the removal of the morse code requirement, I have assumed its removal as well.

EXCEPT for making it possible to have an "HF ONLY" license, this isn't significantly different from our current license structure.

1230. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 21:51:45 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <m9J%7.10638$GP2.743689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30792

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
>
> Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
> most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
> (easily built) and some free software you can download.
>

The problem (as I have always seen it) is that it *requires* the use of a computer and associated software to interface the technology with the radio. (and we all know what can happen to installed software when we need it most) It's bad enough that we have to have a deep cell marine battery to run the rig during emergency comms (those suckers are heavy) but now we have to lug around a laptop and a separate power supply for it as well. Don't get me wrong, I think advancing the radio technology is a wonderful thing and I'm all for it, but where does the dependency on additional outside equipment end? Next thing, I guess, is we'll all be toting mini sat-dishes. The more equipment involved, (and their inter-dependence on each other) the greater chance for one of them to fail and crash the whole system. That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW; basic equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the other? What are your thoughts, Carl?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1231. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 21:53:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111165305.16238.00000730@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 30791

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> "Y'all" is one of the (few) Southern contractions that is useful
>anywhere.

Up north, we use the Yankee equivalent -- youze guys. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1232. Re: KV4FZ tries, then fails to get back on the air

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 22:02:16 UTC
From: Herbie <Herbie@KV4FZliveson14313.net>
Message-ID: <a1nnbn$tf6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30793
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I shall return to 14313. My followers demand it, and
I shall grant their wishes, so that they can worship me.

Herb

1233. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 22:09:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111170901.16238.00000731@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 30794

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

>A life membership (used to) cost 20 years' current membership.
> Invested properly, the interest pays the "annual dues".

That is pretty much how ARRL does it, plus or minus. To do otherwise would, IMHO, be fiscally irresponsible.

I am always amazed how many old time life members apologize to ARRL for their belief that they no longer pay their way. I hope they believe me when I point out that ARRL has been using the interest to fund their membership and to grow the investment. If one looks at an ARRL Annual Report (they are on the web page), one will see an investment account. That is primarily the invested dues of life members. The League has occasionally tapped into that for operating expenses, with the belief that its long-term goals should not be significantly impacted by short term financial ups and downs, but over the long run, it has to build that back up to continue to fund the organization.

Many of those I know who became life members did so because they got tired of having to renew all the time.

Whatever makes one happy is fine by me. And that includes those that choose not to be members. I can't see how any of the things that the Leauge has done that have honked me off over the years are more important than the things I believe are being done correctly to the overall good of Amateur Radio, but I can also understand that to be my own opinion. If someone truly believes that even a single wrong is too important not to overshadow the rest, that is their opinion.

Of course, I am always amazed at the people who are not ARRL members but email our tech guys for some advice on their station. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1234. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 22:16:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111171648.16238.00000732@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 30795

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net

>CC&R's. Big deal. Only does anything for homeowners. What about the many
>thousands of people that are not in a home ownership situation.

I apologize; I used the term CC&R too loosely. The ARRL's position is that hams should be able to put up at least the amount of antenna that is permitted under the FCC's pre-emption for broadcast-reception antennas. It might help us to better discuss this if you look at the various ARRL policy positions at:

http://www.arrl.org/govrelations/

>> http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

>Not for me, but for me to hand out to others to encourage them to consider
>the hobby.

That is the intent of the above hamradio.html page, but I do know what you mean. See:

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/ead/materials/

And this is one that was actually found on the ARRL web-page index. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1235. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 22:18:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <vyJ%7.10997$GP2.756525@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30796

"Carl R. Stevenson" responded ...
>
> > I prefer cw mostly because of it's utter simplicity and superior
> > effectiveness given the usual ERPs vs. propagation/noise level
> > conditions
>
> More "Morse gets through where nothing else will." myth ...
>

I don't necessarily think Morse gets "through" better than any other mode in physical (propagational) terms. But the effectiveness of the mode over say, SSB under identical conditions is obvious. Good CW ops can distinguish a dit and a dah through some pretty rough hash. The same cannot always be said for SSB. We prove this every year at Field Day when the SSB side of the table is asking for repeats on callsigns and we're getting them the first time through. For example, let's say the Call AB5CD is received by a SSB station. Given some less than optimal conditions, that Call could be confused for AB9CD. If it was sent in CW, there would never be any doubt as to the call area (for example) because a 5 and a 9 are completely different sounds on CW. It's really not a myth, Carl. It's been proven time and time again to be a reality.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1236. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 23:09:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111180939.06877.00001206@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30797

In article <C_C%7.398$rU.95206@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>What about all the fines paid by other people/entities as it stands right
>now?

They do NOT go to the FCC - they go to the general fund.

>And of course the fines that would be created by the time they catch
>these fools?

Same deal.

Does your local police force get to keep the fines for offenses it discovers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1237. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-11 23:44:36 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020111184436.00766.00000714@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 30798

>> > I come to the table as a relatively
>> > "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
>> > be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
>> > element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
>> > equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
>> > remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
>> > EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
>> > skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?
>>
>K2UNK wrote:
>
>> If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
>> have passed the test.
>
>Or they could have been the ones that made him flunk it.
>
>> Equating the "separate" morse test to
>> one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
>> a valid comparison.
>
>But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
>most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
>General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
>are as "necessary" as the Morse test.
>
>> > Are not the
>> > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
>> > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
>> > questions?
>
>That depends on one's background.
>
>Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
>current amateur exams is not very high.
>
>Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
>to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
>a bit of radio.
>>
>> The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
>> some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
>> send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
>
>In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the

>obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

BTW, out of the hundreds of characters sent during the Morse exam, I ONLY had to get twenty-five in a row correct to pass. That made my (or anybody else's) odds for passing (...or not failing, depending on your POV.) much better than ANY written exam.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1238. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 00:01:56 UTC
From: technomage <technomage-hawke@home.com>
Message-ID: <U1L%7.122069$Wd.37246816@news1.rdc1.az.home.com>
Source record: 30799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

actually,
"we" don't have to treat you with anything more than minimum tolerance as
fellow human beings (and for some, thats even a stretch).

your continued p[rotests and proliferation of illicit and illegal
activities will be pretty much ignored, save those actions that cause
harm to other services (then the fcc or whatever other governmental
agency in whatever other country will step in and slap you a hard one).

granted, there are a few in the ham community that are bad apples (god
knows we have more than a few here in arizona), but that they should not
be used as examples of good operating ethics.

you wanna operate ham radio, get your damned ticket and quit whining!

Technomage

In article <b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>, "Moparholic"
<moparho1ic@hotmail.com> wrote:

> I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression that
> the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB freebanders.
> I don't see one article about high power linears or freeband DX or radio
> mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage. Don't you guys know you have
> to be nice to us and treat us with respect or we won't get our licenses
> and then your hobby will die? Who can I write to about this at the ARRL?
>
> ~/Moparholic~

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

1239. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 00:53:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F88F5.2A5E87DB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30800

Arnie Macy wrote:
> It's bad enough that we have to have a deep cell marine battery to run the
> rig during emergency comms (those suckers are heavy) but now we have to lug
> around a laptop and a separate power supply for it as well.

Actually, any store like Compuserve carries 12vdc power adapters
for laptops. I run my laptop off my marine battery charged by
solar panels. Anyone running their RF modem from a Palmtop?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1240. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 00:56:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3F89AD.FA3D7AE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30901

Arnie Macy wrote:
> It's really not a myth, Carl. It's been proven time and time
> again to be a reality.

Ever compared CW to PACTOR II? I regularly raise a mailbox in
Germany with 50w to a dipole when I cannot even hear the signal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1241. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 01:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111200958.22158.00000109@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 30902

In article <#kTNNvtmBHA.1816@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>I said:
>
>>> But I like my version better..... "Any technology distinguishable
>>> from magic is insufficiently advanced."
>
>Carl responds:
>
>> The only part that leaves out is the part about someone
>> having enough knowledge to know the difference ...
>
>Although I've made my fortune in "knowing the difference", I wanted
>to bring out the notion of "awe and wonder". That's what ultimately
>brings "human-ness" into the equation. You really should read
>Clarke's "Childhoods End" and "The 9-Billion Names of God".
>Maybe it will soften the technocrat side of you.
>
Megadittoes on that, Hans.

Also some Vonnegut:

Short stories:
"Welcome To The Monkey House"
"The Euphio Question"
"Harrison Bergeron"

Novels:
"Cat's Cradle"
"Slapstick"
"Slaughterhouse Five"
"The SIrens of Titan"

And of course Joseph Heller's immortal "Catch 22"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1242. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 01:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111200958.22158.00000108@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 30903

In article <3c3f1dff_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020111080939.22158.00000080@mb-mr.aol.com...
>>
>> The key to the whole electronic QSL thingie is what it's used for. A
>> confirmation that is not acceptable for an award is NOT the same
>thing as one
>> that is accepted - if the recipient cares about awards.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>That's where I have a problem ... philosophically
>and as a member, since I'm not that interested
>in awards ...

How's the country count shaping up? I'm told the last dozen or so are harder to
get than all preceding them.

If you are not interested in awards, what's the problem?
>
>It's the idea that the ARRL appears to be attempting
>to "freeze out" the eQSL folks (who have a working
>system now) by refusing to acknowledge anything
>but LOTW as being a "valid" QSL ...

You are ASSUMING that you know the ARRL BoD's motives. Have you talked with
our Director about this? Have you let the Board know how you feel about it? How
about the committee that sets the standards for awards?

Y'know, it's really getting surreal to see Carl arguing about what should and
should not be accepted as a QSL for award credit.

For as long as ham radio has existed, the paper "QSL card" confirmation has
been the gold standard of whether a valid contact was made or not. Electronic
confirmation must meet or exceed that standard. It's up to those who issue the
awards to determine what is acceptable and what is not. That's the CAC (I
think) and the ARRL BoD.

ARRL is not the only issuer of ham radio awards, btw.

From where I sit, it seems to me that the BoD and CAC must have good reasons to
institute LOTW, rather than simply accepting eQSLs for awards. Hq. has plenty
to do as it is, so they do not take on new projects lightly.

btw - what mode did you use to work that DX? Was it PSK31, Pactor, or something else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1243. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 02:32:33 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <maN%7.259$V55.62828@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30904

"CAM" wrote in ...
>
> Actually, any store like Compuserve carries 12vdc power adapters
> for laptops. I run my laptop off my marine battery charged by
> solar panels. Anyone running their RF modem from a Palmtop?
>

Cecil,

How long will it last compared to running an HF radio solo? Just curious. I can run my radio off of the deep cell for about 18 or so hours before I need to recharge it. And, how long to recharge it using solar panels as compared to say a trickle charger. Sounds like something I might want to tinker with.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1244. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 02:35:07 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <NcN%7.274$V55.64202@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30905

"CAM" wrote ...

>
> Ever compared CW to PACTOR II? I regularly raise a mailbox in
> Germany with 50w to a dipole when I cannot even hear the signal.
>

No, but I don't doubt what you say is true. This is partly what I am talking about. We should have *all* the tools in the box, then use them as necessary.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1245. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 02:53:04 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <CtN%7.394$V55.74335@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30906

"N2EY" wrote ...

> Megadittoes on that, Hans.
>
> Also some Vonnegut:
>
> Short stories:
> "Welcome To The Monkey House"
> "The Euphio Question"
> "Harrison Bergeron"
>
> Novels:
> "Cat's Cradle"
> "Slapstick"
> "Slaughterhouse Five"
> "The SIrens of Titan"
>
> And of course Joseph Heller's immortal "Catch 22"
>

Might I add:
Books for the game of life:

"Golf is Not a Game of Perfect ", Dr. Bob Rotella
"Dave Pelz's Short Game Bible", Dave Pelz

7 handicap and dropping : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1246. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 03:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111221003.16311.00000136@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 30907

In article <3c3e39d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <none@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020110080954.07935.00000094@mb-mw.aol.com...
>> In article <20020108071442.13150.00000352@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>>
>> >From: krill dxiswhereits@boom.bust
>> >
>> >>Here we go. I read a bunch of Carl's google stuff and noticed the above
>> >>pattern.
>> >
>> >How much have Carl's postings changed over the past 5 years?
>> >
>> He's toned down the animosity a bit, but he still exudes attitudes of
>disdain
>> for many radio amateurs and their activities. Phrases like "beep real
>fast" and
>> "CW Olde Fartz" are still common in Carl's posts.
>>
>> And a few nice posts do not immediately erase the memory of years of nasty
>> ones.
>>
>> The thing to watch in anyone's postings is not how they behave when
>someone
>> agrees with them, but how they behave when someone disagrees.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Kind of like when you disagree, too, Jim.

In what way? Show some examples from my posts. They're all in google.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1247. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 03:10:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020111221005.16311.00000137@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 30908

In article <f5F%7.349506$W8.13212759@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>* * * A R S P R O P O S A L P R O P O S A L * * *
>
>When S25.5 is deleted the FCC will most likely drop any requirement for
>Element 1, so here is the framework, I believe, we will have to work in for
>proposals in the future.

Sure looks that way.
>
>First, a list of 'virtual' facts; these will be the basic guidelines for all
>future proposals...
>
>Rule 1) Existing licensed operators will not lose, and not gain, any
>operating privileges without earning the change.
>
>Rule 2) When there is any ambiguity in proposing changes to the Amateur
>Radio Service refer to Rule 1.

Definitely reasonable. The "will not gain" may run into some problems, though.
>
>Therefore, all existing operator privileges can forever remain, and will
>always have the option of renewal, with the privileges presently in effect.
>This implies that everyone and everything is grandfathered.
>
>In order to build a consensus for a proposal the preceding should be bought
>by the proponents.
>
>Going forward... proposing a new structure, with new qualifications, for
>obtaining new privileges is fair game. Although, leaving the existing
>structure untouched is imperative for realizing a successful proposal.
>
>I think, three license classes is fine; reorganizing and even totally
>revamping the three examinations is well within these parameters. We have
>discussed this back in 1999 and is well worth revisiting here.

But three classes made from the existing 5 or 6 means somehow some classes get
combined.
>
>This is only to demonstrate where the emphasis should be.
>
>Element 2 should have at least,(and I want all of)the FCC rules, operating
>procedures, Amateur Radio practices, and RF safety. The emphasis is safe
>proper operation.

The core basics, IOW.
>
>Element 3 should have at least antennas and feed lines, signals and
>emissions, radio wave propagation, and circuit components. The emphasis is
>safe MF/HF worldwide operation.
>
OK

>Element 4 should have at least electrical principles, practical circuits,
>and VE procedures. The emphasis is highly competent to safely 'Elmer and/or
>pursue the full hobby.

The full monty, as it were.

>Also, we restrict power for any new licensees with Power Endorsements. Power
>Endorsements given when General or Amateur Extra privileges are granted
>rated for medium or high power respectively. This implies Technician
>privileges include a Power endorsement of low power. Existing licensees
>would be granted High Power endorsement.

Or simply require that existing hams keep their old license documents as proof
that they are qualified to run full power.
>
>Lastly, the VE questions could be broken out to a separate examination which
>would allow Element 4 to be more technically oriented.
>
>What say you????
>
So far so good. I think the tests need a bit more integration. For example,
Element 2 doesn't need all the RF power safety stuff if the license only allows
low power. But the basic idea seems like a logical outgrowth of our earlier
discussions.

Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1248. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 03:56:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FA753.C3D0CB99@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30909

Richard Plourde wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > Cecikl liks to twist things to fit his Agenda du Jour. He knows there
> are metods
> > of operating a repeater IDer which have nothing to do with binary encoding
> of
> > EPROMs. I built one over 25 years ago which used diode programmng that was
> strobed
> > with a decoder which turned an oscillator on when it "saw" a diode and
> back off
> > when there was none. By no stretch of his very active imagination could
> this device
> > be considered "binary code programming" but I have no doubt he'll try. Of
> course
> > the output was binary - bi-state, but not binary coded. He deliberately
> fails to
> > note the difference. And of course the "third state" involved in
> radiotelegraphy is
> > the intelligence transferred.
>
> Wrong, Dick...
>
> You've programmed the circuit with diodes and that, Carroll, is binary. How
> can "binary - bi-state" not be binary coding.
>
> What you call you decoder was, in fact, the encoder. The strobe was defining
> the state (on or off) for the predefined time period. The information going,
> from your encoder, to your oscillator was binary encoded serial data. Some
> binary representations follow for your edification...
>
> 1/0
> on/off
> true/false
> high/low
> diode/empty
>

I don't know what you do for a living nor who you work for, but I fervently
hope they don't entrust you with anything critical. Your lack of understanding
of what you claim to have mastered is amazing. *I* was the encoder.

>
> Calling radiotelegraphy the third state doesn't make any sense at all...

> could you explain that one to me, please?
>

I said it once already - check with ED HARE, that was his phrase which I just picked up, *understood exactly what he meant* and merely used again. If it is so wrong, then you idiots can come down on him for starting it off.

Of course what it means is that CW - you know, that well entrenched old mode that Real Hams(TM) use, must have an information state as well as the mandatory binary electrical states in order to function at all.
It is really amazing that all the dippy geeks here, liteweights all,. fail to catch any hint of a clue.

>
> Rich

1249. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:03:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FA92A.F6142473@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30910

CAM wrote:

> > You know that fully as well as I, you just use dictionary definitions to try to
> > confuse the poorly informed. Shame on you, you digigeek troll extriordinaire.
>
> Dick, here's the IEEE definition of "continuous wave" again for your benefit.
> When amateurs disagree with professionals, it's time for the amateurs to change.
>
> "continuous wave - A carrier that is not modulated or switched"

I couldn't care less what it says. It may be your bible as as digigeek, but most Real Hams(TM) will rely on the original definition that far predates any hint of IEEE.

1250. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:12:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FAB2D.8CD1DB0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30911

W1RFI wrote:

>I am always amazed how many old time life members apologize to ARRL for their

> belief that they no longer pay their way. I hope they believe me when I point
> out that ARRL has been using the interest to fund their membership and to grow
> the investment.

Actually it was a shrewd plan. The investment keeps members paying dues on past
their demise!

1251. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:15:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FABF5.6FCC1FDC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30912

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" responded ...
> >
> > > I prefer cw mostly because of it's utter simplicity and superior
> > > effectiveness given the usual ERPs vs. propagation/noise level
> > > conditions
> >
> > More "Morse gets through where nothing else will." myth ...
> >
>
> I don't necessarily think Morse gets "through" better than any other mode in
> physical (propagational) terms. But the effectiveness of the mode over say,
> SSB under identical conditions is obvious. Good CW ops can distinguish a
> dit and a dah through some pretty rough hash. The same cannot always be
> said for SSB. We prove this every year at Field Day when the SSB side of
> the table is asking for repeats on callsigns and we're getting them the
> first time through. For example, let's say the Call AB5CD is received by a
> SSB station. Given some less than optimal conditions, that Call could be
> confused for AB9CD. If it was sent in CW, there would never be any doubt as
> to the call area (for example) because a 5 and a 9 are completely different
> sounds on CW. It's really not a myth, Carl. It's been proven time and time
> again to be a reality.

Carl's (and NCI's) problem is that it has never been proven to him (them) For as we know, one has to prove it to himself, and he (they) just haven't done that..

1252. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:31:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FAFAC.CBD778D7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30913

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> >
> > Ever compared CW to PACTOR II? I regularly raise a mailbox in
> > Germany with 50w to a dipole when I cannot even hear the signal.
> >
>
> No, but I don't doubt what you say is true. This is partly what I am
> talking about. We should have *all* the tools in the box, then use them as
> necessary.

Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will always have some late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs which have SSB and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no more than logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.

1253. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:37:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3FBD8B.DCCC076D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30914

Arnie Macy wrote:
> How long will it last compared to running an HF radio solo? Just curious.

I've never run it down. It should be relatively easy to calculate. My
laptop is fused at 2 amps and my IC-706 draws 2 amps on receive. As
always, it's the transmitter that eats up the power - up to 20 amps
for my IC-706 and 50 amps for my 500w amp on SSB. I don't run the
amp if AC power has failed.

> I can run my radio off of the deep cell for about 18 or so hours before I
> need to recharge it. And, how long to recharge it using solar panels as
> compared to say a trickle charger.

I've got 150 watts of solar panels on the roof ored with an Astron RS20M
into the marine battery using big Schokey (sp?) diodes. Everything runs
directly off the battery including my SGC 500 watt amp. I don't even
hiccup when AC power fails.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1254. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:39:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3FBE07.F51FDA11@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30916

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, here's the IEEE definition of "continuous wave" again for your benefit.
> > When amateurs disagree with professionals, it's time for the amateurs to change.
> >
> > "continuous wave - A carrier that is not modulated or switched"
>
> I couldn't care less what it says.

We know, Dick, we know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1255. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:41:10 UTC
From: ROCK <rock1@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <G7P%7.8908$uA.79309@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 30915
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I've been on the CB for about 30 years now and its been going down hill because of crap like this.....

" <eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com> wrote in message > We've got to get those damned truck drivers off the cb. Trucks suck,
> and truckers suck even worse.
>
> The average truck driver is even dumber than a no-code technician, and
> I didn't think that was possible.
>
> The average trucker smells like a pile of crap because he bathes maybe
> once a year at most.
>
> We need to pass a law making it illegal for truckers to use two way
> radio's of any kind. No antenna on the trucks, no radios in the
> trucks.
>
> Trucks and truckers are a menace.
>
> > Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> > crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> > messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> > gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> > Truckers are leading the way....
> >
> > Scott, Unit-69
> > Chesapeake Bay

1256. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:42:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3FBE9D.60CEBA76@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30917

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I don't know what you do for a living nor who you work for, but I fervently
> hope they don't entrust you with anything critical. Your lack of understanding
> of what you claim to have mastered is amazing. *I* was the encoder.

I'm trying to visualize Dick with EPROM wires shoved up his posterior,
whistling into the microphone while IDing his repeater.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1257. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:47:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C3FBFC7.F895BC19@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30919

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will always have some
> late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs which have SSB
> and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no more than
> logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.

I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether Morse code
should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try to
force PACTOR II upon you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1258. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 04:49:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ofcn$2m1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30918

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3FAFAC.CBD778D7@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > "CAM" wrote ...
> > > Ever compared CW to PACTOR II? I regularly raise a mailbox in
> > > Germany with 50w to a dipole when I cannot even hear the signal.
> >
> > No, but I don't doubt what you say is true. This is partly what I am
> > talking about. We should have *all* the tools in the box, then use them
as
> > necessary.
>
> Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will always have
some
> late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs which have
SSB
> and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no more
than
> logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.

It is perfectly sensible. YOU can do as you please.
You can operate or be prepared for one mode, two,
three or whatever. The point is that even if YOU
want to have CW as a backup, that is not a reason
to mandate code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1259. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:05:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1og75did1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30921

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020111000953.06877.00001175@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a1lfh9$2ab$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020110080956.07935.00000097@mb-mw.aol.com...
> >> In article <a1gcf3$4a3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >> >> "Bill Sohl"<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> (Bert Craig wrote):
> >> >> >>Do you think NCI would agree to a vote by
> >> >> >> licensed amateurs to determine whether or not the 5-wpm
requirement
> >is
> >> >> >> dropped...regardless of the ITU treaty. "Power to the people?"
> >>
> >> >> >I will speak for myself (but I believe I am consistent
> >> >> >with the rest of the NCI board). We (NCI) will not rest
> >> >> >until all code testing is gone. It is that simple.
> >> >>
> >> >> Which means "we don't care what the amateur community thinks"
> >> >
> >> >Not at all...it means the amateur community does NOT hold
> >> >any exclusive role in the establishing of, or the approval of
> >> >FCC rules.
> >>
> >> So NCI doesn't care what hams think about the issue.
> >>
> >> Note that Bert proposes a vote of all hams, not just those who have
passed
> >a
> >> code test. Note also that those who comment to the FCC on amateur radio
> >matters
> >> are overwhelmingly licensed radio amateurs.
> >>
> >> >None of us involved in NCI have seen any
> >> >reason to not stay the course in our attempt end all code testing.
> >>
> >> Which means that even if the vast majority of hams of all license
classes

> >> disagree, it doesn't matter.
> >>
> >> >> >Your reference to "power to the people" is anything
> >> >> >but that in as much as you only want the voice
> >> >> >of existing hams heard.
> >> >>
> >> >> But note that Bert wants ALL existing hams heard, code-tested or
not.
> >> >
> >> >Just how would you expect to truly get the input from "ALL"
> >> >existing hams?
> >>
> >> Aren't all US hams listed in the databases?
> >> >
> >> >> The code
> >> >> test is NOT a barrier to being a US ham - it's simply a requirement
for
> >> >HF/MF
> >> >> privileges.
> >> >
> >> >Yes, it is a requirement...however, it is a requirement which (IMHO)
> >> >makes no sense and, isn't justifiable at all EXCEPT to meet the
> >> >current ITU treaty clause (S25.5).
> >>
> >> Your opinion noted. Mine's different. If it's an opinion question, why
not
> >put
> >> it to a vote?
> >>
> >> >> Yet the answer seems to be "NCI doesn't care what hams think about
> >> >> the issue - codetest has gotta go".
> >> >
> >> >NCI has NO problem with existing hams giving their opinion.
> >>
> >> Sure - NCI just isn;t going to listen to it.
> >>
> >> >Indeed, we have directed many of the written arguments filed by NCI
> >> >as direct rebutle to claims/arguments made by hams. We (NCI) have
not,
> >> >in any aspect, found any reason voiced to retain code testing as
> >> >valid, rational and certainly not compeling.
> >>
> >> That's a given.> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >All your comments and efforts (along with a number
> >of other people's efforts) are directed (IMHO)
> >at trying to do anything to get NCI to back off.
>

> They are devoted to pointing out the facts in this matter. Have I posted
> anything in this thread that is not true?
>
> >The idea of a VOTE is nuts because if such was even
> >thought to hold merit, the FCC would have followed
> >such a path.
>
> NO. WRONG.
>
> The idea of a vote or poll is simply to indicate what people's opinins
really
> are. The FCC is not required to follow majority opinion. Saying that the
idea
> of a vote is "nuts" sure looks like you don;t want to know what the
opinion of
> the amateur community really is.

The FCC does NOT poll the public or the licensed ham community.
The FCC opens a comment period to which interested parties can
file their comments. YOU want a specific "ballot" or opinion poll
sent out on the issue(s).

> > Code testing as a part of international
> > regs is going...even the ARRL supports that now.
>
> They don't oppose it.

Say it any way you want, the ARRL is NOT going
to take any roll in opposing the end of code testing as a treaty
requirement which means they will either cast a vote of abstention
or a yea vote on the issue to abolish.

> Neither did the ARRL BoD survey the membership or the
> amateur radio community on the issue.

Fine by me. I sent my opinion to my director.

> Back in 1975, when the idea of a nocodetest license was first proposed by
the
> FCC, ARRL sent out a detailed questionnaire to all members, then posted
the
> results in QST. Nobody has done anything like that since.
> >
> >Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
> >decision of each administration.
>
> It's pretty clear what the FCC will do.

Fine by me...assuming you believe they will drop all
code testing then for the USA.

> >You can then ask the FCC for a vote.
>

> Won't make any difference to them.

If so, then why should I care?

> > Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
> >because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
> >only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
> >the jurisdiction of the FCC.
>
> "The amateur community" includes all who are interested, not just licensed
> hams.

So how do you identify all those that are interested but aren't
hams IF the FCC agreed to a vote?

> > I suspect (IMHO) that you
> >and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
> >regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
> >and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the
> >future rules changes.
>
> I am not pleased at what I see as something that is not in the best
interests
> of the ARS. I don't think the NCI folks are pleased that hams like me
presented
> our views to the FCC and in this public forum.

We really don't care much at all. I and, on occasion, some other
NCI folks routinely counter those comments anyway. I see no
shift in opinion or attitude towards retention of code testing
because of anything being stated in this forum or via FCC
comments.

> Whether NCI or any group is really influencing the FCC on license test
matters
> is a matter of pure speculation. Heck, the FCC quoted KENWOOD'S comments
11
> times in the R&O.

Exactly, which still goes to the heart of my point...if
NCI has so little influence, there sure is enough inerest
in making us go away or compromise.

> > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> >back off.
>
> What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.

Good.

> If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off, just
> produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.

Then we have no disagreement there.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1260. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:05:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C3FB7AB.4933E272@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30920

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will always have some
> > late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs which have SSB
> > and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no more than
> > logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.
>
> I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether Morse code
> should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try to
> force PACTOR II upon you?

Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it. I'll buy one.

1261. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:07:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ogef$m1v$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30922

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C3E6CB0.BF1CE930@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> > >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> > >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> > >back off.
> >
> > What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
> >
> > If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off,
just
> > produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.
>
> Looks like he's trying to intimidate you into backing off from posting so
many
> embarassing facts. The one thing that NCI can't tolerate if bare fact.

WRONG! NCI loves the facts because when facts and rational
thought processes are invoked in looking at the need for
continued code testing, the testing goes away.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1262. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:15:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1ogpv$c92$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30923

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201100907.2c61358@posting.google.com...
> KC2HMN wrote:
>
> > > I come to the table as a relatively
> > > "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
> > > be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
> > > element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
> > > equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
> > > remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
> > > EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
> > > skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?
> >
> K2UNK wrote:
>
> > If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
> > have passed the test.
>
> Or they could have been the ones that made him flunk it.
>
> > Equating the "separate" morse test to
> > one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
> > a valid comparison.
>
> But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
> most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
> General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
> are as "necessary" as the Morse test.

So you now want to end written testing, theory testing?
Take it to the FCC if you want. I and the most other NCI
BOD believe theory knowledge is good. I don't have to
defend that unless the FCC suddenly
wanted to change that. The FCC has already accepted the
idea that morse testing is no longer needed.

> > > Are not the
> > > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
> > > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
> > > questions?
>
> That depends on one's background.
>
> Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
> current amateur exams is not very high.

Would you expect otherwise?

> Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
> to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
> a bit of radio.

How do you define HARD? What is the measurement?

> > The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
> > some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
> > send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
>
> In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
> obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.

The parrallel doesn't exist...it is that simple. Disagree all you
want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either. They (the FCC)
are the ones you'd need to convince to change anything. The R&O
is almost 2 years old...NCI doesn't have to "see or acknowledge"
anything...and even if we did, so what...it would impact nothing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1263. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:26:20 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C4062EB.C4B737DF@mailcity.net>
Source record: 30924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Eustis Cornhauser wrote:

> The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys
> his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A
> cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The
> cell phone user actually gets quality communications.

And a cber does more?

1264. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:27:12 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C406320.BAD2B672@mailcity.net>
Source record: 30925
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Eustis Cornhauser wrote:
>
> That's an insult, how dare they not post such articles. I remember in
> the late 70's and the early 80's 73 magazine carried mods for just
> about every single chicken band radio of any significance.
>
> The average ham sits around with his mike in one hand, his cock in the
> other, and kerchunks the local repeater all day while jacking off.
>
> Sorry, that's just the way it is. The tests are so easy, they're
> meaningless, the hobby is going down the tubes, fast.
>
> The freebanders will become the real hams within a few years.
>
> The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys
> his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A
> cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The
> cell phone user actually gets quality communications.
>
> These new no coders are nothing but cellular phone user wanna bees.
> They can't afford the monthly rate of a cell phone, and their trailer
> park doesn't allow external antennas so they use their little two
> meter hand held jackoff box.
>
>

You couldn't pass the test huh?

1265. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:31:43 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3TP%7.80686$fe1.1074330@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30926

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

> >Rule 1) Existing licensed operators will not lose, and not gain, any
> >operating privileges without earning the change.

> >Rule 2) When there is any ambiguity in proposing changes to the Amateur
> >Radio Service refer to Rule 1.

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Definitely reasonable. The "will not gain" may run into some problems,
though.

I don't mean to say that a privilege couldn't be modified or more spectrum granted to a license class, only that a wholesale upgrade of a class is out of the question. You know the 'something for nothing' issue.

> >I think, three license classes is fine; reorganizing and even totally
> >revamping the three examinations is well within these parameters. We have
> >discussed this back in 1999 and is well worth revisiting here.

> But three classes made from the existing 5 or 6 means somehow some classes
get
> combined.

Nope, the three classes relegated to limbo can stay there. They will diminish in numbers and if a privilege is changed or a subband edge is moved that's fine. Nothing need be done unless it becomes obvious a change is warranted.

> >This is only to demonstrate where the emphasis should be.

> >Element 2 should have at least,(and I want all of)the FCC rules,
operating
> >procedures, Amateur Radio practices, and RF safety. The emphasis is safe
> >proper operation.

> The core basics, IOW.

> >Element 3 should have at least antennas and feed lines, signals and
> >emissions, radio wave propagation, and circuit components. The emphasis
is
> >safe MF/HF worldwide operation.

> OK

> >Element 4 should have at least electrical principles, practical circuits,
> >and VE procedures. The emphasis is highly competent to safely 'Elmer
and/or

> >pursue the full hobby.

> The full monty, as it were.

> >Also, we restrict power for any new licensees with Power Endorsements.
Power
> >Endorsements given when General or Amateur Extra privileges are granted
> >rated for medium or high power respectively. This implies Technician
> >privileges include a Power endorsement of low power. Existing licensees
> >would be granted High Power endorsement.
>
> Or simply require that existing hams keep their old license documents as
proof
> that they are qualified to run full power.

Sure and the new licenses take on the low, medium, and high power privileges of the license class; this sounds cleaner than additional endorsement documents.

> >Lastly, the VE questions could be broken out to a separate examination
which
> >would allow Element 4 to be more technically oriented.

> >What say you????

> So far so good. I think the tests need a bit more integration. For
example,
> Element 2 doesn't need all the RF power safety stuff if the license only
allows
> low power. But the basic idea seems like a logical outgrowth of our
earlier
> discussions.

I think the safety knowledge, even for the high power is nessecary, though.

> Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?

This is probably going to be what we have now for Technician, General, and Amateur Extra with slight, or not so slight, modifications.

For Technician class adjusting the question pool and limiting the power makes it a reasonable foundation. One thing is they, at the very least, should be given the same privileges as Technician Plus. I think the FCC plans on this grant by the way they've not handled the database issue. ;-)

That leaves Novices who can take Element 2 if they care for all the privileges above 50 MHz. Otherwise they remain as is.

For General Class, I don't know what the consensus would be but, as the numbers of Advanced class operators decline the Generals may assume Advanced subbands on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters. The Advanced would have high power there and Generals the medium power so sharing the same subband edges seems reasonable.

Amateur Extra class should have an additional examination for VE status.
That's all I can think of for that class.

You have also alluded to moving the forty meter band and other issues which were not licensing changes.

Rich

1266. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 05:53:31 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <vbQ%7.80699$fe1.1076628@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30927

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > You've programmed the circuit with diodes and that, Carroll, is binary. How
> > can "binary - bi-state" not be binary coding.

> > What you call you decoder was, in fact, the encoder. The strobe was defining
> > the state (on or off) for the predefined time period. The information going,
> > from your encoder, to your oscillator was binary encoded serial data. Some
> > binary representations follow for your edification...

> > 1/0
> > on/off
> > true/false
> > high/low
> > diode/empty

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> I don't know what you do for a living nor who you work for, but I fervently
> hope they don't entrust you with anything critical. Your lack of understanding
> of what you claim to have mastered is amazing. *I* was the encoder.

I should know better than to apply logic and expect you to admit to comprehending. I do know you understand this stuff you have a mental block about being agreeable... even when you do agree. sheesh...

> > Calling radiotelegraphy the third state doesn't make any sense at all...
> > could you explain that one to me, please?

> I said it once already - check with ED HARE, that was his phrase which I just
> picked up, *understood exactly what he meant* and merely used again. If it is so
> wrong, then you idiots can come down on him for starting it off.

Fine... you can't explain it... I can believe that ;-) Well, maybe Ed will chime in...

Now, it's time for your abligatory name-calling rant...

> Of course what it means is that CW - you know, that well entrenched old mode

> that Real Hams(TM) use, must have an information state as well as the
mandatory
> binary electrical states in order to function at all.
> It is really amazing that all the dippy geeks here, liteweights all,.
fail to
> catch any hint of a clue.

Well, I was going to mention a paradigm shift in how you think about CW. It's just that when you send code you transmit dits and dahs. This is not CW. Transmitting CW, ends up the same but to think of it correctly, you transmit a continuous wave upon which you insert bit spaces, letter spaces, and word spaces which encodes the signal with morse code. If you don't like that analogy, please, don't kill the messenger. ;-)

Rich

1267. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 08:08:26 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <A5S%7.2717$V55.291940@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30928

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> I've never run it down. It should be relatively easy to calculate. My
> laptop is fused at 2 amps and my IC-706 draws 2 amps on receive. As
> always, it's the transmitter that eats up the power - up to 20 amps
> for my IC-706 and 50 amps for my 500w amp on SSB. I don't run the
> amp if AC power has failed.
>

I also draw about 2 amps on receive with my TS440. If I run a series of dits, it draws about 8 amps. Using my straight key and steady keying draws close to 18 amps. I also use an Astron PS, but switched from an RS20M to an RS35M a while back. I generally run it at about 80w even though it is capable of 100w.

Thanks for the info on the solar panel set-up. I'm going to check into it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1268. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 08:10:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <Q7S%7.2737$V55.301330@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30929

"Dick Carroll" wrote ...
>
> Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will always have
some
> late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs which have
SSB
> and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no more
than
> logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.
>

I agree that having CW available is the logical choice because it is
available on almost all rigs.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1269. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 08:13:55 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <KaS%7.2772$V55.302710@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30930

"Dick Carroll" wrote ...
>
> Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it.
I'll buy
> one.
>

I'd like a Bucket-O-Pactor, please. :-))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1270. Re: Let us expose your talent! New site launch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 10:00:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QOT%7.80803$fe1.1093298@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30931

Don't dream it, BE IT. Damn it, Janet, I love you.

<info@myrealtalent.com> wrote in message
news:rVN%7.15335$h2c.12670@news2.bloor.is...
> Only the talented and serious needed!
>
> BETA SITE LAUNCH
>
> www.myrealtalent.com
>
> We would like to invite all talent and Industry professionals of every
> genres to logon now for the beta testing of MYREALTALENT.com
>
> Be part of our final stages of the development of our site and enjoy
some
> very exciting benefits while at it.
>
> Join us today!!
>
> myrealtalent.com team

1271. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:03:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020112070306.15114.00000534@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30932

In article <20020111221005.16311.00000137@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely should NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur allocations. IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are -- CW/digital only, >200w. No phone band expansion. Expanding the phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS. So, let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.

The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up or shut up!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1272. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:16:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4028FB.9A76150@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30933

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3E6CB0.BF1CE930@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> > > >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> > > >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> > > >back off.
> > >
> > > What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
> > >
> > > If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off,
> just
> > > produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.
> >
> > Looks like he's trying to intimidate you into backing off from posting so
> many
> > embarassing facts. The one thing that NCI can't tolerate if bare fact.
>
> WRONG! NCI loves the facts because when facts and rational
> thought processes are invoked in looking at the need for
> continued code testing, the testing goes away.

NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected board
and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
Its views are the views of the directors.

Dave K8MN

1273. Re: Let us expose your talent! New site launch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:21:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C402A12.8F5CD500@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30934

info@myrealtalent.com wrote:
>
> Only the talented and serious needed!
>
> BETA SITE LAUNCH
>
> www.myrealtalent.com
>
> We would like to invite all talent and Industry professionals of every
> genres to logon now for the beta testing of MYREALTALENT.com
>
> Be part of our final stages of the development of our site and enjoy some
> very exciting benefits while at it.
>
> Join us today!!
>
> myrealtalent.com team

I can play Green Dolphin Street on guitar while sending morse with a
foot key and I make a mean homemade Teriyaki sauce.

Dave K8MN

1274. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:32:12 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net> wrote:
> : --
> : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> : pschleck@novia.net
> : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
>
> : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> : pschleck@gonix.com
> : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> :
>
> Do you even READ your own posts?

Do you?

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

1275. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:33:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020112073332.15114.00000536@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30937

In article <CtN%7.394$V55.74335@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote ...
>
>> Megadittoes on that, Hans.
>>
>> Also some Vonnegut:
>>
>> Short stories:
>> "Welcome To The Monkey House"
>> "The Euphio Question"
>> "Harrison Bergeron"
>>
>> Novels:
>> "Cat's Cradle"
>> "Slapstick"
>> "Slaughterhouse Five"
>> "The SIrens of Titan"
>>
>> And of course Joseph Heller's immortal "Catch 22"

I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
there read it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

Who is John Galt?

1276. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:33:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020112073333.15114.00000537@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30935

In article <3C3D1697.B5266F77@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
> Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et al
>are radiotelegraphy!
> We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case of
>it!

Dick:

Uhhh -- don't look now, but RTTY and PSK-31 (I don't know what "et al" are)
ARE radiotelegraphy! If you think they aren't, what, then, pray tell, are
they? (IYOHO, that is.)

73 de Larry, K3LT
QRV on RTTY, PSK-31, and PACTOR -- my favorite RADIOTELEGRAPHY
modes!

1277. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:33:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020112073333.15114.00000538@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 30936

In article <eWG5qhlmBHA.1168@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> Wasn't it Einstein who said "To the uninitiated, any sufficently
>> advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." ?
>
>No, it wasn't.
>
>It was Sir Arthur Clarke, author of "Childhoods End", and inventor
>of the communications satellite.
>
>But I like my version better..... "Any technology distinguishable
>from magic is insufficiently advanced."

Hansl:

In that case, Arthur C. (that's MISTER Clarke to you!) said it better!

>With all kind wishes,

Whatever.

73 de Larry, K3LT

"Open the Pod Bay doors, HAL."

"I'm sorry, Dave, I can't do that."

1278. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:38:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112073835.14268.00000777@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30938

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I said it once already - check with ED HARE, that was his phrase which I
> just picked up, *understood exactly what he meant* and merely used again.

Actually, Dick, my original use of the phrase was in response to Cecil, who said that in his professional (digital) experience, if it wasn't a 0 or a 1, it was broken. I posted one word -- "tristate."

What was pointing out is that in the digital world since the 1970s, digital circuits can be 0, 1 or not there -- the tristate mode.

I think that somehow, this got confused with Morse code. Not having been involved in the early part of this thread, I offered that the off state in OOK CW can be likened to the off state in digital circuitry, commonly known as "tri-state."

Now, whether OOK CW is a dual state or a tri-state mode depends on how one thinks about it and how it is encoded, IMHO. If, for example, one could use the off state to represent a 0 and the on state to represent a 1. In that case, OOK CW is binary.

However, in modulating signals, what is a logic 0 and what is a logic 1 can be determined by any defined state, from the above off=0/on=1 state to the states defined by FSK, PSK and any of a number of "digital" modulation methods.

So, if one is sending Morse-encoded OOK CW, it becomes a matter of semantics as to what level represents what bit state. Is the letter A 10111000 or is the "dit" a 0 and the dah a 1, giving 0-tristate-1-tristate?
Or is it 0-tristate_element_space_length-1-tristate_character_space_length?

IMHO, the off-state of OOK CW most physically resembles the off-state of a tri-state digital device, so if one really needs to make this more than the joke I had made, then the analogy is not a flawed one. Neither are the ones that Cecil is discussing, either, and, in the case of Morse encoding, at least for human decoding of same, 0 and 1 really have no meaning. To me, the overall sound of di-dah registers as a A.

Now, you are probably missing the real point of this, Dick. I think that Cecil has taken a position and kept this going primarly to get your goat. In this case, it appears to me that he has suceeded.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1279. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:45:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112074541.14268.00000778@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30939

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Actually it was a shrewd plan. The investment keeps members paying dues on
>past
>their demise!

It's not quite that simple, I am sure, Dick. The League keeps its investments at a level sufficient to fund life-member membership services and to ensure some cushion against the ups and downs of running an organization. In some years, the budget has run at a deficit; in other years, the mandate has been to put the money back into investment.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1280. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:48:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112074811.14268.00000779@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30940

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

> That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW; basic
> equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the other?

Would not a mode that has so many advantages really "balance" itself?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1281. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:50:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112075033.14268.00000780@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30941

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>We should have *all* the tools in the box, then use them as
>necessary.

All of the tools except Morse code exist without testing. If the testing for Morse code were removed, that tool would not cease to exist. The same amount of work would be necessary to learn it. If it is a good tool, people will use it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1282. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 12:52:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112075244.14268.00000781@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 30942

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it.
>I'll buy one.

I have seen you imply that Morse code equipment and operatin is the equivalent of a single easily portable box. Perhaps you are saying that one does not have to force Morse code use, either?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1283. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 13:12:40 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <uFW%7.4153$3x5.396115@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30943

"W1RFI" wrote ...
>
> All of the tools except Morse code exist without testing. If the testing
for
> Morse code were removed, that tool would not cease to exist. The same
amount
> of work would be necessary to learn it. If it is a good tool, people will
use
> it.
>

Those of us who use CW on a regular basis, already know this. That's why we are out there elmering and extolling the virtues of the mode, whether they remove the testing requirement or not.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1284. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 13:30:15 UTC
From: technomage <technomage-hawke@home.com>
Message-ID: <HTW%7.124984$Wd.37626318@news1.rdc1.az.home.com>
Source record: 30944
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

funny thing is,
someone else said that about another "G-man" (hoover) and when it came
down to it, that other someone did nothing except get the cuffs slapped
on him by hoover personally.

only in your case, if you get gunned down by government agents, they
might be doing the rest of us a favor by removing you from the gene pool.

Technomage

In article <3c2f7974.1135127@netnews.att.net>, "One High Powered Mother
Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote:

> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 23:47:57 -0500, "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org> wrote:
>
>>How about we just forward it to Riley and let him sort it out.
>>
>>Done.
>
>
> fuck gayboy riley and his bullshit i'd like that asshole son of a bitch
> to come fuck with me he'd be pulling bullets out his ass i'd nail his
> ass with my 9MM
>
> fuck that cock suckin' bastard
>
> OHPM
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

1285. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 13:31:59 UTC
From: technomage <technomage-hawke@home.com>
Message-ID: <jVW%7.124988$Wd.37626464@news1.rdc1.az.home.com>
Source record: 30945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

it ain't that hard. Also, a simple request from the FBUI to your ISp will
have those telco logs open so fast, you won't have time to say anything
at all.

Technomage

In article <3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net>, "One High Powered Mother
Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote:

> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
>>Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
>
>
> like they'd take the time to do that....
>
> if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> just for someone saying they would get real
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

1286. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:09:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <WsX%7.80934$fe1.1106730@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30946

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020112073332.15114.00000536@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <CtN%7.394$V55.74335@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie
Macy"
> <kt4st@csam.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote ...
> >
> >> Megadittoes on that, Hans.
> >>
> >> Also some Vonnegut:
> >>
> >> Short stories:
> >> "Welcome To The Monkey House"
> >> "The Euphio Question"
> >> "Harrison Bergeron"
> >>
> >> Novels:
> >> "Cat's Cradle"
> >> "Slapstick"
> >> "Slaughterhouse Five"
> >> "The SIrens of Titan"
> >>
> >> And of course Joseph Heller's immortal "Catch 22"
>
> I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
> hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
> there read it?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Who is John Galt?
>
>

John Galt Blvd is in an industrial park in Omaha.

Personally, I grooved on Ragnar Daneskold. Been a few years since I read
it tho.

1287. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:23:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c404949_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30947

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020112070306.15114.00000534@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <20020111221005.16311.00000137@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely should
> NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur
> allocations. IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are --
> CW/digital only, >200w. No phone band expansion. Expanding the
> phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on
> code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate
> same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS. So,
> let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone
> emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.
>
> The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
> or shut up!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1288. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:37:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c404cb0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30948

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020112070306.15114.00000534@mb-ba.aol.com...
>
> If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely
should
> NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur
> allocations. IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are --
> CW/digital only, >200w. No phone band expansion. Expanding the
> phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on
> code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate
> same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS.
So,
> let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone
> emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.

This REALLY scares the hell out of me, but I agree FULLY with Larry
on NOT diminishing the space available for digital modes (including
"CW") by expanding the space available to SSB. (WHEN, not if,
code testing is abolished :-)

I also agree with Larry on keeping the lower power limit in at
least those parts of the bands. As I've said many times before,
there's much more to be gained with better modulation and
coding techniques than through brute force power.

Unfortunately (in terms of protecting our allocations in the future),
our bands are FAR from "overcrowded" in any reasonable sense
(looking at spectrum usage compared to other services). I see
NO need to expand the use of SSB at the expense of the digital
modes and believe that to do so would be a bad move.

However, it's inaccurate on Larry's part to assert that "the
main argument used by those seeking to eliminate (Morse
testing) ws the fact that digital modes were the future of the
ARS" ... the MAIN argument for eliminating Morse testing
is and always was that it is no longer justified as a legitimate
regulatory requirement for obtaining a license with full HF
privileges.

> The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
> or shut up!

The statement above is also inaccurate, Larry ... I assume
you're referring to some of my comments, at least in part ...
I didn't "promise a digital 'paradise' " ... what I said was that
there were benefits in adopting more modern, effective
technologies and that the ARS should take advantage of those
benefits, rather than staying stuck in the past forever.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEBKK5e+N6+q84HiEQLmyQCeJAaGG1SLPVYsO41lV8sJ/wHwXMsAoPM2
2j1h8s+Q29wNMa/6k1snGCjB
=xz5F
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1289. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:40:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c404d6e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30949

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3FBE9D.60CEBA76@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I don't know what you do for a living nor who you work for, but I
fervently
> > hope they don't entrust you with anything critical. Your lack of
understanding
> > of what you claim to have mastered is amazing. *I* was the encoder.
>
> I'm trying to visualize Dick with EPROM wires shoved up his posterior,
> whistling into the microphone while IDing his repeater.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1290. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:43:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c404e14_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30950

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3FBE9D.60CEBA76@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I don't know what you do for a living nor who you work for, but I
fervently
> > hope they don't entrust you with anything critical. Your lack of
understanding
> > of what you claim to have mastered is amazing. *I* was the
encoder.
>
> I'm trying to visualize Dick with EPROM wires shoved up his
posterior,
> whistling into the microphone while IDing his repeater.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil,

I *REALLY* wish you hadn't gone there ... the picture
that can't help but conjure up is so revolting that I nearly
barfed on my notebook :-)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEBLjJe+N6+q84HiEQJjWwCgyAgHlAkw7qJ68OVSj6MMh6pHy38AoMm+
j7RruLGjy3O4bV5Za802eRjk
=RRRJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1291. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:55:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C404E47.A7E6B5A7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30701

Dave Heil wrote:
> NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected board
> and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
> Its views are the views of the directors.

That's because the new members sign on to the published goals
of NCI. If one doesn't agree with those published goals, one
doesn't join.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1292. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:56:34 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <17j04ukeftpj64sr1csmgl2j9tnb56bagm@4ax.com>
Source record: 30703
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 04 Jan 2002 20:22:10 GMT, N4ZN <nevermind@all.com> wrote:

>On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
>(Joshua Senecal) wrote:
>
>>Hi all,
>>
>>I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
>>carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
>>having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
>>situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
>>them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>>
>>Thanks!
>>
>>-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>
>
>Pack it with the suitcases and it's no problem. Pack it in the carry
>on, and be prepared to unpack it and do all that explaining every time
>you change flights.

This is nonsense. I fly with several radios and GPS units all the
time.

I have never had to "explain" anything. In fact I have never been
asked to turn one on. Since Sept. 11 I have flown at least 30 times
both in the US and Europe same story every where no problems
with the radios. What I do pack in my luggage are long sharp antennas.
I have had no problem with rubber ducks not even a question.

Packed in the suit case and it is vulnerable to theft and the
airline is not responsible for electronics in luggage--read the
ticket.

Take it on board leave it off and in your bag and don't worry
have a nice trip.

1293. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 14:58:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C404F09.BBD41DC2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30704

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether Morse code
> > should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try to
> > force PACTOR II upon you?
>
> Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it. I'll buy
> one.

Same with CW. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1294. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:03:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c4052b4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30713

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:m9J%7.10638$GP2.743689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
> >
> > Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
> > most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
> > (easily built) and some free software you can download.
> >
>
> The problem (as I have always seen it) is that it *requires* the use
of a
> computer and associated software to interface the technology with
the radio.

SO???? We do that all the time ... it's VERY common these days.

> (and we all know what can happen to installed software when we need
it most)

Backups, Arnie ... backups (both hardware and software ...) This is
the
most effective strategy to assure effective emergency communications.

> It's bad enough that we have to have a deep cell marine battery to
run the
> rig during emergency comms (those suckers are heavy) but now we have
to lug
> around a laptop and a separate power supply for it as well. Don't
get me
> wrong, I think advancing the radio technology is a wonderful thing
and I'm
> all for it, but where does the dependency on additional outside
equipment
> end?

The pros have backup systems ... so should we if we want the
best reliability.

> Next thing, I guess, is we'll all be toting mini sat-dishes.

Guess what ... that's EXACTLY what the FEMA folks do ...
they go into a disaster area and plop down a portable satellite
terminal ... vioila, no more dependence on the local infrastructure
which was quite probably damaged or destroyed by the incident

that brought the FEMA folks into the picture.

We could do the same with our satellites ... and, if we did, we'd
probably boost our leverage in getting free launches from NASA
and DoD by a bunch ...

> The more
> equipment involved, (and their inter-dependence on each other) the
greater
> chance for one of them to fail and crash the whole system. That's
(and you
> have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW; basic equipment
and
> ease of use.

I don't (nor, to I "have to") agree ... I'd classify it as "primitive,
limited
capability equipment, with a requirement for an operator with less
than
universal manual skill" ... using cw for recreation is fine ... go for
it ...
but the emergency management folks just don't have any use for it
these days ... they want "tactical voice" on VHF/UHF for local, and on
HF-SSB for regional/long haul, and increasingly, they want computer
to computer data links so that they can accurately send large amounts
of data, pictures, etc. in short amounts of time.

> So, how do we balance one against the other? What are your
> thoughts, Carl?

See above ....

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEBQEJe+N6+q84HiEQJL0QCfSntIrHuyqp8v2QcV7WMyb2c+ZI4AoJMs
H0InljjV2MEWJPmiPNNxO/kE
=OdXf
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1295. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:03:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C405037.FBE9615C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30706

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I agree that having CW available is the logical choice because it is
> available on almost all rigs.

I agree with that. What we disagree on is whether an HF ham should
have the right to choose to learn Morse code or not. If he chooses
not to learn Morse code and then has a need for CW, that's his problem,
not yours or mine. I suspect if he needed CW bad enough, he would
learn Morse code pretty darn fast.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1296. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:06:39 UTC
From: richard ruiz <resacaga@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <9fY%7.4444$3x5.452317@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30705
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's people like you Useless that make Truckers and others people in a bad light, Since I'm a Ham Radio Operator, and a Truck Driver. This would seem that you have Railroad tracks running to your back door.

Remember ONE thing if you can Simple Minded Little Shit.
TRUCKS MOVE AMERICA

William
"Eustis Cornhauser" <eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:e9af79fa.0201091028.14c4c766@posting.google.com...
> We've got to get those damned truck drivers off the cb. Trucks suck,
> and truckers suck even worse.
>
> The average truck driver is even dumber than a no-code technician, and
> I didn't think that was possible.
>
> The average trucker smells like a pile of crap because he bathes maybe
> once a year at most.
>
> We need to pass a law making it illegal for truckers to use two way
> radio's of any kind. No antenna on the trucks, no radios in the
> trucks.
>
> Trucks and truckers are a menace.
>
> > Hey man don't be worried. What did we do when chs 1 thru 23 got
> > crowded? We MOVED ON UP. And what did we do when 23 thru 40 got all
> > messed up with idiots? We MOVED ON UP AGAIN. So what if the freeband
> > gets trashed with idiots? We just MOVE ON UP to escape the mess.
> > Truckers are leading the way....
> >
> > Scott, Unit-69
> > Chesapeake Bay

1297. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101000.05154.00001023@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30711

In article <3C3F4556.9B238ABD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Consider WWV. Most of its transmission is simply an unmodulated
>> carrier. Yet from that carrier I have frequently obtained standard
>> frequency information by
>> zero beating an oscillator at my station with the carrier from WWV.
>> That's how I adjusted my 100 kHz standard, BC-221/LM freq meters, and
>> do drift runs on VFOs under development.
>
>I don't doubt that you have done that, Jim, but in the process you disturbed
>the energy in that wave and caused it to be discontinuous.

Nope. The antenna and receiver present the same effect to the passing wave
whether I am using the receiver or not.

>And you
>necessarily
>must be uncertain of the content of the part of the wave that you didn't
>disturb.
>
>> Now before you start quoting dictionary verbiage, Cecil, recall that
>> several posts back I defined what "information" means in this context.
>> I have demonstrated that information can be transmitted by an
>> unmodulated carrier.
>
>But you have NOT demonstrated that information can be collected from
>an undisturbed unmodulated carrier.

That wasn't the challenge.

> How can you prove that the discontinuity
>caused by your gathering of the information has not disturbed the wave and
>the information gathered?

Don't have to. The claim was that information could not be extracted from an
unmodulated carrier. I should how I and many others have done it. QED.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1298. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101001.05154.00001025@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30708

In article <3C3F89AD.FA3D7AE3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Arnie Macy wrote:
>> It's really not a myth, Carl. It's been proven time and time
>> again to be a reality.
>
>Ever compared CW to PACTOR II? I regularly raise a mailbox in
>Germany with 50w to a dipole when I cannot even hear the signal.
>--
Sorry about your hearing loss, Cecil.

How much power does the PACTOR II box require?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1299. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101001.05154.00001024@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30709

In article <3C3F3E9B.70F1C9E9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>> How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
>> order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
>> test?
>
>The only CW-only frequencies are available to nocode techs. The
>FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence there.

Alrighty then.

Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.

> In
>fact, the FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence
>in ANY mode except CW below 30 MHz.

Doesn't mean it's the right thing to do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1300. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101002.05154.00001026@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30707

In article <A5S%7.2717$V55.291940@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>I also draw about 2 amps on receive with my TS440. If I run a series of >dits, it draws about 8 amps. Using my straight key and steady keying draws >close to 18 amps.

Take a look at Elecraft products. My K2 draws less than 300 mA on receive with all of the accessories running.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1301. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101002.05154.00001027@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30710

In article <20020112073332.15114.00000536@mb-ba.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand.

Best of her other stuff:

"The Fountainhead" (should really be read before "Atlas")
"Anthem"

> Got the
>hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
>there read it?

I've read all of her stuff many times. Most of it in hardcover. First discovered "Atlas" 30 years or so ago. A dern good writer. Particularly when you know that English was not her native language.

Her descriptions of Taggart Transcontinental are based on the New York Central system as it was when the book was being written.

"Fountainhead" was made into a movie in 1949, starring Gary Coper and Patricia Neal. "Atlas" was supposed to be made into a TV miniseries about 20 years ago but it never happened because the network management changed hands.

"Atlas" is her masterpiece but in many ways "Fountainhead" is a better book.

How far along are you in the book? Have you reached the chapter where the story of the Twentieth Century Motor Company is told?

73 de Jim, N2EY

yes, I know who John Galt is.

1302. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112101003.05154.00001028@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30712

In article <3C3FBD8B.DCCC076D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Arnie Macy wrote:
>> How long will it last compared to running an HF radio solo? Just curious.
>
>I've never run it down.

That doesn't tell us anything.

> It should be relatively easy to calculate. My
>laptop is fused at 2 amps and my IC-706 draws 2 amps on receive.

The laptop draws about 1 amp if it's fused for 2. Add 2 amps for the receiver
and we have 3 amps constant draw just to receive.

How much does the PACTOR II box draw? As I understand it, PACTOR II is a
proprietary system that is not implemented with just a computer and sound card.

So it takes at least 3 amp hours to power that setup for one hour using PACTOR
II and 2 amp hours per hour using CW/Morse.

>As
>always, it's the transmitter that eats up the power

No, not as always.

> - up to 20 amps
>for my IC-706

Most "modern digital modes" have the transmitter running almost continuously.
So at the 100 W power level the rig draws
about 20 amps whenever in transmit mode, plus the 1 amp for the computer.

CW/Morse has a key-down percentage ratio of about 40% when transmitting.

So if it's in 100W transmit mode 50% of the time, that station needs 12 amp
hours for each hour of PACTOR II operation but only 5.6 amp hours for each hour
of Morse/CW operation

>and 50 amps for my 500w amp on SSB. I don't run the
>amp if AC power has failed.

50 amps at 12 volts is only 480 watts.

>> I can run my radio off of the deep cell for about 18 or so hours before I
>> need to recharge it. And, how long to recharge it using solar panels as
>> compared to say a trickle charger.
>
>I've got 150 watts of solar panels on the roof ored with an Astron RS20M

>into the marine battery using big Schokey (sp?) diodes.

Schottky.

> Everything runs
>directly off the battery including my SGC 500 watt amp. I don't even
>hiccup when AC power fails.

Some critical design questions

How big (ampere hours) are the batteries?

How efficient are the batteries?

How many amp-hours will the solar cells provide per 24 hour period during bad weather?

At what voltage does the connected equipment stop operating?

What is the expected life of the various components?

Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less emergency energy capacity than he thinks.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1303. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:15:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C405316.E5FD87A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30714

W1RFI wrote:
> Now, you are probably missing the real point of this, Dick. I think that Cecil
> has taken a position and kept this going primarly to get your goat. In this
> case, it appears to me that he has suceeded.

I got the entire herd, Ed. :-) "Head 'em up, move 'em out!"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1304. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:16:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c4055e1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 30717

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3FBFC7.F895BC19@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Somehow the anticoders always act like every ham station will
always have some
> > late digital mode available when in fact most hams use HF rigs
which have SSB
> > and CW and nothing more. So having CW available as a backup is no
more than
> > logical. I guess that's too sensible for them.
>
> I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether
Morse code
> should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try
to
> force PACTOR II upon you?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dick obviously has a computer ... and I'll bet it has a sound card
in it (if not, it's likely so old that it's incapable of running the
vast
majority of modern "mainstream" software) ...

Thus, he has the capability to use at least many of the more
modern, effective digital modes.

The fact that he CHOOSES not to exercise that capability
to be better prepared for emergency communications does
NOT constitutue an excuse to force everyone else to adopt
his favorite mode (cw) as the "least common denominator."

(Note that I'm not asserting that Dick is not free to choose
not to exercise the capability ... he certainly is free to operate
whatever mode(s) he chooses ... all I'm saying is that his
refusal to be better prepared is not a valid reason to insist
on dragging everyone else down to his level ....)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPEBTPpe+N6+q84HiEQJrJACcDCbRMXnLp+x2ZNUrZzmAz96VAAQAoNBs
99PvR/5hq0okhFbQpWbq7AXC
=xvA5
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1305. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:20:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C405447.6FB74A61@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30715

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
> hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
> there read it?

Yep, back in the 60's. But Larry, Ayn Rand would be against the
federal Morse code requirement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1306. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:20:48 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <irY%7.3836$V55.450454@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30716

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> I agree with that. What we disagree on is whether an HF ham should
> have the right to choose to learn Morse code or not. If he chooses
> not to learn Morse code and then has a need for CW, that's his problem,
> not yours or mine. I suspect if he needed CW bad enough, he would
> learn Morse code pretty darn fast.
>

We don't disagree on that, Cecil. If you recall, "Know Code International" advocated a much higher written standard if the Morse testing was abolished. We said that it wasn't about the Code test, per se; it was about keeping high standards. What the FCC did, IMO, was lower the standards at both ends. We are still waiting for the floodgate of new Hams to arrive. What I have seen since restructuring is a lot of General and Extra upgrades, but not much more beyond that.

We certainly agree on the last part of your post. If someone doesn't know Morse and needs it, that's their problem. I'd advocate that everyone learn Morse at least at the 5 wpm level. Notice I didn't say be tested on that skill. Then, in the event that they needed it, wallah, there it is. I personally don't believe that 5 wpm Morse is beyond the ability of 95% of the Amateurs out there. I started out at 0 wpm and worked my way up. After 8 years on CW, I think I can head copy about 6 wpm now : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1307. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:24:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C405547.363FFF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30718

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
> or shut up!

GSM digital phones, for instance, carry digitized voice or data.
I see a mode something like that taking over most all amateur
communications in the future. So sub-bands will be obsolete.

BTW, Larry, which no-coders promised a digital paradise?
Please be specific.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1308. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:46:23 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <KVY%7.4535$3x5.486669@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30719

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
>
> Backups, Arnie ... backups (both hardware and software ...) This is
> the most effective strategy to assure effective emergency communications.
>

And while you're sitting there re-installing the software, I've started
sending and receiving information via SSB/CW.

>
> Guess what ... that's EXACTLY what the FEMA folks do ...
> they go into a disaster area and plop down a portable satellite
> terminal ... vioila, no more dependence on the local infrastructure
> which was quite probably damaged or destroyed by the incident
> that brought the FEMA folks into the picture.
>

I'm not against new technology. My point was that we need to configure our
ARS with as small an inventory as possible while still getting the job done.

>
> I don't (nor, to I "have to") agree ... I'd classify it as "primitive,
> limited capability equipment, with a requirement for an operator with less
> than universal manual skill" ... using cw for recreation is fine ... go
for
> it ...
>

I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer technologies.
Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
inherent reliability and simplicity of use.

>
> but the emergency management folks just don't have any use for it
> these days ... they want "tactical voice" on VHF/UHF for local, and on
> HF-SSB for regional/long haul, and increasingly, they want computer
> to computer data links so that they can accurately send large amounts
> of data, pictures, etc. in short amounts of time.
>

Yep, I agree that high speed computer data links and tactical voice are the
wave of the future in emergency operations. Yet as long as we are using HF
radios, Morse will have a place. You are very much wrong when you say that
it is not used (CW) in HF emergency communications. Our County EOC has been
CW capable (and will be) far into the foreseeable future. The way the EOC
folks explain it, "Why get rid of something that we may need to use, as long

as we have qualified operators available." During our last actual activation, Morse was used to send and receive numerous messages via HF when SSB operations were being hampered by QRM, QRN, and QSB. It's the old have the tools in the toolbox theory.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1309. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 15:51:00 UTC
From: "Mark Carpenter Sr." <noemail@noemail.com>
Message-ID: <3C405BFC.8080408@noemail.com>
Source record: 30720
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ship your rigs via FedEX. Ship all valuable items via FedEX. You can purchase insurance and they are very unlikely to loose it. This allows you to ship all you want. Read your ticket information. The airline won't do much for you on your return flight, if they loose your stuff. They figure that you are at home and should have more stuff there. Ship them to your motel room or the place you are staying. Carry on bags should include a change of cloths, cash and documents needed when you arrive. never put all of your clothing in your checked baggage. To much hassle when the airline looses them. One last thing always have contact information in your bags. The tags on the outside can get lost in handling.

Gerald Schmitt wrote:

>On Fri, 04 Jan 2002 20:22:10 GMT, N4ZN <nevermind@all.com> wrote:
>
>>On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
>>(Joshua Senecal) wrote:
>>
>>>Hi all,
>>>
>>>I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
>>>carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
>>>having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
>>>situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
>>>them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>>>
>>>Thanks!
>>>
>>>-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>>>
>>
>>Pack it with the suitcases and it's no problem. Pack it in the carry
>>on, and be prepared to unpack it and do all that explaining every time
>>you change flights.
>>
>
>This is nonsense. I fly with several radios and GPS units all the
>time.
>
>I have never had to "explain" anything. In fact I have never been
>asked to turn one on. Since Sept. 11 I have flown at least 30 times
>both in the US and Europe same story every where no problems
>with the radios. What I do pack in my luggage are long sharp antennas.

>I have had no problem with rubber ducks not even a question.
>
>Packed in the suit case and it is vulnerable to theft and the
>airline is not responsible for electronics in luggage--read the
>ticket.
>
>Take it on board leave it off and in your bag and don't worry
>have a nice trip.
>

1310. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 16:21:41 UTC
From: JT <smeg_007@nospam.hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a1pnu9$6v8$1@newsreader.mailgate.org>
Source record: 30724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If it were not for truckers, you wouldnt have CB these days and the old days wouldnt have been as much fun.

1311. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 16:40:24 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201120840.26abf077@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30721

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c3f0e9c_2@news7.fast.net>...

>
> The point is that a demonstration of manual proficiency is
> unnecessary as a condition of licensure ... those who want
> to use the mode will learn it ... in fact, back in my novice
> days, I remember quite a few folks with REALLY bad "fists"
> and who asked for LOTs of repeats ... they learned by
> doing ... what did they hurt? No difference today ...
>
Nobody got to be a Novice without passing a 5 wpm code test and we
took it from there.
>
>
>
> > Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested
> for
> > having any competence with the mode?
>
> There is NO test of operating proficiency for SSB or
> any other mode ...
>
>
Yeah - I've NOTICED!
>
>
> only a requirement, in the written
> tests for some technical understanding of the principles
> of the various other modes ... why should Morse be
> any different? Answer: "It shouldn't."
>
>
No, there is no point to asking "technical questions" about cw in the
exams beyond one question to which the answer would be "ayup, it's
dots, dashes and spaces". That's completely inadequate for licensure
to use the mode.
>
>
>
> More "Morse gets through where nothing else will." myth ...
>
>
Horespucky, don't play that game with me, see below, I've already

freely stated without reservation that PSK31 and Pactor (amongst other
modes)will "get through" better than manual cw when push comes to
shove wrt to noisy low-level signal detection and decoding.
>
>
> I certainly DO know how to use Morse ... I'm not very fast because
> I choose not to use it because it's not my thing, but I do know how.
>
>
Good. That skill just might prove very useful someday, perhaps
critically useful huh? And why are you equipped with that skill?
Because you had to pass a code test to become a ham. Whether you
happened to like it or not.
>
>
> Huff and puff ... the "PCTA bunch" have already lost the war.
> Morse testing will go the way of the dinosaur at WRC-03.
>
>
Don't count yer chickens before they're hatched, it ain't over until
the fat lady sings Sweetums.
>
>
>
> Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
> most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
> (easily built) and some free software you can download.
>
> Where's the (alleged) "cost penalty" in that???
>
>
On the high end my PC cost me $2,300, a decent mutimode HF xvcr is in
the same range. On the low range a 486 doorstop and a used junk xcvr
might be had for what, $600? I could cobble together a usable junkbox
cw station for $150 (which I've already done) or anybody can pop for
one of the very inexpensive cw xcvr kits from MFJ or Ten-Tec. Which do
not have com ports. How many thousands of those are out there?
>
>
Your asumption that every ham or even a large fraction of hams have
computers and/or have any interest in taking a computer into the ham
bands simply highlights your cluelessness wrt to what ham radio is
really all about, particularly HF ham radio. Ham radio is not
digi-centric, you are whence cometh your problem.
>
>
> Can't you see the advantage in being able to do it with
> RADIO and enjoy the freedom of being untethered from
> the telephone network (and the survivability of not being
> dependent on that infrastructure when disasters strike ...

>
>
I've been "untethered" from the phone lines since the day I first hit
the airwaves as a Novice in the 50s. I do not intend to "tether"
myself to a computer which is at least a couple magnitudes less
reliable than both the power mains and the phones.
>
>
> > >
> > "Channel." Boink: There it is again. You'll never get it. 'Nother
> Tech
> > cum HF The Easy Way.
>
>
> [snipped some irrelevant ranting about the definition of "channel")
>
>
> No ... you still don't "get it" ... and probably won't, but Gary
> and I were tring to stimulate some thought on how things
> could be done better and more spectrally-efficiently, so that
> out bands would be better utilized, have less interference,
> and be even more capable of supporting the increased
> numbers of hams that will likely be needed to hold on to the
> large amounts of spectrum we currently have allocated to us.
>
>
Ya just closed the loop. The HF bands are not under fire, the
vhf/uhf/microwave ham bands certainly are endangered. Simple logic
dicates that those bands are where more occupancy needs to happen, not
only that but those bands are wide open for experimentation without
getting tangled up in interfernce issues and the right regs are in
place. But we been here before Sqiuggy, you haven't done a thing about
getting any kind of advanced technology up and running. Except to
bitch about the TAPR thrust to do that. Windbag.
>
>
> [deleted the rest of the "don't get it" rants ... it's clear that
> Mr. Kelly will forever be unwilling to accept or recognize
> any advantages in anything more modern than manual
> Morse ... I wish him all the enjoyment of his beeping]
>
>
Trust me, I will Sweetums. Along with ssb, FM, packet, PSK31 and with
whatever whizzy new "modes" I dump into my hard drive as they pop up .
. . can we expect you to be the author of one of those? THERE's yer
opportunity to become an HF digihero.
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>

w3rv

1312. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 16:44:21 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <FJZ%7.249286$WW.13354871@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30722

> N2EY writes:

> >Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely should
> NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur
> allocations.

Never say never Larry... if they move 40 meters there will need to be a
change.

> IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are --
> CW/digital only, >200w.

Larry, there are NO CW/digital only subbands for Novice/Tech Plus. What are
you talking about? Of course, they don't have a phone subband either, only
CW/ssb. They do have one CW, RTTY and data subband. Novice and Tech plus
numbers are decreasing rapidly but these subbands may very well be relegated
to the Technician class in the absense of Element 1.

> No phone band expansion. Expanding the
> phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on
> code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate
> same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS.

Right, well, maybe just a slight change. I think for now, as the Advanced
numbers decrease the Generals could move to the Advanced subbands because
with a three license structure you don't need three subbabnds for two
licenses.

> So,
> let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone
> emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.

I believe the CW, RTTY and digital subband should remain as is.

> The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
> or shut up!

They don't have anywhere to work, yet. So, patience, Larry. Now is not the
time.

Rich

1313. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 17:09:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112120948.22158.00000128@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 30723

In article <a1ogpv$c92$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0201100907.2c61358@posting.google.com...
>> KC2HMN wrote:
>>
>> > > I come to the table as a relatively
>> > > "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure to
>> > > be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
>> > > element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
>> > > equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
>> > > remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station and
>> > > EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of these
>> > > skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?
>> >
>> K2UNK wrote:
>>
>> > If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
>> > have passed the test.
>>
>> Or they could have been the ones that made him flunk it.
>>
>> > Equating the "separate" morse test to
>> > one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
>> > a valid comparison.
>>
>> But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
>> most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
>> General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
>> are as "necessary" as the Morse test.
>
>So you now want to end written testing, theory testing?

Nope.

I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is not
necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written tests -
particularly the General and Extra written tests.

>Take it to the FCC if you want.

I won't. But somebody else will.

> I and the most other NCI
>BOD believe theory knowledge is good.

So do I. But why MUST it be tested? Why MUST the FCC force it down people's throats with all that written testing just to get a license?

> I don't have to
>defend that unless the FCC suddenly
>wanted to change that.

At which time you will be listened to the same way the procodetest folks were listened to.

>The FCC has already accepted the
>idea that morse testing is no longer needed.

And they've already accepted the idea that less written testing is needed.

>> > > Are not the
>> > > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
>> > > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
>> > > questions?
>>
>> That depends on one's background.
>>
>> Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
>> current amateur exams is not very high.
>
>Would you expect otherwise?

I would expect the top license to require somewhat more knowledge of radio than it does.
>
>> Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
>> to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
>> a bit of radio.
>
>How do you define HARD? What is the measurement?

I define it as how much you actually have to know about radio to pass the test. From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs from scratch than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it didn;t require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
>
>> > The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
>> > some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
>> > send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
>>
>> In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
>> obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.
>
>The parrallel doesn't exist...it is that simple.

Of course it exists - you just don't see it, or don't want to see it.

>Disagree all you
>want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.

Not yet.

>They (the FCC)
>are the ones you'd need to convince to change anything. The R&O
>is almost 2 years old...NCI doesn't have to "see or acknowledge"
>anything...and even if we did, so what...it would impact nothing.

Exactly.

My point is simply this: When someone preaches about "eliminating unnecessary barriers to a license" they cannot logically say the Morse test is a barrier but the written tests above Technician are not. That the FCC or others don't see it is immaterial.

A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to operate a transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter on 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate a transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter on 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid answer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1314. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 17:39:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112123901.25530.00001470@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30725

> I assume
>you're referring to some of my comments, at least in part ...
>I didn't "promise a digital 'paradise' " ... what I said was that
>there were benefits in adopting more modern, effective
>technologies and that the ARS should take advantage of those
>benefits, rather than staying stuck in the past forever.
>
>Carl - wa6vse

BULLSHIT Karl, your the one who was Whinning about not being able to
Experiment with all "your" New Digital Stuff on VHF and UHF because you had to
have HF Access to this.

1315. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 17:41:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112124134.25530.00001472@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 30726

>I *REALLY* wish you hadn't gone there ... the picture
>that can't help but conjure up is so revolting that I nearly
>barfed on my notebook :-)
>
>Carl - wa6vs

Im surprised you didnt see a Black Helicopter over your house. Or maybe even a GUN on your Monitor

1316. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 17:54:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407856.EBFAE5D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30727

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Arnie Macy wrote:
> >> How long will it last compared to running an HF radio solo? Just curious.
> > >
> > >I've never run it down.
> >
> > That doesn't tell us anything.

It tells you everything I know. :-)

> > > It should be relatively easy to calculate. My
> > >laptop is fused at 2 amps and my IC-706 draws 2 amps on receive.
> >
> > The laptop draws about 1 amp if it's fused for 2. Add 2 amps for the receiver
> > and we have 3 amps constant draw just to receive.
> >
> > How much does the PACTOR II box draw? As I understand it, PACTOR II is a
> > proprietary system that is not implemented with just a computer and sound card.

The PTC2e draws 1/2 amp.

> > So it takes at least 3 amp hours to power that setup for one hour using PACTOR
> > II and 2 amp hours per hour using CW/Morse.

Nope, that's not true. PACTOR II uses 16DPSK modulation and so enjoys a
considerable noise margin over CW/Morse. I believe that margin is around 6dB.

> > Most "modern digital modes" have the transmitter running almost continuously.
> > So at the 100 W power level the rig draws
> > about 20 amps whenever in transmit mode, plus the 1 amp for the computer.

Ah, but most modern digital modes don't require 100 watts to function. While
the CW transmitter is outputting an average of 50w, the PACTOR II transmitter
is outputting an average of 12 watts for the same S/N ratio. Thus the PACTOR II
setup draws much less current than the CW setup. Plus PACTOR II has a throughput
about 50 times higher than CW so CW consumes many magnitudes more power over all.

> > Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less emergency energy
> > capacity than he thinks.

Maybe so, but magnitudes more than if I was using CW. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1317. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 17:57:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407921.E43796E1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30728

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer technologies.
> Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
> inherent reliability and simplicity of use.

In the late 50's, the AMers said that SSB was too unreliable and too
complicated to be used for emergency communications. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1318. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:03:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407A8D.640F02F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30729

Arnie Macy wrote:
> We don't disagree on that, Cecil. If you recall, "Know Code International"
> advocated a much higher written standard if the Morse testing was abolished.
> We said that it wasn't about the Code test, per se; it was about keeping
> high standards. What the FCC did, IMO, was lower the standards at both
> ends. We are still waiting for the floodgate of new Hams to arrive.

It's apparently not going to happen which means the FCC set the standards
at just about where they need to be. Technical folk find the testing
easier than it once was but technical folk are the type of hams we
need. Non-technical folk don't find getting a ham license appreciably
easier than it was before since the written exam was always the hardest
part for them. Not much has changed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1319. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:07:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407B76.E8BAE00F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30730

N2EY wrote:
> How much power does the PACTOR II box require?

Half an amp but I can usually lower the transmit output
power and more than make up the difference. For instance,
increasing the power consumption by 2 amps to support the
laptop and PCT2e allows me to run ten watts output thus
reducing the transmitter power consumption by 15 amps.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1320. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:13:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407CB8.1D75BE2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30731

N2EY wrote:
> Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.

Actually, I think it would be a good idea to make the present
Extra CW/digital sub-bands into CW-only sub-bands. Do you also
want to put a lower speed limit on operators there? :-)

Has anybody suggested making the lower 25kHz of every HF ham
band CW-only? Why would anybody object to that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1321. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:17:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C407DCB.48574C34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30732

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I don't doubt that you have done that, Jim, but in the process you disturbed
> >the energy in that wave and caused it to be discontinuous.
>
> Nope. The antenna and receiver present the same effect to the passing wave
> whether I am using the receiver or not.

AND it has disturbed the energy in the wave either way. As my
college EE prof once said: "Everything you make a measurement,
you make an error."

> Don't have to. The claim was that information could not be extracted from an
> unmodulated carrier. I should how I and many others have done it. QED.

But you disturbed the energy in the wave in the process.
Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1322. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:21:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C407221.A7AB77D9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30733

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it.
> >I'll buy one.
>
> I have seen you imply that Morse code equipment and operatin is the equivalent
> of a single easily portable box. Perhaps you are saying that one does not have
> to force Morse code use, either?

What, when one is "forced" to learn Morse code to use it? Why, Ed, you commit sacrilege!
What I am still waiting for is for Cecil and Squiggy et al to fulfill their promise of an advanced digital revolution they promised if CW testing would just go away. What I want is a single box that will do all that now demands a rats nest of fragile cabling and shakey,crashprone software. They insist it has all been so posssible for so long yet none of them deliver, instead just hang out on HF SSB. Just as predicted.

1323. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:30:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C40745C.DD0368D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30734

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C3D1697.B5266F77@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Hey W3RV, didja get a loada that? Squiggy thinks that RTTY, PSK31 et al
> >are radiotelegraphy!
> > We knew he (and Cecil) were screwed up but hey, they got a real case of
> >it!
>
> Dick:
>
> Uhhh -- don't look now, but RTTY and PSK-31 (I don't know what "et al" are)
> ARE radiotelegraphy! If you think they aren't, what, then, pray tell, are
> they? (IYOHO, that is.)
>

I dunno, Larry, I haven't yet figured out how to key PACTOR or PSK31 with a bug or even an electronic keyer. Actually I haven't even made it to 50WPM RTTY or ASCII. How'd ya do it?

1324. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:31:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4080F3.241453E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30736

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What, when one is "forced" to learn Morse code to use it?

All US HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code, Dick.
No-code techs are the only hams who can use Morse code on the air without being
forced to learn it. Go figger.

> What I am still waiting for is for Cecil and Squiggy et al to fulfill their
> promise of an advanced digital revolution they promised if CW testing would just
> go away.

We've said many times that it was possible, Dick, and it is. But please
re-post any posting of mine where I promised I was going to do it.

> What I want is a single box that will do all that now demands a rats nest
> of fragile cabling and shakey,crashprone software. They insist it has all been so
> posssible for so long yet none of them deliver, instead just hang out on HF SSB.
> Just as predicted.

I haven't been on HF SSB for more than six months, Dick. In fact, the
only mode I've used in the last six months is my favorite, CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1325. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:32:12 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <Mi%%7.81177$fe1.1127859@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30735

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> > I said it once already - check with ED HARE, that was his phrase which
I
> > just picked up, *understood exactly what he meant* and merely used
again.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> Actually, Dick, my original use of the phrase was in response to Cecil,
who
> said that in his professional (digital) experience, if it wasn't a 0 or a
1, it
> was broken. I posted one word -- "tristate."

In my mind, tri-state is when you shut the rig down or when you're not transmitting and someone else can have the frequency. That is the main use of tri-state is to not assert yourself on the bus in order for another circuit to assert the bus.

> What was pointing out is that in the digital world since the 1970s,
digital
> circuits can be 0, 1 or not there -- the tristate mode.

Right, tri-state on bus structured systems tend to be high impedance and with a pull-up/pull-down arraingenment for a quiescent voltage ~ 1.4 V in between a 0 and a 1.

> I think that somehow, this got confused with Morse code. Not having been
> involved in the early part of this thread, I offered that the off state in
OOK
> CW can be likened to the off state in digital circuitry, commonly known as
> "tri-state."

Yes and no, I think that's the 'not transmitting' mode.

> Now, whether OOK CW is a dual state or a tri-state mode depends on how one
> thinks about it and how it is encoded, IMHO. If, for example, one could
use
> the off state to represent a 0 and the on state to represent a 1. In that
case,
> OOK CW is binary.

I wrote in another response that CW was when you transmit a continuous wave and modify the transmition by inserting bit spaces, letter spaces, and word spaces which encodes the morse. The crux of that is don't think about sending dits and dahs but think about modulating your continuous wave with

well spaced spaces. ;-) Then it becomes apparant that it is binary and if you use the word tristate... reserve it for when your listening.

Now you'll tell me your spaces are tri-state because someone else could 'break-in'. Of course you know, in a bus stuctured system, the bus is usually low true and if someone assert a 1 on the bus it's entirely possible (but not kosher) that another board could assert a zero and the zero would win.

> However, in modulating signals, what is a logic 0 and what is a logic 1 can be
> determined by any defined state, from the above off=0/on=1 state to the states
> defined by FSK, PSK and any of a number of "digital" modulation methods.

PSK31 idles with a constantly changing phase... 0's when the phase doesn't change is how that encodes a 1 and they're off to the races. I wouldn't call the idle time tri-state time though because no one else can assert themselves.

> So, if one is sending Morse-encoded OOK CW, it becomes a matter of semantics as
> to what level represents what bit state. Is the letter A 10111000 or is the
> "dit" a 0 and the dah a 1, giving 0-tristate-1-tristate?

Well, 'on' is usually considered a 1 or true or high but I have seen negative logic systems where a 1 is low. One system I did used -12V for VCC because PNP transistors were faster. The whole system was built on NOR logic rather than the typical 7400 series NAND logic and +5. It was before 7400 were invented. I mean 5 or 9 input NOR gates are wierd to get used to we called them B-Fog's short for big fogging gates. ;-)

> Or is it
0-tristate_element_space_length-1-tristate_character_space_length?

Highly unlikely... ;-)

> IMHO, the off-state of OOK CW most physically resembles the off-state of a
> tri-state digital device, so if one really needs to make this more than the
> joke I had made, then the analogy is not a flawed one. Neither are the ones
> that Cecil is discussing, either, and, in the case of Morse encoding, at least
> for human decoding of same, 0 and 1 really have no meaning. To me, the overall
> sound of di-dah registers as a A.

Yes, if you consider that someone can break in on your transmission, during the off time, then the 0 or 'off' state is a 'tri-state' state then,,,
'tristate' is NOT 'on' therefore...
'off' is NOT 'on' therefore...

'tristate' is 'off' therefore...
'tristate' is the same as off...
so it still has two states; one state has two names.

If we wanted to be more clear then we would say OTK... ;-)

> Now, you are probably missing the real point of this, Dick. I think that
Cecil
> has taken a position and kept this going primarly to get your goat. In
this
> case, it appears to me that he has suceeded.

OOK CW is binary. That my assertion, mox nix what Cecil or anyone else says.
Unless they can prove it's not binary. It is what it is, ;-)

Rich

1326. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:51:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C407921.C54345B0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30737

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether Morse code
> > > should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try to
> > > force PACTOR II upon you?
> >
> > Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it. I'll buy
> > one.
>
> Same with CW. :-)

So you missed the fact that CW is already "all in one portable box", along with SSB?
Maybe that's why you're so misinformed.

1327. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 18:54:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4079E1.72931223@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30738

CAM wrote:

> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > I agree that having CW available is the logical choice because it is
> > available on almost all rigs.
>
> I agree with that. What we disagree on is whether an HF ham should
> have the right to choose to learn Morse code or not. If he chooses
> not to learn Morse code and then has a need for CW, that's his problem,
> not yours or mine. I suspect if he needed CW bad enough, he would
> learn Morse code pretty darn fast.

Oh, yeah, Right! I guess that would be one of the many who "can't"?

1328. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:04:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C407C41.7E5B019@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30739

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> > Now, you are probably missing the real point of this, Dick. I think that Cecil
> > has taken a position and kept this going primarly to get your goat. In this
> > case, it appears to me that he has suceeded.
>
> I got the entire herd, Ed. :-) "Head 'em up, move 'em out!"

Unhuh. Of course we knew he was trolling all along, but there are many newcomers who take his nonsense seriously. They were'nt around when he was cornered into stating that nothing he posts here is to be taken seriously. That's a big mistake and a serious disservice to them and to the ARS.

1329. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:09:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112140943.05154.00001031@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30741

In article <20020112070306.15114.00000534@mb-ba.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely should
>NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur
>allocations. IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are --
>CW/digital only, >200w. No phone band expansion. Expanding the
>phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on
>code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate
>same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS. So,
>let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone
>emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.

I agree with most of that, Larry. But I also expect that support for more room for 'phone will grow to the point that the 'phone bands are widened again and again.

Or an organization with a name like "No Subbands International" will arise...
>
>The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
>or shut up!

Predicted, not promised. Hasn't happened. Won't happen for a long time.

Ask Carl what mode(s) he used to work all that HF DX. He probably won't answer you either, but I betcha "modern digital modes" didn't account for many countries.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1330. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:09:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112140944.05154.00001032@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 30740

In article <3C405447.6FB74A61@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
>> hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
>> there read it?
>
>Yep, back in the 60's. But Larry, Ayn Rand would be against the
>federal Morse code requirement.

Just the opposite. She'd be for it.

That is, if she wasn't against amateur radio as a whole. Her philosophy would probably have auctioned off the entire EM spectrum to the highest bidders decades ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1331. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:10:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TS%%7.350814$W8.13337412@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30742

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020112073332.15114.00000536@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <CtN%7.394$V55.74335@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie
Macy"
> <kt4st@csam.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote ...
> >
> >> Megadittoes on that, Hans.
> >>
> >> Also some Vonnegut:
> >>
> >> Short stories:
> >> "Welcome To The Monkey House"
> >> "The Euphio Question"
> >> "Harrison Bergeron"
> >>
> >> Novels:
> >> "Cat's Cradle"
> >> "Slapstick"
> >> "Slaughterhouse Five"
> >> "The SIrens of Titan"
> >>
> >> And of course Joseph Heller's immortal "Catch 22"
>
> I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
> hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
> there read it?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Who is John Galt?
>
>

If you do not like to get into the surrealism that Jim and I like, there
are three classic bits of sci-fi by the late Robert Heinlein in your local
library that would stretch you out a bit>

The Moon is a Harsh Mistress
Starship Troopers in spite of the bad movie.
Stranger in a Strange Land if the God Squad, some New Agers, or the
Charles Manson Fan Club haven't stolen it.

I see you have not gotten to the soliloqy on the meaning of the light at the end of a cigarette in AS.

1332. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:11:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C407DF4.9B9F2FC8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30743

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

Dick obviously has a computer ... and I'll bet it has a sound card

> in it (if not, it's likely so old that it's incapable of running the
> vast
> majority of modern "mainstream" software) ...
>
> Thus, he has the capability to use at least many of the more
> modern, effective digital modes.
>

Bet I was on PSK31 before you were. You WERE weren't you? Funny, there's not much of it to be heard on the bands anymore. Could it have been a bit boring?

>
> The fact that he CHOOSES not to exercise that capability
> to be better prepared for emergency communications does
> NOT constitutue an excuse to force everyone else to adopt
> his favorite mode (cw) as the "least common denominator."
>

The fact that you choose to be an illiterate idiot is your problem, not mine. If you had rentd a clue you'd have done some real life comparisons and taken a look at what's out there in use, and why modes are (and are NOT in use). Instead, you chew on your bile still, all these years later, while you yak on SSB.

>
> (Note that I'm not asserting that Dick is not free to choose
> not to exercise the capability ... he certainly is free to operate
> whatever mode(s) he chooses ... all I'm saying is that his
> refusal to be better prepared is not a valid reason to insist
> on dragging everyone else down to his level ....)

Yep, fool, spout your BS, as always. But when the crap comes down it's the capable who handle the problem, not the bullshitters with an attitude and big ideas.

1333. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:12:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C407E29.FC85B29C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30744

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
> > hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
> > there read it?
>
> Yep, back in the 60's. But Larry, Ayn Rand would be against the
> federal Morse code requirement.

Oh, you asked her?

1334. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:30:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C40823C.CC29A328@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30745

CAM wrote:

> > Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less emergency energy
> > capacity than he thinks.
>
> Maybe so, but magnitudes more than if I was using CW. :-)
> --

That is incorrect for a very basic reason. There are far more CW capable `ham stations than there are Pactor2 stations. That is unlikely to change in the forseeable future, if ever.

And if you think there are not many CW capable hams you haven't listened to the HF CW bands on a contest weekend.

1335. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:32:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4082BB.A4791DE2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30746

CAM wrote:

> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer technologies.
> > Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
> > inherent reliability and simplicity of use.
>
> In the late 50's, the AMers said that SSB was too unreliable and too
> complicated to be used for emergency communications. :-)

So you were an AMer then and stated untruths then, as you do now? It's odd, I was around then and heard no such nonsense.

1336. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C40840B.F588136F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30747

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I don't doubt that you have done that, Jim, but in the process you disturbed
> > >the energy in that wave and caused it to be discontinuous.
> >
> > Nope. The antenna and receiver present the same effect to the passing wave
> > whether I am using the receiver or not.
>
> AND it has disturbed the energy in the wave either way. As my
> college EE prof once said: "Everything you make a measurement,
> you make an error."
>
> > Don't have to. The claim was that information could not be extracted from an
> > unmodulated carrier. I should how I and many others have done it. QED.
>
> But you disturbed the energy in the wave in the process.
> Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
> The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
> discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.

What a BS story ! So tell us, o wise ass, just how an antenna disturbs a transmitted wave differently when his receiver is on than when it is off? Doesn't happen, on any level. The impedance of space is constant at 377 ohms, whether or not all the receivers in the world are turned on or off that particular frequency. The receiver loading of a wave once launched into space cannot affect the transmitter.

1337. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:45:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4085DA.764DD593@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30748

Richard Plourde wrote:

> OOK CW is binary. That my assertion, mox nix what Cecil or anyone else says.
> Unless they can prove it's not binary. It is what it is, ;-)
>

Seems I said that it is binary with a third information state added. If you
don't like it I find that very unsurprising.

1338. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 19:49:27 UTC
From: Anonymous <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a1q3v7$n4k$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30749
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
> >
> > On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net>
wrote:
> > : --
> > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> > : pschleck@novia.net
> > : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> > : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
> >
> > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> > : pschleck@gonix.com
> > : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> > : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> > :
> >
> > Do you even READ your own posts?
>
> Do you?
>
> Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
>
> "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> status makes the story even less credible."
>
alt.flame awards elected Roger Wiseman as: Most Boring Writer, Worst
Flamer, Fuckhead of the Year, Most Tenuous Spankclaim, Best Punching
Bag, Most Unwelcome Comeback, and gave him the Golden Peewee Award for
most Blatant IKYABWAI

1339. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 20:49:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A175.3F31D0F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30750

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less emergency energy
> > > capacity than he thinks.
> >
> > Maybe so, but magnitudes more than if I was using CW. :-)
>
> That is incorrect for a very basic reason.

It is incorrect that my PACTOR II setup consumes less power running ten
watts than my transceiver consumes running 100w CW? Dick, you really
need to study the ARRL Handbook a little closer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1340. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 20:57:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A326.67786EF9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30801

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Arnie Macy wrote:
> > > I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer technologies.
> > > Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
> > > inherent reliability and simplicity of use.
> >
> > In the late 50's, the AMers said that SSB was too unreliable and too
> > complicated to be used for emergency communications. :-)
>
> So you were an AMer then and stated untruths then, as you do now? It's odd, I
> was around then and heard no such nonsense.

You've got to be kidding. Seems all I heard was how those single-sidewinders
were going to ruin amateur radio. When did you get your first license? And
I never ran AM. My first voice contact was in the late 60's and it was SSB.
I didn't have a voiceband XTAL for my Globe Scout and my ARC-5 was CW only.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1341. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:00:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A3E1.4724837E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30802

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I agree that it's logical, Dick. What we disagree on is whether Morse code
> > > > should be forced on all HF hams. How would you like someone to try to
> > > > force PACTOR II upon you?
> > >
> > > Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force it. I'll buy
> > > one.
> >
> > Same with CW. :-)
>
> So you missed the fact that CW is already "all in one portable box", along with SSB?
> Maybe that's why you're so misinformed.

Got any idea what :-) means, Dick? What I am saying if there were a "single easily portable box" that would decode CW, then nocoders would buy it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1342. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:09:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A609.63817A7D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30806

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What a BS story ! So tell us, o wise ass, just how an antenna disturbs a
> transmitted wave differently when his receiver is on than when it is off? Doesn't
> happen, on any level. The impedance of space is constant at 377 ohms, whether or
> not all the receivers in the world are turned on or off that particular frequency.
> The receiver loading of a wave once launched into space cannot affect the
> transmitter.

We are not talking about the transmitter, Dick. If a receiver exhibits a
different load when it is on than when it is off, it will affect the
received wave differently. If there is a load resistor in the receiver,
at least some of the received wave is dissipated in the resistor. That
dissipation causes the received wave not to be continuous. When you
detect a wave, it, by being detected, ceases to be a continuous wave.
The only continuous wave possible is, by definition, one that has not
been detected.

Only undetected waves can possibly be continuous. So exactly how are
you going to prove that continuous waves exist?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1343. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:10:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112161007.06877.00001221@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30803

In article <3C407921.E43796E1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Arnie Macy wrote:
>> I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer technologies.
>> Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
>> inherent reliability and simplicity of use.
>
>In the late 50's, the AMers said that SSB was too unreliable and too
>complicated to be used for emergency communications. :-)

And they were right, at that time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1344. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:10:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112161007.06877.00001220@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30805

In article <a1og75did1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >All your comments and efforts (along with a number
>> >of other people's efforts) are directed (IMHO)
>> >at trying to do anything to get NCI to back off.
>>
>> They are devoted to pointing out the facts in this matter. Have I posted
>> anything in this thread that is not true?
>>
>> >The idea of a VOTE is nuts because if such was even
>> >thought to hold merit, the FCC would have followed
>> >such a path.
>>
>> NO. WRONG.
>>
>> The idea of a vote or poll is simply to indicate what people's opinins
>really
>> are. The FCC is not required to follow majority opinion. Saying that the
>idea
>> of a vote is "nuts" sure looks like you don;t want to know what the
>opinion of
>> the amateur community really is.
>
>The FCC does NOT poll the public or the licensed ham community.

True - but that doiesn't mean they shouldn't.

>The FCC opens a comment period to which interested parties can
>file their comments.

When they feel like it.

>YOU want a specific "ballot" or opinion poll
>sent out on the issue(s).

Sure. Why not?

The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.
>
>> > Code testing as a part of international
>> > regs is going...even the ARRL supports that now.
>>
>> They don't oppose it.

>
>Say it any way you want, the ARRL is NOT going
>to take any roll in opposing the end of code testing as a treaty
>requirement which means they will either cast a vote of abstention
>or a yea vote on the issue to abolish.

ARRL and the other IARU societies have no vote on the issue. They can only
advise.
>
>> Neither did the ARRL BoD survey the membership or the
>> amateur radio community on the issue.
>
>Fine by me. I sent my opinion to my director.

Me too.
>
>> Back in 1975, when the idea of a nocodetest license was first proposed by
>the
>> FCC, ARRL sent out a detailed questionnaire to all members, then posted
>the
>> results in QST. Nobody has done anything like that since.
>> >
>> >Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
>> >decision of each administration.
>>
>> It's pretty clear what the FCC will do.
>
>Fine by me...assuming you believe they will drop all
>code testing then for the USA.

I think the FCC will simply issue some sort of "waiver" of Element 1 until the
necessary paperwork is done to remove code testing from the rules. In other
words, they could say that anyone with a valid Tech ticket or above
automatically has Element 1 credit.
>
>> >You can then ask the FCC for a vote.
>>
>> Won't make any difference to them.
>
>If so, then why should I care?

Little thing called democracy...
>
>> > Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
>> >because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
>> >only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
>> >the jurisdiction of the FCC.
>>
>> "The amateur community" includes all who are interested, not just licensed
>> hams.
>

>So how do you identify all those that are interested but aren't
>hams IF the FCC agreed to a vote?
>
Simple - ask 'em. Do a survey where anyone not licensed but interested can ask
for and receive a questionaire.

>> > I suspect (IMHO) that you
>> >and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
>> >regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
>> >and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the
>> >future rules changes.
>>
>> I am not pleased at what I see as something that is not in the best
>interests
>> of the ARS. I don't think the NCI folks are pleased that hams like me
>presented
>> our views to the FCC and in this public forum.
>
>We really don't care much at all. I and, on occasion, some other
>NCI folks routinely counter those comments anyway. I see no
>shift in opinion or attitude towards retention of code testing
>because of anything being stated in this forum or via FCC
>comments.

Which is what I'm saying - FCC's mind was made up long long ago.
>
>> Whether NCI or any group is really influencing the FCC on license test
>matters
>> is a matter of pure speculation. Heck, the FCC quoted KENWOOD'S comments
>11
>> times in the R&O.
>
>Exactly, which still goes to the heart of my point...if
>NCI has so little influence, there sure is enough inerest
>in making us go away or compromise.

The interest is in pointing out errors in NCI arguments.
>
>> > IF we (NCI) were truly of
>> >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
>> >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
>> >back off.
>>
>> What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
>
>Good.

Then you agree that I've never said that anyone should "back off" or be silent
(same thing).
>
>> If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off, just

>> produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.
>
>Then we have no disagreement there.
>
Agreed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1345. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112161008.06877.00001222@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 30804

In article <3C407856.EBFAE5D6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >Arnie Macy wrote:
>> >> How long will it last compared to running an HF radio solo? Just
>curious.
>> >
>> >I've never run it down.
>>
>> That doesn't tell us anything.
>
>It tells you everything I know. :-)

Exactly.
>
>> > It should be relatively easy to calculate. My
>> >laptop is fused at 2 amps and my IC-706 draws 2 amps on receive.
>>
>> The laptop draws about 1 amp if it's fused for 2. Add 2 amps for the
>receiver
>> and we have 3 amps constant draw just to receive.
>>
>> How much does the PACTOR II box draw? As I understand it, PACTOR II is a
>> proprietary system that is not implemented with just a computer and sound
>card.
>
>The PTC2e draws 1/2 amp.

So we have 3.5 amps total system power just to RECEIVE.
>
>> So it takes at least 3 amp hours to power that setup for one hour using
>PACTOR
>> II and 2 amp hours per hour using CW/Morse.
>
>Nope, that's not true.

The correct numbers are 3.5 amp hours and 2 amp hours to RECEIVE.

> PACTOR II uses 16DPSK modulation and so enjoys a
>considerable noise margin over CW/Morse. I believe that margin is around 6dB.
>
Maybe. The power required to receive a Pactor 2 signal is still almost double
that required to receive a CW/Morse signal.

>> Most "modern digital modes" have the transmitter running almost
>continuously.
>> So at the 100 W power level the rig draws
>> about 20 amps whenever in transmit mode, plus the 1 amp for the computer.
>
>Ah, but most modern digital modes don't require 100 watts to function.

Neither does CW.

>While
>the CW transmitter is outputting an average of 50w, the PACTOR II transmitter
>is outputting an average of 12 watts for the same S/N ratio.

Let's see...

6 dB is 4 times the power. So if the PACTOR II box is putting out 12.5 watts,
the CW box will theoretically need to do 50 watts for the same S/N.

However, the CW box has an on-time of 40% maximum. So 50 watts of transmitted
power averages out to 20 watts.

Thus, for the same S/N, the CW box needs to AVERAGE 20 watts on TX to match the
PACTOR II box's 12.5 watts.

The computer and PACTOR II decoder draw a total of 1.5 amps at 12 volts. That's
18 watts.

So the total system power requirements for the same S/N works out like this:

CW rig needs 7.5 watts more TX power than the PACTOR II setup,

BUT

The PACTOR II setup needs 18 more watts to power the TNC and laptop.

Difference: 10.5 watts (almost an amp at 12 volts) in FAVOR of the CW setup.

>Thus the PACTOR
>II
>setup draws much less current than the CW setup.

Nope. Do the math. The CW setup wins on the power scenario, receive or
transmit, at the power level you specified..

> Plus PACTOR II has a
>throughput
>about 50 times higher than CW so CW consumes many magnitudes more power over
>all.

PACTOR 2 can do 1500-2000 wpm??
>
>> Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less emergency
>energy
>> capacity than he thinks.
>
>Maybe so, but magnitudes more than if I was using CW. :-)

We're not talking about YOU, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1346. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:18:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30807

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
> > > hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
> > > there read it?
> >
> > Yep, back in the 60's. But Larry, Ayn Rand would be against the
> > federal Morse code requirement.
>
> Oh, you asked her?

Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1347. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:19:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40A87C.E59D9774@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30808

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Stranger in a Strange Land if the God Squad, some New Agers, or the
> Charles Manson Fan Club haven't stolen it.

One of the best books of all time, IMO.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1348. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 21:40:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C40AD3F.3AE17D4A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30809

N2EY wrote:
> Nope. Do the math. The CW setup wins on the power scenario, receive or
> transmit, at the power level you specified..

Not when you include the PACTOR II throughput edge over CW. In that
minute that it takes you to send 20 words, PACTOR II can send 960
words. How does one minute of PACTOR II operation compare with 48
minutes of CW operation as far as power consumption?

> > Plus PACTOR II has a throughput
> >about 50 times higher than CW so CW consumes many magnitudes more power over
> >all.

> PACTOR 2 can do 1500-2000 wpm??

PACTOR II has a throughput about 50 times higher than *my* fastest CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1349. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 22:25:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112172555.20942.00001174@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30810

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
>The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
>discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.

So we are back to a state where what you claim a continuous wave means cannot exist.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1350. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 22:41:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112174108.20942.00001175@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30811

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>Those of us who use CW on a regular basis, already know this. That's why we
>are out there elmering and extolling the virtues of the mode, whether they
>remove the testing requirement or not.

Way to go, Arnie! That is just what I am doing. Some of what I have seen some say in an attempt (futile?) to preserve code testing in its present form would undermine that effort if there were no code testing. I think all of us should be careful not to say things we will have to deny later! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1351. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 22:42:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112174222.20942.00001176@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30812

From: "Richard Plourde" rplourde@att.net

>In my mind, tri-state is when you shut the rig down or when you're not
>transmitting and someone else can have the frequency. That is the main use
>of tri-state is to not assert yourself on the bus in order for another
>circuit to assert the bus.

I agree, that is a better analogy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1352. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 23:00:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112180014.01565.00000910@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30813

From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>I'm not against new technology. My point was that we need to configure our
>ARS with as small an inventory as possible while still getting the job done.

I see it quite differently, Arnie. I believe that, as a whole, Amateur Radio should be as diverse as possible to get the job done. That way, no matter what type of problem crops up, there will be a solution at hand.

I think the real discussion here is to what degree configuring the Amateur Radio Serivce to get the job done should be a matter of the self-training aspects of Amateur Radio vis a vis the regulated testing requirements to enter Amateur Radio. For all modes but one, the former seems to be the dominant factor. I believe that even for that singled-out mode, it would still be a dominant factor in hams choosing to use a mode that has significant utility and use.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1353. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 23:02:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112180243.01565.00000912@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30814

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>Ya just closed the loop. The HF bands are not under fire, the
>vhf/uhf/microwave ham bands certainly are endangered.

The threats to HF are significant, not necessarily from an allocations point of view, but from a growing problem of power-line noises, DSL and cable leakage, home networking and a host of other things that have been authorized under Part 15 for decades, but are just now coming into widespread use. Occupancy will become moot if the band is filled with unlicensed S9+signals.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1354. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 23:07:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112180701.01565.00000914@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 30815

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Got any idea what :-) means, Dick? What I am saying if there were a "single
>easily
>portable box" that would decode CW, then nocoders would buy it.

http://www.mfjenterprises.com/products.php?prodid=MFJ-461

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1355. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 23:44:43 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <LT308.81707$fe1.1157137@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30816

Jim, I like that! No Subbands International. Great, and we might see it. Perhaps if the phone bands are expanded to be legal anywhere, we could add a "super" class ticket, higher than the extra. To obtain this license, all one would have to do is bring their export radio with echo mic and roger beep to the exam. They would be given the ticket immediately, along with any callsign they desire (even WWV). Oh, they would be allowed 5,000 watts at 150% modulation also.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112140943.05154.00001031@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <20020112070306.15114.00000534@mb-ba.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >>Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim:
> >
> >If code testing is ever abolished, the one thing that absolutely should
> >NOT be done is to change the current subbands within the amateur
> >allocations. IOW, keep the Novice/Tech Plus subbands as they are --
> >CW/digital only, >200w. No phone band expansion. Expanding the
> >phone bands makes no sense, when all throughout the debate on
> >code testing, the main argument used by those seeking to eliminate
> >same was the fact that digital modes were the future of the ARS. So,
> >let's not junk up our present CW/digital operating space with phone
> >emissions. CW would remain to be authorized everywhere, of course.
>
> I agree with most of that, Larry. But I also expect that support for more
room
> for 'phone will grow to the point that the 'phone bands are widened again
and
> again.
>
> Or an organization with a name like "No Subbands International" will
arise...
> >
> >The no-coders promised a digital paradise; now it's time to put up
> >or shut up!
>

> Predicted, not promised. Hasn't happened. Won't happen for a long time.
>
> Ask Carl what mode(s) he used to work all that HF DX. He probably won't
answer
> you either, but I betcha "modern digital modes" didn't account for many
> countries.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1356. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-12 23:54:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <51408.81720$fe1.1158064@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30817

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112172555.20942.00001174@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
> >The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
> >discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.
>
> So we are back to a state where what you claim a continuous wave means
cannot
> exist.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Not precisely, Ed. He is saying that if you know it exists, it doesn't
anymore and you are a wave-murderer.

1357. Re: Freeband Getting Trashed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 00:00:51 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f5wo6e.j5p7n11wkfrg9N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 30818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

richard ruiz <resacaga@bellsouth.net> wrote:

> It's people like you Useless that make Truckers and others people in a bad
> light, Since I'm a Ham Radio Operator, and a Truck Driver. This would seem
> that you have Railroad tracks running to your back door.
>
> Remember ONE thing if you can Simple Minded Little Shit.
> TRUCKS MOVE AMERICA

And little lambs eat ivy.

--
What's the difference between light & hard?
You can sleep with a light on...

1358. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 00:06:06 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <a1qj1elqu1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 30819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote:
>Do you even READ your own posts? And just which call is really yours?
>I see that someone else on here is very annoyed with you, claiming that
>you send out unsolicited email (spam).
>
>So are you K3FU or KD3FU, and do you send out spam? If you do send
>unsolicited email, you are another example of why people should never
>put their real email addresses in Usenet posts.

Paul set up an automailing of a "Welcome To Rec.radio.amateur"
FAQ to welcome new posters to the rra newsgroups. It's an
excellent idea for a new poster to immediately receive the auto-sent
FAQ rather than waiting for my sporadic posting of it (I used to
post it monthly, then 4 times per year, then...) It's a one-time
mailing, so no one should get bent out of shape for having received
it. The few complaints ISPs have received have been immediately
dismissed; apparently they too feel it's a great idea.

Paul's new call is K3FU. When someone gets a new call, their old
one can still show up at some sites. My old WH6U along with my
newer call still pops up on the callsign.ualr.edu 2000 telnet site.

73, Jeff KH6O (poster of the rec.radio FAQs, when I get around to it!)

--
Operations Specialist | Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard | University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil | jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

1359. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 00:30:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020112193010.16286.00001043@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 30820

From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>Not precisely, Ed. He is saying that if you know it exists, it doesn't
>anymore and you are a wave-murderer.

I don't know if the horse is dead, but it appears that the horse-beating stick
is getting a bit frayed. I think everybody understands OOK CW and folks are
just trying to make it look like their "opponent" does not. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1360. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 00:45:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1N408.81824$fe1.1161979@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30821

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112193010.16286.00001043@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Not precisely, Ed. He is saying that if you know it exists, it doesn't
> >anymore and you are a wave-murderer.
>
> I don't know if the horse is dead, but it appears that the horse-beating
stick
> is getting a bit frayed. I think everybody understands OOK CW and folks
are
> just trying to make it look like their "opponent" does not. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Oh it could get worse. From Heisenberg we could easily go to inflation of the universe, string theory, the Standard Model, and whether the big bang was a tunnel diode phenomenon (I kid you not) on a quantum scale. We have not yet begun to fight; we are limited only by the symbol sets on our keyboards. e to the u du dx, e to the x dx, secant cosine tangent sine, 3.14159.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1361. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 01:33:37 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <e6TQbF9mBHA.1876@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30822

N2EY wrote:

> Also some Vonnegut:
>
> Short stories:
> "Welcome To The Monkey House"
> "The Euphio Question"
> "Harrison Bergeron"
>
> Novels:
> "Cat's Cradle"
> "Slapstick"
> "Slaughterhouse Five"
> "The SIrens of Titan"

If you like Kurt, whose theme in all his work is "Be nice, god-damn it!",
you would
love Orson Scott Card whose work has the underlying theme of "right
conduct".
Get a copy of "Enders Game", "Speaker for the Dead", or the five books in
the
"Tales of Alvin Maker" collection, especially "Heartfire" -- I dare you to
try lay that
one down!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1362. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 01:57:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40eb04_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30823

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201091127.5ac252c5@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c39f4b8_1@news7.fast.net>...>
> >
> >
> > I personally don't care if people are still beeping (or not) long
> > after I'm gone ... as long as they do it by choice rather than
> > being forced to do it against their will in order to obtain totally
> > unrelated privs that they're otherwise fully qualified for ...
> >
> >
> How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
> order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
> test?
> >

No one tested me on voice before I keyed up the first time. No one's ever
tested me on APRS, either.

Kim W5TIT

1363. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:01:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40ebc2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30824

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3E7411.C4CC7F40@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C3D2517.8E7CBA6A@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > > > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > > > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > > > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> > > > > >
> > > > > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > > > > --
> > > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > > >
> > > > Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|
> > > >
> > > That you could have posted the idiotic statements you made and then
make
> > > any comment about another's rational thoughts is the ultimate in sheer
> > > gall. What a Jeter.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > What idiotic statements are you speaking of, Dave?
>
> Kim Walker's Secrets Of 2m FM Sucess in one difficult to swallow post,
> of course.
>
> Dave K8MN

If you saw the post, then it's not much of a secret then, is it? Hey, Dave,
exemplify yourself.

Kim W5TIT

1364. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:02:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40ec10_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30825

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3E763D.56F226EA@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over
some of
> > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave
Heil
> > be damned....
>
> I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
>
> Dave K8MN

Sorry to so disappoint you, Dave. But for whatever reasons they work. You
don't have to have such feelings one way or the other, as I suppose you'll
never use them anyway.

Kim W5TIT

1365. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:03:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40ec69_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30826

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3E77FC.7E03470C@earthlink.net...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over
some of
> > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them
work,
> > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc.
We
> > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave
Heil
> > > be damned....
> >
> > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
>
> Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> yourself with 'em.
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh, I always love the "you're spelling it wrong" responses...

Exemplify yourself, Dave. Rise above the pit you've got yourself in.

Kim W5TIT

1366. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:05:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40ecd2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30827

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C3E8306.85F98013@earthlink.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting
over some of
> > > > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them
work,
> > > > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them,
etc. We
> > > > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times,
Dave Heil
> > > > > be damned....
> > > >
> > > > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > > > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't
have
> > > > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > > > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
> > >
> > > Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> > > yourself with 'em.
> >
> > Dave, be nice to Miss Piggy, she may turn out to be the Rodney
Dangerfield of
> > rrap.
>
> Well, there's the part where Rodney Dangerfield is intentionally funny.
> The grins we get from Kim are entirely unintentional on her part.
> At the moment, she is more like the Yuri Geller of rrap. Her junk
> science is moronic.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then, you'd best not ever be surrounded by any one of us who do our "crazy"
things when we're playing or being serious. Your high and mightiness is
moronic, Dave. You can't even lead by example, or anything else.

Kim W5TIT

1367. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:12:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40ee86_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30828

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020111070253.20970.00000752@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" none@none.net
>
> >The ARRL Organization in this area is in just as bad a shape.
>
> I didn't mean to imply that things are always rosy, because they are not.
I
> don't know which areas of the country are in good shape, and which are
not, and
> I am sure there are others in your area that hold a view exactly opposite
to
> yours.
>
> I do know that in many areas, the Section Manager, or even Director/Vice
> Director positions, run unopposed. Maybe you could consider giving it a
go!
> :-)
>
> >Our local hams (new *and* old) have no idea
> >about local ARRL leadership, activities, goals, objectives, long-term
plans;
> >and there are no local information nets, etc.
>
> It sounds like you have some good ideas for improvement, Kim. You have
every
> right to ask your Director and SM about his/her plans and objectives for
the
> Division and Section, then to make their answers quite public.
>

ho ho ho...I've "gone public" in the Dallas area a few times, Ed. That's
what I'm "best known" for. When one goes public around here, challenges the
status quo, etc., etc., one pretty much becomes mud.

> >
> > Maybe this isn't stuff that is generally done on a local basis--but it
> > darned well should be in my opinion.
>
> I agree, it should be done more than it is.
>
> > And, whenever I have mentioned it--there's lots of resistance.
>
> Have you mentioned it and offered to help?
>

Yep. Typical answer: "be one of us for a while, then *maybe* your ideas
will be accepted."

> >
> >The resistance may be valid: can't get enough people involved, too much
> >politics, etc., etc. But, as an outgoing ARRL Field Representative, I
can
> >say that it is very frustrating when most of the questions I "fielded"
were
> >those of a general nature and not even all that specific to my specialty:
> >emergency communication.
>
> Unfortunately, the staff in Newington (about 120 folks) cannot do it all
from
> Newington, nor should they. I do not want to see all good things in ham
radio
> coming from Newington, CT. There is a lot of good talent in ham radio and
the
> fact that our ~650,000 numbers can get a lot more done than a handful of
paid
> staff in Connecticut is one of its strengths. But those folks are all
> volunteers, and in my experience, although some volunteers have given so
much
> of themselves that it brings tears to my eyes, there have to be limits. I
don't
> know what the answers are to this one, Kim -- that is why I stick with
RFI. At
> least I have a vision of how to make things better in that area. :-)
>

Nope, I think the National HQ of ARRL effectively does what it's supposed to
do. It's really too bad that more isn't "advertised" at a local level by
those people who are ARRL--maybe they'd increase the membership.

> > Heck, to ask anyone "in the know" around here
> >why upcoming elections are never discussed and pushed on the air, it is
> >because "we can't have ARRL Section leadership outside the Dallas area!"
>
> There is nothing in Part 97 that prohibits the discussion of ARRL section
> politics on the air. There is nothing in the ARRL bylaws that stipulates
that
> your SM can only come from Dallas. The SM must be a resident of the
section,
> meeting some age and membership requirements.
>

I think the mindset set in a long time ago, even before I got into ham
radio. Try saying anything about RACES policy on a Dallas repeater!! Whew!
No debates allowed.

> >
> >Goodness, how lame is that? Then, when you go out into the field, as I
have

> >many, many times, those in the rural area dread getting involved in
Dallas
> >area politics!
>
> That may be the crux of the problem, Kim. If no one is willing to step
forth
> other than the folks from the Dallas area, I can assure you that the SM
will
> always come from the Dallas area. . .
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Yeah, but maybe the rural folks are right :) Maybe that is best. As they say, let Dallas have their ham radio--we'll get the real work done...LOL?

Kim W5TIT

1368. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 02:46:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c40f66b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30829

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:m9J%7.10638$GP2.743689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
> >
> > Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
> > most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
> > (easily built) and some free software you can download.
> >
>
> The problem (as I have always seen it) is that it *requires* the use of a
> computer and associated software to interface the technology with the
radio.
> (and we all know what can happen to installed software when we need it
most)
> It's bad enough that we have to have a deep cell marine battery to run the
> rig during emergency comms (those suckers are heavy) but now we have to
lug
> around a laptop and a separate power supply for it as well.
> [SNIP}
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

Dave H., ignore this, it's too inventive for you:

A lot of the new Handheld PC devices take the place of the laptop computer!
And, with micro-this and micro-that, it won't be but a few years and what
now takes up a whole backpack will fit in the palm of our hand, I bet!

Kim W5TIT

1369. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 03:11:45 UTC
From: Crazy Horse <itsame@my.net>
Message-ID: <3c40fc5a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 30830

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C40823C.CC29A328@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > Cecil's concept is basically a good one, but he may have less
emergency energy
> > > capacity than he thinks.
> >
> > Maybe so, but magnitudes more than if I was using CW. :-)
> > --
>
> That is incorrect for a very basic reason. There are far more CW capable
`ham
> stations than there are Pactor2 stations. That is unlikely to change in
the
> forseeable future, if ever.
>

Tit for tat, Dick. Where's your reference for the above information? Or,
are you using your crystal ball again?

Kim W5TIT :o (coming in under the radar)

1370. Re: Damn Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 04:05:42 UTC
From: Richard Dalton <rsdalton1@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qI708.26310$Vz3.2677930@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 30831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

As long as the barrel has a soft bottom,it's okay by me :-)
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:H9H%7.80004$fe1.1018398@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Richard, lemme give you a clue. You will note that Google is the source
> for both of these posts and google is a well-known public urinal.
>
> You will note that it is cross-posted to two groups that have little in
> common.
>
> So it is a pretty fair bet they are the same guy. They are also ancient
> history.
>
> Everyone is a rookie once. You have had your once. Then you can fall
> into the barrel as I have been known to and it will be twice.
>
> OK?
>
> Dick N�BK
>
> "Richard Dalton" <rsdalton1@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:7%G%7.22731$zw3.2250108@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Don't be so bitter about not passing the electronics test
> > the world needs cbers too!
> > "Eustis Cornhauser" <eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:e9af79fa.0201091023.5c25bd02@posting.google.com...
> > > That's an insult, how dare they not post such articles. I remember in
> > > the late 70's and the early 80's 73 magazine carried mods for just
> > > about every single chicken band radio of any significance.
> > >
> > > The average ham sits around with his mike in one hand, his cock in the
> > > other, and kerchunks the local repeater all day while jacking off.
> > >
> > > Sorry, that's just the way it is. The tests are so easy, they're
> > > meaningless, the hobby is going down the tubes, fast.
> > >
> > > The freebanders will become the real hams within a few years.
> > >
> > > The average no-coder has the intelligence of a fart. A no-coder buys
> > > his two meter hand held, takes it out of the box, and talks. A
> > > cellular phone user does the same thing. What's the difference? The
> > > cell phone user actually gets quality communications.
> > >

> > > These new no coders are nothing but cellular phone user wanna bees.
> > > They can't afford the monthly rate of a cell phone, and their trailer
> > > park doesn't allow external antennas so they use their little two
> > > meter hand held jackoff box.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > moparho1ic@hotmail.com (Moparholic) wrote in message
> > news:<b4f86a9c.0201051753.50543d66@posting.google.com>...
> > > > I just got finished reading a QST magazine and I get the impression
> > > > that the whole damn amateur radio hobby is not encouraging to CB
> > > > freebanders. I don't see one article about high power linears or
> > > > freeband DX or radio mods to get 25 to 32 mhz transmit coverage.
> Don't
> > > > you guys know you have to be nice to us and treat us with respect or
> > > > we won't get our licenses and then your hobby will die? Who can I
> > > > write to about this at the ARRL?
> > > >
> > > > ~/Moparholic~
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

1371. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 04:16:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <IV708.13372$3x5.925980@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30832

"Kim" wrote ...
>
> A lot of the new Handheld PC devices take the place of the laptop
computer!
> And, with micro-this and micro-that, it won't be but a few years and what
> now takes up a whole backpack will fit in the palm of our hand, I bet!
>

That is a good answer, Kim. I wonder why Carl didn't think of that?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1372. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 04:44:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41109A.4C4B8065@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30833

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
> >The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
> >discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.
>
> So we are back to a state where what you claim a continuous wave means cannot
> exist.

A continuous wave probably can exist, Ed, but one cannot prove that it exists.
It is essentially the same problem as trying to simultaneously determine
both the mass and position of an electron.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1373. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 04:45:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4110F8.1B205E6B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30834

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Not precisely, Ed. He is saying that if you know it exists, it doesn't
> anymore and you are a wave-murderer.

If you detect a continuous wave, it ceases to be continuous.
Seems we must rely on faith for the existence of continuous waves. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1374. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:01:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Uw808.263263$WW.13423827@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30835

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C4110F8.1B205E6B@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Not precisely, Ed. He is saying that if you know it exists, it
doesn't
> > anymore and you are a wave-murderer.
>
> If you detect a continuous wave, it ceases to be continuous.
> Seems we must rely on faith for the existence of continuous waves. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Faith: believing what you know damned well isn't so.

Mark Twain

1375. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:12:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411723.4A4B6CAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30836

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected board
> > and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
> > Its views are the views of the directors.
>
> That's because the new members sign on to the published goals
> of NCI. If one doesn't agree with those published goals, one
> doesn't join.

That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
There is no known mechanism for "unjoining". I don't know of any other
membership organization which operates in the same manner.

Dave K8MN

1376. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:21:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201122121.4906b199@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30837

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020112101001.05154.00001024@mb-fm.aol.com>...

> >The only CW-only frequencies are available to nocode techs. The
> >FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence there.
>
> Alrighty then.
>
> Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.
>
>
Yeah the lower 25s of 160, 80, 40 (the treaty already settled the
matter of the cw setaside on 30m), 20 and 15m, absolutely, makes huge
sense, let's go for it.
>
>

> > In
> >fact, the FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence
> >in ANY mode except CW below 30 MHz.
>
>
The FCC doan require ya to operate on 30m either but don't try it
unless yer beeping.
>
>

> Doesn't mean it's the right thing to do.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

1377. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:24:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30838

> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW;
basic
> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the other?

But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
to send/receive. That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
the ham can be the operator. Most other modes allow for
anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
as control operator. That allows the ham to let emergency
people directly communicate with each other even though they
no knowthing about the ham radio, etc. There is a beutiful
simplicity too in just being able to use the mike button/push
to talk. Balance one againt the other? The world has
already done that by default.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1378. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:31:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411B89.88FA297F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30839

```
W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3E7411.C4CC7F40@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C3D2517.8E7CBA6A@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C3D17BA.9C45A32@IEEE.org...
> > > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > > > > Since I've seen this message from Dave about 4-5 times
> > > > > > > so far, I'm beginning to believe that HE actually BELIEVES
> > > > > > > these ridiculous statements ... otherwise, why would he
> > > > > > > keep posting them over and over again? :-)
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He has exhausted all his rational thoughts?
> > > > > > > --
> > > > > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Rational?! Dave H.? CECIL!! {:|
> > > > >
> > > > > That you could have posted the idiotic statements you made and then
> make
> > > > > any comment about another's rational thoughts is the ultimate in sheer
> > > > > gall. What a Jeter.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > What idiotic statements are you speaking of, Dave?
> > >
> > > Kim Walker's Secrets Of 2m FM Sucess in one difficult to swallow post,
> > > of course.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > If you saw the post, then it's not much of a secret then, is it? Hey, Dave,
> > exemplify yourself.

That's kind of what I thought when I read your post--it's not much of a
secret. In fact, it isn't much of anything valid.

Dave K8MN
```

1379. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:31:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r64c$b02$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30840

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:KVY%7.4535$3x5.486669@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
> >
> > Backups, Arnie ... backups (both hardware and software ...) This is
> > the most effective strategy to assure effective emergency
communications.
> >
>
> And while you're sitting there re-installing the software, I've started
> sending and receiving information via SSB/CW.
>
> >
> > Guess what ... that's EXACTLY what the FEMA folks do ...
> > they go into a disaster area and plop down a portable satellite
> > terminal ... vioila, no more dependence on the local infrastructure
> > which was quite probably damaged or destroyed by the incident
> > that brought the FEMA folks into the picture.
> >
>
> I'm not against new technology. My point was that we need to configure
our
> ARS with as small an inventory as possible while still getting the job
done.

WHY would anyone configure there ability to as small an inventory as
possible. Far better to have multiple capability and multiple rigs
if personal finances, space allow.

> > I don't (nor, to I "have to") agree ... I'd classify it as "primitive,
> > limited capability equipment, with a requirement for an operator with
less
> > than universal manual skill" ... using cw for recreation is fine ... go
> > for it ...
> >
>
> I classify SSB as "old" and "primitive" compared to the newer
technologies.
> Yet, it is still widely used in emergency communications because of its
> inherent reliability and simplicity of use.

AND, because it is voice, ANYONE can fill in at the mike to
send and several people can listen too. None of them need
to be hams.

> > but the emergency management folks just don't have any use for it
> > these days ... they want "tactical voice" on VHF/UHF for local, and on
> > HF-SSB for regional/long haul, and increasingly, they want computer
> > to computer data links so that they can accurately send large amounts
> > of data, pictures, etc. in short amounts of time.
>
> Yep, I agree that high speed computer data links and tactical voice are
the
> wave of the future in emergency operations. Yet as long as we are using
HF
> radios, Morse will have a place. You are very much wrong when you say
that
> it is not used (CW) in HF emergency communications. Our County EOC has
been
> CW capable (and will be) far into the foreseeable future. The way the EOC
> folks explain it, "Why get rid of something that we may need to use, as
long
> as we have qualified operators available." During our last actual
> activation, Morse was used to send and receive numerous messages via HF
when
> SSB operations were being hampered by QRM, QRN, and QSB. It's the old
have
> the tools in the toolbox theory.

Equip for morse if you like, nobody is attempting to end your
ability to do so. The fact remains that your county EOC is
an anomoly in today's EOC preparations efforts. Far more
want modes that allow the ham to be the control operator
while allowing other (non-hams) to also directly communicate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1380. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:34:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411C52.AD69AFDB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30841

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3E763D.56F226EA@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over
> some of
> > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them work,
> > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc. We
> > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave
> Heil
> > > be damned....
> >
> > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Sorry to so disappoint you, Dave. But for whatever reasons they work. You
> don't have to have such feelings one way or the other, as I suppose you'll
> never use them anyway.

Kim, you are without doubt one of the biggest ditzes I've encountered in
years. You don't even have the sense to clam up when your ignorance is
revealed.

You *suppose* I'll never use your "beyond physics" FM hints? Bank on
it.

Dave K8MN

1381. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:39:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411D79.CB2243F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30842

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3E77FC.7E03470C@earthlink.net...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting over
> some of
> > > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them
> work,
> > > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them, etc.
> We
> > > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times, Dave
> Heil
> > > > be damned....
> > >
> > > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't have
> > > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
> >
> > Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> > yourself with 'em.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Oh, I always love the "you're spelling it wrong" responses...
>
> Exemplify yourself, Dave. Rise above the pit you've got yourself in.

Kim? Oh, Kim? I called attention *to my own spellchecker's goof*.

I've exemplified myself for decades. I'm up here on high, dry ground so
I can't fathom your pit comment.

Since you brought up rising above things, why not try rising above your
lack of knowledge as to the physics of radio?

Dave K8MN

1382. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:41:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411DE8.BF15B3CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30843

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C3E8306.85F98013@earthlink.net...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Absolutely. Dave Heil is having a blast sniveling and fretting
> over some of
> > > > > > the concepts I posted in that post. However, he hasn't heard them
> work,
> > > > > > hasn't heard the many hours of discussion we've had about them,
> etc. We
> > > > > > know they work, and we know they've saved our butts a few times,
> Dave Heil
> > > > > > be damned....
> > > > >
> > > > > I haven't sniveled nor have I fretted. The so-called "concepts" you
> > > > > posted are absolute crap unworthy of any radio amateur. They can't
> have
> > > > > saved your ample butt. If you've spent two minutes discussing those
> > > > > particular ideas, you need to aquatint yourself with a few books.
> > > >
> > > > Love those spellcheckers: aquatint. Hell, Kim--you can even aquatint
> > > > yourself with 'em.
> > >
> > > Dave, be nice to Miss Piggy, she may turn out to be the Rodney
> Dangerfield of
> > > rrap.
> >
> > Well, there's the part where Rodney Dangerfield is intentionally funny.
> > The grins we get from Kim are entirely unintentional on her part.
> > At the moment, she is more like the Yuri Geller of rrap. Her junk
> > science is moronic.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Then, you'd best not ever be surrounded by any one of us who do our "crazy"
> things when we're playing or being serious. Your high and mightiness is

> moronic, Dave. You can't even lead by example, or anything else.

The only conclusion I can draw is that either you are playing stupid or that you are stupid. Which is it?

Dave K8MN

1383. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:43:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C411E66.D9399E59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30844

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:m9J%7.10638$GP2.743689@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...
> > >
> > > Assuming you already have a PC, all that's required for
> > > most of the digital modes these days are a simple interface
> > > (easily built) and some free software you can download.
> > >
> >
> > The problem (as I have always seen it) is that it *requires* the use of a
> > computer and associated software to interface the technology with the
> radio.
> > (and we all know what can happen to installed software when we need it
> most)
> > It's bad enough that we have to have a deep cell marine battery to run the
> > rig during emergency comms (those suckers are heavy) but now we have to
> lug
> > around a laptop and a separate power supply for it as well.
> > [SNIP}
> > Arnie -
> > KT4ST
> >
> > www.qsl.net/kt4st
> > Home of Walt's World on the web
> >
>
> Dave H., ignore this, it's too inventive for you:
>
> A lot of the new Handheld PC devices take the place of the laptop computer!
> And, with micro-this and micro-that, it won't be but a few years and what
> now takes up a whole backpack will fit in the palm of our hand, I bet!

Good. You can use the rest of the backpack for batteries.

Dave K8MN

1384. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:43:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r6qg$d8p$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30845

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201120840.26abf077@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c3f0e9c_2@news7.fast.net>...
>
> >
> > The point is that a demonstration of manual proficiency is
> > unnecessary as a condition of licensure ... those who want
> > to use the mode will learn it ... in fact, back in my novice
> > days, I remember quite a few folks with REALLY bad "fists"
> > and who asked for LOTs of repeats ... they learned by
> > doing ... what did they hurt? No difference today ...
> >
> Nobody got to be a Novice without passing a 5 wpm code test and we
> took it from there.
> >
> >
> >
> > > Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested
> > for
> > > having any competence with the mode?
> >
> > There is NO test of operating proficiency for SSB or
> > any other mode ...
> >
> >
> Yeah - I've NOTICED!
> >
> >
> > only a requirement, in the written
> > tests for some technical understanding of the principles
> > of the various other modes ... why should Morse be
> > any different? Answer: "It shouldn't."
> >
> >
> No, there is no point to asking "technical questions" about cw in the
> exams beyond one question to which the answer would be "ayup, it's
> dots, dashes and spaces". That's completely inadequate for licensure
> to use the mode.

Yet there is NO prohibition in the rules that forcloses a ham
that has never passed a CW test from using morse code...is there?
ANY "nocode tech" can decide to operate morse (CW) in
the ONLY two exclusively CW bands (50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1)

without violating any rules...therefore, the FCC must not feel
such a skill test is NOT needed to operate morse.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1385. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:46:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r70dpht1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30846

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112101001.05154.00001024@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3C3F3E9B.70F1C9E9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Brian Kelly wrote:
> >> How does one appropriately demonstrate his/her's competence with cw in
> >> order to earn the privelege of using the mode without taking a code
> >> test?
> >
> >The only CW-only frequencies are available to nocode techs. The
> >FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence there.
>
> Alrighty then.
>
> Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.
>
> > In
> >fact, the FCC doesn't require any demonstration of competence
> >in ANY mode except CW below 30 MHz.
>
> Doesn't mean it's the right thing to do.

Alright then, WHY is it the WRONG thing?
We've had over 10 years of that process with no
bad results. What is the problem that needs to
be fixed that would require demonstrations
of competence in any particular mode or modes?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1386. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:49:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r759$i4s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30847

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C407CB8.1D75BE2C@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.
>
> Actually, I think it would be a good idea to make the present
> Extra CW/digital sub-bands into CW-only sub-bands. Do you also
> want to put a lower speed limit on operators there? :-)
>
> Has anybody suggested making the lower 25kHz of every HF ham
> band CW-only? Why would anybody object to that?

I'd have no problem with that. I will note, however,
that I speak only for myself on that issue, not NCI as
a policy position. The whole area of bandplans doesn't
much concern me. I long ago said I'd support having
CW only for the first 25 KHz.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1387. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 05:55:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r7qb$v45$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30848

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C4028FB.9A76150@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C3E6CB0.BF1CE930@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > > > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> > > > >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> > > > >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> > > > >back off.
> > > >
> > > > What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
> > > >
> > > > If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off,
> > just
> > > > produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.
> > >
> > > Looks like he's trying to intimidate you into backing off from
posting so
> > many
> > > embarassing facts. The one thing that NCI can't tolerate if bare
fact.
> >
> > WRONG! NCI loves the facts because when facts and rational
> > thought processes are invoked in looking at the need for
> > continued code testing, the testing goes away.
>
> NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected board
> and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
> Its views are the views of the directors.

Wrong again...
The initial set of NCI BOD membership was self created by a core
of the founding members of NCI. All the current directors have
been re-elected by the membership.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1388. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:02:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r829kef1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30849

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C411723.4A4B6CAD@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected
board
> > > and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
> > > Its views are the views of the directors.
> >
> > That's because the new members sign on to the published goals
> > of NCI. If one doesn't agree with those published goals, one
> > doesn't join.
>
> That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
> begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
> are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.

Why do you think an NCI member has no voice. We (the NCI
BOD members) do recieve input from the members throughout
the year...as does ARRL directors.

> There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".

Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
by email or snail mail will suffice.

> I don't know of any other
> membership organization which operates in the same manner.

Except for the annual dues that many other organizations
have... whereby failure to pay results in a member being
dropped, NCI operates on very similar processes as do other
organizations. Most BODs for other orgs (eg. ARRL) are
free to set policy. Did anyone that is an ARRL member
vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's position to not
oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement? Most any prganization
establishes a range of allowed policy setting to the BOD rather
than calling for an all member vote on every action/issue.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1389. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:12:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4118C2.63ADDBA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30850

CAM wrote:

>Please produce a reference that

> indicates that the intelligence transferred in radiotelegraphy is some
> "third state".

Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an "advantage"
over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's OK
because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!

"Hey, Boss, I can't copy PSK, the signal's too weak, but there is this CW station that's coming through fine". "Sorry, son, can't use it. It's a poor mode that won't work as well, hey, just because you can copy it when you can't print PSK means nothing!!"

You dingaling.

1390. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:19:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r8uf$9cj$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30851

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112161007.06877.00001220@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a1og75did1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >All your comments and efforts (along with a number
> >> >of other people's efforts) are directed (IMHO)
> >> >at trying to do anything to get NCI to back off.
> >>
> >> They are devoted to pointing out the facts in this matter. Have I
posted
> >> anything in this thread that is not true?
> >>
> >> >The idea of a VOTE is nuts because if such was even
> >> >thought to hold merit, the FCC would have followed
> >> >such a path.
> >>
> >> NO. WRONG.
> >>
> >> The idea of a vote or poll is simply to indicate what people's opinins
> >really
> >> are. The FCC is not required to follow majority opinion. Saying that
the
> >idea
> >> of a vote is "nuts" sure looks like you don;t want to know what the
> >opinion of
> >> the amateur community really is.
> >
> >The FCC does NOT poll the public or the licensed ham community.
>
> True - but that doesn't mean they shouldn't.

Take it up with the FCC then.

> >The FCC opens a comment period to which interested parties can
> >file their comments.
>
> When they feel like it.

Most of the time for Part 97 rules.

> >YOU want a specific "ballot" or opinion poll
> >sent out on the issue(s).

>
> Sure. Why not?
>
> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.

By who? ARRL? Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?
Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
(NOTE - You actually answered this below)

> >> > Code testing as a part of international
> >> > regs is going...even the ARRL supports that now.
> >>
> >> They don't oppose it.
> >
> >Say it any way you want, the ARRL is NOT going
> >to take any roll in opposing the end of code testing as a treaty
> >requirement which means they will either cast a vote of abstention
> >or a yea vote on the issue to abolish.
>
> ARRL and the other IARU societies have no vote on the issue. They can only
> advise.

Never-the-less, advice of considerable influence to each of their
respective adminsitrations.

> >> Neither did the ARRL BoD survey the membership or the
> >> amateur radio community on the issue.
> >
> >Fine by me. I sent my opinion to my director.
>
> Me too.

Good.

> >> Back in 1975, when the idea of a nocodetest license was first proposed
by
> >the
> >> FCC, ARRL sent out a detailed questionnaire to all members, then posted
> >the
> >> results in QST. Nobody has done anything like that since.

SO! The 1975 "vote" you mentioned above was NOT of
ALL licensed hams then? Good, glad you cleared that up.

> >> >Once the treaty changes, the issue becomes the individual
> >> >decision of each administration.
> >>
> >> It's pretty clear what the FCC will do.
> >
> >Fine by me...assuming you believe they will drop all
> >code testing then for the USA.
>
> I think the FCC will simply issue some sort of "waiver" of Element 1 until

the
> necessary paperwork is done to remove code testing from the rules. In
other
> words, they could say that anyone with a valid Tech ticket or above
> automatically has Element 1 credit.

We'll need to wait and see on that.

> >> >You can then ask the FCC for a vote.
> >>
> >> Won't make any difference to them.
> >
> >If so, then why should I care?
>
> Little thing called democracy...

FCC rules are NOT set based on democratic voting
of ONLY licensed hams! FCC rules are set to establish
public policy. Such rules can NOT be the sole
result of only ham "voting" anymore than bradcast
rules should be exclusive to owners of broadcast
licenses.

> >> > Will NCI support a vote...I sure wouldn't
> >> >because the issue is NOT a matter of the opinion of
> >> >only already licensed hams...it is a public policy matter under
> >> >the jurisdiction of the FCC.
> >>
> >> "The amateur community" includes all who are interested, not just
licensed
> >> hams.
> >
> >So how do you identify all those that are interested but aren't
> >hams IF the FCC agreed to a vote?
> >
> Simple - ask 'em. Do a survey where anyone not licensed but interested can
ask
> for and receive a questionaire.

Practically an impossible effort...unless you expect the FCC
to mail questionaires to every person in the USA? Thats
over 250 million mailings.

> >> > I suspect (IMHO) that you
> >> >and others are not at all pleased that NCI came to the
> >> >regulatory arena, learned the rules and the processes,
> >> >and, are continuing to play a role in influencing the
> >> >future rules changes.
> >>
> >> I am not pleased at what I see as something that is not in the best
> >> interests of the ARS. I don't think the NCI folks are pleased that
> >> hams like me presnted our views to the FCC and in this public forum.

> >
> >We really don't care much at all. I and, on occasion, some other
> >NCI folks routinely counter those comments anyway. I see no
> >shift in opinion or attitude towards retention of code testing
> >because of anything being stated in this forum or via FCC
> >comments.
>
> Which is what I'm saying - FCC's mind was made up long long ago.

Then why do you appear so concerned (IMHO) about
what we (NCI) do?

> >> Whether NCI or any group is really influencing the FCC on license test
> >> matters is a matter of pure speculation. Heck, the FCC quoted
KENWOOD's
> >> comments 11 times in the R&O.
> >
> >Exactly, which still goes to the heart of my point...if
> >NCI has so little influence, there sure is enough inerest
> >in making us go away or compromise.
>
> The interest is in pointing out errors in NCI arguments.

The reality for us (NCI) is that the only place all that counts
is in the comment process. We, NCI, will continue our
efforts predicated on obtaining our goal. If you believe
as strongly as you seem that the FCC's mind is made up, then
we, NCI might be wasting our time, but we (NCI) would
rather do what we feel is needed to assure ourselves we have
done everything possible to get the outcome we want.
If you are convinced the FCC's mind is made up, I'll
be surprised IF you file any more comments on the issue
if/when it is opened for public comment again by the FCC.

> >> > IF we (NCI) were truly of
> >> >no consequence to the end result, then I am truly amazed
> >> >at the efforts being made in this forum to get us to
> >> >back off.
> >>
> >> What efforts? Have I EVER said that ANYONE should "back off"? Nope.
> >
> >Good.
>
> Then you agree that I've never said that anyone should "back off" or be
silent
> (same thing).

In that you have cleared away any smoke on that point, yes.

> >> If you think I have ever tried to get anyone to shut up or back off,
just
> >> produce the posts of mine. They're all in google.

> >
> >Then we have no disagreement there.
> >
> Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1391. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:33:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1r9ni$t1m$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30852

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112120948.22158.00000128@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <a1ogpv$c92$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0201100907.2c61358@posting.google.com...
> >> KC2HMN wrote:
> >>
> >> > > I come to the table as a relatively
> >> > > "unspoiled" newbie. I've had neither the time in nor the exposure
to
> >> > > be "jaded" one way or the other re. this issue. Having just passed
> >> > > element 1 and from a relatively "unbiased" POV, I have a hard time
> >> > > equating 5-wpm for "additional" privies with a "barrier." I seem to
> >> > > remember studying for (and answering) questions on space station
and
> >> > > EME contacts. Honestly, I don't plan on ever utilizing either of
these
> >> > > skills. Should they be stricken from the writtens?
> >> >
> >> K2UNK wrote:
> >>
> >> > If you got both of those questions wrong, you could still
> >> > have passed the test.
> >>
> >> Or they could have been the ones that made him flunk it.
> >>
> >> > Equating the "separate" morse test to
> >> > one or more specific subject areas on the written is not
> >> > a valid comparison.
> >>
> >> But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
> >> most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
> >> General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
> >> are as "necessary" as the Morse test.
> >
> >So you now want to end written testing, theory testing?
>
> Nope.
>
> I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is not
> necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written tests -
> particularly the General and Extra written tests.

Let them, IMHO, look the fools for raising such an argument.

> >Take it to the FCC if you want.
>
> I won't. But somebody else will.

Ditto my last comment.

> > I and the most other NCI
> >BOD believe theory knowledge is good.
>
> So do I. But why MUST it be tested? Why MUST the FCC force it down
people's
> throats with all that written testing just to get a license?

IF you believe it shouldn't be, then petition the FCC for the
change. I am not here to provide those answeres for you.
IF it ever came up via the FCC, I'd spend the time and effort
to defend the theory as being needed. For now, your
question is just an academic waste of my time.

> > I don't have to
> >defend that unless the FCC suddenly
> >wanted to change that.
>
> At which time you will be listened to the same way the procodetest folks
were
> listened to.

You have so little faith in the FCC. The fact
that the procode test advocates did not prevail is
not an indication that the FCC didn't listen to them.
In fact, the R&O went into considerable
detail to address the specific arguments raised
for preservation of code testing. Did the FCC
miss any procode test arguments in their reply?

> >The FCC has already accepted the
> >idea that morse testing is no longer needed.
>
> And they've already accepted the idea that less written testing is needed.

We disagree that such is the conclusion to be reached
because of the changed testing and licenseing.

> >> > > Are not the
> >> > > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
> >> > > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
> >> > > questions?
> >>
> >> That depends on one's background.
> >>
> >> Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
> >> current amateur exams is not very high.

> >
> >Would you expect otherwise?
>
> I would expect the top license to require somewhat more knowledge of radio
than
> it does.

Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
easy for anyone that has an EE or above?

> >> Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
> >> to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
> >> a bit of radio.
> >
> >How do you define HARD? What is the measurement?
>
> I define it as how much you actually have to know about radio to pass the
test.
> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs from
scratch
> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it didn;t
> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.

Nor did it 50 years ago. It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
learn on their own if they wanted to.

> >> > The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
> >> > some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
> >> > send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
> >>
> >> In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
> >> obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.
> >
> >The parrallel doesn't exist...it is that simple.
>
> Of course it exists - you just don't see it, or don't want to see it.

No, you want to play this game of "if you are in favor of
ending morse testing, you must be also working to make
the written harder". I won't play...although I have on
severla occasions submitted comments to the VCCs as to how
to make the testing better (not easier, better).

> >Disagree all you
> >want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.
>
> Not yet.

I doubt they ever will.

> >They (the FCC)
> >are the ones you'd need to convince to change anything. The R&O

> >is almost 2 years old...NCI doesn't have to "see or acknowledge"
> >anything...and even if we did, so what...it would impact nothing.
>
> Exactly.

Good!

> My point is simply this: When someone preaches about "eliminating
unnecessary
> barriers to a license" they cannot logically say the Morse test is a
barrier
> but the written tests above Technician are not. That the FCC or others
don't
> see it is immaterial.

It is your crusade, not mine.

> A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to
operate a
> transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter
on
> 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate a
> transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter
on
> 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid answer.

I have already agreed with you in another set of posting
that the Extra privileges are inconsistent with the
content of what is tested for.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1392. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:41:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C411F8F.3A214524@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30853

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Therefore what you received was not a continuous wave.
> >The mere detection of the wave caused the wave to be
> >discontinuous. Reference quantum physics.
>
> So we are back to a state where what you claim a continuous wave means cannot
> exist.

One would think he'd tire of all that trolling. Must be a really dull life he
leads.

1393. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 06:48:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C412143.48C7A962@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30854

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>
> >I'm not against new technology. My point was that we need to configure our
> >ARS with as small an inventory as possible while still getting the job done.
>
> I see it quite differently, Arnie. I believe that, as a whole, Amateur Radio
> should be as diverse as possible to get the job done. That way, no matter what
> type of problem crops up, there will be a solution at hand.

You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely that any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one will be in as widespread use as CW. There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?

>
>
> I think the real discussion here is to what degree configuring the Amateur
> Radio Serivce to get the job done should be a matter of the self-training
> aspects of Amateur Radio vis a vis the regulated testing requirements to enter
> Amateur Radio. For all modes but one, the former seems to be the dominant
> factor. I believe that even for that singled-out mode, it would still be a
> dominant factor in hams choosing to use a mode that has significant utility and
> use.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1394. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 07:22:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C412921.CB96820D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30855

Bill Sohl wrote:

All the current directors have

> been re-elected by the membership.

So how do they get "re" elected when they were never elected in the first place?

1395. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 10:14:15 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <m9d08.18237$3x5.1068342@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30856

"Bill Sohl" wrote in ...
>
> WHY would anyone configure there ability to as small an inventory as
> possible. Far better to have multiple capability and multiple rigs
> if personal finances, space allow.
>

The US military does it that way. They take *just* what they need and travel as light as possible. The US Army converted to fast and "light" units many years ago. The idea is to get the most bang out of the least amount of equipment.

>
> Equip for morse if you like, nobody is attempting to end your
> ability to do so. The fact remains that your county EOC is
> an anomoly in today's EOC preparations efforts. Far more
> want modes that allow the ham to be the control operator
> while allowing other (non-hams) to also directly communicate.
>

We disagree on this one. There are many EOC's that still have Morse capability. All that is required is the addition of a set of paddles or key. Most EOC's can swing that additional (minimal) equipment requirement.

Question: Are you implying that the EOC operates as some sort of third party traffic with the Ham as control op?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1396. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 12:43:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113074356.11123.00001133@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30857

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I see it quite differently, Arnie. I believe that, as a whole, Amateur
>> Radio should be as diverse as possible to get the job done. That way, no
>> matter what type of problem crops up, there will be a solution at hand.

> You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely
>that any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one
will
>be in as widespread use as CW.

So what is the solution? Take steps to limit the number of operating modes that Amateurs might use? That sure doesn't sound right. CW is not the mode that is most often used for emergency communications by a long shot, so no regulatory solution, IMHO, should be based on a mode that is not the most widespread.

> There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
>across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?

Which mode is the mode of choice right now for most emergency and public-service communications?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1397. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 12:48:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113074813.11123.00001134@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30858

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.

>By who? ARRL? Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?
>Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
>(NOTE - You actually answered this below)

I do not think that governenace by poll is the best way to make decisions. I am a licensed ham. Assume that I get a poll from the FCC about a subject I know nothing about. I look at my choices, think about it for 3 seconds, mark a box and send it in. Is that really useful input? I don't believe so.

IMHO, the process that the FCC uses right now, with a rulemaking process in which anyone is able to make comments any time they think it appropriate, with those inputs evaluated by FCC staff and a decision made by those who are charged to make such decisions is much better than allowing that decision to be made by people who may or may not know anything about it and who may or may not have spent more than a few seconds thinking about the issues.

I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from knowledgeable people.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1398. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 12:51:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113075133.11123.00001136@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30859

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>A continuous wave probably can exist, Ed, but one cannot prove that it
>exists.
>It is essentially the same problem as trying to simultaneously determine
>both the mass and position of an electron.

I think that claiming that CW does not exist is getting a bit too far into the
anti-CW camp. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1399. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 12:55:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113075545.11123.00001138@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30860

From: "Crazy Horse" itsame@my.net

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>There are far more CW capable ham stations than there are
>Pactor2 stations. That is unlikely to change in
>the forseeable future, if ever.

>Tit for tat, Dick. Where's your reference for the above information?

It wouldn't take very long poring through QST Product Reviews and manufacturers web pages to determine that virtually every HF transmitter sold today is CW capable, in however a rough form, using only the rig, a single commonly available connector and two wires to touch together. Virtually every rig sold today requires a separate piece of active electronics -- computer/sound card or TNC to be able to run digital modes.

>Or, are you using your crystal ball again?

I don't think any of us need a crystal ball for this one. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1400. Re: Jews To Bomb American Arabs?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 14:44:37 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1sbvv$815$7@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30882
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600

```
Repeater jammer
"JizzswallowingRecepticle" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
news:a1qt4c$qe1$0@pita.alt.net...

Poor Georgie Girl Arselicks hiding from W4AMP....

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1qb99$ls7$3@pita.alt.net...
> > CONVICT
> > "Muhamed Akhbar" <makhbar@goma.dr.ag> wrote in message
> > news:3C40976C.DB563114@goma.dr.ag...
> > > http://www.guardian.co.uk/uslatest/story/0,1282,-1439439,00.html
> > > Grand [bullshit]
> >
> > Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> > revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> > news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
> >
> > "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> > status makes the story even less credible."
> >
> >
>
> Poor KC8JBO

Gets the best of you idiots and makes you dance to every post. LOL LOL LOL
LOL LOL!
```

1401. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 14:51:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1sc04$815$c@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30883
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Repeater Jammer
"JR" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message news:a1qrs3$o99$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> LOL LOL LOL ROTFLMAO!!!!!!

Still jamming repeaters with music, I see.

1402. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 14:52:10 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1sc05$815$d@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30881
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
news:a1qs13ohk0@pita.alt.net...
> LOL LOL LOL !!!! ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!

Jizzswallowing Recepticle, tell us how you got your HIV from your father.

1403. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 14:57:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A05B.2AD9D209@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30862

Dave Heil wrote:
> That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
> begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
> are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
> There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".

Of course there is a mechanism for "unjoining". I unjoined. Fred
took me off the membership list.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1404. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 14:57:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s79sfml1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30861

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113074356.11123.00001133@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I see it quite differently, Arnie. I believe that, as a whole, Amateur
> >> Radio should be as diverse as possible to get the job done. That way,
no
> >> matter what type of problem crops up, there will be a solution at hand.
>
> > You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the
> >less likely that any serious percentage of hams will be using any one,
> >certainly no one will be in as widespread use as CW.
>
> So what is the solution? Take steps to limit the number of operating modes
that
> Amateurs might use? That sure doesn't sound right. CW is not the mode that
is
> most often used for emergency communications by a long shot, so no
regulatory
> solution, IMHO, should be based on a mode that is not the most widespread.

Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.) The
ability to do that today is very inexpensive (used laptops and
desktop PCs are almost being given away). The additional
equipment needed to do digital is easy to accomplish.

As to "being prepared." I have said this before...BUT, if those
that profess a need to be prepared are thinking of that last
minute effort when a ham would cobble together some simple
CW transciever or to be pressed into service having not
previously done the "preparedness" activities...well, that's
not what be emergency prepared should be.

Those people that talk the talk (need for CE testing to
augment emergency preparedness), but do not, themselves,
walk the walk (participate actively with their local emergency
preparedness organizations such as RACES) have little or
no credibility intheir comments.

> > There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> >across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of
choice?
>
> Which mode is the mode of choice right now for most emergency and

> public-service communications?

Can't wait to see the answers from some folks on that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1405. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:01:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A153.ACE98651@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30863

Bill Sohl wrote:
> FCC rules are NOT set based on democratic voting
> of ONLY licensed hams! FCC rules are set to establish
> public policy. Such rules can NOT be the sole
> result of only ham "voting" anymore than bradcast
> rules should be exclusive to owners of broadcast
> licenses.

To allow only members of a governmental service to set policy
for that service would be against the interests of the
average American citizen. We don't want the ARS to become
like the US Congress. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1406. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:03:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s7l7ndl1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30864

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:m9d08.18237$3x5.1068342@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote in ...
> > WHY would anyone configure their ability to as small an inventory as
> > possible. Far better to have multiple capability and multiple rigs
> > if personal finances, space allow.
>
> The US military does it that way. They take *just* what they need and
> travel as light as possible. The US Army converted to fast and "light"
> units many years ago. The idea is to get the most bang out of the least
> amount of equipment.

I strongly disagree that the military does it as you suggest.
They do not put all their eggs in ONE (i.e. small inventory)
basket.

> > Equip for morse if you like, nobody is attempting to end your
> > ability to do so. The fact remains that your county EOC is
> > an anomoly in today's EOC preparations efforts. Far more
> > want modes that allow the ham to be the control operator
> > while allowing other (non-hams) to also directly communicate.
>
> We disagree on this one. There are many EOC's that still have Morse
> capability. All that is required is the addition of a set of paddles or
> key. Most EOC's can swing that additional (minimal) equipment
requirement.

Having it available doesn't mean it is used at all. Most EOC
and/or RACES have the ability (if they have HF rigs), but they
rarely, if ever, use it and few integrate CW into their practice
drills.

> Question: Are you implying that the EOC operates as some sort of third
> party traffic with the Ham as control op?

Absolutely! The emergency ops supported by hams more often
than not involve "3rd party" traffic such as police to first aid,
first aid to Red Cross, etc, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1407. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:06:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A27A.72F99C2A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30866

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely that
> any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one will be in
> as widespread use as CW. There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?

The best one determined by the consumers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1408. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:07:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113100744.17515.00001165@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 30865

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 1/12/2002 8:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c404cb0_1@news7.fast.net>

>I also agree with Larry on keeping the lower power limit in at
>least those parts of the bands. As I've said many times before,
>there's much more to be gained with better modulation and
>coding techniques than through brute force power.

To go one further, I would support an overall regulatory reduction in our authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40, and no more than 250W on the rest of our allocations, including UHF and above.

If anyone thinks they need more power than that, they should apply to the FCC for an STA, and be prepared to explain why.

I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this inducement would foster more experimentation in antenna design.

>Unfortunately (in terms of protecting our allocations in the future),
>our bands are FAR from "overcrowded" in any reasonable sense
>(looking at spectrum usage compared to other services). I see
>NO need to expand the use of SSB at the expense of the digital
>modes and believe that to do so would be a bad move.

And by reducing the allowable power limits we would greatly increase the capacity of the existing bands by reducing co-channel interference.

>However, it's inaccurate on Larry's part to assert that "the
>main argument used by those seeking to eliminate (Morse
>testing) ws the fact that digital modes were the future of the
>ARS" ... the MAIN argument for eliminating Morse testing
>is and always was that it is no longer justified as a legitimate
>regulatory requirement for obtaining a license with full HF
>privileges.

It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on the digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was the proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that field over manual telegraphy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1409. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:09:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s86q$lj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30867

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C412921.CB96820D@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > All the current NCI board of directors have
> > been re-elected by the membership.
>
> So how do they get "re" elected when they were
> never elected in the first place?

The same as happens in most any organization...
1. A nomination period is opened,
2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
3. nominations are closed,
4. The mebership is asked to vote.

NCI has been there/done that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1410. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:09:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A337.2D019733@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30869

Brian Kelly wrote:
> The FCC doan require ya to operate on 30m either but don't try it
> unless yer beeping.

Does PACTOR beep?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1411. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:10:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A37E.2B32B441@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30870

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Faith: believing what you know damned well isn't so.
>
> Mark Twain

Is that from, "Letters From Earth"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1412. Re: AM Antenna (Justice or Super Select-A-Tenna)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:11:37 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlinkdot.net>
Message-ID: <u438tf1b4g6c2e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 30868
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.broadcasti

If select-a-tenna is just a loop with a tuner why couldn't I just roll my
own from the junk box under the work bench ?

--

Fruitcakes, if well-wrapped and stored in airtight tins, are reputed to
remain enjoyable for as long as 25 years..
"Daniel Simpson" <dzan@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:u40o87k86h877@corp.supernews.com...
| I have a Mckay Dymek AM7 with a Terk antenna plug into it I would like
| better reception then what i am getting and have been looking at the
| Justice or Super Select-A-Tenna Does anybody have opinions on these
| models or other sugestions.
|
| Thank You
| Dan
|
|

1413. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:13:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A428.85B6D817@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30871

W1RFI wrote:
> I think that claiming that CW does not exist is getting a bit too far into the
> anti-CW camp. :-)

'CW' stands for "Commutated Waves".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1414. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:16:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A4C4.9C341EF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30872

Dick Carroll wrote:
> One would think he'd tire of all that trolling. Must be a really dull life he
> leads.

I troll, you carp. To each his own.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1415. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:19:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A58C.30194B3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30873

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an "advantage"
> over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's OK
> because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!

Ah yes, you're the unfortunate technician who confuses PSK31 with PSK.
PACTOR II uses PSK and doesn't have that problem. PACTOR II gets
through when the CW signal is inaudible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1416. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:23:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s8prifk1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30874

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113074813.11123.00001134@mb-cr.aol.com...

> >Jim, N2EY wrote:
> >> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.

> Bill K2UNK wrote:
> >By who? ARRL? Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?
> >Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
> >(NOTE - You actually answered this below)
>
> I do not think that governenace by poll is the best way to make decisions.
I
> am a licensed ham. Assume that I get a poll from the FCC about a subject
I
> know nothing about. I look at my choices, think about it for 3 seconds,
mark a
> box and send it in. Is that really useful input? I don't believe so.

I agree completely and would also note that the vast majority
of people would look at that poll, see it has nothing to do with
them and throw it out. They'd not even mail it back. The idea
that the FCC would notice every person in the USA of pending
NPRMs is simply nuts.

> IMHO, the process that the FCC uses right now, with a rulemaking process
in
> which anyone is able to make comments any time they think it appropriate,
with
> those inputs evaluated by FCC staff and a decision made by those who are
> charged to make such decisions is much better than allowing that decision
to be
> made by people who may or may not know anything about it and who may or
may not
> have spent more than a few seconds thinking about the issues.

Agree again.

> I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from
knowledgeable
> people.

I think that's true for the vast majority of amateurs who have
filed comments on any issue...BUT, in reality...
the process doesn't guarantee only "knowledgeable" people
will reply. The comment process creates the situation whereby only

"interested" people are most likly to do so. All "interested"
parties may not also be "knowledgeable" : -)

That process (coment period) has, however, served
the FCC and ARS quite well for many decades. Hams may
not have always agreed with the end result, either collectively
(i.e. in some of the loss of spectrum decisions) or as different
groups as in the morse testing issue.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1417. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:27:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41A75F.CC57BDD8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30875

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
> variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.) The
> ability to do that today is very inexpensive (used laptops and
> desktop PCs are almost being given away). The additional
> equipment needed to do digital is easy to accomplish.

The new IC-746pro decodes and displays RTTY. All that is needed
for full RTTY operation is a keyboard.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1418. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:32:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s9a5$pm5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30876

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4118C2.63ADDBA@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >Please produce a reference that indicates that the
> > intelligence transferred in radiotelegraphy is some "third state".
>
> Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
"advantage"
> over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's
OK
> because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!
>
> "Hey, Boss, I can't copy PSK, the signal's too weak, but there is this CW
station that's
> coming through fine". "Sorry, son, can't use it. It's a poor mode that
won't work as
> well, hey, just because you can copy it when you can't print PSK means
nothing!!"
>
> You dingaling.

Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
an uninformed statement. You do NOT need to hear
anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
station set to copy and send on that frequency. As already
stated, to do so requires advance participation in
emergency planning.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1419. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:36:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1s9he$21j$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30877

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C41A05B.2AD9D209@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
> > begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
> > are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
> > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".
>
> Of course there is a mechanism for "unjoining" NCI. I unjoined. Fred
> took me off the membership list.
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Thanks Cecil, and, for the record:

1. So have a number of others.
2. If any NCI member wishes to "unjoin", just send NCI
a request to do so (email or snail mail will suffice).

Cheers, Bill K2UNK

1420. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 15:52:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1sagp$74e$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 30878

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113100744.17515.00001165@mb-fy.aol.com...

Carl wrote:
> >I also agree with Larry on keeping the lower power limit in at
> >least those parts of the bands. As I've said many times before,
> >there's much more to be gained with better modulation and
> >coding techniques than through brute force power.

> To go one further, I would support an overall regulatory reduction in
our
> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40, and no
more
> than 250W on the rest of our allocations, including UHF and above.

Steve,
Speaking only for myself, I agree with that concept too.
I might be more inclined to use 400 w which I have seen
used in some other countries already (e.g. Great Britain I think).

One example that justifies the lower power limit can be
taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
site where thousands of contacts are then made all
over the globe with the DX station usually only running
about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
are with other stations running similar or even lower
power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
do it because they need the power, they do it to
"over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
practice..

The same is true for operating contests...although maybe
the time has come for the ARRL and CQ magazine
to begin imposing DE-multipliers for running high power.

> If anyone thinks they need more power than that, they should apply to
the
> FCC for an STA, and be prepared to explain why.

Agree again.

> I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this inducement would
> foster more experimentation in antenna design.

Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
would be just about impossible.

> Carl wrote:
> >Unfortunately (in terms of protecting our allocations in the future),
> >our bands are FAR from "overcrowded" in any reasonable sense
> >(looking at spectrum usage compared to other services). I see
> >NO need to expand the use of SSB at the expense of the digital
> >modes and believe that to do so would be a bad move.
>
> And by reducing the allowable power limits we would greatly increase
the
> capacity of the existing bands by reducing co-channel interference.

OK by me.

> >However, it's inaccurate on Larry's part to assert that "the
> >main argument used by those seeking to eliminate (Morse
> >testing) ws the fact that digital modes were the future of the
> >ARS" ... the MAIN argument for eliminating Morse testing
> >is and always was that it is no longer justified as a legitimate
> >regulatory requirement for obtaining a license with full HF
> >privileges.
>
> It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on the
> digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was the
> proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that field
> over manual telegraphy.

But that argument, raised by (?) wasn't accepted as justification
to end morse testing. It was (IMHO) more the argument,
stated by Carl, that "the MAIN argument for eliminating
Morse testing is and always was that it is no longer justified
as a legitimate regulatory requirement for obtaining a license
with full HF privileges.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1421. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:14:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ODerzxEnBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 30879

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> I would support an overall regulatory reduction in our
> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP
> on 160, 80 and 40, and no more than 250W on the rest
> of our allocations, including UHF and above.

Shall we take up a collection so the old retired
sarge can buy an amplifier?

QRP is for sissies.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1422. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:20:15 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <enPu00EnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30880

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> > I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this inducement would
> > foster more experimentation in antenna design.
>
> Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
> would be just about impossible.
>

Uh, yup, right, fer shure good buddy. How is it that you're going to enforce power output, but you can't enforce ERP?

And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP on the air, so all your high sounding bias against "big guns" is just so much envy, it would seem.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1423. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:41:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020113114133.23507.00000769@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30886

In article <3c40ecd2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> writes:

>> Well, there's the part where Rodney Dangerfield is intentionally funny.
>> The grins we get from Kim are entirely unintentional on her part.
>> At the moment, she is more like the Yuri Geller of rrap. Her junk
>> science is moronic.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Then, you'd best not ever be surrounded by any one of us who do our "crazy"
>things when we're playing or being serious. Your high and mightiness is
>moronic, Dave. You can't even lead by example, or anything else.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Dave:

Ouch! Another mortal blow from the One With The Embarrasing Call
Sign. How can you possibly go on in the face of such -- such --
such -- banality? You can just count yourself lucky she didn't rip loose
with another stinging ROFLMAO!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1424. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:41:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020113114134.23507.00000771@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30884

In article <3C405447.6FB74A61@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Got the
>> hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
>> there read it?
>
>Yep, back in the 60's. But Larry, Ayn Rand would be against the
>federal Morse code requirement.

Cecil:

That's OK, because I don't recall having axed her for her opinion on
the matter!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1425. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:41:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020113114134.23507.00000770@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30888

In article <20020112101002.05154.00001027@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>In article <20020112073332.15114.00000536@mb-ba.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>I've just started reading "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand.
>
>Best of her other stuff:
>
>"The Fountainhead" (should really be read before "Atlas")

Jim:

I read The Fountainhead years ago, after having seen the movie a
couple of times.

>"Anthem"

Maybe next year.

>> Got the
>>hardcover as a Christmas Present. Ripping good stuff. Anyone out
>>there read it?
>
>I've read all of her stuff many times. Most of it in hardcover. First
>discovered "Atlas" 30 years or so ago. A dern good writer. Particularly when
>you know that English was not her native language.
>Her descriptions of Taggart Transcontinental are based on the New York
>Central
>system as it was when the book was being written.
>
>"Fountainhead" was made into a movie in 1949, starring Gary Coper and
>Patricia
>Neal. "Atlas" was supposed to be made into a TV miniseries about 20 years ago
>but it never happened because the network management changed hands.

I've always wondered about that.

>"Atlas" is her masterpiece but in many ways "Fountainhead" is a better book.
>How far along are you in the book?

Page 120, as of this morning's session in the "library" -- you know, the
one with the porcelin seat?

>Have you reached the chapter where the
>story
>of the Twentieth Century Motor Company is told?

Not yet, but no spoilers, please!

>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>yes, I know who John Galt is.

So far, everyone's just asking who he is. Haven't been introduced yet. I can't wait. Gonna have to try to pull a long page-turning session this weekend. I may have to pack all 5 lbs. of the book off to the local public library to read it in the absence of my computer, TV, radios, kitchen, etc. just like I used to do every day when I was in college.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1426. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:41:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020113114136.23507.00000772@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30885

In article <3C40745C.DD0368D2@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Dick:
>>
>> Uhhh -- don't look now, but RTTY and PSK-31 (I don't know what "et al" are)
>> ARE radiotelegraphy! If you think they aren't, what, then, pray tell, are
>> they? (IYOHO, that is.)
>>
>
> I dunno, Larry, I haven't yet figured out how to key PACTOR or PSK31 with a
>bug or even an electronic keyer. Actually I haven't even made it to 50WPM
>RTTY
>or ASCII. How'd ya do it?

OK, OK -- I get it. Sorry, I've been a bit under the WX lately. RTTY,
PSK-31, et al. are RADIOTELETYPE. Damn, I look silly with this
dunce cap on!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1427. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:41:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020113114137.23507.00000773@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30887

In article <TS%%7.350814$W8.13337412@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>If you do not like to get into the surrealism that Jim and I like, there
>are three classic bits of sci-fi by the late Robert Heinlein in your local
>library that would stretch you out a bit>
>
>The Moon is a Harsh Mistress
>Starship Troopers in spite of the bad movie.
>Stranger in a Strange Land if the God Squad, some New Agers, or the
>Charles Manson Fan Club haven't stolen it.

Dick:

I've read Stranger in a Strange Land, none of the other sci-fi stuff.
I like my Sci-Fi on TV; don't have time to read it. I'm good for only
about a half-dozen novels a year, if that -- and Atlas Shrugged will
probably displace at least three of them. I read The Fountainhead
years ago, and have been wanting to read AS ever since. Started
to many times, but always had time conflicts, couldn't get any
traction on the book in the two weeks the library let me have it.
Since I know own it, I can whittle away at it. Maybe I'll have to
spend less time here and more time in the bathroom.

>I see you have not gotten to the soliloqy on the meaning of the light at
>the end of a cigarette in AS.

Nope, but don't spoil it for me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1428. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 16:52:44 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <SUi08.9166$V55.1368703@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 30889

"Bill Sohl" responded to ...
> >
> > The US military does it that way. They take *just* what they need and
> > travel as light as possible. The US Army converted to fast and "light"
> > units many years ago. The idea is to get the most bang out of the least
> > amount of equipment.
>
> I strongly disagree that the military does it as you suggest.
> They do not put all their eggs in ONE (i.e. small inventory)
> basket.
>

The military has a huge inventory of equipment (we agree). However, when they deploy, they develop a list of what will be required for the mission and take the *least* amount possible to accomplish that mission. That is what I am referring to as "light". In the "old" days, they would just lug it all with them. Operational and cost issues forced them to re-think this strategy and go with the "light" units concept. My point concerning emergency operations was the same. Take the least amount possible to accomplish the mission.

>
> Having it available doesn't mean it is used at all. Most EOC
> and/or RACES have the ability (if they have HF rigs), but they
> rarely, if ever, use it and few integrate CW into their practice
> drills.
>

I agree that few integrate it into their practice drills (we don't), but I think you'll find that it has been used more than you think when actual EOC activations have occurred. I'm not saying that some guy down at the EOC is saying we *have* to have CW because it is so useful. What is happening is a CW op is using it when they are having problems getting through on HF SSB because of interference issues.

>
> > Question: Are you implying that the EOC operates as some sort of third
> > party traffic with the Ham as control op?
>
> Absolutely! The emergency ops supported by hams more often
> than not involve "3rd party" traffic such as police to first aid,
> first aid to Red Cross, etc, etc.
>

I've heard some third party traffic at the EOC, but it was never used as a mainstay. However, each EOC is different and I'm not doubting that yours

does it that way.

1429. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 17:13:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113121317.11155.00001251@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30890

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on the
>digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was the
>proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that field over
>manual telegraphy.

Don't applaud if that doesn't happen, Steve. If most of Amateur Radio continues
to be behind the technological times, it may be held against us somehow.

Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1430. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 17:17:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113121724.11155.00001252@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30891

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>The same as happens in most any organization...
>1. A nomination period is opened,
>2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
>3. nominations are closed,
>4. The mebership is asked to vote.

NCI has been there/done that.

Almost. As I recall, when the nominations wer e closed, there were no nominees other than the existing Directors, so there was no need to vote. I see nothing wrong with declaring unopposed candidates elected, mind you; it happens often enough in elections. But, for at least the one election I know about, that is what the outcome was. When did that happen? Has NCI held an election since that time?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1431. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 17:20:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113122004.11155.00001253@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30892

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>I think that's true for the vast majority of amateurs who have
>filed comments on any issue...BUT, in reality...
>the process doesn't guarantee only "knowledgeable" people
>will reply. The comment process creates the situation whereby only
>"interested" people are most likly to do so. All "interested"
>parties may not also be "knowledgeable" : -)

True enough, but at least then the FCC staff who evaluate those comments have something to evaluate. It is usually quite clear from reading the comments how knowledgeable the person is, what their interest is and whether they have put more than a few seconds thought and analysis into their comments. It is not at all possible to determine any of that from a check box on a survey form.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1432. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 17:23:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113122310.11155.00001255@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 30893

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
>variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.)

The digital modes in common use in Amateur Radio may meet that very narrow definition, but in the rest of radio technology, digital modes move hugh chunks of data that is printed readout, graphics, web pages, computer code and probably a few more that I haven't listed. In addition, much of the voice techology that is in use outside of Amateur Radio is also digital, utilitizing digital techniques to share spectrum orders of magnitude more effectively that the allocation of repeater pairs that sit idle most of the time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1433. Re: AM Antenna (Justice or Super Select-A-Tenna)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:15:29 UTC
From: Bob <balbert@cnmnetwork.com>
Message-ID: <59k08.469189$C8.34091936@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 30894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.broadcasti

You certainly can. Fancy (and expensive) antennas aren't very good and don't have any secrets in them, regardless of advertising hype.

A good antenna has to be large and installed in a clear, high place. No shortcuts work.

1434. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:17:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131017.318af714@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30895

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C407CB8.1D75BE2C@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Let's replace CW/Morse testing with more CW/Morse-only subbands.
>
> Actually, I think it would be a good idea to make the present
> Extra CW/digital sub-bands into CW-only sub-bands.

For a start. But I don't think you're serious.

> Do you also
> want to put a lower speed limit on operators there? :-)

Nope.
>
> Has anybody suggested making the lower 25kHz of every HF ham
> band CW-only?

Not formally. But 25 kHz isn't enough - it should be at least 50-75
kHz on most bands. Making just the Extra CW digital subbands CW-only
would mean that one would need an Extra to access them - not a good
thing.

As a bare minimum:

160: 1800-1850
80: 3500-3575
40: 7000-7050
30: 10100-10125
20: 14000-14075
17: 18068-18093
15: 21000-21075
12: 24890-24915
10: 28000-28075

>Why would anybody object to that?

Only reason I can think of is that they want the mode to die out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1435. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:34:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41D32C.23C3C89B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30897

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
> >variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.)
>
> The digital modes in common use in Amateur Radio may meet that very narrow
> definition, ...

Actually, I think Bill oversimplified things. The different layers
of protocol have different advantages. In particular, the forward error
correction of PACTOR leaves RTTY in the shade (even though both use FSK)
just as the forward error correction of PACTOR II leaves PSK31 in the
shade (even though both use PSK).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1436. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:41:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41D4D0.125750A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30898

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Actually, I think it would be a good idea to make the present
> > Extra CW/digital sub-bands into CW-only sub-bands.
>
> For a start. But I don't think you're serious.

I'm serious enough to sign the FCC petition if someone else
will write it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1437. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:42:00 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O3NpBEGnBHA.464@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 30896

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Steve,
> Speaking only for myself, I agree with that concept too.
> I might be more inclined to use 400 w which I have seen
> used in some other countries already (e.g. Great Britain I think).
>

I'm sure one arbitrary number is just as good as any other arbitrary number, so I recommend 1499W PEP.

Of course I could hardly ever actually use that much power because 97.313(a) defines the REAL "legal limit".

Now the IODHW (International Order of Dismayed Hand Wringers) will rise up a group whine that nobody really pays any attention to 97.313(a), to which the obvious response is "So why would they pay any attention to your limit of 250 or 400 (or whatever)?"

Rising in the background you will also hear the murmured mumblings of the QRP crowd extolling the nobility of "5 watts or less" and the great skills learned from piss-weak transmitters, especially when used in a basement apartment with a kids slinky-toy or other makeshift antenna. I got a hot flash for them -- it takes no more skill or effort to key a 1milliwatt transmitter than it does to key a 1kilowatt transmitter. The real skill and effort is displayed by those who pull your whisper-thin signals out of the atmospheric noise.

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1438. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:51:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41D721.E067980@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30899

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
> > "advantage" over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too
> > weak to copy,

Dick apparently doesn't realize that RTTY and PSK31 share a common problem which is easily corrected with forward error correction as is done in PACTOR I & II. RTTY and PSK31 are not the best choices for emergency communications but PACTOR I & II are very good choices.

> Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> an uninformed statement.

"The Institute", a monthly publication of the IEEE has an article titled, "IEEE Standard Assists Emergency Response Teams". It says, "When fully deployed, the IEEE Standard for Common Incident Management Message Sets for Use by Emergency Management Centers (IEEE Std 1512-2000) will become a major component of the country's Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)." Any hams working on that standard?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1439. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 18:52:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41D764.568A3B0A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30900

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >"Anthem"
>
> Maybe next year.

Don't forget, "We The Living".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:06:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131106.1027a9d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30951

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020113074813.11123.00001134@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.
>
> >By who? ARRL?

Yes.

> >Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?

Of course not.

Do you know what the proposed changes of 1975 were?

> >Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
> >(NOTE - You actually answered this below)

It went to all US ARRL members. Dig out your 1975 QSTs and see what
was going on.

> I do not think that governenace by poll is the best way to make decisions. I
> am a licensed ham. Assume that I get a poll from the FCC about a subject I
> know nothing about. I look at my choices, think about it for 3 seconds, mark a
> box and send it in. Is that really useful input? I don't believe so.

Any system that allows everyone to express an opinion is going to have
a certain amount of "noise" from folks who don't know what they are
talking about. The comment system is just as open to such things.
>
> IMHO, the process that the FCC uses right now, with a rulemaking process in
> which anyone is able to make comments any time they think it appropriate, with
> those inputs evaluated by FCC staff and a decision made by those who are
> charged to make such decisions is much better than allowing that decision to be
> made by people who may or may not know anything about it and who may or may not
> have spent more than a few seconds thinking about the issues.
>
> I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from knowledgeable
> people.

Ah - but WHO decides who is "knowledgeable" and who isn't? And by what
standard is a person's knowledge judged?

By the "knowledgeable" philosophy, only "knowledgeable" people should
be allowed to vote in elections.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1441. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:19:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C41DDDA.36A18370@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30952

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C411723.4A4B6CAD@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > NCI is an small, loose membership organization with a non-elected
> board
> > > > and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate anything.
> > > > Its views are the views of the directors.
> > >
> > > That's because the new members sign on to the published goals
> > > of NCI. If one doesn't agree with those published goals, one
> > > doesn't join.
> >
> > That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
> > begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
> > are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
>
> Why do you think an NCI member has no voice. We (the NCI
> BOD members) do recieve input from the members throughout
> the year...as does ARRL directors.
>
> > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".
>
> Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
> by email or snail mail will suffice.

So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?

> > I don't know of any other
> > membership organization which operates in the same manner.
>
> Except for the annual dues that many other organizations
> have... whereby failure to pay results in a member being
> dropped, NCI operates on very similar processes as do other
> organizations.

That's a BIG exception.

> Most BODs for other orgs (eg. ARRL) are
> free to set policy. Did anyone that is an ARRL member
> vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's position to not
> oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement? Most any prganization

> establishes a range of allowed policy setting to the BOD rather
> than calling for an all member vote on every action/issue.

Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct result of that one particular shift in position?

Dave K8MN

1442. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:27:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C41DF96.1BA86B15@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30953

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C41A05B.2AD9D209@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent and
> > > begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy, they
> > > are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
> > > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".
> >
> > Of course there is a mechanism for "unjoining" NCI. I unjoined. Fred
> > took me off the membership list.
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Thanks Cecil, and, for the record:
>
> 1. So have a number of others.
> 2. If any NCI member wishes to "unjoin", just send NCI
> a request to do so (email or snail mail will suffice).

This should take care of everyone except the dead.

I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.

Dave K8MN

1443. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:30:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C41E05B.E4A1E12A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30954

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3c40ecd2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" <none@none.net> writes:
>
> >> Well, there's the part where Rodney Dangerfield is intentionally funny.
> >> The grins we get from Kim are entirely unintentional on her part.
> >> At the moment, she is more like the Yuri Geller of rrap. Her junk
> >> science is moronic.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Then, you'd best not ever be surrounded by any one of us who do our "crazy"
> >things when we're playing or being serious. Your high and mightiness is
> >moronic, Dave. You can't even lead by example, or anything else.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Dave:
>
> Ouch! Another mortal blow from the One With The Embarrasing Call
> Sign. How can you possibly go on in the face of such -- such --
> such -- banality? You can just count yourself lucky she didn't rip loose
> with another stinging ROFLMAO!!!

Did Kim just admit to being crazy or admit to being serious? Her
"leading" seems to consist of leading folks astray.

Dave K8MN

1444. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:35:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C41E175.EFCC3DD9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30955

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >"Anthem"
> >
> > Maybe next year.
>
> Don't forget, "We The Living".

Izzat about a percentage of the NCI membership?

Dave K8MN

1445. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 19:56:52 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C42806D.FBE036E@mailcity.net>
Source record: 30956
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> Repeater Jammer
> "JR" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message news:a1qrs3$o99$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > LOL LOL LOL ROTFLMAO!!!!!!
>
> Still jamming repeaters with music, I see.

You don't even know which JR you are replying to moron, check the
headers idiot.

1446. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:01:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a1soubhmj1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 30957

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3f1006_1@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C3E5EE6.91326583@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50
> years, an extra
> > > lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.
> >
> > Oh, I know why it has always been known as CW, Dick, because it
> > doesn't decay like the original spark gap. But CW was misnamed.
> >
> > From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
> > modulated or switched."
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
> hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
> their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
> propagated forever through all generations of hams in the
> name of "tradition."
>
> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPD8Ovpe+N6+q84HiEQJOUACgji3YqXPg8u47e3ZUcRKNGbx8oAwAnRH7
> f4sPp3YffdLiRg/f5wlvUPRJ
> =A3Pu
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
>
>

1447. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:03:51 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a1sp36hqb1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 30958

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c3f1006_1@news7.fast.net...
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C3E5EE6.91326583@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You'd think a dingaling who claims to have been a ham for 50
> years, an extra
> > > lite yet, would know why it has always been known as CW.
> >
> > Oh, I know why it has always been known as CW, Dick, because it
> > doesn't decay like the original spark gap. But CW was misnamed.
> >
> > From the IEEE Dictionary: "continuous wave - A carrier that is not
> > modulated or switched."
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> That's another significant problem ham radio faces, Cecil ...
> hams full of technically incorrect missinformation, who thump
> their chests and insist that that missinformation must be
> propagated forever through all generations of hams in the
> name of "tradition."

Is it also a significant problem facing the photonics industry? All sorts
of people talk about CW lasers. They are often modulated by various means.

1448. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:08:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a1spbhhve1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 30959

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020111064417.20970.00000749@mb-fx.aol.com...
> Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass
a
> code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only
segments in
> Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.

Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.

> >Or if I elect not to run ssb why should I be "forced" to be tested for
> >having any competence with the mode?
>
> You can get every one of the SSB questions on all of the exams wrong and
still
> be issued an Extra class license. You can get every one of the safety
questions
> wrong and still be issued an Extra Class license. If you get 4 out of 10
of the
> Morse-code-content questions wrong, you cannot obtain any license past
> Technician.
>
> I don't want to argue the definition of "forced" again, but I can clearly
see
> the difference between the way Morse code is treated vis a vis the other
> operating/mode questions.
>
> >Sure, ya can get deeper into the noise keyboarding with the likes of
> >PSK31 and Pactor but there goes the simplicity and cost advantages of
> >cw. Might as well dial up my ISP and jump into a chat room.
>
> If the code test were removed at some future point, the above statement
would
> continue to be true. It appears that you do not believe that the
advantages of
> CW are enough to continue its use in the Amateur Radio Service. If the
code
> test is removed at some future time, will you continue to tell people
that no
> one will learn it unless it is part of Amateur testing, or will you start
> saying different things to encourage its continued use on the ham bands?
>
> >See Squiggy that's not RADIO any more than your digital "simulated
> >contesting enviornment" is radio the way hams do real radio including
> >the contests.

>
> You are right that Carl doesn't understand that the mode is the message
when it
> comes to CW operation and that the difference between "real" Morse CW and
what
> he proposes would be like the difference between a real love affair and a
Star
> Trek Holideck fling.
>
> However, developing such a system on HF WOULD be radio -- perhaps just the
kind
> of technological development that we need more of in ham radio.
>
> >We've had thousands doing it simultaneously mostly in the lower 50 Khz
> >for decades with the oldest modulation scheme on the planet. Tune
> >14.000-14.050 on Sunday morning during the upcoming ARRL cw dx test.
>
> You would find stations stacked in there about 400 Hz apart, on average.
That
> is about 125 simultaneous QSOs being heard at any given location.
>
> >You're a troll who has tossed out enough techo razzle-dazzle bullshit
> >to collect some witless groupies. Now go play with yer RADIO and best
> >of luck with the dxing.
>
> I know Carl personally, and although he and I do not see eye to eye on
every
> issue, we both believe the other to be sincere. Carl may be wrong on some
> issues (heh!), but he does not post views just to stir the pot -- a
> conventional definition of troll.
>
> Now, as to the razzle-dazzle, I have always been a bit disappointed that
Carl
> has not found the time (made the time?) to get more done to bring some of
that
> razzle dazzle into ham radio. I believe that he has the talent and
knowledge to
> do so, and it is unfortunate that he has not. He has confidentially
shared a
> few ideas with me, and, IMHO, they are good ones. I really hope that he
can
> make them happen someday soon...
>
> >Either the future of ham radio is in deep doo-doo or all the
> >smoke & mirrors you digigeeks have been pumping is
> >exactly that.
>
> The technology being discussed is not smoke and mirrors outside of ham
radio.
> IMHO, "real" radio technology is leaving ham radio in the dust, and that

is
> very unfortunate. In the 1960s, I was a dumb new ham, but if I had taken
the
> back off of a commercial transmitter of the day, I would have recognized
what I
> saw. Could we say that today? Could we draw the block diagram of a
> spread-spectrum system such as the Nextel or any of hte other "razzle
dazzle"
> high-tech devices that are being used by the general public? Some of the
> unlicensed devices operate on ham bands, and, for the most part, hams
aren't
> using them. If all this doesn't tell us that something is wrong, what
will?
>
> >Which, the way I see it, apparently have no limits.
>
> I quoted this a bit out of order, but only to finish by saying that I
believe
> that ham radio has no limits. We can do virtually anything our unlimited
> imaginations can dream up. Let's let Carl have some fun with his new
> priveleges -- after all, he is in it for the fun of it, too, but a year
from
> now, let's ask him what improvements he has brought to technology by
virtue of
> those priveleges.
>
> I will go so far as to put a lobster dinner on the plate (so to speak)
that he
> will accomplish something by 1/1/03 that you feel warrants the lobster
dinner.
> :-) (And Carl, if you cost me another lobster dinner, I will never stick
up for
> you again.)
>
> 73, Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1449. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:23:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131223.5fbc1374@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30960

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> The new IC-746pro decodes and displays RTTY. All that is needed
> for full RTTY operation is a keyboard.

What kind of "RTTY"? Baudot, ASCII, or some other type? What speed? What shift? Can received text be stored or printed somehow, or must one write it down manually? Will it send as well as receive when a keyboard is added?

One of the biggest problems of the "keyboard modes" is that there are so many of them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1450. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:38:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30961

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<e6TQbF9mBHA.1876@cpimsnntpa02>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Also some Vonnegut:
> >
> > Short stories:
> > "Welcome To The Monkey House"
> > "The Euphio Question"
> > "Harrison Bergeron"

Add:

"Long Walk To Forever"
"Deer In The Works"
> >
> > Novels:
> > "Cat's Cradle"
> > "Slapstick"
> > "Slaughterhouse Five"
> > "The Sirens of Titan"
>
> If you like Kurt, whose theme in all his work is "Be nice, god-damn it!",
> you would
> love Orson Scott Card whose work has the underlying theme of "right
> conduct".
> Get a copy of "Enders Game", "Speaker for the Dead", or the five books in
> the
> "Tales of Alvin Maker" collection, especially "Heartfire" -- I dare you to
> try lay that
> one down!
>
Never heard of him but I will look him up. Thanks, Hans.

--

And now, for an added bit of surrealism, I bring you:

"The Movie Game"

The Movie Game is an exercise in imagination. In the Game, you imagine
that you are casting a movie or miniseries to be made from a book or a
life situation, then decide what actors you would cast in the various
roles. You are not limited to the current crop of actors - you can
pick actors from the past, at any time of their careers. You can do
Hollywood-style makeovers like changing hair color and disguising
height differences. End result of the Game is a cast of characters.

The most common forms of the Game are to imagine making books into movies and life-situations such as one's co-workers or immediate family into a movie or TV series. The Gane can also be played in reverse, where you cast people you know into various roles.

For example, suppose a miniseries were to be made of "Atlas". Who would play Dagny Taggart? Katharine Hepburn at about age 30-35 would be one choice. Meryl Streep is another obvious one. Hank Rearden? Harrison Ford, of course.

Ayn Rand herself had a particular favorite back in the early '80s (see spoiler below).

Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the various characters?

73 de Jim, N2EY

spoiler follows

SPOILER!!!!

Ayn Rand wanted Farrah Fawcett to play Dagny Taggart. Absolute fact.

1451. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:42:57 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <"Doggie Daze"@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a1srfpcdb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1sc05$815$d@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
> news:a1qs13$ohk$0@pita.alt.net...
> > LOL LOL LOL !!!! ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Jizzswallowing Recepticle, tell us how you got your HIV from your father.

--
One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
"The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
ad nauseum, ad infinitum."
```

1452. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:54:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131254.4515820b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30963

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0112310131.692cc35a@posting.google.com...
> > . . . .
> > >
> > > Plunk Your Magic Twanger, Froggie.
> > >
> > > Dick, Nï¿½BK ENTP
> > >
> Bwaaaaahaha! Booful but they'll never get it . . !
> > >
> > w3rv

Andy Devine was a ham, he was, he was.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1453. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 20:56:00 UTC
From: Teddy Kennedy <"Doggie Daze"@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a1ss89enn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 30964
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill, KD0HG" <shoot@spammersonsight.org> wrote in message
news:qg254u4assl5idccl3ierdba4s9r4uhoqj@4ax.com...
> Over the last few weeks, I've been doing a lot more listening on all the
HF
> bands than talking-
> One thing that stands out is the increasing number of ops with some of the
> most appalling audio I've ever heard.
>
> Compression so extreme that fan and shack noise is as loud as the op's
voice.
>
> EQ that's so pinched and frequency restricted that I missed maybe a
quarter of
> what was being said on a +20 over signal- until I got a blinding headache
from
> the screeching and QSYed- after only a minute.
>
> Audio quality and intelligibility that a $9.95 telephone could put to
shame.
> That's supposed to 'punch through' ? That's cool?
>
> Some years ago one could say about most ham audio was it sounded, "OK". It
was
> pretty hard to screw up a D-104, 444 or handheld dynamic plugged into a
> ricebox or old American iron. About the worst sound came from the rigs
with RF
> clipping that might have been turned up way too high.
>
> Now the examples of complete audio garbage proliferate on the bands.
>
> What's the deal here? Is it those Brand "H" mics that are being heavily
> promoted and sold? Frankly, I think a D-104 sounds a hellofa lot better
for
> 'communications quality' audio at a fraction of the price.
>
> Are there too many opportunities to completely screw up one's audio in the
> menus of the new rigs?
>
> Since the 1930s, many studies have been done on speech intelligibility vs.
> frequency response and flatness and the more pinched audio is, the less
> intelligible it is. Period. Putting a huge peak at the top of an overall
> response of 500-2000 Hz doesn't help intelligibility (if a little is good,
> more isn't better), and restricting one's transmitted bandwidth without a

> corresponding reduction at the other end does't help anyone's S/N, either.
> Clipping in itself generates odd order and harsh sounding harmonics and
adding
> an inappropriate amount of upper midrange boost makes it worse.
> Try yelling over a rotary saw cutting through a knotty piece of hardwood.
> That's what it sounds like and about as intelligible.
>
> You never hear this sort of moronic audio processing on broadcast
stations, in
> spite of the loudness wars on the dial. One can greatly increase the punch
and
> intelligibility of audio with the intelligent use of compression and
clipping
> at audio and RF with the processing being transparent to the listener.
That
> should be the goal. Sounding good- clean and loud- what a concept.
>
> Me, I'm going to get some aspirin and cotton ear plugs or switch to data
mode
> if this trend keeps up. Good grief. Gimme a break.
> Save it for the freeband along with the roger beeps and heavy reverb.
>
> <vent mode off>
>
>
> -Bill/HG

Would you be counting W4ASX among these "over-audioed" abusers? That man is absolutely fixated on his audio and rarely talks about anything else and he does not give one hoot that his signal is wiiiiiiiide!

1454. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:03:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41F60A.77B429E0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30965

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a
> > code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in
> > Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.
>
> Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.

Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1455. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:09:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113160956.20967.00001219@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30966

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
>> by email or snail mail will suffice.

>So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?

Yes, that does tend to inflate the membership numbers a bit. It was a moot point when NCI was first formed, but all of those whose licences have expired, or who still have licenses but are not currently active in ham radio who once joined NCI are counted as current "members." ARRL membership numbers would look pretty good if the League counted past members in ITS arguments to the FCC! And, if they did so count past members in a filing related to code testing, I bet the NCI howls of protest would lead the fray. :-)

>>Did anyone that is an ARRL member vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's
>>position to not oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement?

>Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct
>result of that one particular shift in position?

It would be interesting to see a run for the Directorship on a "preserve code testing" platform.

As to the current international position, I very much want to see ARRL spend its limited resources (staff time and money) doing something concrete about the 40 meter issue than I want to see it expend some of those resources fighting a battle to maintain an international treaty requiring code testing for HF access in the Amateur Radio Service.

Think about it for a bit -- right now, we have an international treaty requiring code testing for HF access in the Amateur Radio Service -- an international treaty. Limiting (or eliminating) ICBMs, global warming, overfishing, extradition -- THESE warrant international treaties. When Morse code was THE primary mode in all radio, or at least part of the mainstream, I could understand the reasons for an international treaty. But frankly, with all of the problems the world faces right now, just about the last thing they need to be debating, IMHO, is the need for an international treaty on Morse code testing in Amateur Radio.

If the League were to spend any significant part of its spectrum-protection resources fighting such a cause, they would lose me as a member. I have told Tom Frenaye that, in so many words. But your views may differ, so I encourage you do do the same with YOUR Director.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1456. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:10:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113161024.07935.00000181@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30969

In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
>person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
>to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
>and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
>definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
>--

Nice tale.

Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)

Of course at least one of Rand's book heroes knew the code, and didn't complain about learning it. Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator at "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore Dagny knew it and was skilled in its use.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1457. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:10:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113161024.07935.00000182@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 30970

In article <TS%%7.350814$W8.13337412@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>If you do not like to get into the surrealism that Jim and I like, there
>are three classic bits of sci-fi by the late Robert Heinlein in your local
>library that would stretch you out a bit>
>
>The Moon is a Harsh Mistress
>Starship Troopers in spite of the bad movie.
>Stranger in a Strange Land if the God Squad, some New Agers, or the
>Charles Manson Fan Club haven't stolen it.

I've only read "Stranger" so I've got some catching up to do.
>
>I see you have not gotten to the soliloqy on the meaning of the light at
>the end of a cigarette in AS.

I almost took up smoking after that one.

But if you want surrealism, just think about how the frequent posters to rrap
imagine themselves as characters in "Atlas". Who do ya think would imagine
themselves as Dagny, Francisco, Eddie Williers.....?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1458. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:10:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113161048.20967.00001220@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30968

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.

Bill, in about a month, let us know the outcome.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1459. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:11:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201132058280.1642-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 30967

On 13 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>> It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on the
>>digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was the
>>proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that field over
>>manual telegraphy.
>
>Don't applaud if that doesn't happen, Steve. If most of Amateur Radio continues
>to be behind the technological times, it may be held against us somehow.
>
>Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
>how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

RE: Digital:

Then perhaps we should get the artificial symbol rate limits removed from the rules. If someone can figure out how to cram in a 9600 baud transmission into a SSB signal on 30m, he shouldn't be limited to a symbol rate of only 300 baud. BANDWITH ALONE of the signal should be the governing factor.

Likewise, on the higher end, doesn't the artificial SS hop pattern that's mandated by our rules also limit things? Granted on 33cm and shorter, there's no more symbol rate restrictions, but aren't we severly limited in playing with different hopping sequences to find something that has larger throughput for the same bandwith and selected frequencies...?

1460. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:14:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113161413.20967.00001221@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30971

From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net

> it takes no more skill or effort to key a
>1milliwatt transmitter than it does to key a 1kilowatt transmitter.
>The real skill and effort is displayed by those who pull your
>whisper-thin signals out of the atmospheric noise.

Something very much recognized, and appreciated, by the QRP community.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI/QRP

1461. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:15:26 UTC
From: Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com>
Message-ID: <ONm08.23412$dG.12149315@news1.rdc1.sdca.home.com>
Source record: 30972
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Having run an ISP before, I can assure you that we could care less about some papers from some FBUI.

If you meant the FBI, it takes QUITE some doing to get them involved.

Toll_Free

"technomage" <technomage-hawke@home.com> wrote in message news:jVW%7.124988$Wd.37626464@news1.rdc1.az.home.com...
> it ain't that hard. Also, a simple request from the FBUI to your ISp will
> have those telco logs open so fast, you won't have time to say anything
> at all.
>
> Technomage
>
> In article <3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net>, "One High Powered Mother
> Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote:
>
> > On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> > <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
> >
> >>Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
> >
> >
> > like they'd take the time to do that....
> >
> > if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> > just for someone saying they would get real
> >
> >
> > one high powered mutha
> > powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> > i don't play
> > i drop da maul
>
>
> --
> I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
> My life is my own - No. 6

1462. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:16:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41F92C.3AF4B13A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30973

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > The new IC-746pro decodes and displays RTTY. All that is needed
> > for full RTTY operation is a keyboard.
>
> What kind of "RTTY"? Baudot, ASCII, or some other type? What speed?
> What shift? Can received text be stored or printed somehow, or must
> one write it down manually? Will it send as well as receive when a
> keyboard is added?

The specification is available in .pdf format from icomamerica.com
"RTTY" usually means Baudot as it does in this case. The specs
do not address most of your questions. Most late model ICOM HF
transceivers support a digital input to the built-in FSK generator.
Hopefully, there's a digital output from the FSK decoder. If so,
PACTOR might be implemented in software in a laptop.

> One of the biggest problems of the "keyboard modes" is that there are
> so many of them.

I have standardized on PACTOR I & II. RTTY and PSK31 are too
error prone for my tastes. We have forward error correction
for CW, might as well have it for other digital modes. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1463. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:18:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41F9A5.43504B53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30974

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Is it also a significant problem facing the photonics industry? All sorts
> of people talk about CW lasers. They are often modulated by various means.

I have declared that 'CW' stands for "Comutated Wave", Jim
so the problem is solved.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1464. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:19:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41F9EA.7497153A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30975

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >"Anthem"
> > >
> > > Maybe next year.
> >
> > Don't forget, "We The Living".
>
> Izzat about a percentage of the NCI membership?

Ayn Rand's book about communist oppression in early
Soviet Russia.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1465. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:28:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <j_m08.372933$W8.13473171@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30976

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113161024.07935.00000182@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article
<TS%%7.350814$W8.13337412@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >If you do not like to get into the surrealism that Jim and I like,
there
> >are three classic bits of sci-fi by the late Robert Heinlein in your
local
> >library that would stretch you out a bit>
> >
> >The Moon is a Harsh Mistress
> >Starship Troopers in spite of the bad movie.
> >Stranger in a Strange Land if the God Squad, some New Agers, or the
> >Charles Manson Fan Club haven't stolen it.
>
> I've only read "Stranger" so I've got some catching up to do.
> >
> >I see you have not gotten to the soliloqy on the meaning of the light
at
> >the end of a cigarette in AS.
>
> I almost took up smoking after that one.
>
> But if you want surrealism, just think about how the frequent posters to
rrap
> imagine themselves as characters in "Atlas". Who do ya think would
imagine
> themselves as Dagny, Francisco, Eddie Williers.....?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

While a lot can be said of this group, cardboard characters are not among them and her characters are a bit limited having to wear white or black hats all the time. This bunch wouldn't recognize a limitation if it drove over their toes on a tricycle. And someone would try to link Squiggy and Cheers to the black hats -- which may not be that much of a stretch.

TMHM is Heinlein's best to me because among a lot of other interests I was an undergraduate Econ major. The layout of a lunar colony made a lot of sense to me as did UN politics of the vintage (which may not have really improved given the five new Security Council members coming on this month are Syria, Bulgaria, the Cameroon, Guinea, and Mexico; I feel more secure

already). Like everything of Heinlein at his best, it is a romping good story.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1466. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:32:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C41FCD5.DC58F390@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30977

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > > Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a
> > > code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in
> > > Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.
> >
> > Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.
>
> Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)

You are a supposedly intelligent man (for you've told us so on numerous occasions) yet you seem to make up so many incorrect translations of the comments of others. I read Jim's comment and got it as, "Jeez. Not this gain. That's a worn out shoe if ever I saw one". Are you incapable of taking someone's comment at face value or are you simply not being serious?

Dave K8MN

1467. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:32:45 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <12n08.372939$W8.13474232@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30978

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113161024.07935.00000181@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
> >person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
> >to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
> >and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
> >definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
> >--
>
> Nice tale.
>
> Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)
>
> Of course at least one of Rand's book heroes knew the code, and didn't
complain
> about learning it. Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator
at
> "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore
Dagny knew
> it and was skilled in its use.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

WTH Jim. Alan Greenspan could live it down, we should let Cecil off the
hook. Greenspan learned to make Delphic statements while watching the
Bond market; Cecil learned Bafflegab as a Second Language quite well, too.
Coincidence? I think not.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1468. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:34:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C41FD5E.B9DE4051@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30980

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
> >person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
> >to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
> >and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
> >definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
>
> Nice tale.
>
> Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)

I also met Nathaniel and Barbara Brandon and Alan Greenspan while
visiting Ayn Rand's offices. I barely missed meeting Milton Freedman
there. I was installing SCADA systems for Con Ed at the time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1469. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:35:46 UTC
From: Jack Shit <Jack718@jqmza.net>
Message-ID: <a1sul8dh0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JR" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C42806D.FBE036E@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Repeater Jammer
> > "JR" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
news:a1qrs3$o99$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > LOL LOL LOL ROTFLMAO!!!!!!
> >
> > Still jamming repeaters with music, I see.
>
> You don't even know which JR you are replying to moron, check the
> headers idiot.

You cannot expect Roger to know what day it is, let alone what
post he is replying to. Roger's sole goal in life is to share his
and Big Marie's miserable life with the rest of the world.

Jack Shit

1470. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:38:33 UTC
From: Jack Shit <Jack718@jqmza.net>
Message-ID: <a1suqeos0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 30981
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
> >
> > On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net>
wrote:
> > : --
> > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> > : pschleck@novia.net
> > : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> > : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
> >
> > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> > : pschleck@gonix.com
> > : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> > : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> > :
> >
> > Do you even READ your own posts?
>
> Do you?
>
> Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
>
> "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> status makes the story even less credible."
>
Roger, get off Usenet and go change Big Marie's bed
pan. She's been screaming for you for the last hour. some
son you are!

Jack Shit
```

1471. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:40:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113164052.20967.00001222@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 30982

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Then perhaps we should get the artificial symbol rate limits removed from the
>rules. If someone can figure out how to cram in a 9600 baud transmission
>into a SSB signal on 30m, he shouldn't be limited to a symbol rate of only 300
>baud.

>BANDWITH ALONE of the signal should be the governing factor.

I agree. I have been asked by our DC office to do some studies of the occupied bandwidth of present-day Amateur signals (with occupied bandwidth being the bandwidth at the -26 dB points.) . . .

>Likewise, on the higher end, doesn't the artificial SS hop pattern that's
>mandated by our rules also limit things?

At one point, I believe only two hopping sequences were permitted. The FCC changed that about two years ago. It was shameful -- for a while, one could go to Comp USA and buy spread-spectrum radios that operated on 2.4 GHz and use them under Part 15, but they would have been illegal to use under Part 97.

Equally shameful, or perhaps even more so, is now that it IS legal to use those Part 15 devices under Part 97, at much higher powers and with no limitations on antenna gain, hams are not doing so.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1472. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:48:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4200BB.29C6B20@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30983

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > > > Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a
> > > > code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in
> > > > Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.
> > >
> > > Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.
> >
> > Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)
>
> You are a supposedly intelligent man (for you've told us so on numerous
> occasions) yet you seem to make up so many incorrect translations of the
> comments of others. I read Jim's comment and got it as, "Jeez. Not
> this gain. That's a worn out shoe if ever I saw one". Are you
> incapable of taking someone's comment at face value or are you simply
> not being serious?

Dave, do you think :-) means "serious"? Maybe you should read the
netnews FAQ on emoticons?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1473. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:55:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4201F9.39385E08@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30984

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
> >> by email or snail mail will suffice.
>
> >So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?
>
> Yes, that does tend to inflate the membership numbers a bit. It was a moot
> point when NCI was first formed, but all of those whose licences have expired,
> or who still have licenses but are not currently active in ham radio who once
> joined NCI are counted as current "members." ARRL membership numbers would
> look pretty good if the League counted past members in ITS arguments to the
> FCC! And, if they did so count past members in a filing related to code
> testing, I bet the NCI howls of protest would lead the fray. :-)
>
> >>Did anyone that is an ARRL member vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's
> >>position to not oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement?
>
> >Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct
> >result of that one particular shift in position?
>
> It would be interesting to see a run for the Directorship on a "preserve code
> testing" platform.

A candidate need not run on that platform. All he needs to be is
someone other than the guy who voted to change with the wind.

> As to the current international position, I very much want to see ARRL spend
> its limited resources (staff time and money) doing something concrete about the
> 40 meter issue than I want to see it expend some of those resources fighting a
> battle to maintain an international treaty requiring code testing for HF access
> in the Amateur Radio Service.

I've been a ham for 38 years. In 38 years, nothing has been done about
40 meters despite the time and funds the League has already spent on the
issue at past world conferences.

> Think about it for a bit -- right now, we have an international treaty
> requiring code testing for HF access in the Amateur Radio Service -- an
> international treaty. Limiting (or eliminating) ICBMs, global warming,
> overfishing, extradition -- THESE warrant international treaties. When Morse
> code was THE primary mode in all radio, or at least part of the mainstream, I
> could understand the reasons for an international treaty. But frankly, with all

> of the problems the world faces right now, just about the last thing they need
> to be debating, IMHO, is the need for an international treaty on Morse code
> testing in Amateur Radio.

Lucky for us that the ITU doesn't concern itself with matters of global warming, nuclear disarmament, extradition or overfishing. I don't feel badly that a communications conference should deal with communications matters, no matter how trivial some see the issues. All the voting participants are getting paid to attend.

> If the League were to spend any significant part of its spectrum-protection
> resources fighting such a cause, they would lose me as a member. I have told
> Tom Frenaye that, in so many words. But your views may differ, so I encourage
> you do do the same with YOUR Director.

Naw, I'm not a one-issue guy when it comes to governmental or amateur radio politics. I certainly wouldn't leave a political party or an organization of radio amateurs over one single issue. I think you should apologize to Tom for your one-issue mindset.

I decided though that I won't contribute money for the conference effort. If the League can afford to hire the big time, non-ham, lady fund raiser from the corporate world--you know, the one who sent me two letters over the course of three weeks telling me what MY RESPONSIBILITIES toward amateur radio are--that Newington has waaaay too much money already.

By the way, if you run into the fund raiser, tell her that I think she should realize her responsibility toward amateur radio's future and donate her salary to the cause. I don't take kindly to receiving advice from some woman who likely heard about amateur radio less than a year ago. In the past, I've donated for the building you work from, the W1AW station renovation and to the Foundation (on more than one occasion) as memorials for friends who have become silent keys. I also put my money where my mouth is by becoming a Life Member about 25 years ago when what doesn't seem like a lot of money now was a big chunk for a young ham with a mortgage.

Dave Heil K8MN

1474. Free IOTA List download - UPDATED - 13-Jan-02

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 21:58:14 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c4202f6@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 30985
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

The FREE IOTA List download has been updated as of 13-Jan-2002 and is
located on the IOTA List Page of the web site listed below.

available as text file -or- MS Word document

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

1475. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:00:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30986

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
> >person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
> >to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
> >and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
> >definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
> >--
>
> Nice tale.
>
> Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)
>
> Of course at least one of Rand's book heroes knew the code, and didn't complain
> about learning it. Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator at
> "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore Dagny knew
> it and was skilled in its use.

Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage" on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob Margolin from Muddy's Band). If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd have supported continued code testing. I'm pretty sure that the late Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.

I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.

Dave K8MN

1476. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:08:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C42054B.8DACE971@earthlink.net>
Source record: 30987

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > > > > Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a
> > > > > code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in
> > > > > Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.
> > > >
> > > > Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.
> > >
> > > Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)
> >
> > You are a supposedly intelligent man (for you've told us so on numerous
> > occasions) yet you seem to make up so many incorrect translations of the
> > comments of others. I read Jim's comment and got it as, "Jeez. Not
> > this gain. That's a worn out shoe if ever I saw one". Are you
> > incapable of taking someone's comment at face value or are you simply
> > not being serious?
>
> Dave, do you think :-) means "serious"? Maybe you should read the
> netnews FAQ on emoticons?

You are a supposedly intelligent man :) (for you've told us so on
numerous occasions) yet you seem to make up so many incorrect
translations of the comments of others. ;-) I read Jim's comment and
got it as, "Jeez. Not this gain. That's a worn out shoe if ever I saw
one". Are you incapable of taking someone's comment at face value =:(
or are you simply not being serious? :o

There you go, Cecil.

Dave K8MN

1477. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:34:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131434.703f7a4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30988

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C41D764.568A3B0A@IEEE.org>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >"Anthem"
> > >
> > > Maybe next year.
> >
> > Don't forget, "We The Living".

Her WORST book, by far. Not worth the time to read it.

btw, she did some short stories 'way back before the novels that were only recently published. There were also entire chapters removed from "Fountainhead". I've read those, too. Much of it is quite awful, which simply shows that ol' Annie Rosenberg learned her trade pretty well over time.

--

The books are also a bit of a window into a different time, when the spaces betwen cities were vast and dark and when people spoke of "the press" rather than "the media" because the #1 means of mass communications was newspapers. Back when railroads were the predominant means of land transportation and foreign competition was unknown to American industry.

Rand's philosphy is interesting but incomplete. Her novels have certain interesting holes in them:

- None of her characters has any real family ties or a happy marriage.
- Her heroes hop into the sack spontaneously but there are no consequences (like babies).
- Her characters' physical appearance always matches their character.
- No matter how much her heroes neglect themselves or common sense safety rules, they never get sick, hurt or make a mistake due to impaired capacity.
- Natural disasters play no role in her books, even though they are about industries that constantly battle the weather.
- None of her characters has a hobby, avocation, spiritual life or any real interest outside of their work.

Ya gotta wonder what she'd make of the Internet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1478. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:47:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpw6701.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 30989

On Sun, 13 Jan 2002 10:23:29 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>I think that's true for the vast majority of amateurs who have
>filed comments on any issue...BUT, in reality...
>the process doesn't guarantee only "knowledgeable" people
>will reply. The comment process creates the situation whereby only
>"interested" people are most likly to do so. All "interested"
>parties may not also be "knowledgeable" : -)

Which is why a BRIEF statement of qualifications ("I have been a
licensee for thirty years, and hold a degree in social engineering,
etc") in any filing is invaluable for establishing standing and
sorting out the "knowledgeable" commenters from the "shooters off of
the mouth/pen/keyboard".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1479. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:57:05 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10201132252590.1848-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 30990

On 13 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Then perhaps we should get the artificial symbol rate limits removed from the
>>rules. If someone can figure out how to cram in a 9600 baud transmission
>>into a SSB signal on 30m, he shouldn't be limited to a symbol rate of only 300
>>baud.
>
>>BANDWITH ALONE of the signal should be the governing factor.
>
>I agree. I have been asked by our DC office to do some studies of the occupied
>bandwidth of present-day Amateur signals (with occupied bandwidth being the
>bandwidth at the -26 dB points.) . . .
>
>>Likewise, on the higher end, doesn't the artificial SS hop pattern that's
>>mandated by our rules also limit things?
>
>At one point, I believe only two hopping sequences were permitted. The FCC
>changed that about two years ago. It was shameful -- for a while, one could go
>to Comp USA and buy spread-spectrum radios that operated on 2.4 GHz and use
>them under Part 15, but they would have been illegal to use under Part 97.
>
>Equally shameful, or perhaps even more so, is now that it IS legal to use those
>Part 15 devices under Part 97, at much higher powers and with no limitations on
>antenna gain, hams are not doing so.

I was not aware of this last fact (and perhaps others weren't either). Maybe
when I have some "money to burn," I'll get a wireless lan transmitter and a
2.4GHz amplifier (20+W) and see if it raises the noise floor on my voice
repeater's 2.4GHz input. Don't expect this soon. It will also be interesting
to see how many birds end up fried on my roof.

1480. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 22:58:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1t3a00vg8@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30992

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113161024.07935.00000181@mb-mw.aol.com...
> Nice tale.
>
> Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)
>
> Of course at least one of Rand's book heroes knew the code, and didn't
complain
> about learning it. Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator
at
> "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore Dagny
knew
> it and was skilled in its use.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The key phrase here is "in those days".

1481. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:00:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1t3e50vq2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30993

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> >
> > >Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
> > >person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
> > >to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
> > >and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
> > >definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
> > >--
> >
> > Nice tale.
> >
> > Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)
> >
> > Of course at least one of Rand's book heroes knew the code, and didn't
complain
> > about learning it. Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator
at
> > "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore
Dagny knew
> > it and was skilled in its use.
>
> Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
> with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
> on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
> Margolin from Muddy's Band). If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
> have supported continued code testing. I'm pretty sure that the late
> Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
> morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.
>
> I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.
>
> Dave K8MN

1482. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:01:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1t3gp0vvl@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30994

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net...

> I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.
>
> Dave K8MN

At least he's not like John Edward.

1483. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:05:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1t3n3010e2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30995

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020113114137.23507.00000773@mb-md.aol.com...
> I've read Stranger in a Strange Land, none of the other sci-fi stuff.
> I like my Sci-Fi on TV; don't have time to read it.

Well, if you spent less time in front of the TV...

1484. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:05:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201131505.604a7063@posting.google.com>
Source record: 30991

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C40AD3F.3AE17D4A@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Nope. Do the math. The CW setup wins on the power scenario, receive or
> > transmit, at the power level you specified..
>
> Not when you include the PACTOR II throughput edge over CW. In that
> minute that it takes you to send 20 words, PACTOR II can send 960
> words.

It doesn't take me anywhere near a minute to send 20 words via CW.

PACTOR 2's speed is determined in large part by the S/N. How much S/N
do you need to get that sort of speed? The website doesn't list wpm,
either.

> How does one minute of PACTOR II operation compare with 48
> minutes of CW operation as far as power consumption?

Doesn't matter if you have to keep everything running all the time.
Which is the usual case in emergencies - everyone is listening.

> > > Plus PACTOR II has a throughput
> > >about 50 times higher than CW so CW consumes many magnitudes more power over
> > >all.
>
> > PACTOR 2 can do 1500-2000 wpm??
>
> PACTOR II has a throughput about 50 times higher than *my* fastest CW.

But it's not about YOU, Cecil.

The "economy" PACTOR 2 box costs $649 and the big one goes for $950.
Plus a rig and a computer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1485. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:09:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1t3vu0113c@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 30997

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C41F60A.77B429E0@IEEE.org...
> > Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.
>
> Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That's as may be, but there's no need to keep hitting us over the head with
it when you've already made your point. It hurts, you know.

1486. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-13 23:32:55 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <HOo08.100502$fe1.1269522@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 30996

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
> with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
> on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
> Margolin from Muddy's Band). If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
> have supported continued code testing. I'm pretty sure that the late
> Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
> morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.

Yes, Dave, that's exactly what it is... proper morse operation is a musical thing. Admittedly, it tends to be monotonic but... it's HIGHLY rhythmic requiring fast twitch muscles and clear, clean rhythmic perception. Anyone who does it well and thinks they're not talented is only kidding themselves or has never really thought about it. Not just anyone diddly-bopping down the street could be trained to perform at those levels.

So, Dave, what do YOU think? (truthfully)

Rich
Remember I said monotonic not monotonous... ;-)

1487. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:14:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4222D1.960D8DDC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30998

N2EY wrote:
> > PACTOR II has a throughput about 50 times higher than *my* fastest CW.
>
> But it's not about YOU, Cecil.

Of course it is, Jim. I have to decide whether to trust my straight
key and failing hearing or go with state of the art in amateur digital.
Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1488. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:16:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C422363.B760D5E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 30999

Dave Heil wrote:
> I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.

A lot of Libertarians are still alive, Dave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1489. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:17:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4223A4.19FA422C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31000

Richard Plourde wrote:
> Yes, Dave, that's exactly what it is... proper morse operation is a musical
> thing. Admittedly, it tends to be monotonic but... it's HIGHLY rhythmic
> requiring fast twitch muscles and clear, clean rhythmic perception. Anyone
> who does it well and thinks they're not talented is only kidding themselves
> or has never really thought about it. Not just anyone diddly-bopping down
> the street could be trained to perform at those levels.

I vaguely remember some musical CW. Did it make the pop charts?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1490. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:21:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdn6$3nl$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31013
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Repeater jammer
"Jiozzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C42806D.FBE036E@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Repeater Jammer
> > "JR" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
news:a1qrs3$o99$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > LOL LOL LOL ROTFLMAO!!!!!!
> >
> > Still jamming repeaters with music, I see.
>
> You don't even know which

All you gutless, chickenshit cowards are the same.
Admission of jamming repeaters with music playing, noted.

1491. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:22:54 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdn7$3nl$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31012
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Repeater jammer
"Jackeats Shit" <Jack718@jqmza.net> wrote in message
news:a1sul8$dh$0@dosa.alt.net...
> "JR" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3C42806D.FBE036E@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > Repeater Jammer
> > > "JR" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
> news:a1qrs3$o99$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > LOL LOL LOL ROTFLMAO!!!!!!
> > >
> > > Still jamming repeaters with music, I see.
> >
> > You don't even know which JR you are replying to moron, check the
> > headers idiot.
>
> You cannot expect

I can't expect you to quit hiding, gutless COWARD, anymore than Riley can
expect you to quit jamming. But he's closing in on your hovel of a QTH.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
Better get all that downloaded kiddie porn off your hard drive before they
seize it, scumbag.
```

1492. Re: (no subject)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:24:20 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdn8$3nl$5@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Clinton and Taliban supporter
"Arf! Arf!" <Doggie Dicksucker@Liberal.comz> confessed to his positive HIV
condition in message news:a1srfp$cdb$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1sc05$815$d@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <JR@nobodyyou.com> wrote in message
> > news:a1qs13$ohk$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > LOL LOL LOL !!!! ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!
> >
> > Jizzswallowing Recepticle, tell us how you got your HIV from your
father.
>
>
>
> --
>

Jizzswallowing Recepticle's admission of contracting HIV from his father,
noted.
```

1493. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:33:09 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9Hp08.100611$fe1.1274606@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31001

Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:

> To go one further, I would support an overall regulatory reduction in our
> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40, and no more
> than 250W on the rest of our allocations, including UHF and above.

It must be nice to have a rural QTH far from the light-dimmers,
neon signs, unshielded battery-chargers and other miscreant sources
of FCC-approved RFI.

I, on the other hand, am a denizen of a noisy, rf-infested
suburban ghetto and I am more than appreciative of stations willing
to run enough power for me to hear them over the din. Not only
is life too short for QRP, my sanity becomes periously thin when
having to dig somebody's piss-weak signal out of the splatter and
inadvertent mixing products from the local 50 kW religious
broadcasting outlet.

Wake up, Hamdom! It's time to consider the little guy in the hobby,
the fellow who doesn't have the big bucks to move to the country and
commute to work with a gas-guzzling SUV.

My motto: If you can't lower the noise floor, raise the power ceiling!

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1494. Re: Roger Does Know Me and He's Making Me Hide

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:41:34 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdnk$3nl$f@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31014
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jackeats Shit" <Jack718@jqmza.net> backpedaled in message
news:a1svcl$20q$0@dosa.alt.net...
> Roger,
>
> Your wild guesses as to who is posting what just serve to
> prove what the Usenet community already knows. You don't
> know Jackeats Shit! In fact, I'll prove that you don't know
> Jackeats Shit. Anyone is welcome to post here if they think Roger
> knows Jackeats Shit. I guarantee you don't know Jackeats Shit
> Roger.
>
> Jackeats Shit

Nor would I want to, HIV positive.

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

>
>
>
>

1495. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:42:45 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdnm$3nl$g@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

```
"Jackeats Shit" <Jack718@jqmza.net> slobbered in message
news:a1suqe$os$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
> > >
> > > On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net>
> wrote:
> > > : --
> > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> > > : pschleck@novia.net
> > > : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> > > : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
> > >
> > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> > > : pschleck@gonix.com
> > > : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> > > : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> > > :
> > >
> > > Do you even READ your own posts?
> >
> > Do you?
> >
> > Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> > revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> > news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
> >
> > "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> > status makes the story even less credible."
> >
> Roger, get off

That's sick, even from a feltcher like you, Jackeats Shit.

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
```

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous status makes the story even less credible."

1496. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:48:25 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1tdnn$3nl$h@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Teddy Kennedy" <Doggie Dicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
news:a1ss89enn0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Bill, KD0HG" <shoot@spammersonsight.org> wrote in message
> news:qg254u4assl5idccl3ierdba4s9r4uhoqj@4ax.com...
> > Over the last few weeks, I've been doing a lot more listening on all the
> HF
> > bands than talking-
> > One thing that stands out is the increasing number of ops with some of
the
> > most appalling audio I've ever heard.
> >
> > Compression so extreme that fan and shack noise is as loud as the op's
> voice.
> >
> > EQ that's so pinched and frequency restricted that I missed maybe a
> quarter of
> > what was being said on a +20 over signal- until I got a blinding
headache
> from
> > the screeching and QSYed- after only a minute.
> >
> > Audio quality and intelligibility that a $9.95 telephone could put to
> shame.
> > That's supposed to 'punch through' ? That's cool?
> >
> > Some years ago one could say about most ham audio was it sounded, "OK".
It
> was
> > pretty hard to screw up a D-104, 444 or handheld dynamic plugged into a
> > ricebox or old American iron. About the worst sound came from the rigs
> with RF
> > clipping that might have been turned up way too high.
> >
> > Now the examples of complete audio garbage proliferate on the bands.
> >
> > What's the deal here? Is it those Brand "H" mics that are being heavily
> > promoted and sold? Frankly, I think a D-104 sounds a hellofa lot better
> for
> > 'communications quality' audio at a fraction of the price.
> >
> > Are there too many opportunities to completely screw up one's audio in
the

> > menus of the new rigs?
> >
> > Since the 1930s, many studies have been done on speech intelligibility
vs.
> > frequency response and flatness and the more pinched audio is, the less
> > intelligible it is. Period. Putting a huge peak at the top of an
overall
> > response of 500-2000 Hz doesn't help intelligibility (if a little is
good,
> > more isn't better), and restricting one's transmitted bandwidth without
a
> > corresponding reduction at the other end does't help anyone's S/N,
either.
> > Clipping in itself generates odd order and harsh sounding harmonics and
> adding
> > an inappropriate amount of upper midrange boost makes it worse.
> > Try yelling over a rotary saw cutting through a knotty piece of
hardwood.
> > That's what it sounds like and about as intelligible.
> >
> > You never hear this sort of moronic audio processing on broadcast
> stations, in
> > spite of the loudness wars on the dial. One can greatly increase the
punch
> and
> > intelligibility of audio with the intelligent use of compression and
> clipping
> > at audio and RF with the processing being transparent to the listener.
> That
> > should be the goal. Sounding good- clean and loud- what a concept.
> >
> > Me, I'm going to get some aspirin and cotton ear plugs or switch to data
> mode
> > if this trend keeps up. Good grief. Gimme a break.
> > Save it for the freeband along with the roger beeps and heavy reverb.
> >
> > <vent mode off>
> >
> >
> > -Bill/HG
>
> Would you be counting W4ASX among these "over-audioed" abusers? That man
is
> absolutely fixated on his audio and rarely talks about anything else and
he
> does not give one hoot that his signal is wiiiiiiiide!

Says N4CND, whose wide audio interfered 10 Kilocycles up and down the band
from 3.901.
--

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

1497. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:50:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201131650.6feea45a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31002

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C41A337.2D019733@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > The FCC doan require ya to operate on 30m either but don't try it
> > unless yer beeping.
>
> Does PACTOR beep?
>
>
Beeps like crazy and it's allowable on 30 huh? It also sucks up
obscene amounts of bandwidth vs. cw and the PSK sortsa modes and
Pactor is hardware-based. Ya gotta pay what . . $600 for the
"download" of an economy version of a Pactor modem?
>
>
Better you tham me, enjoy.
>
>
But doan put any ssb on 30.

1498. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 00:58:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C422D4D.825075EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31003

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C41A337.2D019733@IEEE.org>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > The FCC doan require ya to operate on 30m either but don't try it
> > > unless yer beeping.
> >
> > Does PACTOR beep?
> >
> Beeps like crazy and it's allowable on 30 huh? It also sucks up
> obscene amounts of bandwidth vs. cw and the PSK sortsa modes and
> Pactor is hardware-based. Ya gotta pay what . . $600 for the
> "download" of an economy version of a Pactor modem?

PACTOR II is actually less than 500 Hz wide and I would say it
chirps rather than beeps. My 500 Hz filter works just fine on
PACTOR II signals. It a heck of a mode, Brian, and well
worth the money, IMO. It is the one amateur mode that I
have ever used that runs circles around CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1499. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:08:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1tb25$g8t$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31004

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113160956.20967.00001219@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
> >> by email or snail mail will suffice.
>
> >So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?
>
> Yes, that does tend to inflate the membership numbers a bit. It was a
moot
> point when NCI was first formed, but all of those whose licences have
expired,
> or who still have licenses but are not currently active in ham radio who
once
> joined NCI are counted as current "members."

Since NCI doesn't publish any membership stats, what difference
does it make. If it is a problem, it only
affects internal NCI activity and records.

> ARRL membership numbers would
> look pretty good if the League counted past members in ITS arguments to
the
> FCC! And, if they did so count past members in a filing related to code
> testing, I bet the NCI howls of protest would lead the fray. :-)

I really don't care. Neither does the FCC I suspect.

> >>Did anyone that is an ARRL member vote to approve the ARRL shifting
it's
> >>position to not oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement?
>
> >Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct
> >result of that one particular shift in position?
>
> It would be interesting to see a run for the Directorship on a "preserve
code
> testing" platform.

I guess we'll just have to wait and see.

> As to the current international position, I very much want to see ARRL
spend
> its limited resources (staff time and money) doing something concrete
about the

> 40 meter issue than I want to see it expend some of those resources
fighting a
> battle to maintain an international treaty requiring code testing for HF
access
> in the Amateur Radio Service.

Sounds good to me.

> Think about it for a bit -- right now, we have an international treaty
> requiring code testing for HF access in the Amateur Radio Service -- an
> international treaty. Limiting (or eliminating) ICBMs, global warming,
> overfishing, extradition -- THESE warrant international treaties. When
Morse
> code was THE primary mode in all radio, or at least part of the
mainstream, I
> could understand the reasons for an international treaty. But frankly,
with all
> of the problems the world faces right now, just about the last thing they
need
> to be debating, IMHO, is the need for an international treaty on Morse
code
> testing in Amateur Radio.

Agreed and so, it seems, do most other countries. The elimination
of S25.5 will likly just be an almost unanomous vote (IMHO).

> If the League were to spend any significant part of its
spectrum-protection
> resources fighting such a cause, they would lose me as a member. I have
told
> Tom Frenaye that, in so many words. But your views may differ, so I
encourage
> you do do the same with YOUR Director.

Agree with your comments.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1500. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:10:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1tb7mrmu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31005

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C41DF96.1BA86B15@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C41A05B.2AD9D209@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent
and
> > > > begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy,
they
> > > > are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.
> > > > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".
> > >
> > > Of course there is a mechanism for "unjoining" NCI. I unjoined. Fred
> > > took me off the membership list.
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > Thanks Cecil, and, for the record:
> >
> > 1. So have a number of others.
> > 2. If any NCI member wishes to "unjoin", just send NCI
> > a request to do so (email or snail mail will suffice).
>
> This should take care of everyone except the dead.
>
> I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.

Good point. One other way we "lose" members is when we
send out a communication. We do "lose" members when they
don't keep us (NCI) updated on their current email address.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1501. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:12:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1tbav$ji5$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31006

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113121724.11155.00001252@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >The same as happens in most any organization...
> >1. A nomination period is opened,
> >2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
> >3. nominations are closed,
> >4. The mebership is asked to vote.
>
> NCI has been there/done that.
>
> Almost. As I recall, when the nominations wer e closed, there were no
nominees
> other than the existing Directors, so there was no need to vote. I see
nothing
> wrong with declaring unopposed candidates elected, mind you; it happens
often
> enough in elections. But, for at least the one election I know about,
that is
> what the outcome was. When did that happen? Has NCI held an election since
that
> time?

We held nominations and election the beginning
of last year (2001).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1502. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:14:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a1tbdl$c3l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31007

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gpw6701.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sun, 13 Jan 2002 10:23:29 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >I think that's true for the vast majority of amateurs who have
> >filed comments on any issue...BUT, in reality...
> >the process doesn't guarantee only "knowledgeable" people
> >will reply. The comment process creates the situation whereby only
> >"interested" people are most likly to do so. All "interested"
> >parties may not also be "knowledgeable" : -)
>
> Which is why a BRIEF statement of qualifications ("I have been a
> licensee for thirty years, and hold a degree in social engineering,
> etc") in any filing is invaluable for establishing standing and
> sorting out the "knowledgeable" commenters from the "shooters off of
> the mouth/pen/keyboard".

Agree completely and I did exactly that in my comments.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1503. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:16:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201131716.5591475a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31008

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020112180243.01565.00000912@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >Ya just closed the loop. The HF bands are not under fire, the
> >vhf/uhf/microwave ham bands certainly are endangered.
>
> The threats to HF are significant, not necessarily from an allocations point of
> view, but from a growing problem of power-line noises, DSL and cable leakage,
> home networking and a host of other things that have been authorized under Part
> 15 for decades, but are just now coming into widespread use. Occupancy will
> become moot if the band is filled with unlicensed S9+signals.
>
>
Of course our 1.8Mhz to our light wave bands are under fire and we're
subject to losing all of them by one means or another. But there is no
particular threat to our mostly-exclusive HF *allocations*, the HF P15
stuff is interference with us who are the primaries in those
allocations as you more than just understand. The far more serious
threat to our inventory of allocations lives 'way up the spectrum
where we can lose the actual allocations due to non-occupancy. Which
was my point.
>
>
If we lose those allocations at least you won't have to deal with the
P15 crap in those bands huh?
>
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

1504. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:44:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C422B90.3796E0D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31009

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I see it quite differently, Arnie. I believe that, as a whole, Amateur
> >> Radio should be as diverse as possible to get the job done. That way, no
> >> matter what type of problem crops up, there will be a solution at hand.
>
> > You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely
> >that any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one
> will
> >be in as widespread use as CW.
>
> So what is the solution? Take steps to limit the number of operating modes that
> Amateurs might use? That sure doesn't sound right.

That would be because it isn't right. I believe as Arnie doesd, that CW should be retained as an alternate to whatever main mode is most used, probably SSB and FM voice.

> CW is not the mode that is
> most often used for emergency communications by a long shot, so no regulatory
> solution, IMHO, should be based on a mode that is not the most widespread.
>

Why should not the most basic, most easily implemented and most efficient radiocommunications mode (in terms of what is produced as opposed to the complexity and power requirements of the gear needed to produce it- see N2EY's recent post on that subject) be retained as a valuable asset within ham radio? Why should not regulators view that very fact as adequate reason to require the majority of mainstream ham radio operators to be at least minimally qualified? (not that it will happen).

>
> > There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> >across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
>
> Which mode is the mode of choice right now for most emergency and
> public-service communications?

Voice modes. It is always easier to talk than anything else. This NG (Cecil in particular) as proved that beond any shadow of a doubt

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1505. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 01:51:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C422D49.C0BF47B7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31010

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.
>
> >By who? ARRL? Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?
> >Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
> >(NOTE - You actually answered this below)
>
> I do not think that governenace by poll is the best way to make decisions. I
> am a licensed ham. Assume that I get a poll from the FCC about a subject I
> know nothing about. I look at my choices, think about it for 3 seconds, mark a
> box and send it in. Is that really useful input? I don't believe so.
>
> IMHO, the process that the FCC uses right now, with a rulemaking process in
> which anyone is able to make comments any time they think it appropriate, with
> those inputs evaluated by FCC staff and a decision made by those who are
> charged to make such decisions is much better than allowing that decision to be
> made by people who may or may not know anything about it and who may or may not
> have spent more than a few seconds thinking about the issues.
>
> I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from knowledgeable
> people.

So you believe that non-hams who comment on FCC proposals are then more competent to do so than active, longtime licensed hams? I suppose that refugees from Channel 19 or the region just below, and even gthe illicits just above, 28 Mhz are competent. Ok, if that's your view, that's your view.
I think you will surely agree that FCC has historically relied on licensed hams for the majority of their data and information used to formulate new regulations for the ARS. Why not? Not that many FCC staff have experience and expertise in ham radio. Many licensed hams do. And I don't think they have relied on the ARRL for large amounts of input for no good reason.

1506. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:10:01 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Z5r08.269916$WW.13526472@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31017
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well, along with deregulation and downgrading tests (commercial licenses as well as amateur), has come the all-knobs-to-the-right operators. Even FRS transceivers (which are SUPPOSED to be not-user-adjustable) have had their deviation turned up to make it 'loud'. Maybe the CW forever gang has a point. Myself, I enjoy 440 FM. You'd be surprised how close by the control ops are. These are not the 'NUT' control op types. Show up on one off frequency or over-deviated and watch how fast the control op shows up (time usually can be measured in milliseconds).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Bill, KD0HG" <shoot@spammersonsight.org> wrote in message news:qg254u4assl5idccl3ierdba4s9r4uhoqj@4ax.com...
> Over the last few weeks, I've been doing a lot more listening on all the HF
> bands than talking-
> One thing that stands out is the increasing number of ops with some of the
> most appalling audio I've ever heard.
>
> Compression so extreme that fan and shack noise is as loud as the op's voice.
>
> EQ that's so pinched and frequency restricted that I missed maybe a quarter of
> what was being said on a +20 over signal- until I got a blinding headache from
> the screeching and QSYed- after only a minute.
>
> Audio quality and intelligibility that a $9.95 telephone could put to shame.
> That's supposed to 'punch through' ? That's cool?
>
> Some years ago one could say about most ham audio was it sounded, "OK". It was
> pretty hard to screw up a D-104, 444 or handheld dynamic plugged into a
> ricebox or old American iron. About the worst sound came from the rigs with RF
> clipping that might have been turned up way too high.
>
> Now the examples of complete audio garbage proliferate on the bands.
>
> What's the deal here? Is it those Brand "H" mics that are being heavily
> promoted and sold? Frankly, I think a D-104 sounds a hellofa lot better

for
> 'communications quality' audio at a fraction of the price.
>
> Are there too many opportunities to completely screw up one's audio in the
> menus of the new rigs?
>
> Since the 1930s, many studies have been done on speech intelligibility vs.
> frequency response and flatness and the more pinched audio is, the less
> intelligible it is. Period. Putting a huge peak at the top of an overall
> response of 500-2000 Hz doesn't help intelligibility (if a little is good,
> more isn't better), and restricting one's transmitted bandwidth without a
> corresponding reduction at the other end does't help anyone's S/N, either.
> Clipping in itself generates odd order and harsh sounding harmonics and
adding
> an inappropriate amount of upper midrange boost makes it worse.
> Try yelling over a rotary saw cutting through a knotty piece of hardwood.
> That's what it sounds like and about as intelligible.
>
> You never hear this sort of moronic audio processing on broadcast
stations, in
> spite of the loudness wars on the dial. One can greatly increase the punch
and
> intelligibility of audio with the intelligent use of compression and
clipping
> at audio and RF with the processing being transparent to the listener.
That
> should be the goal. Sounding good- clean and loud- what a concept.
>
> Me, I'm going to get some aspirin and cotton ear plugs or switch to data
mode
> if this trend keeps up. Good grief. Gimme a break.
> Save it for the freeband along with the roger beeps and heavy reverb.
>
> <vent mode off>
>
>
> -Bill/HG

1507. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:12:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpwgat5.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 31018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 13 Jan 2002 19:09:44 GMT, Bill, KD0HG wrote:

>You never hear this sort of moronic audio processing on broadcast
>stations, in spite of the loudness wars on the dial.

You also don't see many ham stations using Orban 8200 processors,
either (they cost a LOT more than the most top-end rig).

As far as broadcast audio quality goes, don't get me started now
that the setting of the processors has been almost universally
taken out of the hands of the engineering staff and given over to
program directors and air staff.

GIGO

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1508. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:24:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4234EE.C7AFBC10@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31019

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
> variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.) The
> ability to do that today is very inexpensive (used laptops and
> desktop PCs are almost being given away). The additional
> equipment needed to do digital is easy to accomplish.
>

That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is suddenly thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that stuff is not at hand. If you have ever rigged a laptop for use with a HF radio for digital work you should know that it is not merely a "plug and play" operation. You must research the radio and computer manuals for input and output requirements which can vary considerably among radio gear, then build whatever interface is required, with consideration and thought to levels required, PTT needs, etc. Some of you guys seem to think this is trivial and quick. No.

>
> As to "being prepared." I have said this before...BUT, if those
> that profess a need to be prepared are thinking of that last
> minute effort when a ham would cobble together some simple
> CW transciever or to be pressed into service having not
> previously done the "preparedness" activities...well, that's
> not what be emergency prepared should be.

So you aren't familiar with the fact that emergency communications can be required at the most inopportune times in just as opportune circumstances, and that all can be previously set in place for instant use. That shows that you really don't know much about the requirements of emergency communications. Just because the HT jocks working the EOC's get the press does not mean that is what it's about. Aa dozen years of work in planning for communicatioins needs resulting from a major earthquake resulting in widespread destruction formed my thinking on the subject.

>
>
> Those people that talk the talk (need for CE testing to
> augment emergency preparedness), but do not, themselves,
> walk the walk (participate actively with their local emergency
> preparedness organizations such as RACES) have little or
> no credibility intheir comments.
>

Ah. See the above paragraph for whatever credentials you require.

>
> > > There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> > >across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of
> choice?
> >
> > Which mode is the mode of choice right now for most emergency and
> > public-service communications?
>
> Can't wait to see the answers from some folks on that.

I doubt you'd recognize fact from fiction anyway.

1509. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:28:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4235E2.4EF9C97A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31020

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely that
> > any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one will be in
> > as widespread use as CW. There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> > across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
>
> The best one determined by the consumers.

Yeah, that would be a "consensus". As if.

1510. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:28:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113212854.04440.00001234@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31021

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
>Date: 1/13/2002 10:14 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ODerzxEnBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>

>Shall we take up a collection so the old retired
>sarge can buy an amplifier?

But why, Hans? I got a QSL card from Minnesota with a "59" report on it...Did it with 100W and a dipole at less-than-optimum height...Imagine what I could do with some decent feedline and a "real" antenna.

Oh yeah...it was from K0HB!

Don't need the amp, but thanks for the sentiment!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1511. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:34:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113213402.05154.00001069@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31022

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gpw6701.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Sun, 13 Jan 2002 10:23:29 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>I think that's true for the vast majority of amateurs who have
>>filed comments on any issue...BUT, in reality...
>>the process doesn't guarantee only "knowledgeable" people
>>will reply. The comment process creates the situation whereby only
>>"interested" people are most likly to do so. All "interested"
>>parties may not also be "knowledgeable" : -)
>
> Which is why a BRIEF statement of qualifications ("I have been a
> licensee for thirty years, and hold a degree in social engineering,
> etc") in any filing is invaluable for establishing standing and
> sorting out the "knowledgeable" commenters from the "shooters off of
> the mouth/pen/keyboard".
>
Dang. Wish I'd known that a few years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1512. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:34:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113213402.05154.00001068@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31023

In article <3C41DDDA.36A18370@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?

Yup.

>> > I don't know of any other
>> > membership organization which operates in the same manner.
>>
>> Except for the annual dues that many other organizations
>> have... whereby failure to pay results in a member being
>> dropped, NCI operates on very similar processes as do other
>> organizations.
>
>That's a BIG exception.

JA operator licenses work that way, too.
>
>> Most BODs for other orgs (eg. ARRL) are
>> free to set policy. Did anyone that is an ARRL member
>> vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's position to not
>> oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement?

Nope. In fact, there was simply a quiet announcement in late December 2000 that
the issue would be considered in the January BOD meeting. Only a few days were
allotted for members to make their views known to their Directors. I made mine
known and spread the word as much as possible.

>> Most any prganization
>> establishes a range of allowed policy setting to the BOD rather
>> than calling for an all member vote on every action/issue.
>
>Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct
>result of that one particular shift in position?

Maybe. But the way various Directors voted has NOT been made public. My
Director called for the vote to be recorded, but was voted down by a majority
of the others. What this means is that the only way to know how a Director
voted is to ask him/her. Maybe you'll get an answer, maybe you won't. I know
how my Director voted, but none of the others.

The whole thing was done quietly. One would think that if the majority believed
they were doing the right thing, they'd be proud of it and would want it
publicized.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1513. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:34:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113213404.05154.00001071@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31024

I am currently mostly a QRP operator - 5-10 watts for most QSOs. The most power I have ever run using my own station is about 125 watts output. Been at this 35 years and hope to be at it at least that much longer.

In article <9Hp08.100611$fe1.1274606@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> To go one further, I would support an overall regulatory reduction in
>our
>> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40, and no
>more
>> than 250W on the rest of our allocations, including UHF and above.

>It must be nice to have a rural QTH far from the light-dimmers,
>neon signs, unshielded battery-chargers and other miscreant sources
>of FCC-approved RFI.

Yup. Wish I had one!
>
>I, on the other hand, am a denizen of a noisy, rf-infested
>suburban ghetto and I am more than appreciative of stations willing
>to run enough power for me to hear them over the din. Not only
>is life too short for QRP, my sanity becomes periously thin when
>having to dig somebody's piss-weak signal out of the splatter and
>inadvertent mixing products from the local 50 kW religious
>broadcasting outlet.

The funny thing about QRP is that the stations I work don't know I'm QRP until after a few go-rounds. 599s are not uncommon from my 10-watts-to-an-inverted-V-at-35-feet.

Then again, I run almost all CW.
>
>Wake up, Hamdom! It's time to consider the little guy in the hobby,
>the fellow who doesn't have the big bucks to move to the country and
>commute to work with a gas-guzzling SUV.

That's ME, to a T! As a "little guy", I say that my results are NOT, repeat NOT, reduced by the existence of the "big guns". Lowering the power limit will NOT make it better for me, either at the QRP level or the 100 watt level.
>
>My motto: If you can't lower the noise floor, raise the power ceiling!
>
Yup.

There are times when 15 watts is more than enough, and other times when 1500 watts isn't enough.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1514. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:36:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113213655.04440.00001235@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31025

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 1/13/2002 6:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9Hp08.100611$fe1.1274606@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>It must be nice to have a rural QTH far from the light-dimmers,
>neon signs, unshielded battery-chargers and other miscreant sources
>of FCC-approved RFI.

What does MY transmitted power (or yours, for that matter...) have to do
with your ability to receive?

>I, on the other hand, am a denizen of a noisy, rf-infested
>suburban ghetto and I am more than appreciative of stations willing
>to run enough power for me to hear them over the din.

Still comes down to YOUR receiver...My QTH in rural Tenessee
notwithstanding, there are numerous occassions when my noise level sucks too.

But it's amazing what an active antena and some DSP can do to fix
that...and the other guy didn't have to change things by so much as a watt.

>Wake up, Hamdom! It's time to consider the little guy in the hobby,
>the fellow who doesn't have the big bucks to move to the country and
>commute to work with a gas-guzzling SUV.

I have a Ford Contour and an old Yaesu FT757 with an outboard DSP.
Hmmm......

>My motto: If you can't lower the noise floor, raise the power ceiling!

Let's see.....DSP unit for $150 or Linear Amp for $800 and the associated
increase in power bills.....Hmmmmm......I might increase my signal at HIS end
by a couple dB, but still can't hear squat cuz I didn't fix things on MY
end......Guess I opt for the DSP!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1515. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:38:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113213842.04440.00001236@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31026

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 1/13/2002 11:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020113121317.11155.00001251@mb-cr.aol.com>

>
>Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
>how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

As pointed out before, most Hams had already abandoned Spark when it was
regulated out.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1516. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:49:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C424731.C1C40B6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31027

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you believe that non-hams who comment on FCC proposals are then more competent
> to do so than active, longtime licensed hams?

So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur radio?
(See, I can do the same thing you did.)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1517. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:53:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42482D.DC98DDFF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31029

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is suddenly
> thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that stuff
> is not at hand.

Why should that happen, Dick? All my equipment is up and running.
Why would a ham wait for an emergency to start hooking up his
equipment? What if a ham waited for an emergency to buy his
CW transceiver and the hamstore was closed? Get real!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1518. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:53:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C423BC4.A1BE2031@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31028

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C4118C2.63ADDBA@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >Please produce a reference that indicates that the
> > > intelligence transferred in radiotelegraphy is some "third state".
> >
> > Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
> "advantage"
> > over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's
> OK
> > because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!
> >
> > "Hey, Boss, I can't copy PSK, the signal's too weak, but there is this CW
> station that's
> > coming through fine". "Sorry, son, can't use it. It's a poor mode that
> won't work as
> > well, hey, just because you can copy it when you can't print PSK means
> nothing!!"
> >
> > You dingaling.
>
> Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> an uninformed statement.

Actually, not ever actually doing it on the air is what leads to "seems to you"...

> You do NOT need to hear
> anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
> pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
> XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
> station set to copy and send on that frequency.

And if the prior arrangments don't work out, or you experience a (highly likelyO) equipment malfunction that takes your station off PACTOR or whatever digital mode you "prearranged" then you can toss in the towel. Think it doesn't happen? I have personally experienced just exactly that sort of failure. On the job.

> As stated, to do so requires advance participation in emergency planning.

I probably have more time in the chow line than you have in emergency planning. One thing I learned early is that the best laid plans frequently don't work as expected. Rely solely on them at your peril.

1519. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 02:57:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42491B.6E871597@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31030

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I believe as Arnie does, that CW should be
> retained as an alternate to whatever main mode is most used, probably SSB and FM
> voice.

CW is not going to be outlawed anytime soon, Dick, so you can use it
to your heart's content.

> Why should not the most basic, most easily implemented and most efficient
> radiocommunications mode (in terms of what is produced as opposed to the complexity
> and power requirements of the gear needed to produce it- see N2EY's recent post on
> that subject) be retained as a valuable asset within ham radio?

CW is NOT going to be outlawed, Dick. Why do you act like it is?

> Voice modes. It is always easier to talk than anything else. This NG (Cecil in
> particular) has proved that beyond any shadow of a doubt

I haven't used HF voice modes for more than a year, Dick. I do mostly
CW with some PACTOR.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1520. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:00:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4249DF.14AB18A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31031

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less likely that
> > > any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one will be in
> > > as widespread use as CW. There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> > > across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
> > >
> > The best one determined by the consumers.
>
> Yeah, that would be a "consensus". As if.

There doesn't have to be a consensus, Dick. There is room for Chevrolets,
Fords, Chryslers, etc. What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1521. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:11:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31032

Bill Sohl wrote:

One example that justifies the lower power limit can be

> taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
> site where thousands of contacts are then made all
> over the globe with the DX station usually only running
> about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
> are with other stations running similar or even lower
> power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
> do it because they need the power, they do it to
> "over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
> stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
> practice..

That's because you don't know better. At times it takes lots of power to work those 100 watt DX stations. I had to turn on a full 1400 watts on CW to get the Heard Island group on a dying 20 meter band, they could tell I was there with the
100 watts but no copy. And when you become DX you see it firsthand. It's a real zoo out there as heard from across the pond.
Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power. They found that 1.5KW caused almost no additional problems to consumer devices than 100 watts did. And there has long been rules in place requiring hams to use the minimum power required to complete the desired communication. I for one very rarely turn on my amp because I don't often need to.
Bill you should gain some HF experience before making sweeping prouncements on operation there. An Extra Lite alone won't do it.

1522. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:28:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4243ED.EDCED501@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31033

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on the
> >digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was the
> >proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that field over
> >manual telegraphy.
>
> Don't applaud if that doesn't happen, Steve. If most of Amateur Radio continues
> to be behind the technological times, it may be held against us somehow.
>
> Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
> how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

I think you mistated the case. Hams were not only willing but eager to abandon spark in favor of the efficiency and bandwidth reduction of tube based CW. SUch is simply not the case today when comparing CW and voice modes to the high data rate capabiligties of the advanced digital modes. The reason is not hard to find. There is simply no imperative nor need for hams to use high throughput, neither as an operational requirement where almost all contacts are conversational in nature, nor in handling basic emergency traffic. We are not commercial banking concerns requiring vast amounts of data to be transferred quickly. In no concievable emergency situation- and I have as a public safety communications officer, handled emergency traffic situations- is it ever a pressing need. The main need for communications in emergency situations is the need to pass basic information, which can easily be done by many normal non-high tech methods.
This is not to reject those efficient methods and their improved techniques, but rather to note that vintage modes are just as useful and should not be relegated to the scrap pile of history just because newer methods exist. They do not exist on anywhere near the widespread basis as the older modes.To reject the use of "lgacy" modes in emergency communications on that basis is unrealistic and indeed irresponsible.

1523. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:37:56 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <Gms08.15983$V55.1757851@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31036

"Dick Carroll" wrote ...
>
> That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is
suddenly
> thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that
stuff
> is not at hand. If you have ever rigged a laptop for use with a HF radio
for
> digital work you should know that it is not merely a "plug and play"
operation.
> You must research the radio and computer manuals for input and output
> requirements which can vary considerably among radio gear, then build
whatever
> interface is required, with consideration and thought to levels required,
PTT
> needs, etc. Some of you guys seem to think this is trivial and quick. No.
>

Give me an HF rig, portable antenna, emergency power supply, and a straight key, and I can be up and running in about 10 minutes. Add an extra minute if I'm going to use my paddles and an electronic keyer running off of a 9v battery : -))

> So you aren't familiar with the fact that emergency communications can be
> required at the most inopportune times in just as opportune circumstances,
and
> that all can be previously set in place for instant use. That shows that
you
> really don't know much about the requirements of emergency communications.
Just
> because the HT jocks working the EOC's get the press does not mean that is
what
> it's about. Aa dozen years of work in planning for communicatioins needs
> resulting from a major earthquake resulting in widespread destruction
formed my
> thinking on the subject.
>

Two hurricanes later, and I understand the term as it relates to equipment -- "less is more".

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1524. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:41:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020113224123.04424.00001124@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31034

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 1/13/2002 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C4243ED.EDCED501@worldnet.att.net>

>The reason is not hard to find. There
>is simply no imperative nor need for hams to use high throughput, neither as
>an
>operational requirement where almost all contacts are conversational in
>nature, nor
>in handling basic emergency traffic. We are not commercial banking concerns
>requiring vast amounts of data to be transferred quickly.

More realistically, it's too much extra gear to carry around when it's not
needed.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1525. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 03:44:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4247B0.F3EFDE7D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31035

CAM wrote:

> Dick apparently doesn't realize that RTTY and PSK31 share a common
> problem which is easily corrected with forward error correction
> as is done in PACTOR I & II.

What I do or do not "realize" is immaterial to the discussion, and you may draw no such conclusions from my statement. My point was simply that a transmitter running PSK31 with a CWID where the PSK31 cannot be copied but the CWID can be, is a very revealing facet of real life, day to day radio communications. What it shows is that there is always more to consider than the underlhying theory.

> RTTY and PSK31 are not the best
> choices for emergency communications but PACTOR I & II are very
> good choices.
>

And from a purely efficiency standpoint radiotelegraphy isn't anywhere on the radarscope. But again, there is always more to consider than theory. A Mercedes is a much more attractive option than a Plmouth Neon, but both do the same job.

1526. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 04:44:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C42620C.97F23D96@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31037

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
> > with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
> > on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
> > Margolin from Muddy's Band). If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
> > have supported continued code testing. I'm pretty sure that the late
> > Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
> > morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.
>
> Yes, Dave, that's exactly what it is... proper morse operation is a musical
> thing. Admittedly, it tends to be monotonic but... it's HIGHLY rhythmic
> requiring fast twitch muscles and clear, clean rhythmic perception. Anyone
> who does it well and thinks they're not talented is only kidding themselves
> or has never really thought about it. Not just anyone diddly-bopping down
> the street could be trained to perform at those levels.
>
> So, Dave, what do YOU think? (truthfully)
>
> Rich
> Remember I said monotonic not monotonous... ;-)

I think I'd already learned morse before I picked up a musical
instrument. While I think an inclination toward music and ease of
learning morse can go hand-in-hand, I believe that just about anybody
diddly bopping down the street. Remember, many folks play an instrument
but not many can do it so well as to make money playing. Many folks
will never get really good at morse but can still use it adequately.
I've only met one person I considered hopeless as a guitar student and
I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse. Perhaps he or she is
out there somewhere.

After playing guitar since 1963 and after taking a year of music theory
in school, I STILL can't sight read worth a damn.

Dave K8MN

1527. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 04:45:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C426270.170B1E0F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31038

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.
>
> A lot of Libertarians are still alive, Dave.

A lot of librarians are still alive too. You weren't garnering support from either group. You were telling us what a dead person would believe.

Dave K8MN

1528. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 04:48:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4256B6.5A620DBA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31039

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is suddenly
> > thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that stuff
> > is not at hand.
>
> Why should that happen, Dick? All my equipment is up and running.
> Why would a ham wait for an emergency to start hooking up his
> equipment? What if a ham waited for an emergency to buy his
> CW transceiver and the hamstore was closed? Get real!

At times I find myself thinking "Cecil really couldn't be that much of a dunce" then he comes up with something like this that proves it.

1529. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 08:33:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201140033.1d0f1e8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31040

> >
>
> Two hurricanes later, and I understand the term as it relates to
> equipment -- "less is more".
>
>
Amen Brother! But they'll NEVER get it!
>
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>
w3rv

1530. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 09:11:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201140111.7be8222c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31041

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C422D4D.825075EE@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C41A337.2D019733@IEEE.org>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > The FCC doan require ya to operate on 30m either but don't try it
> > > > unless yer beeping.
> > >
> > > Does PACTOR beep?
> > >
> > Beeps like crazy and it's allowable on 30 huh? It also sucks up
> > obscene amounts of bandwidth vs. cw and the PSK sortsa modes and
> > Pactor is hardware-based. Ya gotta pay what . . $600 for the
> > "download" of an economy version of a Pactor modem?
>
> PACTOR II is actually less than 500 Hz wide and I would say it
> chirps rather than beeps. My 500 Hz filter works just fine on
> PACTOR II signals. It a heck of a mode, Brian, and well
> worth the money, IMO. It is the one amateur mode that I
> have ever used that runs circles around CW.
>
>
. . . chirp yer buns off and enjoy but keep the damned stuff up the
band and outta MY cw channel!
>
>
w3rv

1531. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:09:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114060952.16311.00000200@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31044

In article <3C41A27A.72F99C2A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You're dreaming, Ed. The more "new modes" that are out there the less
>likely that
>> any serious percentage of hams will be using any one, certainly no one will
>be in
>> as widespread use as CW. There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well
>disipated
>> across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
>
>The best one determined by the consumers.
>--
Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1532. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:09:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114060952.16311.00000199@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31045

In article <a1s9a5$pm5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
>a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
>an uninformed statement. You do NOT need to hear
>anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
>pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
>XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
>station set to copy and send on that frequency. As already
>stated, to do so requires advance participation in
>emergency planning.

It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error. If the available equipment can't do
that when it's needed, you're back to tuning around and hopefully finding the
station you want to work.

If you want to run any sort of net operation, ALL stations must be capable of
being dead-on frequency and staying there.

All of this is tough enough in a nice warm dry hamshack. Will the rig still be
within 10 Hz when it's cold and wet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1533. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114060953.16311.00000201@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31043

In article <3C4222D1.960D8DDC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> > PACTOR II has a throughput about 50 times higher than *my* fastest CW.
>>
>> But it's not about YOU, Cecil.
>
>Of course it is, Jim. I have to decide whether to trust my straight
>key and failing hearing or go with state of the art in amateur digital.

"State of the art" is just an advertising buzzphrase. Like "paradigm shift" and all those other 80s/90s jingles. They're all boom-dot-bust now.

>Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.

And hopefully there will be somebody else on the air using PACTOR II if you ever need it....

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

1534. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114060953.16311.00000202@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31046

In article <3C41FD5E.B9DE4051@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C40A837.396A35AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Actually, I did attend many of her lectures and talked to her in
>> >person at the receptions which followed. She seemed to be attracted
>> >to me. I was a charter subscriber to her "Objectivist Newsletter"
>> >and visited her offices in the Empire State Building. She was
>> >definitely against any unnecessary governmental requirement.
>>
>> Nice tale.
>>
>> Sure wish we could take you seriously, Cecil. ;-)
>
>I also met Nathaniel and Barbara Brandon and Alan Greenspan while
>visiting Ayn Rand's offices.

Was that during the time period when Rand was doing the horizontal bop with Mr. Branden? (note the spelling)

> I barely missed meeting Milton Freedman
>there.

I missed meeting Papa Bush and Bill Clinton, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1535. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114060954.16311.00000203@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31042

In article <a1t3a00vg8@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator
>at
>> "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore Dagny
>knew
>> it and was skilled in its use.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The key phrase here is "in those days".
>
Yup. In those days, railroads used Morse quite a bit for train dispatching.
Just like today, hams use Morse quite a bit on HF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1536. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 11:59:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114065902.11155.00001435@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31047

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>> Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of
>> CW, how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

> As pointed out before, most Hams had already abandoned Spark when it was
>regulated out.

Okay, but that doesn't change the premise of the question, in fact, it better drives home the point that the amateurs of our past embraced new technology. Had Amateur Radio NOT had a history of embracing new technology, how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1537. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:01:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114070126.11155.00001436@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31048

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>There doesn't have to be a consensus, Dick. There is room for Chevrolets,
>Fords, Chryslers, etc. What is wrong with live and let live?

A good analogy to all that is that under the present rules, one is allowed to
drive any of those cars, as long as one takes the driving test in the Chevy.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1538. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:02:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114070231.11155.00001437@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31049

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice
>wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.

I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1539. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:04:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114070450.11155.00001438@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31050

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I believe as Arnie doesd, that CW should be
>retained as an alternate to whatever main mode is most used, probably SSB and
>FM
>voice.

I agree, CW should remain legal for use in the ham bands and should be tested
to the same degree as are the more used modes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1540. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:13:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114071307.11155.00001439@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31151

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>But there is no particular threat to our mostly-exclusive HF *allocations*,

Don't discount the threat from that Part 15 stuff, Brian. IMHO, it is more insidious than a direct spectrum grab, in many ways. The rules give us absolute protection from interference, but that sounds a lot better in the rules than it works out in practice. It is time-consuming at best, impossible at worst, to locate an individual source of noise. And there is nothing that can be done to deal with an aggregate of interference from hundreds of devices.

Even so, there are indeed active threats to allocations on HF. One of the 40-m solutions on the plate calls for 200 kHz amatuer-exclusive. And the HF digital broadcasters are looking for a place to do their thing.

From the info at:

http://www.arrl.org/news/bandthreat/

"WRC-2003 Consideration of the 40-Meter Amateur Band

The problem is that since 1938, the 40-meter allocations in the three ITU radio regions are different. Region 2 has 300 kHz from 7.0-7.3 MHz, while Regions 1 and 3 have 100 kHz from 7.0-7.1 MHz (7.1-7.3 MHz in these Regions are currently allocated to the broadcasting service). WRC-2003 agenda item 1.23 is an opportunity to realign the amateur and broadcasting bands around 7 MHz. The amateur service seeks the return to an exclusive, worldwide allocation of no less than 300 kHz in the vicinity of 7 MHz. For further information see http://www.iaru.org/7-MHz-Spectrum.pdf.

Studies of WRC-03 matters relating to the amateur services are conducted in ITU-R Working Party 8A. WP 8A is developing text for the Conference Preparatory Meeting, which is charged with preparing the technical basis for WRC-03--the so-called CPM Report. ITU-R WP 6E (broadcasting emissions) and WP 9C (HF fixed service) are interested working parties, and are exchanging information with WP 8A.

There is a potential threat that the possible expansion of spectrum below 10 MHz by broadcasters may complicate consideration of the amateur band at 7 MHz. See the item related to HF broadcasting, below. "

and

"HF Broadcasting Expansion and Digital Modulation

WRC-03 agenda item 1.36 calls for the WRC "to examine the adequacy of the frequency allocations for HF broadcasting from about 4 MHz to 10 MHz, taking into account the seasonal planning procedures adopted by WRC-97."

HF broadcasting now has regional allocations of 3950-4000 kHz in Region 1 and 3900-4000 kHz in Region 3, and footnotes affording very limited use of 3950-4000 kHz in Greenland. We will resist any expansion of broadcasting that would further reduce the usefulness of the 3500-4000 kHz band to amateurs in Region 2.

Another agenda item, 1.2, provides for a review and taking any required action concerning possibly dropping the idea of HF broadcasters changing from double-sideband AM to single-sideband modulation and migrating, instead, to digital modulation, known as Digital Radio Mondial.

It is too early to tell, but there is the possibility that HF broadcasters might obtain additional spectrum during the transition from analog AM to digital broadcasting.

Both of these items could add confusion to the already difficult WRC-03 agenda item 1.23, that of realignment of the bands around 7 MHz. "

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1541. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:14:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114071439.11155.00001440@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31152

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.

>Good point. One other way we "lose" members is when we
>send out a communication. We do "lose" members when they
>don't keep us (NCI) updated on their current email address.

Do you deduct those former members from the count when you reference the number of members NCI has when you file comments with the FCC?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1542. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:16:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114071610.11155.00001441@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31153

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>. . . chirp yer buns off and enjoy but keep the damned stuff up the
>band and outta MY cw channel!

The necessary bandwidth of an OOK CW signal is about 100 Hz, so it should be
pretty easy to keep the digital stuff >100 Hz away from a CW QSO in progress.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1543. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:18:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114071826.11155.00001442@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31154

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> What does MY transmitted power (or yours, for that matter...) have to do
>with your ability to receive?

If he is in QSO with you, Steve, the more power you are running, the louder you will be in his receiver. If your signal is at his noise level, increasing your power by 10 dB will put you 10 dB above his noise level, for great copy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1544. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:23:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114072339.11155.00001443@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31155

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from
>knowledgeable
>> people.

> So you believe that non-hams who comment on FCC proposals are then more
>competent
>to do so than active, longtime licensed hams?

No, Dick, I believe that our governement should make its decisions with input from knowledgeable people.

If you truly misunderstood, I really can't think of a way to say it differently.

>I suppose that refugees from Channel
>19 or the region just below, and even gthe illicits just above, 28 Mhz are
>competent. Ok, if that's your view, that's your view.

And just what mental house of cards did you build to get all that from what I said? No wonder you are always mad at me for what you think my views are, Dick...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1545. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:24:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114072435.11155.00001444@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31156

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur radio?

Non-hams are completely banned from operating an Amateur Radio station, Cecil.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1546. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:30:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114073013.11155.00001445@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31157

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

> If the League can afford to hire the big time, non-ham, lady
>fund raiser from the corporate world--you know, the one who sent me two
>letters over the course of three weeks telling me what MY
>RESPONSIBILITIES toward amateur radio are--that Newington has waaaay too
>much money already.

The position is initially operating at a defecit. The expectation is that, in the long run, the investment will pay off as more than the traditional sources of revenue are explored and utilized. The end result will be more revenues with which to do more things. Every year in the Lab, I put things on the plate that get trimmed off as a normal part of the budget process. If her salary helps me to do those things a year or two from now, I am all for it.

>By the way, if you run into the fund raiser, tell her that I think she
>should realize her responsibility toward amateur radio's future and
>donate her salary to the cause.

Get real, Dave. That would be spouting nonsense and I leave you to spout your own nonsense personally. Tell you what, though, I will do just that if you donate a year's worth of your income or if she sends you a letter asking you do the same.

Posing the ridiculous to make your case only makes your case look ridiculous...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1547. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:31:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114073125.11155.00001446@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31158

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Since NCI doesn't publish any membership stats, what difference
>does it make. If it is a problem, it only
>affects internal NCI activity and records.

If I recall, NCI cited its membership level in at least some of its comments to the FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1548. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:35:25 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <hgA08.101295$fe1.1325638@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31159

Jim, N2EY (replying to my QRP/QRO rant) wrote:

> There are times when 15 watts is more than enough, and
> other times when 1500 watts isn't enough.

Considering that a typical ionospheric path varies by
20 dB over a period of less than a minute, both
conditions are present practically simultaneously.

OTOH, there are times when 3 dB more transmitter power
is all that is necessary to push the DSP algorithm from
correlating noise and rejecting signal to correlating
signal and rejecting noise.

> Then again, I run almost all CW.

That buys a whole bunch of dB margin, of course, but
that detection threshold is still there. A light-
dimmer swishing across a 250 Hz bandwidth at a 120 Hz
rate will still destroy a QSO that could be had if
limited only by the quiet atmospheric noise of a
winter's night.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1549. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:35:26 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <igA08.101296$fe1.1325781@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31160

Steve Robeson, K4YZ wrote:

> What does MY transmitted power (or yours, for that matter...) have to do
> with your ability to receive?

End-to-end signal-to-noise ratio and detection probability.
Transmitter power is one of the factors in the equation.
But you knew that already, right?

>> My motto: If you can't lower the noise floor, raise the power ceiling!

> Let's see.....DSP unit for $150 or Linear Amp for $800 and the associated
> increase in power bills.....Hmmmmm......I might increase my signal at HIS end
> by a couple dB, but still can't hear squat cuz I didn't fix things on MY
> end......Guess I opt for the DSP!

DSP is nice and that little Am-Com unit works wonders.
But it can't pull intelligibility out of a -10 dB SNR.
(Actually, even under the best of conditions it only
offers a 12 - 15 dB reduction in noise and crud --
not quite enough to get below my 'annoyance' level.)

My beef is with the guy who primly informs me that he
sees no reason to turn on the linear amplifier he has
sitting next to his transceiver because he is hearing
me just fine and believes he has to do his part to
further the QRP credo. (For some reason I always hook
up with this type from the mobile on 75 just as the band
is hanging it up for the daytime hours).

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1550. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:37:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114073710.11155.00001447@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31161

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Maybe
>when I have some "money to burn," I'll get a wireless lan transmitter and a
>2.4GHz amplifier (20+W) and see if it raises the noise floor on my voice
>repeater's 2.4GHz input.

Heck, the wireless LAN itself could raise the noise floor on a nearby repeater. The ~$100.00 devices I have purchased ran about 100 milliwatts and about 0 dBi gain antenna. I could hear it loud and clear, even through building attenuation, for about 500 feet.

There are power limits on SS devices in Amateur Radio. I believe that the power is limited to a max of 50 watts, with a further requirement that automatic power control be used if the power is > 1 watt.

I think it unlikely that birds will fry on your roof. If the antenna gain is low, the fields would be low and if the gain is high, the "near field" region of the antenna can extend quite some distance. In the near field region, the field strengths are less than what would be predicted if the antenna were a point source.

73,
Ed Har, W1RFI

1551. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:43:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114074313.11155.00001448@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31162

From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB"

>Actually, even under the best of conditions it only
>offers a 12 - 15 dB reduction in noise and crud --
>not quite enough to get below my 'annoyance' level.)

In my experience, DSP filtering offers little improvement over analog filtering of bandwidth. A 100 Hz filter will be ~10 dB improvement over a 1000 Hz filter no matter what method is used to attain 100 Hz.

The de-noise techniques can work to make a somewhat noisy signal sound less noisy, but at 0 dB S/N, their effectiveness drops to about 0 dB in my experience. And if that noise and crud is coherent -- ie, computer birdies -- the de-noiser cannot help at all. If one is listening to an SSB signal, the DSP techniques to autonotch carriers may help, but IMHO, most of these "coherent" interferors are still noise-like enough that the DSP just isn't sure enough what to do.

If we had thousands of hams working on developing better DSP techniques, I bet that we would see some state-of-the-art improvements. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1552. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 12:57:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ukg20vgq@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31167

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114060954.16311.00000203@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <a1t3a00vg8@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Early in the book, Dagny is a [signal tower] operator
> >at
> >> "Rockdale", and in those days operators all knew the code. Therefore
Dagny
> >knew
> >> it and was skilled in its use.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >The key phrase here is "in those days".
> >
> Yup. In those days, railroads used Morse quite a bit for train
dispatching.
> Just like today, hams use Morse quite a bit on HF.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

No argument there, but what does that have to do with government mandates?

1553. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:02:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1ukoq0102v@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31168

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C424731.C1C40B6F@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you believe that non-hams who comment on FCC proposals are then more
competent
> > to do so than active, longtime licensed hams?
>
> So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur radio?
> (See, I can do the same thing you did.)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

They already are banned.

1554. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:09:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114080957.13187.00000195@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31165

In article <3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power.

Think about this:

In the old days (before 1989(?) or so), the power limit was 1 kW input. This meant that with a typical solidstate linear amplifier, an amateur running the legal limit on HF/MF could expect no more than 500-550 watts output (average) on modes like CW or most digital modes. One could get a little more by using higher-efficiency amplifiers like tubes in Class C or FETs in Class E.

Then the rule changed to 1500 W peak. Efficiency no longer mattered and hams could run more power to the antenna. Some modes like AM lost, though.

Was there an NPRM and comment period on this? I don't remember one. It just happened by FCC fiat, as I recall. The AM crowd protested but to no avail.

What the FCC is saying to us is that they like average power but not peak power.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1555. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114080958.13187.00000196@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31164

In article <20020113121317.11155.00001251@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
>how long do you think their allocations would have continued?

So what are you saying, Ed? That we hams MUST "willingly" abandon our favorite modes?

Hams replaced spark rigs with tube sets because the results were better - simple as that. "Better" included more DX, less interference, more stations on the air, and lower cost. They did not have to be forced to "willingly" give up spark because of diatribes from Final Authority wannabes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1556. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:09:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114080959.13187.00000197@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31163

In article <ODerzxEnBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I would support an overall regulatory reduction in our
>> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP
>> on 160, 80 and 40, and no more than 250W on the rest
>> of our allocations, including UHF and above.
>
>Shall we take up a collection so the old retired
>sarge can buy an amplifier?

Much cheaper to BUILD one.
>
>QRP is for sissies.

Them's fightin' words!
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1557. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114081001.13187.00000198@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31166

In article <3TP%7.80686$fe1.1074330@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
>
>> >Rule 1) Existing licensed operators will not lose, and not gain, any
>> >operating privileges without earning the change.
>
>> >Rule 2) When there is any ambiguity in proposing changes to the Amateur
>> >Radio Service refer to Rule 1.
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Definitely reasonable. The "will not gain" may run into some problems,
>though.
>
>I don't mean to say that a privilege couldn't be modified or more spectrum
>granted to a license class, only that a wholesale upgrade of a class is out
>of the question. You know the 'something for nothing' issue.

Now I understand. No big giveaways, like giving all Advanceds an Extra just to
make the old license class go away.
>
>> >I think, three license classes is fine; reorganizing and even totally
>> >revamping the three examinations is well within these parameters. We have
>> >discussed this back in 1999 and is well worth revisiting here.
>
>> But three classes made from the existing 5 or 6 means somehow some classes
>get
>> combined.
>
>Nope, the three classes relegated to limbo can stay there. They will
>diminish in numbers and if a privilege is changed or a subband edge is moved
>that's fine. Nothing need be done unless it becomes obvious a change is
>warranted.

Just let 'em fade away by attrition.
>
>> >This is only to demonstrate where the emphasis should be.
>
>> >Element 2 should have at least,(and I want all of)the FCC rules,
>operating
>> >procedures, Amateur Radio practices, and RF safety. The emphasis is safe
>> >proper operation.
>

>> The core basics, IOW.
>
>> >Element 3 should have at least antennas and feed lines, signals and
>> >emissions, radio wave propagation, and circuit components. The emphasis
>is
>> >safe MF/HF worldwide operation.
>
>> OK
>
>> >Element 4 should have at least electrical principles, practical circuits,
>> >and VE procedures. The emphasis is highly competent to safely 'Elmer
>and/or
>> >pursue the full hobby.
>
>> The full monty, as it were.
>
>> >Also, we restrict power for any new licensees with Power Endorsements.
>Power
>> >Endorsements given when General or Amateur Extra privileges are granted
>> >rated for medium or high power respectively. This implies Technician
>> >privileges include a Power endorsement of low power. Existing licensees
>> >would be granted High Power endorsement.
>>
>> Or simply require that existing hams keep their old license documents as
>proof
>> that they are qualified to run full power.
>
>Sure and the new licenses take on the low, medium, and high power privileges
>of the license class; this sounds cleaner than additional endorsement
>documents.

Exactly - the "endorsement documents" are already in place, in the form of
existing licenses.
>
>> >Lastly, the VE questions could be broken out to a separate examination
>which
>> >would allow Element 4 to be more technically oriented.
>
>> >What say you????
>
>> So far so good. I think the tests need a bit more integration. For
>example,
>> Element 2 doesn't need all the RF power safety stuff if the license only
>allows
>> low power. But the basic idea seems like a logical outgrowth of our
>earlier
>> discussions.
>
>I think the safety knowledge, even for the high power is nessecary, though.

Absoluely - just spread it out among the tests according to power level. If Element 2 only allows, say, 100 watts output on HF, then the RF safety questions on Element 2 should not involve 1500 watt output, that's all.
>
>> Now the second part - what privs go with what license/test?
>
>This is probably going to be what we have now for Technician, General, and
>Amateur Extra with slight, or not so slight, modifications.
>
>For Technician class adjusting the question pool and limiting the power
>makes it a reasonable foundation. One thing is they, at the very least,
>should be given the same privileges as Technician Plus.

I think the HF/MF of post-S25.5 Techs should be a LOT more than the current Tech Plus. I'd say about half of the current General allocations is about right.

>I think the FCC
>plans on this grant by the way they've not handled the database issue. ;-)

I think you're on to something there ;-)
>
>That leaves Novices who can take Element 2 if they care for all the
>privileges above 50 MHz. Otherwise they remain as is.

Yup.
>
>For General Class, I don't know what the consensus would be but, as the
>numbers of Advanced class operators decline the Generals may assume Advanced
>subbands on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters. The Advanced would have high power
>there and Generals the medium power so sharing the same subband edges seems
>reasonable.

Nah. Just leave 'em alone.
>
>Amateur Extra class should have an additional examination for VE status.
>That's all I can think of for that class.

Yup. "Element V" (5) with all the VE stuff in it.
>
>You have also alluded to moving the forty meter band and other issues which
>were not licensing changes.
>
If we get a better setup for 40 than the shared mess that dates back to before WW2, some changes may be in order for 40.

But the basic concept begins to take a reasonable shape:

Tech is the entry level, with low power, a sampling of spectrum and modes, plus an easier test than today (focuses on operating and safety)

General is midrange, with more power, modes and a more technical test

Extra is everything, with more emphasis on technical

VE qualification is separate

Nobody loses what they've got now, and nobody gets a big freebie exacept maybe Techs get more HF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1558. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:50:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E214.80799539@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31169

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur radio?
> > (See, I can do the same thing you did.)
>
> They already are banned.

Non-hams are banned from taking amateur radio exams? Where do hams
come from? Amateur radio exams are part of amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1559. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:52:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E2AA.BEF4F7FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31170

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is suddenly
> > > thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that stuff
> > > is not at hand.
> >
> > Why should that happen, Dick? All my equipment is up and running.
> > Why would a ham wait for an emergency to start hooking up his
> > equipment? What if a ham waited for an emergency to buy his
> > CW transceiver and the hamstore was closed? Get real!
>
> At times I find myself thinking "Cecil really couldn't be that much of a dunce" then
> he comes up with something like this that proves it.

Just responding to your idiotic post, Dick. You didn't answer the question.
Why would a ham wait for an emergency to wire up his configuration?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1560. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:53:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E2F4.2ACAD97F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31171

Arnie Macy wrote:
> Give me an HF rig, portable antenna, emergency power supply, and a straight
> key, and I can be up and running in about 10 minutes.

I've been up and running for years. Why do you guys wait so long?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1561. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 13:58:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E403.D29D5DF3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31172

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
> > >
> > >The best one determined by the consumers.

> Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice
> wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.

There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
of modes. Let the market decide.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1562. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:07:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E622.36B0DEE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31173

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice
> >wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.
>
> I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO.

Well, he did say "HF/MF" so that limits the FM to 29.0-29.7 MHz.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1563. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:15:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42E817.BD63B6C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31174

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick apparently doesn't realize that RTTY and PSK31 share a common
> > problem which is easily corrected with forward error correction
> > as is done in PACTOR I & II.
>
> What I do or do not "realize" is immaterial to the discussion, and you
> may draw no such conclusions from my statement. My point was simply that
> a transmitter running PSK31 with a CWID where the PSK31 cannot be copied
> but the CWID can be, is a very revealing facet of real life, day to day
> radio communications. What it shows is that there is always more to
> consider than the underlhying theory.

What it shows is that PSK31 is a toy mode. You really need to broaden
your scope, Dick. Do you understand what forward error correction is?
Digital modes without forward error correction are NOT serious modes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1564. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:27:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42EAB8.18E93052@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31175

N2EY wrote:
> It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error.

That's not true for PACTOR II, Jim. From the manual: "Never tune the VFO by hand with very weak or inaudible signals! With very weak or inaudible signals, the PTC2e adjusts its tuning very slowly to minimize tuning error." The DSP processor locates and tracks the signal by autoadjusting the digital filter coefficients. It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal all by itself.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1565. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:31:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42EBB2.9AE1100E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31176

Dave Heil wrote:
> I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.

Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1566. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:34:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42EC91.514A4B40@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31177

Dave Heil wrote:
> You were telling us what a dead person would believe.

No, I was telling you what a person said were her beliefs
before she died. Ayn Rand believed in as few governmental
regulations as possible. Her philosophy is the foundation
of the Libertarian party.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1567. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:40:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42EDF5.7571AEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31178

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I think you mistated the case. Hams were not only willing but eager to abandon
> spark in favor of the efficiency and bandwidth reduction of tube based CW. SUch is
> simply not the case today when comparing CW and voice modes to the high data rate
> capabiligties of the advanced digital modes. The reason is not hard to find. There
> is simply no imperative nor need for hams to use high throughput, neither as an
> operational requirement where almost all contacts are conversational in nature, nor
> in handling basic emergency traffic.

I have to agree with you on that one, Dick. Most ham conversations contain
virtually zero useful information. One reason I like CW is that I don't
run out of things to say as fast as I do with the other modes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1568. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:43:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42EE99.8CC03D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31179

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20020113121317.11155.00001251@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of CW,
> >how long do you think their allocations would have continued?
>
> So what are you saying, Ed? That we hams MUST "willingly" abandon our favorite
> modes?

I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
interfere with the adoption of a better mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1569. Re: Post on QRZ.COM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:49:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <NdC08.551$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 31180

Thought Youze Guys was a New Yorker thing.... we don't say that in the Midwest..... :)

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020111165305.16238.00000730@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > "Y'all" is one of the (few) Southern contractions that is useful
> >anywhere.
>
> Up north, we use the Yankee equivalent -- youze guys. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed, W1RFI

1570. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:49:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <OdC08.552$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 31182

Oh yeah.... silly me! I forgot that. :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3F0B4D.11377314@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some
confusion.
>
> It usually is but in Dick's case it's "Don't show-me cuz I don't
> wanna hear it". :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1571. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:49:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 31181

And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....

Ryan

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:hnF%7.349523$W8.13213862@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote
>
> > Isn't that the "show-me" state? :) Usually that clears up some
> confusion.
>
> Nope... if you sit around saying 'show me' all the time... that implies
> confusion and thereby signaling to people in more progressive States (as
is
> Massachusetts) to lead you to a better way. ;-)
>
> Rich
>
>

1572. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:49:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <PdC08.554$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 31183

Sex state..... kinda like "getting some" and "getting none?" (two clearly different states :)

Ryan

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message news:3C3DD059.31B5F91D@uci.edu...
> W1RFI wrote:
> > None. I still like my theory that Morse code is sex-state. :-)
>
> Cecil describes it as police-state.

1573. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:52:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C42F09A.61DD495E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31184

W1RFI wrote:
> The de-noise techniques can work to make a somewhat noisy signal sound less
> noisy, but at 0 dB S/N, their effectiveness drops to about 0 dB in my
> experience. And if that noise and crud is coherent -- ie, computer birdies --
> the de-noiser cannot help at all. If one is listening to an SSB signal, the
> DSP techniques to autonotch carriers may help, but IMHO, most of these
> "coherent" interferors are still noise-like enough that the DSP just isn't sure
> enough what to do.

The automatic notch filter in my IC-706 MKII works wonders on 40m at
night and the noise reduction is remarkable. I wonder how it compares
to the IC-756proII DSP? I read somewhere about delayed autonotch
filters that work on continuous heterodynes even in CW mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1574. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 14:58:29 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <pmC08.373906$W8.13558588@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31185

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
"advantage"
> over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's
OK
> because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!

We explained to you, a couple of years ago, when you tried to make this argument before. If you can't hear the PSK31 but you can copy the CWID it's because the power/bandwith of the MCW CWID is much higher and of course you'd have a better chance of hearing that. You should have tried QPSK at the time. Although, if you did get through you wouldn't be able to trash it now, right?

If you keep relating that same story for years and years well what can we say....

> You dingaling.

Loser... (hate to join in the name-calling but it's ALL you understand)

Rich

1575. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 15:07:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C42F40B.69E95C40@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31186

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> > If the League can afford to hire the big time, non-ham, lady
> >fund raiser from the corporate world--you know, the one who sent me two
> >letters over the course of three weeks telling me what MY
> >RESPONSIBILITIES toward amateur radio are--that Newington has waaaay too
> >much money already.
>
> The position is initially operating at a defecit. The expectation is that, in
> the long run, the investment will pay off as more than the traditional sources
> of revenue are explored and utilized. The end result will be more revenues
> with which to do more things. Every year in the Lab, I put things on the plate
> that get trimmed off as a normal part of the budget process. If her salary
> helps me to do those things a year or two from now, I am all for it.

My view is that the ARRL is a non-profit membership organization which
has no need for such a position. We all have to trim things from our
budgets. Our wish list almost always defies the reality of our pockets.

>
> >By the way, if you run into the fund raiser, tell her that I think she
> >should realize her responsibility toward amateur radio's future and
> >donate her salary to the cause.
>
> Get real, Dave. That would be spouting nonsense and I leave you to spout your
> own nonsense personally. Tell you what, though, I will do just that if you
> donate a year's worth of your income or if she sends you a letter asking you do
> the same.

Sorry, Ed, I'm a retiree on a small income. I just don't feel like
resonding positively to someone who is not a ham, not knowledgable about
ham radio, doesn't really care about ham radio and who makes a
transparent pitch to get my money. After all, this Jeanette-come-lately
has outlined *my* responsibilities to something she knows nothing about.
I'm a League member and I care about how the League's funds are spent.
I don't happen to believe that hiring such an individual makes good use
of the League's limited (as you pointed out) resources and I don't think
it sends a particularly good message to the membership.

> Posing the ridiculous to make your case only makes your case look ridiculous...

I don't think so, Ed. I think what happened is that my feelings toward
whether the League should employ such an individual and my feelings that
this individual knows nothing about amateur radio and cares nothing

about amateur radio have been aired publicly. That her second form letter to me (and the preachy tone it took) honked me off as it did might make you think that it effected others in the same manner.

Dave K8MN

1576. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 15:18:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C42F6B6.DE9F1064@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31187

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
>
> Know anybody with Alzheimer's?

Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't have a mental handicap. I don't believe an Alzheimer's patient would be passing a written exam or a morse exam. I think some of the mentally ill might have a problem too. Oh--and don't leave out the dead.

Dave K8MN

1577. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 15:22:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C42F7C8.C3CDD5F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31188

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You were telling us what a dead person would believe.
>
> No, I was telling you what a person said were her beliefs
> before she died. Ayn Rand believed in as few governmental
> regulations as possible. Her philosophy is the foundation
> of the Libertarian party.

That simply isn't true. You told us what she *would have* thought about morse testing. You made no reference to discussing morse testing with her and it would be pretty hard to prove or disprove that you had such a discussion. You put words in the mouth of a dead person.

Dave K8MN

1578. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 15:44:43 UTC
From: mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Message-ID: <L1D08.3023$w92.487264389@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 31189
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <qg254u4assl5idccl3ierdba4s9r4uhoqj@4ax.com> (rec.radio.amateur.misc), Bill, KD0HG wrote:
: Over the last few weeks, I've been doing a lot more listening on all the HF
: bands than talking-
: One thing that stands out is the increasing number of ops with some of the
: most appalling audio I've ever heard.

: Compression so extreme that fan and shack noise is as loud as the op's voice.

: EQ that's so pinched and frequency restricted that I missed maybe a quarter of
: what was being said on a +20 over signal- until I got a blinding headache from
: the screeching and QSYed- after only a minute.

: Audio quality and intelligibility that a $9.95 telephone could put to shame.
: That's supposed to 'punch through' ? That's cool?

: Some years ago one could say about most ham audio was it sounded, "OK". It was
: pretty hard to screw up a D-104, 444 or handheld dynamic plugged into a
: ricebox or old American iron. About the worst sound came from the rigs with RF
: clipping that might have been turned up way too high.

: Now the examples of complete audio garbage proliferate on the bands.

: What's the deal here? Is it those Brand "H" mics that are being heavily
: promoted and sold? Frankly, I think a D-104 sounds a hellofa lot better for
: 'communications quality' audio at a fraction of the price.

[remainder of fairly good and mostly justified rant deleted to
save space]

There are some shining counterexamples, too, like the guys I was
listening to yesterday morning (Sunday 13 Jan) on 40 meters; they
had _lovely_ sound: clear as a bell, full, rich, low-calorie^W^W^W
everything you could want -- and on SSB, too. And it wasn't all
due to my FRG-100, either: some other QSOs nearby sounded like a
heavy metal band singing. No, I didn't get the call for the guys
with the good signal, but I'll listen again next Sunday AM.

I'm in the Oklahoma City area (5-land), but I think that the good
QSO was a K0 talking with a VEsomething. _Good_ longwire antenna!

--
Any site should be designed so that it's usable as a dead file tree with
no server-side smarts. Any sort of active pages or search engines should
be an add-on, not essential.
-- Peter da Silva, in a.s.r.

1579. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 15:56:11 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#zpZ9LRnBHA.1356@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31190

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com>

>
> What does MY transmitted power (or yours, for that matter...) have to
do
> with your ability to receive?

I'm going to assume that you asked that question with your tongue
centered in your mouth.

If I am transmitting at 100W and my signal is 1db below your
noise floor, then increasing my TRANSMITTED power by 3db
should put me 2db above your noise floor, and enable you to
receive my transmissions.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1580. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:42:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201140942.3d980701@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31191

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net>...
>
> Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
> with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
> on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
> Margolin from Muddy's Band).

this is simply WAY too cool for rrap. I am simply in awe, Dave.
"Mountain Stage" is a favorite here.

A.R. was an OK writer but THE Muddy Waters......

> If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
> have supported continued code testing.

Absolutely.

> I'm pretty sure that the late
> Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
> morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.

Muddy Waters AND Albert King?!? oh mama...

I understand that state of the art musical synthesizers have much
greater throughput than any "manual" jazz or blues musician can hope
to obtain.

Yet people insist on "legacy music modes" like live performance and
acoustic instruments.

> I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.

Do you hear any of the dead disagreeing with him?

73 de Jim, N2EY

...who once performed live on stage as a backup singer for Christine
Lavin...

1581. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:49:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C431A38.CCD18DA3@uci.edu>
Source record: 31196

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > The answer is no. Taking a test does not count as operating. Sorry
> > > > that had to be explained to you.
> > >
> > > From Webster's: "operate - to perform a function" "operator - one that operates"
> > > The function performed by the Morse code test is obvious. Sorry that had to
> > > be explained to you.
> >
> > So you're saying that anyone who even just takes a code test can
> > consider himself a CW operator. Interesting point of view.
>
> Being a CW operator requires RF. A person taking the exam is
> performing a Morse code operation (decoding) using audio
> frequencies.

You're putting too fine a point on it, Cecil. Operating, in ham radio,
means to get on the air. Sheesh.

1582. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:55:23 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C431B8B.FA65D007@psu.edu>
Source record: 31192

There must be an "official definition" somewhere. ;^) Where does the
IEEE weigh in on this?

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >A continuous wave probably can exist, Ed, but one cannot prove that it
> >exists.
> >It is essentially the same problem as trying to simultaneously determine
> >both the mass and position of an electron.
>
> I think that claiming that CW does not exist is getting a bit too far into the
> anti-CW camp. :-)

1583. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:56:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C431BDF.723D3A6B@psu.edu>
Source record: 31193

Therefore you are in distinct *need* of us.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > One would think he'd tire of all that trolling. Must be a really dull life he
> > leads.
>
> I troll, you carp. To each his own.

1584. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:58:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C431C46.C3DA1B69@uci.edu>
Source record: 31199

CAM wrote:
> Has anybody suggested making the lower 25kHz of every HF ham
> band CW-only? Why would anybody object to that?

I'm sure NCI could think of a reason.

1585. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 17:59:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C431C8B.4F941AE0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31194

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
> > with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
> > on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
> > Margolin from Muddy's Band).
>
> this is simply WAY too cool for rrap. I am simply in awe, Dave.
> "Mountain Stage" is a favorite here.

I thought it was a great show on radio. On TV, it is awesome.

> A.R. was an OK writer but THE Muddy Waters......

I don't think she garnered the same kind of reaction in the flesh that
Muddy did.
>
> > If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
> > have supported continued code testing.
>
> Absolutely.
>
> > I'm pretty sure that the late
> > Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
> > morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.
>
> Muddy Waters AND Albert King?!? oh mama...

Albert was a great blues man but not a very pleasant person. He
insisted that his sidemen call him "Mister King" and they received only
union scale for gigs. They were quite surprised to learn that Big Joe
Duskin's band did an even split of the loot.

> I understand that state of the art musical synthesizers have much
> greater throughput than any "manual" jazz or blues musician can hope
> to obtain.

Their timing is much more precise and you have none of that nasty
slurring of notes.

> Yet people insist on "legacy music modes" like live performance and
> acoustic instruments.

Remember, we'll have no set asides for those legacy music modes!

> > I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.
>
> Do you hear any of the dead disagreeing with him?

Not as of yet. Cecil is still busy tweaking his story. Stay tuned.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> ...who once performed live on stage as a backup singer for Christine
> Lavin...

Really? Fill us in.

Dave K8MN

1586. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:04:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201141004.6542fbb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31195

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net>
>
> And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes
> from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP
> on the air,

Actually, it's not the same.

There are two ways to get "antenna gain" from a transmitting antenna:

1) Reduce losses in the system

2) Concentrate the radiated energy in the desired direction (which requires reducing it in undesired direction)

Both "amplifier gain" and "antenna gain 1)" increase the signal strength to all receivers. But "antenna gain 2)" increases the signal strength to the intended receiver while DECREASING it to receivers that are not in the desired direction.

In other words, those with big antenna farms are doing us a FAVOR by aiming their RF in precise directions rather than heedlessly blasting away in all directions.

Not only should ERP not be limited, but the users of large directional arrays are to be commended for their consideration of other hams. Just another reason why anti-antenna CC&Rs are a bad thing.

> so all your high sounding bias against "big guns"
> is just so much envy, it would seem.

I have run marathons. So have world class runners. Of course I took a bit more time to run 26.22 miles than a world class runner does. Am I envious of the guy who wins the race? Nope. We both did the same thing, he just did it better and faster than me. Same thing applies to the big gun contest/DX stations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1587. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:09:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C431EF1.BF7F17F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31197

mike coslo wrote:
> There must be an "official definition" somewhere. ;^) Where does the
> IEEE weigh in on this?

Mike, I published the IEEE definition. That's what started the ruckus.
"continuous wave - A carrier that is not modulated or switched."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1588. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:11:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C431F67.EDED046A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31198

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
> > >
> > > Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
>
> Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't
> have a mental handicap.

I inferred that you meant "any person" above.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1589. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:17:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4320C9.5D22B123@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31200

Dave Heil wrote:
> You told us what she *would have* thought about
> morse testing. You made no reference to discussing morse testing with
> her and it would be pretty hard to prove or disprove that you had such a
> discussion. You put words in the mouth of a dead person.

I did NOT discuss Morse testing with her. I am inferring what she would
have said based on the plethora of her writings condemning unnecessary
governmental regulations. There are many other topics upon which we
could make a valid inferrence based on her writings. I'm sure dying
did not change her mind.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1590. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:22:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4321CC.AC677216@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31101

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You're putting too fine a point on it, Cecil. Operating, in ham radio,
> means to get on the air. Sheesh.

Operating in plain English means performing a function. A person taking
a Morse exam is performing a function. It is not I who has "too fine a
point".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1591. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 18:54:37 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <gQF08.32865$3x5.1893067@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31102

"CAM" wrote ..
>
> I've been up and running for years. Why do you guys wait so long?
>

Well, if you ever have an emergency situation at your house, you'll be
prepared. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1592. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:07:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpxqe06.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 31103

On 14 Jan 2002 12:24:35 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur radio?
>
>Non-hams are completely banned from operating an Amateur Radio
>station, Cecil.

Non-hams are banned from being control operators. A non-ham can
still "operate the station" (push the mic button, talk into the
mike, punch the keyboard, pound the Morse key) under the direct
supervision of a licensed control operator.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1593. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:07:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gpxqol7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 31104

On 13 Jan 2002 21:40:52 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>At one point, I believe only two hopping sequences were permitted. The FCC
>changed that about two years ago. It was shameful -- for a while, one could go
>to Comp USA and buy spread-spectrum radios that operated on 2.4 GHz and use
>them under Part 15, but they would have been illegal to use under Part 97.

Part 15 does not have any content restriction - Part 97 does.
That's why the original specs were set - to ensure that the Commish'
could df the signal and intercept and verify compliance of the
content. The specs were relaxed when new equipment came into
service.

>Equally shameful, or perhaps even more so, is now that it IS legal to
>use those Part 15 devices under Part 97, at much higher powers and
>with no limitations on antenna gain, hams are not doing so.

Speak to Dewayne......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1594. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:30:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1vbga0m2h@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31106

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C431F67.EDED046A@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
> > >
> > > Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
> >
> > Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't
> > have a mental handicap.
>
> I inferred that you meant "any person" above.

His key word is "yet."

1595. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:30:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4331DD.1C3AFA9F@uci.edu>
Source record: 31105

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You're putting too fine a point on it, Cecil. Operating, in ham radio,
> > means to get on the air. Sheesh.
>
> Operating in plain English means performing a function.

How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the air?
That's we what we mean when we say 'operate'. Debating points notwithstanding.

> A person taking
> a Morse exam is performing a function.

Ergo, taking an exam is the same as getting on the air.

> It is not I who has "too fine a
> point".

And you're _not_ a 'pointy head' type? ;-)

1596. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:34:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a1vbnv0mji@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31107

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C42E214.80799539@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > So you believe non-hams should be completely banned from amateur
radio?
> > > (See, I can do the same thing you did.)
> >
> > They already are banned.
>
> Non-hams are banned from taking amateur radio exams? Where do hams
> come from? Amateur radio exams are part of amateur radio.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Well, if you would have said that in the first place, you silly...

1597. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:39:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4333DD.47CB6395@uci.edu>
Source record: 31110

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Is it also a significant problem facing the photonics industry? All sorts
> > of people talk about CW lasers. They are often modulated by various means.
>
> I have declared that 'CW' stands for "Comutated Wave", Jim
> so the problem is solved.

That a direct violation of the IEEE dictionary. Shame on you. ;-)

1598. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:42:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4334B0.3D95A3F7@uci.edu>
Source record: 31109

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > > Under the rules we have had for over a decade, people do not need to pass a
> > > code test to use Morse code on the air. In fact, the only code-only segments in
> > > Amateur Radio do not require a code test to use.
> >
> > Jeez. Not this again. That's a worn out shoe if I ever saw one.
>
> Translation: The truth just won't go away. :-)

Sorta like "what's the matter with live and let live." That never seems
to go away for very long either. It's nice to listen to new music every
once in a while, Cecil. Or to have a new thought.

1599. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:48:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4335FF.16F5A9DF@uci.edu>
Source record: 31111

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are a supposedly intelligent man (for you've told us so on numerous
> > occasions) yet you seem to make up so many incorrect translations of the
> > comments of others. I read Jim's comment and got it as, "Jeez. Not
> > this gain. That's a worn out shoe if ever I saw one". Are you
> > incapable of taking someone's comment at face value or are you simply
> > not being serious?

> Dave, do you think :-) means "serious"? Maybe you should read the
> netnews FAQ on emoticons?

However, :-) <> :-P.

1600. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 19:51:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0FG08.374168$W8.13580717@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31108

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....
>
> Ryan
>

In one of the better pieces of wordsmithing, Orange County CA was described in a bio of one of Nixon's henchmen as "everything you ever hated about Indiana grown to grotesque proportions in the desert sun".

1601. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 20:18:00 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C433CF8.79E723F4@psu.edu>
Source record: 31112

> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> > And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....

Someone once wrote that Michagan was Florida in a much better mood.

- mike -

1602. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 20:23:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O7AcahTnBHA.1876@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31113

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> I'm sure dying did not change her mind.

Dying tends to terminate most minds.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1603. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 20:23:59 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C433E5F.D9F6017B@psu.edu>
Source record: 31114

Good heavens! Do we pick and choose what "dictionary" we're going to quote from just to score a point? Ham Radio, or computers, or just about any activity has it's own lingo, that's why when some people say somthing is bad, they mean it is good. Under your definition, every single activity in Ham radio is operating, including scratching ones backside.

Come on, you can do better then that!

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You're putting too fine a point on it, Cecil. Operating, in ham radio,
> > means to get on the air. Sheesh.
>
> Operating in plain English means performing a function. A person taking
> a Morse exam is performing a function. It is not I who has "too fine a
> point".
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1604. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 20:50:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <etwhNwTnBHA.1876@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31115

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C433E5F.D9F6017B@psu.edu...

>
> Come on, you can do better then that!
>

No, I'm not sure he can. I've heard that Cecil is intellectually gifted,
but I've resigned myself to the fact that he has not yet unwrapped all his
presents.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1605. Re: Roger Does Not Know Me

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 21:38:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a1vltr$hb8$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 31119
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test,rec.test

REPEATER JAMMER and degenerate who molests kids
"Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C43A03E.D1BA77C3@mailcity.net...
>
>
> retest boy KC8JBO wrote much to degenerate Jizzswallowing 'cber'
Recepticle's chagrin:

So, you must not've passed the test, otherwise you'd use your callsign. Or
to you mean to tell us you're to fucking ignorant to pass the test?

> >
> > That why I passed the tests two times, while you only could manage that
> > L.P.N., bedpan boy?
>
> It should be "that's why I passed the test"

If you "passed the test" why are you AFRAID to give your callsign,
CHICKENSHIT?
Poor anonymous degenerate pedophile, get back to downloading that kiddie
porn, Arselicks.

1606. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:01:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201142150280.8956-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31116

On 14 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Maybe
>>when I have some "money to burn," I'll get a wireless lan transmitter and a
>>2.4GHz amplifier (20+W) and see if it raises the noise floor on my voice
>>repeater's 2.4GHz input.
>
>Heck, the wireless LAN itself could raise the noise floor on a nearby repeater.
> The ~$100.00 devices I have purchased ran about 100 milliwatts and about 0 dBi
>gain antenna. I could hear it loud and clear, even through building
>attenuation, for about 500 feet.

That all depends on its actual frequency sweep..... Just because part 15 devices are permitted from 2400 to 2483.5 doesn't mean that they hop on enough frequencies to cover the entire range - there could be holes....

>There are power limits on SS devices in Amateur Radio. I believe that the power
>is limited to a max of 50 watts, with a further requirement that automatic
>power control be used if the power is > 1 watt.
>
>I think it unlikely that birds will fry on your roof. If the antenna gain is
>low, the fields would be low and if the gain is high, the "near field" region
>of the antenna can extend quite some distance. In the near field region, the
>field strengths are less than what would be predicted if the antenna were a
>point source.

You haven't seen these birds.... Many like to perch on my antenna ground radials or on the yagi masts between the elements.

A 20 watt signal into a 23dB gain antenna is going to be equivalent to about 4000w ERP [and one heck of a field strength within 1 meter of the antenna]. Microwave ovens are only in the 750-1250w area. Granted, the latter is inside a resonant cavity, but in sheer power, "Mr. Blue Jay" isn't going to live.

On 1270MHz, I know someone who claims that he loaded his 20+dB yagi antenna with 100 watts and burned off the paint on the exterior of his neighbor's house in a nice 2' circle at 30 feet away over the period of less than a week. I don't remember if this was an accident....

In closing, all I will say is that it's possible. Probability is a separate issue.

1607. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:20:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114172007.07903.00001418@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31117

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 1/14/2002 5:59 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020114065902.11155.00001435@mb-cr.aol.com>

>Okay, but that doesn't change the premise of the question, in fact, it better
>drives home the point that the amateurs of our past embraced new technology.
>Had Amateur Radio NOT had a history of embracing new technology, how long do
>you think their allocations would have continued?

I can't say, Ed. But the fact is that the "new technology" exponentially
improved the lot of radio men of the era.

Can we say the say of digital modes and digital voice as it pertains to
Amateur Radio?

Certainly a lot of fun and in some cases even beneficial...But what does
it say that some of these modes have been around a while yet have not been
aggresively embraced by Radio Amateurs?

I liken it to the guys who go fishing with sonar, salinometers, temp
gauges, etc. Do they really have any more fun or catch a "better fish" with
all that stuff? It's great if you are a commercial fisherman or are a tourney
fisherman, but what does "every day" fishing need it for?

73

Steve, K4YZ

1608. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:22:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114172219.07903.00001419@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31118

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 1/14/2002 6:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020114071826.11155.00001442@mb-cr.aol.com>

>If he is in QSO with you, Steve, the more power you are running, the louder
>you
>will be in his receiver.

So becuase he won't add a filter or preamp to his rig (under $200) I need to
add a linear (in excess of $800 and recurring electric bills)...?

1609. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:48:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C436027.785643C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31120

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
>
> How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> air?

Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1610. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:49:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C436078.7225A51F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31121

mike coslo wrote:
> Under your definition, every
> single activity in Ham radio is operating, including scratching ones backside.

Some hams scratch their backsides more than anything else.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1611. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:51:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4360D6.9366A630@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31122

K0HB wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C433E5F.D9F6017B@psu.edu...
>
> >
> > Come on, you can do better then that!
> >
>
> No, I'm not sure he can. I've heard that Cecil is intellectually gifted,
> but I've resigned myself to the fact that he has not yet unwrapped all his
> presents.

I learned my lesson a long time ago, Hans. I unwrapped all my presents
and everyone ran the other way.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1612. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:53:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43615A.29AAF2C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31123

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Sorta like "what's the matter with live and let live." That never seems
> to go away for very long either. It's nice to listen to new music every
> once in a while, Cecil. Or to have a new thought.

At my age, it's impossible to have a new thought. They just seem new.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1613. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 22:58:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C436286.75A4A89F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31124

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Is it also a significant problem facing the photonics industry? All sorts
> > > of people talk about CW lasers. They are often modulated by various means.
> > >
> > I have declared that 'CW' stands for "Comutated Wave", Jim
> > so the problem is solved.
>
> That a direct violation of the IEEE dictionary. Shame on you. ;-)

Well, you don't like the IEEE dictionary definition of CW so I thought
I would humor you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1614. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:00:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4362F5.FFF0536F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31125

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > I'm sure dying did not change her mind.
>
> Dying tends to terminate most minds.

Not according to my Southern Baptist preacher. Are you an atheist?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1615. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:06:06 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <yvJ08.271143$WW.13614410@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31126

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> "State of the art" is just an advertising buzzphrase.

"State of the Art" isn't JUST an advertising buzzphrase. It SHOULDN'T BE an advertizing buzzphrase!!! Usually, when anyone uses it, it's misused because by the time anything gets to market it's NOT "State of the Art" anymore... ;-)

PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)

> Like "paradigm shift" and
> all those other 80s/90s jingles. They're all boom-dot-bust now.

I can't believe you said that. A "paradigm shift" is legitamate (real). It says nothing about how "modern" (there's a word for you to mock) something is. paradigm shift merely implies a new way of looking at something. Copernicus is the poster child for paradigm shift. He caused a paradigm shift in how we see ourselves in the universe. A paradigm shift doesn't have to be that dramatic either. There can be very small almost insignificant paradigm shifts. Also, paradigm shifts aren't neccesarily always positive. We can experience negative paradigm shifts, too. Think about shifts in our society and how it's currently viewed.

If you were listening to the talking heads on the alledged news programs touting the information revolution and the dot coms boom you were being lead down the garden path. Be mindful of the fact these people will invariably say something is ironic when irony had nothing to do with it. In other words they don't know what they're reading most of the time.

> >Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.

Absolutely, but remember, never say never. ;-)

> And hopefully there will be somebody else on the air using PACTOR II if
you
> ever need it....

And now... for something completely different.... ;-)

Rich

1616. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:07:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4364CE.82F35E89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31128

Richard Plourde wrote:
> PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)

PACTOR II is "state of the art" for amateur radio, i.e. the best we
have. Can you think of any way to technically improve upon PACTOR II?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1617. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:10:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43656D.935C5D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31129

K0HB wrote:
> QRP is for sissies.

I think QRP is for masochists. I speak from experience.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1618. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:12:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ORMpAAVnBHA.1356@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31127

----- Original Message -----
From: "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com>

> So becuase he won't add a filter or preamp to his rig (under $200) I need to
> add a linear (in excess of $800 and recurring electric bills)...?

I'm not asking you to add anything. Just understand that I'll probably choose to ignore your station in favor of someone I can hear.

My rig is fully loaded with all available filters, in addition to DSP. (It also has a two-level selectable preamp, but pre-amps are mostly fluff added to impress the uninformed.) I also have a well-engineered antenna farm which has enabled me to make DXCC honor roll and to be a competitor in most radiosport events. I reserve the right to ignore piss-weak signals unless they indicate an emergency.

If you insist on running QRP, don't get all "noble" about being ignored. If you feel that you can't afford the amp and electric bills, get a better job
or learn to live with the shortcomings of your radio station.

QRP is for sissies.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1619. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:27:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C435CE0.9660DD5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31131

N2EY wrote:

> In article <a1s9a5$pm5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> >a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> >an uninformed statement. You do NOT need to hear
> >anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
> >pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
> >XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
> >station set to copy and send on that frequency. As already
> >stated, to do so requires advance participation in
> >emergency planning.
>
> It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error. If the available equipment can't do
> that when it's needed, you're back to tuning around and hopefully finding the
> station you want to work.
>

Yeah, and that means hoping you'll be able to hear it.

> If you want to run any sort of net operation, ALL stations must be capable of
> being dead-on frequency and staying there.
>
> All of this is tough enough in a nice warm dry hamshack. Will the rig still be
> within 10 Hz when it's cold and wet?

And jury - rigged... (ah, I guess they don't think they'll ever have to jury rig
one.

1620. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:29:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#HNgLJVnBHA.1224@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31130

"Steve Robeson K4YZ"

> I liken it to the guys who go fishing with sonar, salinometers, temp
> gauges, etc. Do they really have any more fun or catch a "better fish"
with
> all that stuff? It's great if you are a commercial fisherman or are a
tourney
> fisherman, but what does "every day" fishing need it for?

My other hobby is walleye fishing. I'm not a "tourney" fisherman nor a commercial fisherman, but I equip my boat with every tool that I can afford (for the same reason as those other guys do -- to find fish.)

My walleye rig has 7 sonar transducers, 3 sonar displays, 2 GPS receivers, and marine VHF radio.

I use a PinPoint brand electric trolling motor which can be set up to follow a certain depth level or a certain distance off a shoreline. It can also reproduce (with 2 meters) a track that I have previously trolled and saved on my GPS. All automatically, while I simply pay attention to fishing.

I don't *NEED* as damned bit of that, but it sure is great fun to have.

I find that many of the "noble" fishermen with lesser equipment tend to keep a set of binoculars handy so they can follow me to my fishing spots which I have found with superior electronics.

With all kind wishes to those who can't afford the toys,

de Hans, K0HB

1621. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:31:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C435DCF.591F229C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31132

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C4222D1.960D8DDC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> > PACTOR II has a throughput about 50 times higher than *my* fastest CW.
> >>
> >> But it's not about YOU, Cecil.
> >
> >Of course it is, Jim. I have to decide whether to trust my straight
> >key and failing hearing or go with state of the art in amateur digital.
>
> "State of the art" is just an advertising buzzphrase. Like "paradigm shift" and
> all those other 80s/90s jingles. They're all boom-dot-bust now.
>
> >Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.
>
> And hopefully there will be somebody else on the air using PACTOR II if you
> ever need it....
>

I doubt it'll be me. I don't plan to dump big bucks into a very proprietary interface just to be able to do it. I might use Beezly's "Ritty" program if I could try it first and make sure I *could* use it before springing loose with the bucks for it, but when I ran across an "evaluation copy" on a Brit website, downloaded it and tried to set it up, the "evaluation time" expired before I could ever get it on the air. Must have been good for all of 15 or 20 minutes.

1622. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:37:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C435F5C.F5E4C14F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31133

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >> Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of
> >> CW, how long do you think their allocations would have continued?
>
> > As pointed out before, most Hams had already abandoned Spark when it was
> >regulated out.
>
> Okay, but that doesn't change the premise of the question, in fact, it better
> drives home the point that the amateurs of our past embraced new technology.
> Had Amateur Radio NOT had a history of embracing new technology, how long do
> you think their allocations would have continued?

A far better queuestion is "Why did hams embrace new technollogy?" The answer is very clear - the newer technology was far more useful for their purposes. When you can say that about the newer technologies of today you will have far fewer hams on SSB and CW and many more using the newer technologies.
As always, hams have very little need to transfer vast quantities of text or data in their person to person contacts on the air, nor in most cases during emergencies. So the newer technologies get a look and draw some following, but as always, hams use what they like in the absence of good reason to do otherwise.

1623. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-14 23:42:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43607D.A1841192@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31134

W1RFI wrote:

> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >. . . chirp yer buns off and enjoy but keep the damned stuff up the
> >band and outta MY cw channel!
>
> The necessary bandwidth of an OOK CW signal is about 100 Hz, so it should be
> pretty easy to keep the digital stuff >100 Hz away from a CW QSO in progress.

Only if the digital operator is interested in doing so. Observations indicate
not many are.

1624. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:03:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114190303.20987.00001484@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 31135

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>If he is in QSO with you, Steve, the more power you are running, the louder
>>you will be in his receiver.

> So becuase he won't add a filter

For SSB communications, adding a filter to the existing ~2500 Hz SSB filter already in the rig is not going to buy anything. 2500 Hz is pretty much the necessary bandwidth for SSB. On CW, one can narrow up the bandwidth from the typical 500 Hz bandwidth in today's rigs to about 100 Hz, using either an internal or an outboard filter. This can be either analog or DSP -- the effect will be the same.

> or preamp to his rig (under $200)

If, as originally stipulated, his reception problem is caused by local noise, adding a preamp will only cause him to hear more noise. The ONLY situation a preamplifier solves is to improve on the sensitivity of an inadequate receiver. On HF, with any sort of reasonable antenna, the receiver is sensitive enough that external noise is much greater than the receiver input noise. In those cases, adding a preamp solves nothing, either.

One can get some amount of help making a somewhat noisy signal less noisy using some of the DSP de-noise algorithms, but that techique has its limits, especially for SSB reception.

>I need to add a linear (in excess of $800 and recurring electric bills)...?

The 5 watt QRP station could ask the same question, as could the 100 milliwatt QRP station.

The answer is that if your signal is below someone's external noise level, if you want them to hear you, you will have to increase the level of the signal you transmit in his/her direction.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1625. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:39:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#hl8PwVnBHA.1856@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31136

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > Dying tends to terminate most minds.
>
> Not according to my Southern Baptist preacher.

I'm not a member of that cult, and I don't subscribe to
their myths and legends.

> Are you an atheist?

No, I'm an agnostic.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1626. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:45:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C437BAA.CD7AD671@uci.edu>
Source record: 31137

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > Is it also a significant problem facing the photonics industry? All sorts
> > > > of people talk about CW lasers. They are often modulated by various means.
> > >
> > > I have declared that 'CW' stands for "Comutated Wave", Jim
> > > so the problem is solved.
> >
> > That a direct violation of the IEEE dictionary. Shame on you. ;-)
>
> Well, you don't like the IEEE dictionary definition of CW so I thought
> I would humor you.

Who's going around telling people that I don't like the IEEE
definition? I hate when that happens.

1627. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:48:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2021q$47v$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31143

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4234EE.C7AFBC10@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Remember too, the digital modes are really just a modern
> > variation of RTTY (typed copy and printed readout.) The
> > ability to do that today is very inexpensive (used laptops and
> > desktop PCs are almost being given away). The additional
> > equipment needed to do digital is easy to accomplish.
>
> That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is
suddenly
> thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that
stuff
> is not at hand.

Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
get the job done.

> If you have ever rigged a laptop for use with a HF radio for
> digital work you should know that it is not merely a "plug and play"
operation.
> You must research the radio and computer manuals for input and output
> requirements which can vary considerably among radio gear, then build
whatever
> interface is required, with consideration and thought to levels required,
PTT
> needs, etc. Some of you guys seem to think this is trivial and quick. No.

Ditto my last comment.

> > As to "being prepared." I have said this before...BUT, if those
> > that profess a need to be prepared are thinking of that last
> > minute effort when a ham would cobble together some simple
> > CW transciever or to be pressed into service having not
> > previously done the "preparedness" activities...well, that's
> > not what be emergency prepared should be.
>
> So you aren't familiar with the fact that emergency communications can be
> required at the most inopportune times in just as opportune circumstances,
and
> that all can be previously set in place for instant use. That shows that
you
> really don't know much about the requirements of emergency communications.

Just
> because the HT jocks working the EOC's get the press does not mean that is
what
> it's about. Aa dozen years of work in planning for communicatioins needs
> resulting from a major earthquake resulting in widespread destruction
formed my
> thinking on the subject.

I repeat again...it is those that are prepared that will heed
the call and get it done. Indeed, even you admit it is the
preparation (EOC) that makes it all happen. Might an
occasional person suddenly be involved...certainly, but I still
believe it is those that are prepared who are then ready
to serve.

> > Those people that talk the talk (need for CE testing to
> > augment emergency preparedness), but do not, themselves,
> > walk the walk (participate actively with their local emergency
> > preparedness organizations such as RACES) have little or
> > no credibility intheir comments.

> Ah. See the above paragraph for whatever credentials you require.

I did and it reveals nothing of any import.

> > > > There are now enough that the ARS is fairly well disipated
> > > >across a numer of different modes. Which one will be "the" mode of
> > choice?
> > >
> > > Which mode is the mode of choice right now for most emergency and
> > > public-service communications?
> >
> > Can't wait to see the answers from some folks on that.
>
> I doubt you'd recognize fact from fiction anyway.

As I doubt you are able to answer the question apparently.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1628. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:57:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2029unhv1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31147

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C423BC4.A1BE2031@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C4118C2.63ADDBA@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >Please produce a reference that indicates that the
> > > > intelligence transferred in radiotelegraphy is some "third state".
> > >
> > > Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
> > "advantage"
> > > over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy,
that's
> > OK
> > > because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!
> > >
> > > "Hey, Boss, I can't copy PSK, the signal's too weak, but there is
this CW
> > station that's
> > > coming through fine". "Sorry, son, can't use it. It's a poor mode that
> > won't work as
> > > well, hey, just because you can copy it when you can't print PSK means
> > nothing!!"
> > >
> > > You dingaling.
> >
> > Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> > a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> > an uninformed statement.
>
> Actually, not ever actually doing it on the air is what leads to "seems
to
> you"...
>
>
> > You do NOT need to hear
> > anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
> > pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
> > XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
> > station set to copy and send on that frequency.
```

>
> And if the prior arrangments don't work out, or you experience a (highly
> likelyO) equipment malfunction that takes your station off PACTOR or
whatever
> digital mode you "prearranged" then you can toss in the towel. Think it
doesn't
> happen? I have personally experienced just exactly that sort of failure.
On the
> job.
>
> > As stated, to do so requires advance participation in emergency
planning.
>
> I probably have more time in the chow line than you have in emergency
planning.
> One thing I learned early is that the best laid plans frequently don't
work as
> expected. Rely solely on them at your peril.

So what's your point...preparation is a waste of time?

Do things happen that upset the best laid plans? Sure
they do...BUT the planning still works 99% of the time.
Those that participate get it done. Those that don't and
are waiting for their 15 seconds of ham emergency
calling due to a sudden problem in their neighborhood
are usually never going to be called.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1629. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 00:58:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a202jq$b7e$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31148

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114060952.16311.00000199@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <a1s9a5$pm5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> >a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> >an uninformed statement. You do NOT need to hear
> >anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
> >pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
> >XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
> >station set to copy and send on that frequency. As already
> >stated, to do so requires advance participation in
> >emergency planning.
>
> It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error. If the available equipment can't
do
> that when it's needed, you're back to tuning around and hopefully finding
the
> station you want to work.

Which is the case for most any decent HF transciever today.

> If you want to run any sort of net operation, ALL stations must be capable
of
> being dead-on frequency and staying there.
>
Which is the case for most any decent HF transciever today.

> All of this is tough enough in a nice warm dry hamshack. Will the rig
still be
> within 10 Hz when it's cold and wet?

Do you leave your rig out in the rain?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1630. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:01:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a202h9$17d$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31150

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C435CE0.9660DD5E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <a1s9a5$pm5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > >Seems to me that this shows that NOT being
> > >a part of emergency PREPARATION creates such
> > >an uninformed statement. You do NOT need to hear
> > >anything to copy the digital mode. It would be
> > >pre-arranged that the digital transmissions would be on
> > >XX.YYY frequency and all I'd need do is have my
> > >station set to copy and send on that frequency. As already
> > >stated, to do so requires advance participation in
> > >emergency planning.
> > >
> > It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> > xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error. If the available equipment can't
do
> > that when it's needed, you're back to tuning around and hopefully
finding the
> > station you want to work.
> > >
>
> Yeah, and that means hoping you'll be able to hear it.

YOU don't have to hear anything. The equipment detects
it and tunes it in.

> > If you want to run any sort of net operation, ALL stations must be
capable of
> > being dead-on frequency and staying there.
> > >
> > All of this is tough enough in a nice warm dry hamshack. Will the rig
still be
> > within 10 Hz when it's cold and wet?
>
> And jury - rigged... (ah, I guess they don't think they'll ever have to
jury rig
> one.

Just how would YOU jury rig a receiver that would have any
use in an emergency?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1631. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:02:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a202kp$l3d$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31052

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114073125.11155.00001446@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Since NCI doesn't publish any membership stats, what difference
> >does it make. If it is a problem, it only
> >affects internal NCI activity and records.
>
> If I recall, NCI cited its membership level in at least some of its
comments to
> the FCC.

In round numbers...and if a few happened to go SK, I doubt
it made any difference.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1632. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:04:33 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ad9066edd6cebc989694@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31138

In article <3C42E2F4.2ACAD97F@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > Give me an HF rig, portable antenna, emergency power supply, and a straight
> > key, and I can be up and running in about 10 minutes.
>
> I've been up and running for years. Why do you guys wait so long?

You obviously eat more prunes than most other guys

1633. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:05:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C438041.D4DF44F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31139

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
> > >
> > > Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
> >
> > Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't
> > have a mental handicap.
>
> I inferred that you meant "any person" above.

That wasn't very smart of you at all.

Dave K8MN

1634. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:05:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a202qb$ck6$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31053

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114071439.11155.00001440@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.
>
> >Good point. One other way we "lose" members is when we
> >send out a communication. We do "lose" members when they
> >don't keep us (NCI) updated on their current email address.
>
> Do you deduct those former members from the count when you reference the
number
> of members NCI has when you file comments with the FCC?

Sure, the "roll of members" is still a discrete number and
easy enough to tally. It isn't a "deduct", they are just dropped from
our database of members. Like most databases, it can
tally a sum of all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1635. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:07:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4380BA.E7FC4077@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31140

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You told us what she *would have* thought about
> > morse testing. You made no reference to discussing morse testing with
> > her and it would be pretty hard to prove or disprove that you had such a
> > discussion. You put words in the mouth of a dead person.
>
> I did NOT discuss Morse testing with her.

I think we all realize that you had no such conversation.

> I am inferring what she would
> have said based on the plethora of her writings condemning unnecessary
> governmental regulations. There are many other topics upon which we
> could make a valid inferrence based on her writings. I'm sure dying
> did not change her mind.

Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
Moore telling us what the dead believed.

Dave K8MN

1636. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:11:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4381AE.8F525D4E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31141

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
> >
> > How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> > air?
>
> Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.

To some.

Dave K8MN

1637. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:22:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a203on$ui0$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31057

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C422D49.C0BF47B7@worldnet.att.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >> The last time there was a comprehensive poll on the issue was 1975.
> >
> > >By who? ARRL? Certainly wasn't done by the FCC?
> > >Did it go to EVERY licensed ham?
> > >(NOTE - You actually answered this below)
> >
> > I do not think that governenace by poll is the best way to make
decisions. I
> > am a licensed ham. Assume that I get a poll from the FCC about a
subject I
> > know nothing about. I look at my choices, think about it for 3 seconds,
mark a
> > box and send it in. Is that really useful input? I don't believe so.
> >
> > IMHO, the process that the FCC uses right now, with a rulemaking process
in
> > which anyone is able to make comments any time they think it
appropriate, with
> > those inputs evaluated by FCC staff and a decision made by those who are
> > charged to make such decisions is much better than allowing that
decision to be
> > made by people who may or may not know anything about it and who may or
may not
> > have spent more than a few seconds thinking about the issues.
> >
> > I prefer that my governement make its decisions with input from
knowledgeable
> > people.
>
> So you believe that non-hams who comment on FCC proposals are then more
competent
> to do so than active, longtime licensed hams?

Some may very well be. Why you would not expect that to be
possible is beyond me. Indeed, I'll state catagorically that there
probably are some "active, longtime licensed hams" that are NOT
competent.

> I suppose that refugees from Channel
> 19 or the region just below, and even gthe illicits just above, 28 Mhz
are
> competent. Ok, if that's your view, that's your view.

> I think you will surely agree that FCC has historically relied on
licensed hams
> for the majority of their data and information used to formulate new
regulations
> for the ARS.

If you believe that, then what's your concern. The NPRM comments and
subseqent R&O dropping all code testing to 5 wpm must, therefore,
have relied on the input of licensed hams.

> Why not? Not that many FCC staff have experience and expertise in ham
> radio. Many licensed hams do. And I don't think they have relied on the
ARRL for
> large amounts of input for no good reason.

I have no real problem with that. Must also, therefore, be true that the
5 wpm testing properly reflects and or accounted for ARRL input.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1638. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:22:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C438451.3468861E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31142

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > "State of the art" is just an advertising buzzphrase.
>
> "State of the Art" isn't JUST an advertising buzzphrase. It SHOULDN'T BE an
> advertizing buzzphrase!!! Usually, when anyone uses it, it's misused because
> by the time anything gets to market it's NOT "State of the Art" anymore...
> ;-)
>
> PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)
>
> > Like "paradigm shift" and
> > all those other 80s/90s jingles. They're all boom-dot-bust now.
>
> I can't believe you said that. A "paradigm shift" is legitamate (real). It
> says nothing about how "modern" (there's a word for you to mock) something
> is. paradigm shift merely implies a new way of looking at something.
> Copernicus is the poster child for paradigm shift. He caused a paradigm
> shift in how we see ourselves in the universe. A paradigm shift doesn't have
> to be that dramatic either. There can be very small almost insignificant
> paradigm shifts. Also, paradigm shifts aren't neccesarily always positive.
> We can experience negative paradigm shifts, too. Think about shifts in our
> society and how it's currently viewed.
>
> If you were listening to the talking heads on the alledged news programs
> touting the information revolution and the dot coms boom you were being lead
> down the garden path. Be mindful of the fact these people will invariably
> say something is ironic when irony had nothing to do with it. In other words
> they don't know what they're reading most of the time.
>
> > >Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.
>
> Absolutely, but remember, never say never. ;-)
>
> > And hopefully there will be somebody else on the air using PACTOR II if
> you
> > ever need it....
>
> And now... for something completely different.... ;-)
>
> Rich

We had an Assistant Secretary of State for Information Management--at least our office stopped being known as the Office of Communications under his watch--back about 1994. The guy began sending out cables filled with terms like "paradigm shift", "proactive", "market the migration" and such. This particular goober even began pouching videotapes of himself addressing various groups at Main State to all embassies. His biggest mistake was to have the camera zoom out or pan while he was speaking to reveal that his audience consisted of about 15 geeks afflicted with Mego (lifted from P.J. O'Rourke--it stands for "My Eyes Glazed Over").

People are still tripping over the debris left by the fellow's "reorganization and modernization". The biggest change which I could see was that we were soon infomaniacs rather than baggy-eyed communicators.

Dave K8MN

1639. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:30:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C438627.86E48988@uci.edu>
Source record: 31144

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
> >
> > How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> > air?

> Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.

As is the field of medicine. Your definition applies to that kind of 'operating' too, right? A doctor doesn't really have to cut tissue in order to operate. He must only perform a function, like checking your blood pressure for example.

1640. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:34:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31059

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> One example that justifies the lower power limit can be
>
> > taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
> > site where thousands of contacts are then made all
> > over the globe with the DX station usually only running
> > about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
> > are with other stations running similar or even lower
> > power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
> > do it because they need the power, they do it to
> > "over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
> > stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
> > practice..
>
> That's because you don't know better. At times it takes lots of power to
work
> those 100 watt DX stations. I had to turn on a full 1400 watts on CW to
get the
> Heard Island group on a dying 20 meter band, they could tell I was there
with
> the
> 100 watts but no copy. And when you become DX you see it firsthand. It's a
real
> zoo out there as heard from across the pond.

You give probably one of the few examples where the power
appears justified. MOST, however, of the power stations
routinely operate at high power to simply drown out the other
stations (IMHO).

> Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power. They found that 1.5KW
> caused almost no additional problems to consumer devices than 100 watts
did. And
> there has long been rules in place requiring hams to use the minimum power
> required to complete the desired communication. I for one very rarely turn
on my
> amp because I don't often need to.

But you are (IMHO) an exception as many others just crank up the amp
and operate high power throughout the contest period or until they
are finally replied to by the DX station they are after.

> Bill you should gain some HF experience before making sweeping
prouncements on
> operation there. An Extra Lite alone won't do it.

My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming" in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power at the time and for the conditions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1641. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:53:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C438BA3.DC728BE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31145

Jim Kelley wrote:
> As is the field of medicine. Your definition applies to that kind of
> 'operating' too, right? A doctor doesn't really have to cut tissue in
> order to operate. He must only perform a function, like checking your
> blood pressure for example.

I was hired as VP of Engineering of Koala Technologies. I met the VP of Operations at a party. I told him my wife was a nurse and would be interested in talking to him about operations. His comeback was: "What the hell would a nurse know about operations?" When he realized what he had just said, his expression was priceless, and he called me a Sonnafabitch. We've been good friends ever since.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1642. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 01:54:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C438BEA.30B5AC9B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31146

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
> > >
> > > How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> > > air?
> >
> > Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.
>
> To some.

Moderation in all things, Dave. Ham radio ain't no religion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1643. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:00:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C438D3D.FB469776@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31051

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
> > > >
> > > > Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
> > >
> > > Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't
> > > have a mental handicap.
> > >
> > I inferred that you meant "any person" above.
>
> That wasn't very smart of you at all.

If I said, "I've yet to meet the person who can learn morse", what
would you think?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1644. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:01:29 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <Z3M08.102271$fe1.1385886@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31149

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

> >For Technician class adjusting the question pool and limiting the power
> >makes it a reasonable foundation. One thing is they, at the very least,
> >should be given the same privileges as Technician Plus.

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> I think the HF/MF of post-S25.5 Techs should be a LOT more than the
current
> Tech Plus. I'd say about half of the current General allocations is about
> right.

Which half do you mean? ;-)
Half the bands, half the spectrum, half the mode?

> >For General Class, I don't know what the consensus would be but, as the
> >numbers of Advanced class operators decline the Generals may assume
Advanced
> >subbands on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters. The Advanced would have high power
> >there and Generals the medium power so sharing the same subband edges
seems
> >reasonable.

> Nah. Just leave 'em alone.

Yep whatever the masses wants here. I'm sure ARRL would petition if need be.

> >Amateur Extra class should have an additional examination for VE status.
> >That's all I can think of for that class.

> Yup. "Element V" (5) with all the VE stuff in it.

> >You have also alluded to moving the forty meter band and other issues
which
> >were not licensing changes.

> If we get a better setup for 40 than the shared mess that dates back to
before
> WW2, some changes may be in order for 40.

> But the basic concept begins to take a reasonable shape:

> Tech is the entry level, with low power, a sampling of spectrum and modes,
plus
> an easier test than today (focuses on operating and safety)

Less technical test without electronics but ALL the ARS rules pertaining to
Technician class operation or amateur operation in general should be fair

game.

> General is midrange, with more power, modes and a more technical test

> Extra is everything, with more emphasis on technical

> VE qualification is separate

> Nobody loses what they've got now, and nobody gets a big freebie exacept
maybe
> Techs get more HF.

the current allocations... ponder these...

15, 40, and 80 CW only (RTTY and data forbidden)

28.100 - 28.300 CW, RTTY and data (normal modes)

28.300 - 28.500 CW and SSB only (phone and image forbidden)

HF/MF contains two types of bands...

10, 12, 17, 30, and 160 meters no subbands between General, Advanced, and
Extra.

15, 20, 40, and 80 meters has subbands between General, Advanced, and Extra.
General and Advanced have the same CW, RTTY, and data.
General and Advanced have different subbands for CW, phone, and image.

Well, how should Technician class be included here? What are the arguments
on this? How can you come up with half that makes sense and thereby, will
fly?

Rich

1645. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:05:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C438E67.6D90CD9D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31054

Dave Heil wrote:
> Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
> address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
> Moore telling us what the dead believed.

I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1646. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:12:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43900B.42148CE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31055

Bill Sohl wrote:
> So what's your point...preparation is a waste of time?

Dick wants a macho challenge so he doesn't ever prepare. :-)
During an emergency, you will find him sifting through grains
of sand looking for an NPN junction.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1647. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:14:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C439068.3FCB0813@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31056

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Do you leave your rig out in the rain?

Dick likes the macho challenge of drying it out and
getting it working again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1648. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 02:23:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201150221330.14291-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31058

On Tue, 15 Jan 2002, Richard Plourde wrote:
> ...
>the current allocations... ponder these...
>15, 40, and 80 CW only (RTTY and data forbidden)
>28.100 - 28.300 CW, RTTY and data (normal modes)
>
>28.300 - 28.500 CW and SSB only (phone and image forbidden)

????? SSB allowed but not "phone"? Then exactly what kind of information do
you plan to allow for SSB?

> ...

1649. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221000.02067.00000341@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31060

In article <3C4364CE.82F35E89@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Richard Plourde wrote:
>> PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)
>
>PACTOR II is "state of the art" for amateur radio, i.e. the best we
>have.

No it isn't.

> Can you think of any way to technically improve upon PACTOR II?

Yes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1650. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221001.02067.00000343@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31062

In article <3C42EAB8.18E93052@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
>> xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error.
>
>That's not true for PACTOR II, Jim.

Sure it is.

> From the manual: "Never tune the VFO
>by hand with very weak or inaudible signals! With very weak or inaudible
>signals, the PTC2e adjusts its tuning very slowly to minimize tuning error."
>The DSP processor locates and tracks the signal by autoadjusting the digital
>filter coefficients. It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal
>all by itself.

Sure. But you still have to get close by hand. And what does the box do if
there is more than one PACTOR II signal in the passband?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1651. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221001.02067.00000342@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31065

In article <yvJ08.271143$WW.13614410@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> "State of the art" is just an advertising buzzphrase.
>
>"State of the Art" isn't JUST an advertising buzzphrase. It SHOULDN'T BE an
>advertizing buzzphrase!!! Usually, when anyone uses it, it's misused because
>by the time anything gets to market it's NOT "State of the Art" anymore...
>;-)
>
AGREED! The over-use and mis-use has made it into a buzzphrase, though.

>PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)

Exactly. Same is true of both PACTOR flavors.
>
>> Like "paradigm shift" and
>> all those other 80s/90s jingles. They're all boom-dot-bust now.
>
>I can't believe you said that.

I did - in the same context as above.

>A "paradigm shift" is legitamate (real). It
>says nothing about how "modern" (there's a word for you to mock) something
>is. paradigm shift merely implies a new way of looking at something.
>Copernicus is the poster child for paradigm shift. He caused a paradigm
>shift in how we see ourselves in the universe. A paradigm shift doesn't have
>to be that dramatic either. There can be very small almost insignificant
>paradigm shifts. Also, paradigm shifts aren't neccesarily always positive.
>We can experience negative paradigm shifts, too. Think about shifts in our
>society and how it's currently viewed.

Exaclty. My point is the same as with "state of the art". The phrase is so
overused and misused it becomes a parody of itself.
>
>If you were listening to the talking heads on the alledged news programs
>touting the information revolution and the dot coms boom you were being lead
>down the garden path. Be mindful of the fact these people will invariably
>say something is ironic when irony had nothing to do with it. In other words
>they don't know what they're reading most of the time.

Exactly. But much of what we hear comes from induhviduals who make the
decisions...

>
>> >Your mileage may vary. My choice is clear.
>
>Absolutely, but remember, never say never. ;-)

Yup.
>
>> And hopefully there will be somebody else on the air using PACTOR II if
>you
>> ever need it....

Maybe.
>
>And now... for something completely different.... ;-)
>
Lemon curry?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1652. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221002.02067.00000344@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31061

In article <20020114065902.11155.00001435@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>> Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of
>>> CW, how long do you think their allocations would have continued?
>
>> As pointed out before, most Hams had already abandoned Spark when it
>was
>>regulated out.
>
>Okay, but that doesn't change the premise of the question,

Yes, it does. It turns the whole question upside down.

> in fact, it better
>drives home the point that the amateurs of our past embraced new technology.

ONLY when its advantages were clearly displayed, and WITHOUT being pushed into it.

This is a key point that some folks (not you, Ed) just don't get. Spark did not have to be outlawed to get hams to use CW. AM did not have to be outlawed or restricted to get hams to use SSB and FM.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>Had Amateur Radio NOT had a history of embracing new technology, how long do
>you think their allocations would have continued?
>

1653. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221003.02067.00000345@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31063

In article <3C42EE99.8CC03D2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20020113121317.11155.00001251@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>>
>> >Had amateurs not been willing to abandon spark transmissions in favor of
>CW,
>> >how long do you think their allocations would have continued?
>>
>> So what are you saying, Ed? That we hams MUST "willingly" abandon our
>favorite
>> modes?
>
>I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
>interfere with the adoption of a better mode.

No, he wasn't.

The requirements for an amateur license in those days included "spark testing"
- and code testing. Even if a ham was never going to use spark, there were
questions about it in the test.

The test does not hinder the adoption of new modes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1654. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221003.02067.00000346@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31064

In article <3C4320C9.5D22B123@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> You told us what she *would have* thought about
>> morse testing. You made no reference to discussing morse testing with
>> her and it would be pretty hard to prove or disprove that you had such a
>> discussion. You put words in the mouth of a dead person.
>
>I did NOT discuss Morse testing with her.

Then you don;t know what she actually thought about it.

> I am inferring what she would
>have said based on the plethora of her writings condemning unnecessary
>governmental regulations.

No, you're assuming your conclusion. You ASSUME she would say it was
"unnecessary", based on your own biases and prejudices.

> There are many other topics upon which we
>could make a valid inferrence based on her writings.

But not on code testing for an amateur license.

>I'm sure dying
>did not change her mind.

I say she wouldn't support the existence of amateur radio at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1655. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:10:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221004.02067.00000347@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31066

In article <3C431C8B.4F941AE0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net>...
>> >
>> > Back in the mid-seventies, I shared a stage on more than one occasion
>> > with Muddy Waters and his band (in fact, last night's "Mountain Stage"
>> > on WV PBS TV featured pianist Pine Top Perkins and guitarist Bob
>> > Margolin from Muddy's Band).
>>
>> this is simply WAY too cool for rrap. I am simply in awe, Dave.
>> "Mountain Stage" is a favorite here.
>
>I thought it was a great show on radio. On TV, it is awesome.

TV!!!! We only get it on radio here. Sigh.

>> A.R. was an OK writer but THE Muddy Waters......
>
>I don't think she garnered the same kind of reaction in the flesh that
>Muddy did.
>>
>> > If Muddy was still alive, I just know he'd
>> > have supported continued code testing.
>>
>> Absolutely.
>>
>> > I'm pretty sure that the late
>> > Albert King (with whom I also worked) would have supported continued
>> > morse tesing. It's a musical thing, don't you know.
>>
>> Muddy Waters AND Albert King?!? oh mama...
>
>Albert was a great blues man but not a very pleasant person. He
>insisted that his sidemen call him "Mister King" and they received only
>union scale for gigs. They were quite surprised to learn that Big Joe
>Duskin's band did an even split of the loot.

Ugh. I did not know that.
>
>> I understand that state of the art musical synthesizers have much
>> greater throughput than any "manual" jazz or blues musician can hope

>> to obtain.
>
>Their timing is much more precise and you have none of that nasty
>slurring of notes.

And they play it exactly the same way EVERY time. Digital "perfection".
>
>> Yet people insist on "legacy music modes" like live performance and
>> acoustic instruments.
>
>Remember, we'll have no set asides for those legacy music modes!

Not at all. After all, the rest of the music world has moved on to sampling,
drum machines and technomusic. Why should anyone learn to play an instrument
when the computer can do it so much quicker and without error?
>
>> > I love Cecil's new quest: Gathering support from the dead.
>>
>> Do you hear any of the dead disagreeing with him?
>
>Not as of yet. Cecil is still busy tweaking his story. Stay tuned.

Trivia quiz - do you know how the phrase "stay tuned" came about?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> ...who once performed live on stage as a backup singer for Christine
>> Lavin...
>
>Really?

Yeah, really.

> Fill us in.
>
Several years ago, Keswick Theatre, here in Philly.

Christine Lavin, as you may know, founded the Four Bitchin' Babes. At that
time, they were Ms. Lavin, Debi Smith, Megan McDonough and Sally Fingerett.
During Christine's solo time, she did a song called "Sensitive New Age Guys"
and asked all the men in the audience to come up on stage and back her up. So I
and several dozen others did so. Lotsa fun.

Then came the baton twirling.

73 de Jim, N2EY (just a few miles up the road from the Main Point).

1656. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:14:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221449.01549.00001650@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 31068

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>My view is that the ARRL is a non-profit membership organization which
>has no need for such a position. We all have to trim things from our
>budgets. Our wish list almost always defies the reality of our pockets.

Exactly the deficit that the ARRL is gambling she will be able to turn around.
If it is your belief that the ARRL should not solicit funds from those who are
willing to pay them, that is your belief. I disagree.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1657. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:15:17 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31067

In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > One example that justifies the lower power limit can be
> >
> > > taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
> > > site where thousands of contacts are then made all
> > > over the globe with the DX station usually only running
> > > about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
> > > are with other stations running similar or even lower
> > > power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
> > > do it because they need the power, they do it to
> > > "over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
> > > stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
> > > practice..
> >
> > That's because you don't know better. At times it takes lots of power to
> work
> > those 100 watt DX stations. I had to turn on a full 1400 watts on CW to
> get the
> > Heard Island group on a dying 20 meter band, they could tell I was there
> with
> > the
> > 100 watts but no copy. And when you become DX you see it firsthand. It's a
> real
> > zoo out there as heard from across the pond.
>
> You give probably one of the few examples where the power
> appears justified. MOST, however, of the power stations
> routinely operate at high power to simply drown out the other
> stations (IMHO).
>
> > Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power. They found that 1.5KW
> > caused almost no additional problems to consumer devices than 100 watts
> did. And
> > there has long been rules in place requiring hams to use the minimum power
> > required to complete the desired communication. I for one very rarely turn
> on my
> > amp because I don't often need to.
>

> But you are (IMHO) an exception as many others just crank up the amp
> and operate high power throughout the contest period or until they
> are finally replied to by the DX station they are after.
>
> > Bill you should gain some HF experience before making sweeping
> prouncements on
> > operation there. An Extra Lite alone won't do it.
>
> My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> at the time and for the conditions.

Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time of day. The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions were not favorable. Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more on 10 meter propagation to understand that. I guess that if you can't hear anything the bands aren';t crowded. Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe a few new high tech data modes then :-)

1658. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:17:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114221751.01549.00001653@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 31069

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
>address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
>Moore telling us what the dead believed.

And we have another telling us that it is not possible to infer a conclusion
from a long series of evidence.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1659. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:22:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020114222247.01549.00001654@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 31070

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
>interfere with the adoption of a better mode.

No, I am pointing out that back then, hams willingly exchanged spark for a
better operating mode. Today, they can't exchange spectrally efficient
digital-voice techniques for the scheme of allocating repeater pairs that sit
idle 95% of the time.

Why the difference?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1660. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 03:44:06 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <aAN08.271681$WW.13644200@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31071

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

> On Tue, 15 Jan 2002, Richard Plourde wrote:

> >the current allocations... ponder these...
> >15, 40, and 80 CW only (RTTY and data forbidden)
> >28.100 - 28.300 CW, RTTY and data (normal modes)

> >28.300 - 28.500 CW and SSB only (phone and image forbidden)

> ????? SSB allowed but not "phone"? Then exactly what kind of information
do
> you plan to allow for SSB?

That's right, single-sideband is allowed but not phone. This isn't my plan... this is reality street... this is the lame-o allocations we have now. We can do single-sideband suppressed carrier and single-sideband reduced carrier but not single-sideband full carrier or FM or about 24 other phone modes. but don't get me started.... ;-)

Rich

1661. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:10:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43ABAD.6B448003@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31072

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C4364CE.82F35E89@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Richard Plourde wrote:
> >> PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)
> > >
> > >PACTOR II is "state of the art" for amateur radio, i.e. the best we
> > >have.
> >
> > No it isn't.

What's better?

> > > Can you think of any way to technically improve upon PACTOR II?
> >
> > Yes.

How?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1662. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:18:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43AD93.9DB070C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31073

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C42EAB8.18E93052@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> >> xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error.
> >
> >That's not true for PACTOR II, Jim.
>
> Sure it is.

Nope, you don't have to be dead on. You only have to be in the passband.
Even when the box is receiving CW, it dynamically searches for a signal
using adaptive filtering. You can see it tuning in on the display.

> > From the manual: "Never tune the VFO
> >by hand with very weak or inaudible signals! With very weak or inaudible
> >signals, the PTC2e adjusts its tuning very slowly to minimize tuning error."
> >The DSP processor locates and tracks the signal by autoadjusting the digital
> >filter coefficients. It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal
> >all by itself.
>
> Sure. But you still have to get close by hand. And what does the box do if
> there is more than one PACTOR II signal in the passband?

I suspect it will pick out one of them but I don't know for sure. There are
PACTOR II mailboxes all over the world just waiting for someone to give
them a call on their published frequencies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1663. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:22:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C43AE7A.ECE24156@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31074

N2EY wrote:
> No, you're assuming your conclusion. You ASSUME she would say it was
> "unnecessary", based on your own biases and prejudices.

Pretty good assumption since I got most of my biases and prejudices
from her.

> I say she wouldn't support the existence of amateur radio at all.

She would grant property rights to the people who first homesteaded
the radio frequencies. That would be mostly amateurs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1664. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:41:44 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201142041.1e66fa78@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31075

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message

> Ahhhh - Hans, you sent me more than one. Maybe there's a message
> there. ;-)

Yup. The message is that I worked you more than one time! (Actually it was an opportunity to also enclose a photo of the tribe taken up at our mental rehabilitation site -- the picture on the front of my card was taken in a small bay near the site of the photo on the Xmas card.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

1665. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:53:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43A970.BB34E7E2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31076

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > That's easy say, not always easy to do, particularly when a ham is suddenly
> > > > thrust into a situation where he needs instant communications and all that stuff
> > > > is not at hand.
> > >
> > > Why should that happen, Dick? All my equipment is up and running.
> > > Why would a ham wait for an emergency to start hooking up his
> > > equipment? What if a ham waited for an emergency to buy his
> > > CW transceiver and the hamstore was closed? Get real!
> >
> > At times I find myself thinking "Cecil really couldn't be that much of a dunce" then
> > he comes up with something like this that proves it.
>
> Just responding to your idiotic post, Dick. You didn't answer the question.
> Why would a ham wait for an emergency to wire up his configuration?

I see you're still a dunce.

1666. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:55:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43A9E2.99EF2DC5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31077

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >> Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
> > >
> > >The best one determined by the consumers.
>
> > Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice
> > wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.
>
> There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
> spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
> of modes. Let the market decide.

I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...

1667. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 04:58:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43AAA0.15164FDA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31078

CAM wrote:

> Digital modes without forward error correction are NOT serious modes.

And you have said that ham radio is not a serious endeavor, so that makes it FB.

You can't have it both ways. Either you must 'let the market decide" and accept what it decides or you forget it. There is a reason why many Pactor and other fans have gone to PSK31.

1668. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:00:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43AAED.58C674DF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31079

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > It also requires that you have equipment capable of being set dead-on
> > xx.yyy.zzz MHz with a VERY small error.
>
> That's not true for PACTOR II, Jim. From the manual: "Never tune the VFO
> by hand with very weak or inaudible signals! With very weak or inaudible
> signals, the PTC2e adjusts its tuning very slowly to minimize tuning error."
> The DSP processor locates and tracks the signal by autoadjusting the digital
> filter coefficients. It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal
> all by itself.

What's so amazing about it? DIGIPAN does that on PSK31

1669. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:10:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115001007.20370.00000543@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 31080

In article <Z3M08.102271$fe1.1385886@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I think the HF/MF of post-S25.5 Techs should be a LOT more than the
>current
>> Tech Plus. I'd say about half of the current General allocations is about
>> right.
>
>Which half do you mean? ;-)
>Half the bands, half the spectrum, half the mode?

I mean significant parts of each HF/MF band. At least half as many kHz as
Generals have. Modes: at least CW, RTTY, PSK31, SSB, AM and FM.

Note the "at least" ;-)
>
>> >For General Class, I don't know what the consensus would be but, as the
>> >numbers of Advanced class operators decline the Generals may assume
>Advanced
>> >subbands on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters. The Advanced would have high power
>> >there and Generals the medium power so sharing the same subband edges
>seems
>> >reasonable.
>
>> Nah. Just leave 'em alone.
>
>Yep whatever the masses wants here. I'm sure ARRL would petition if need be.
>
>> >Amateur Extra class should have an additional examination for VE status.
>> >That's all I can think of for that class.
>
>> Yup. "Element V" (5) with all the VE stuff in it.
>
>> >You have also alluded to moving the forty meter band and other issues
>which
>> >were not licensing changes.
>
>> If we get a better setup for 40 than the shared mess that dates back to
>before
>> WW2, some changes may be in order for 40.
>
>> But the basic concept begins to take a reasonable shape:
>

>> Tech is the entry level, with low power, a sampling of spectrum and modes,
>plus
>> an easier test than today (focuses on operating and safety)
>
>Less technical test without electronics but ALL the ARS rules pertaining to
>Technician class operation or amateur operation in general should be fair
>game.

Agreed - if a license class allows it, it should be tested.
>
>> General is midrange, with more power, modes and a more technical test
>
>> Extra is everything, with more emphasis on technical
>
>> VE qualification is separate
>
>> Nobody loses what they've got now, and nobody gets a big freebie exacept
>maybe
>> Techs get more HF.
>
>the current allocations... ponder these...
>
>15, 40, and 80 CW only (RTTY and data forbidden)
>
>28.100 - 28.300 CW, RTTY and data (normal modes)
>
>28.300 - 28.500 CW and SSB only (phone and image forbidden)
>
>HF/MF contains two types of bands...
>
>10, 12, 17, 30, and 160 meters no subbands between General, Advanced, and
>Extra.
>
>15, 20, 40, and 80 meters has subbands between General, Advanced, and Extra.
>General and Advanced have the same CW, RTTY, and data.
>General and Advanced have different subbands for CW, phone, and image.
>
>Well, how should Technician class be included here? What are the arguments
>on this? How can you come up with half that makes sense and thereby, will
>fly?
>
Let's take 'em one at a time. No changes to existing privs for Generals and
above. Please forgive/correct any typos.

To keep the Tech test simple, perhaps Techs should not get 160, 30, 17 or 12.
Just an idea, opposing suggestions welcome. Perhaps Techs should get 160 and
all of the WARC bands...

80 - 3500-3575 CW only, 3575-3725 CW/digital, 3725-4000 cw/digital/phone/image.
Techs get 3550-3650, 3925-4000

40 - 7000-7050 CW only, 7050-7150 CW/digital, 7150-7300 cw/digital/phone/image. Techs get 7025-7100

20 - 14000-14075 CW only, 14075-14150 CW/digital, 14150-14350 cw/digital/phone/image Techs get 14050-14125, 14275-14350

15 - 21000-21075 CW only, 21075-21200 CW/digital, 21200-21450 cw/digital/phone/image Techs get 21050-21125, 21350-21450

10 - 28000-28100 CW only, 28100-28300 CW/digital, 28300-29700 cw/digitalphone image Open to all classes.

If I inadvertently widened any of the 'phone bands, please correct.

The idea is that Techs should have a serious sampling of HF bands and modes, not just 10 meters and a tiny slice of 80/40/15. I'm on the fence about 160 and the WARC bands for Techs - would be interesting to hear ideas pro and con.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1670. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:36:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115003642.05453.00000734@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 31083

In article <qg254u4assl5idccl3ierdba4s9r4uhoqj@4ax.com>, "Bill, KD0HG"
<shoot@spammersonsight.org> writes:

>
>Me, I'm going to get some aspirin and cotton ear plugs or switch to data mode
>if this trend keeps up. Good grief. Gimme a break.
>Save it for the freeband along with the roger beeps and heavy reverb.
>
><vent mode off>
>
>
>-Bill/HG

Bill:

I strongly advise QSY'ing to the digital modes. Not only won't you
have to put up with the tortured audio of the Microphone Morons,
but you'll find a generally more intelligent group of people with which
to communicate. My HF operation has been strictly CW and data
modes for almost a decade now.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1671. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:36:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115003643.05453.00000735@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 31082

In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
>various characters?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by Tom Hanks. Bruce Willis would be an acceptable alternate if Tom weren't available...although, when offered the part, I'm sure he'd clear his calendar!

Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr. No substitute would do.

Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor, although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).

I suggest that you (Jim Miccolis) be played by Alan Alda.

Dave Heil should be portrayed by Dan Akroyd.

Dick Carroll should be played by William C. Macy.

Dick McCollum should be played by Sam Waterston.

Carl Stevenson should be played by Jerry Orbach.

Steve Robeson should be played by Patrick Labyorteaux.

Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1672. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:37:33 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201142137.6afffd51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31081

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message

> Not according to my Southern Baptist preacher. Are you an atheist?

BTW, have you noticed that as you encounter people with IQs above
average you notice that the belief in the boogie man begins to wane,
and by the time it reaches about 110 god-belief also starts to trend
downward?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1673. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 05:58:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#7tMciYnBHA.1416@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31084

Larry Roll K3LT wrote

> Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
> Tom Hanks.

Naw, Carroll O'Connor only. No substitutes!

I chatted with NS3E on 20 this afternoon. Told him to tell you
"Howdy".

73, Hans, K0HB

1674. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:00:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C569.3296D4E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31085

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
> > > >
> > > > How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> > > > air?
> > >
> > > Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.
> >
> > To some.
>
> Moderation in all things, Dave. Ham radio ain't no religion.

You don't seem to follow your own advice when it comes to newsgroup
postings.

Dave K8MN
```

1675. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:01:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C5A6.6263140F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31086

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure I do, Cecil. I assumed that we were talking about folks who don't
> > > > > have a mental handicap.
> > > >
> > > > I inferred that you meant "any person" above.
> > >
> > > That wasn't very smart of you at all.
>
> If I said, "I've yet to meet the person who can learn morse", what
> would you think?

I'd think you want to begin playing games as usual.

Dave K8MN
```

1676. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:04:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C64B.186A8140@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31087

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
> > address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
> > Moore telling us what the dead believed.
>
> I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your
> own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed
> to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that
> Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.

That's simply stupid, Cecil. My own opinion is that we do not know, nor will be ever know what Ayn Rand's view of morse testing was. If you could come up with a valid method of determining her views, it wouldn't amout to diddly squat.

On with your new quest: Poll the dead.

Dave K8MN

1677. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:09:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C7AF.C3B389B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31088

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C431C8B.4F941AE0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3C420379.FDBE3643@earthlink.net>...

> Trivia quiz - do you know how the phrase "stay tuned" came about?

Nope, but it has to be nearly as ancient as radio...

> >> ...who once performed live on stage as a backup singer for Christine
> >> Lavin...
> >>
> >Really?
>
> Yeah, really.
>
> > Fill us in.
> >
> Several years ago, Keswick Theatre, here in Philly.
>
> Christine Lavin, as you may know, founded the Four Bitchin' Babes. At that
> time, they were Ms. Lavin, Debi Smith, Megan McDonough and Sally Fingerett.
> During Christine's solo time, she did a song called "Sensitive New Age Guys"
> and asked all the men in the audience to come up on stage and back her up. So I
> and several dozen others did so. Lotsa fun.
>
> Then came the baton twirling.

That has to be one of the more surreal events of the decade.

Dave K8MN

1678. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:11:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C80F.F7276100@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31089

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >My view is that the ARRL is a non-profit membership organization which
> >has no need for such a position. We all have to trim things from our
> >budgets. Our wish list almost always defies the reality of our pockets.
>
> Exactly the deficit that the ARRL is gambling she will be able to turn around.
> If it is your belief that the ARRL should not solicit funds from those who are
> willing to pay them, that is your belief. I disagree.

The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.

Dave K8MN

1679. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:14:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43C8C3.5894BE22@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31090

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
> >address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
> >Moore telling us what the dead believed.
>
> And we have another telling us that it is not possible to infer a conclusion
> from a long series of evidence.

I'm still alive so I can let you know what I'm thinking. I think that it is quite impossible to divine the views of a dead human being who never stated those views. If you believe otherwise, let us know what Richard Nixon thought about morse testing and, more importantly, how he communicated this information to you.

Dave K8MN

1680. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 06:19:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31091

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> No substitute would do.

There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...

Dave K8MN

1681. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 07:44:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115024437.07868.00000988@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31092

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
>Date: 1/14/2002 5:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ORMpAAVnBHA.1356@cpimsnntpa03>

>I'm not asking you to add anything. Just understand that I'll probably
>choose to ignore your station in favor of someone I can hear.

But...but...but...HANS! You sent me two real QSL's and one cyber card said
you heard me just fine!

> I reserve the right to
>ignore piss-weak signals unless they indicate an emergency.

But...but...but...HANS!

>If you insist on running QRP, don't get all "noble" about being ignored.
>If you feel that you can't afford the amp and electric bills, get a better
>job
>or learn to live with the shortcomings of your radio station.

I am not running QRP! Not by the commonly accepted definition, anyway.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1682. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 07:48:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115024800.07868.00000989@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31093

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@arrl.net
>Date: 1/14/2002 5:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <#HNgLJVnBHA.1224@cpimsnntpa02>

>My walleye rig has 7 sonar transducers, 3 sonar displays, 2 GPS
>receivers, and marine VHF radio.

And where do you keep the grenades?

>I find that many of the "noble" fishermen with lesser equipment
>tend to keep a set of binoculars handy so they can follow me to
>my fishing spots which I have found with superior electronics.

I'll be damned if I can see you from here, Hans, but I catch a few fish
too...No sonar...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1683. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 08:27:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43DBA1.E57AA4EB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31094

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > One example that justifies the lower power limit can be
> >
> > > taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
> > > site where thousands of contacts are then made all
> > > over the globe with the DX station usually only running
> > > about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
> > > are with other stations running similar or even lower
> > > power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
> > > do it because they need the power, they do it to
> > > "over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
> > > stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
> > > practice..
> >
> > That's because you don't know better. At times it takes lots of power to
> work
> > those 100 watt DX stations. I had to turn on a full 1400 watts on CW to
> get the
> > Heard Island group on a dying 20 meter band, they could tell I was there
> with
> > the
> > 100 watts but no copy. And when you become DX you see it firsthand. It's a
> real
> > zoo out there as heard from across the pond.
>
> You give probably one of the few examples where the power
> appears justified. MOST, however, of the power stations
> routinely operate at high power to simply drown out the other
> stations (IMHO).
>
> > Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power. They found that 1.5KW
> > caused almost no additional problems to consumer devices than 100 watts
> did. And
> > there has long been rules in place requiring hams to use the minimum power
> > required to complete the desired communication. I for one very rarely turn
> on my
> > amp because I don't often need to.
>

> But you are (IMHO) an exception as many others just crank up the amp
> and operate high power throughout the contest period or until they
> are finally replied to by the DX station they are after.
>
> > Bill you should gain some HF experience before making sweeping
> prouncements on
> > operation there. An Extra Lite alone won't do it.
>
> My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> at the time and for the conditions.

So when he called CQ he knew that a station would answer him which he didn't need high power to work. Right.

1684. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 08:31:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43DC64.27482608@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31095

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Operating in plain English means performing a function.
> > > >
> > > > How can you disagree that in ham radio, 'operating' means to get on the
> > > > air?
> > >
> > > Ham radio is a very minor part of existence.
> >
> > To some.
>
> Moderation in all things, Dave. Ham radio ain't no religion.

Yeah, Dave, to some trolling, wordmeistering, playing adversarial semantic
games and one hit $hit take priority.

1685. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 08:34:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C43DD2D.47043ED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31096

CAM wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > So what's your point...preparation is a waste of time?
>
> Dick wants a macho challenge so he doesn't ever prepare. :-)
> During an emergency, you will find him sifting through grains
> of sand looking for an NPN junction.

Ever hear of "The best laid plans..."? You dreamers seem to think that everything will go as planned. So go without any alternates and see what happens.

1686. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 10:47:45 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31097

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> get the job done.
>

Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that. Lugging a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and running in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what Dick was referring to.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1687. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 10:52:28 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <oJT08.29746$V55.2579149@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31098

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your
> own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed
> to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that
> Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
>

I wasn't aware that the Libertarian Party had a plank in their platform
regarding Morse testing. Could you direct us to that URL?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1688. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 11:09:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115060951.21007.00001540@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 31099

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>I'm still alive so I can let you know what I'm thinking. I think that
>it is quite impossible to divine the views of a dead human being who
>never stated those views. If you believe otherwise, let us know what
>Richard Nixon thought about morse testing and, more importantly, how he
>communicated this information to you.

Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the beliefs of
people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime? How odd.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1689. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 11:14:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115061400.21007.00001541@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 31100

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
>them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
>raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.

I haven't misundertsood at all, Dave. I know that the League has long solicited funds. I just don't think they have done so very well and I don't think they have scratched the surface (even to this day -- yet) on what can be done over and above sending you a letter.

As just one example, do you know of the existance of a fund called the ARRL Lab Fund? It is endowed to help the Lab purchase the test equipment it uses to do Product Review testing? Most hams don't, yet I believe that some would contribute to this willingly. An organized and effective fundraising effort is best done by someone who knows what they are doing, not willy nilly by people guessing at what are the right things to do.

You can support the latter (the old way) if you wish, but I opt for competence over bumbling every time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1690. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 11:18:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115061804.21007.00001542@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 31201

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...

From some of the statements of the FCC, he might have to say, "Gee, I sure miss ham radio." ...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1691. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 12:35:16 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <8mV08.113$%D4.35606@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31202

Look at Michigan..... there is no more industry here anymore. The automotive industry is constantly cutting back on personell. The support businesses that cater to the auto industries aren't a decent choice as these people are only making a little more than the Mexicans that are making after the companies have shifted their operations there, and other places.

Mostly low paying service jobs anymore (6-9 bucks per hour). A person needs to work multiple jobs in order to survive. Michigan may be a place to come back to, but if you are looking to start a career, or in a major life-changing/career changing event, don't do that here in Michigan.

Ryan
KC8PMX

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:0FG08.374168$W8.13580717@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> > And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....
> >
> > Ryan
> >
>
> In one of the better pieces of wordsmithing, Orange County CA was
> described in a bio of one of Nixon's henchmen as "everything you ever
> hated about Indiana grown to grotesque proportions in the desert sun".
>
>

1692. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 12:35:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <9mV08.114$%D4.35640@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31203

I think you have that backwards slightly.... Florida is Michigan in a much better mood (and warmer too) , but with more Cubans and Hatians. :)

Ryan

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3C433CF8.79E723F4@psu.edu...
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> > > And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....
>
> Someone once wrote that Michagan was Florida in a much better mood.
>
> - mike -

1693. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 12:35:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <amV08.115$%D4.35639@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31204

Hey Cecil,

Alzheimers patients can learn morse.... and again, and again, and again, and again.......

And there's the people with "Sometimer's" disease. Sometimes they remember, sometimes they don't! :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C42EBB2.9AE1100E@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've yet to meet the person who can't learn morse.
>
> Know anybody with Alzheimer's?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1694. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 13:09:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115080940.26452.00000210@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 31205

In article <3C43ABAD.6B448003@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C4364CE.82F35E89@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Richard Plourde wrote:
>> >> PacTor is nowhere near "State of the Art". (I rest my case) ;-)
>> >
>> >PACTOR II is "state of the art" for amateur radio, i.e. the best we
>> >have.
>>
>> No it isn't.
>
>What's better?

That would be telling.

>
>> > Can you think of any way to technically improve upon PACTOR II?
>>
>> Yes.
>
>How?

It is obvious to even the most casual observer who knows anyhting about the
subject.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1695. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 13:09:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115080940.26452.00000209@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 31206

In article <3C43A9E2.99EF2DC5@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> > >The best one determined by the consumers.
>>
>> > Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB
>voice
>> > wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.
>>
>> There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
>> spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
>> of modes. Let the market decide.
>
> I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...
>
It already has.

On HF/MF, the "market" has decided on SSB, which has been used by hams for 70 years and even longer by AT&T. CW is a close second.

On VHF/UHF, the "market" has decided on FM, which has been used by ham for at least 50 years and commerically for almost 70 years (thank you Major Armstrong).

Them's the facts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1696. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 13:21:56 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a21a9h010pv@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31208

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020115003643.05453.00000735@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >
> >Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
> >various characters?
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
> Tom Hanks. Bruce Willis would be an acceptable alternate if Tom
> weren't available...although, when offered the part, I'm sure he'd clear
> his calendar!
>
> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> No substitute would do.
>
> Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
> although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).
>
> I suggest that you (Jim Miccolis) be played by Alan Alda.
>
> Dave Heil should be portrayed by Dan Akroyd.
>
> Dick Carroll should be played by William C. Macy.
>
> Dick McCollum should be played by Sam Waterston.
>
> Carl Stevenson should be played by Jerry Orbach.
>
> Steve Robeson should be played by Patrick Labyorteaux.
>
> Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I would like Gary Busey to protray me.

1697. Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 13:27:16 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 31207

Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the group.)

If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs as a result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other words, what will be the purpose of NCI? I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is finite and a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then become the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the other.) Take care and 73.

-.. . Mark

1698. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 13:51:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C442774.718320BE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31209

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> >
> > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > get the job done.
> >
>
> Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that. Lugging
> a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and running
> in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what Dick
> was referring to.

Aws, in Bill's Buttoned Down World no such thing will ever happen.

1699. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 14:04:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C442A98.3537F8E3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31210

Mark Pearsal wrote:

> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the group.)
>
> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs as a
> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other words, what
> will be the purpose of NCI? I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is finite and
> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then become
> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the other.)
> Take care and 73.

No sweat, Mark, the geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC has decided that CW must go. The one think that you can't have if you're a digigeek or a government employee is to be viewed by the leading edge guys as "retro", holding beliefs in anything but leading edge, ya know, stuff that can generate big bucks. Not good for your career path. Plus Government guys gotta spend money, geeks gotta constantly come up with "stuff" to sell us all, whether or not we "need" it. Makes the world go round
. So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting that CW is a good real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has served as such for over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into stone. No matter what the facts really are.

1700. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 14:39:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4432B9.79F16A10@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31211

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...
>
> From some of the statements of the FCC, he might have to say, "Gee, I sure miss
> ham radio." ...
>

More geek-threats. If they are determined to take ham radio away for that reason there's no saving it anyway, and what resulted would be so different it really wouldn't matter to me. And no, I'm not a cw-only-and-forever type as Cecil and others have cast me because I support a code test.. I'd bet I have more digital gear than Cecil has.

1701. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:15:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115101511.17220.00000009@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 31212

In article <3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
>> No substitute would do.
>
>There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Hmmm, I don't watch the Drew Carey show, but I'm sure Kim
does.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1702. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:15:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115101512.17220.00000010@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 31213

In article <#7tMciYnBHA.1416@cpimsnntpa04>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote
>
>> Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
>> Tom Hanks.
>
>Naw, Carroll O'Connor only. No substitutes!
>
>I chatted with NS3E on 20 this afternoon. Told him to tell you
>"Howdy".

Hansl:

Well, I'll be sure to say, "Howdy" right back! Of course, I can do that
any time! Ed and I are "partners in crime" -- ham radio/shooting
buddies. He has got one of the most extraordinary key collections
I've ever seen, and he's a homebrewer of telegraph/CW keys.

I'd have to disagree with Carroll O'Connor (since he's SK), but
G. Gordon Liddy would be an acceptable substitute!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1703. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:19:10 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C44486F.2DF39C96@psu.edu>
Source record: 31214

Naa, its a visual joke. Look at a map of Florida first, then a map of Michagan.

Hint: In one episode of the Simpsons, Homer is distressed when finding
out that Florida is one of the few states theat the family hasn't been
kicked out of on vacation and says "Oh no, not Florida, that's America's
wang!"

- Mike -

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> I think you have that backwards slightly.... Florida is Michigan in a much
> better mood (and warmer too) , but with more Cubans and Hatians. :)
>
> Ryan
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C433CF8.79E723F4@psu.edu...
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > > news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> > > > And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....
> > >
> > Someone once wrote that Michagan was Florida in a much better mood.
> > >
> > > - mike -

1704. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:36:03 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <u3yaRldnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31215

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> I'll be damned if I can see you from here, Hans, but I catch a few fish
> too...No sonar...

Great! And I bet you have a lot of fun at it, too. Nobody "needs" to
have anything more than the very basics if that suits their style.

But in answer to your question " Do they really have any more fun
or catch a "better fish" with all that stuff?", the answer in my case
is "YES". If you're familiar with your lake, you can find your spot.
Even if I'm *not* familiar with your lake, I can find "the" spot on
your spot, and I can return to within a dozen feet of it next week
or tonight in the dark if I want, even if it's in the middle of the
lake with no "crooked birch tree and yellow cabin" to triangulate
in sight.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1705. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:38:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C444CEA.8E8695F5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31217

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >I'm still alive so I can let you know what I'm thinking. I think that
> >it is quite impossible to divine the views of a dead human being who
> >never stated those views. If you believe otherwise, let us know what
> >Richard Nixon thought about morse testing and, more importantly, how he
> >communicated this information to you.
>
> Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the beliefs of
> people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime? How odd.

I "relieve believe" that we can't divine something from the aether if a person who has expired has not addressed a particular issue. It becomes more difficult to gather such information if there are no indications that someone who is dead had much or any knowledge of our little topic of interest. Sitting around playing games about what Ayn Rand might have believed regarding CW testing or contemplating what Beethoven might have thought of Windows XP are things I'd consider *odd*.

Dave K8MN

1706. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:42:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OS1ypodnBHA.1412@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31216

Larry Roll K3LT wrote

> I'd have to disagree with Carroll O'Connor (since he's SK),

Jim said "You are not limited to the current crop of actors - you can pick actors from the past, at any time of their careers."

Carroll O'Connor in his Archie Bunker role is soooooooo right for you. Take off a little hair, and you even *look* like him!

73, Hans, K0HB

1707. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:48:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C444F43.626E65FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31218

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Moderation in all things, Dave. Ham radio ain't no religion.
>
> You don't seem to follow your own advice when it comes to newsgroup
> postings.

Huh? Most of my postings have been criticisms against considering Morse code to be sacred.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1708. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:52:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C44502B.DE1F30E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31219

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
> >them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
> >raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.
>
> I haven't misundertsood at all, Dave. I know that the League has long
> solicited funds. I just don't think they have done so very well and I don't
> think they have scratched the surface (even to this day -- yet) on what can be
> done over and above sending you a letter.

If you believe, as you stated, that I am against any solicitation of
funds by the League, you have misunderstood. Perhaps the League hasn't
"scratched the surface" in attempts to separate me from my money. It
sounds like we're in for a spate of ARRL telephone solicitors or cable
TV info-mercials advising us of "our responsibilities". If future
attempts are seen by those being solicited as heavy handed as these
first epistles, it'll be a long time before I decide to contribute
anything again to the League for *any* purpose.

> As just one example, do you know of the existance of a fund called the ARRL Lab
> Fund? It is endowed to help the Lab purchase the test equipment it uses to do
> Product Review testing? Most hams don't, yet I believe that some would
> contribute to this willingly. An organized and effective fundraising effort is
> best done by someone who knows what they are doing, not willy nilly by people
> guessing at what are the right things to do.

So you are describing all earlier attempts by the League at the
solicitations of funds for construction of the building you now work in,
the renovation of W1AW, contributions to various funds by the ARRL
Foundation as "willy nilly" by "people guessing at what are the right
things to do"? Neat.

> You can support the latter (the old way) if you wish, but I opt for competence
> over bumbling every time.

The old way, to my knowledge, is the only way your new fund raiser has
done it thus far. The new which has been added is the preachy tone from
a person who isn't involved with ham radio except as concerns her pay
check. The old, old way got some money from me. The new, old way has
only honked me off. She succeeded only in alienating a long time life
member. Think the campaign has worked in obtaining funds from K8MN?

Dave K8MN

1709. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:52:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C445037.D20FFDE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31223

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
> > spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
> > of modes. Let the market decide.
>
> I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...

I will say freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society
is the way to go, just as I always have said.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1710. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:53:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C445085.516F6DF9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31220

Krell wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020115003643.05453.00000735@mb-mq.aol.com...
> > In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
> > > >various characters?
> > > >
> > > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
> > Tom Hanks. Bruce Willis would be an acceptable alternate if Tom
> > weren't available...although, when offered the part, I'm sure he'd clear
> > his calendar!
> >
> > Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> > No substitute would do.
> >
> > Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
> > although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).
> >
> > I suggest that you (Jim Miccolis) be played by Alan Alda.
> >
> > Dave Heil should be portrayed by Dan Akroyd.
> >
> > Dick Carroll should be played by William C. Macy.
> >
> > Dick McCollum should be played by Sam Waterston.
> >
> > Carl Stevenson should be played by Jerry Orbach.
> >
> > Steve Robeson should be played by Patrick Labyorteaux.
> >
> > Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I would like Gary Busey to protray me.

...but he'd have to wear a mask.

Dave K8MN

1711. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:55:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4450F3.41FA14F4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31222

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> >> No substitute would do.
> >
> >There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Hmmm, I don't watch the Drew Carey show, but I'm sure Kim
> does.

It is worth one viewing to establish a Mimi-Roseanne baseline, Larry.

Dave K8MN

1712. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:56:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44514A.91F028E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31225

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'd bet I have more digital gear than Cecil has.

You may have more digital gear than Cecil needs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1713. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 15:58:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C445194.B456F6AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31224

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Moderation in all things, Dave. Ham radio ain't no religion.
> >
> > You don't seem to follow your own advice when it comes to newsgroup
> > postings.
>
> Huh? Most of my postings have been criticisms against considering Morse
> code to be sacred.

How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
religion.

Dave K8MN

1714. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:00:41 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uQPQCzdnBHA.1608@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31221

KD0HG wrote

> those $2 Radio Shack electret cartridges in a fancy box, otherwise called brand H mics ....

Those "brand H" mics are not electret.

Awwww, shit, I went and spoiled his rant!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1715. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:01:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C445267.F5FCDA66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31226

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Digital modes without forward error correction are NOT serious modes.
>
> And you have said that ham radio is not a serious endeavor, so that makes it
> FB.
>
> You can't have it both ways. Either you must 'let the market decide" and
> accept what it decides or you forget it. There is a reason why many Pactor and
> other fans have gone to PSK31.

Obviously, because it's fun. The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
forward error correction is not a serious mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1716. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:03:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4452DB.75D9363@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31227

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > So what's your point...preparation is a waste of time?
> > >
> > Dick wants a macho challenge so he doesn't ever prepare. :-)
> > During an emergency, you will find him sifting through grains
> > of sand looking for an NPN junction.
>
> Ever hear of "The best laid plans..."? You dreamers seem to think that
> everything will go as planned. So go without any alternates and see what
> happens.

Thanks very much, Dick, for allowing me to decide what is best for me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1717. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:06:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C445370.9E2F65D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31229

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal all by itself.
>
> What's so amazing about it? DIGIPAN does that on PSK31

It's called digital adaptive filtering, Dick, you know the techniques
that you incessantly bad mouth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1718. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:08:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C445406.22FA38BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31231

K0HB wrote:
> BTW, have you noticed that as you encounter people with IQs above
> average you notice that the belief in the boogie man begins to wane,
> and by the time it reaches about 110 god-belief also starts to trend
> downward?

I have noticed that, Hans. Does it follow that atheists have higher
IQ's than agnostics? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1719. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:12:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4454FF.822D1C65@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31232

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> > Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
>
> That's simply stupid, Cecil. My own opinion is that we do not know, nor
> will be ever know what Ayn Rand's view of morse testing was.

That's perfectly fine, Dave. Unlike you, I support freedom of choice
in the possession of personal opinions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1720. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:13:28 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#6Z#L6dnBHA.1832@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31228

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

>
> How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> religion.

Pot, meet Kettle

Top 5 Posters Jan 2002 Month to date
(from
http://mygate.mailgate.org/report/rec/rec.radio.amateur.policy?date=01/2002)

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
N2EY <n2ey@aol.com>
W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com>

1721. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:15:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C445584.14D21947@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31233

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> >
> > I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your
> > own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed
> > to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that
> > Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> > Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
>
> I wasn't aware that the Libertarian Party had a plank in their platform
> regarding Morse testing. Could you direct us to that URL?

Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
requirements, and regulations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1722. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:17:03 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eAvwL8dnBHA.1356@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31230

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> forward error correction is not a serious mode.

Sounds more like an opinion than a fact.

Define "serious mode". Show proof.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1723. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:20:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4456B4.3EFC5BCB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31234

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the beliefs of
> > people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime? How odd.
>
> I "relieve believe" that we can't divine something from the aether if a
> person who has expired has not addressed a particular issue.

Airplanes and radio waves had not been invented when The Constitution was written, Dave, yet it covers those aspects pretty well. Ayn Rand was a prolific writer. She stated her principles many times. That you are incapable of understanding and/or extending Ayn Rand's principles to concrete present day examples is a serious problem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1724. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 16:27:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44585F.DBB3986F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31235

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting that CW is a good
> real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has served as such for
> over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into stone.

Uhhhhhh Dick, CW is NOT going to be outlawed. It will simply have to
compete on its own merits in a free market of modes in a hobby in a
free society.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1725. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 17:06:47 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#atB#XenBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31236

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
>Does it follow that atheists have higher
> IQ's than agnostics? :-)
>

"Whoever undertakes to set himself up as judge in the field of Truth and
Knowledge is shipwrecked by the laughter of the gods." --- Einstein

1726. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 17:19:33 UTC
From: Fwankie No License <Fwankie@BARFlittleBoy.com>
Message-ID: <a21o88$mv0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31237
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a1tdnm$3nl$g@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Jackeats Shit" <Jack718@jqmza.net> slobbered in message
> news:a1suqe$os$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
> > > > >
> > > > On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net>
> > wrote:
> > > > > : --
> > > > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> > > > > : pschleck@novia.net
> > > > > : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> > > > > : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
> > > > >
> > > > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> > > > > : pschleck@gonix.com
> > > > > : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> > > > > : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> > > > > :
> > > > >
> > > > Do you even READ your own posts?
> > > >
> > > Do you?
> > > >
> > > Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> > > revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> > > news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
> > > >
> > > "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own
anonymous
> > > status makes the story even less credible."
> > > >
> > Roger, get off
>
> That's sick, even from a feltcher like you, Jackeats Shit.
>
> Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
```

> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
>
> "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> status makes the story even less credible."
>
>
Roger, tell us why the authorieties recently visited you and
questioned you, or would you rather have us post it here
unedited? because I am sure you will not be truthful with us.

Fwankie

1727. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 17:45:59 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.15.12.45.58.952340.30621@arrl.org>
Source record: 31239

On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 00:36:43 -0500, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>,
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>>Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
>>various characters?
>
> Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?

Ed Hare should be played by Steve Buscemi.

Bill Sohl should be played by Tony Danza. Or Matt LeBlanc.

(Me, I'm not around here enough to get star treatment. Just have an extra
[no pun] play me. Or Benjamin Bratt. Take your pick.)

Jon

1728. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 17:49:47 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uo3X$venBHA.1280@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31238

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020112075244.14268.00000781@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Put it all in a single easily portablebox and you won't have to force
it.
> >I'll buy one.
>
> I have seen you imply that Morse code equipment and operatin is the
equivalent
> of a single easily portable box. Perhaps you are saying that one does not
have
> to force Morse code use, either?

Here's a solution someone (N0AX) suggested.

Perhaps the correct method is to FORBID the use of Morse Code in
some way. The basic "Oh yeah?" instinct should take care of the problem.
Then some hacker would "discover" the magic of sending encoded info
through the audio channel - there would be a stampede.

The techie competitiveness thrives on "I can do this hard thing
better than you. Watch this!" (bang, crash, screech, tinkle-tinkle-tinkle,
wobbadawobbadawobbadawobbadawobbadawobbada, thunk - sirens
optional)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1729. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 17:55:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <22_08.103245$fe1.1452372@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31240

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.15.12.45.58.952340.30621@arrl.org...
> On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 00:36:43 -0500, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>,
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
> >>various characters?
> >
> > Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?
>
> Ed Hare should be played by Steve Buscemi.
>
> Bill Sohl should be played by Tony Danza. Or Matt LeBlanc.
>
> (Me, I'm not around here enough to get star treatment. Just have an
extra
> [no pun] play me. Or Benjamin Bratt. Take your pick.)
>
> Jon

Whoever you pick I can envision a Method actor asking 'what is my
motivation?'

1730. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 18:09:14 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.15.13.09.14.568177.4195@arrl.org>
Source record: 31241

On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 12:55:10 -0500, Richard McCollum wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2002.01.15.12.45.58.952340.30621@arrl.org...
>> (Me, I'm not around here enough to get star treatment. Just have an
> extra
>> [no pun] play me. Or Benjamin Bratt. Take your pick.)
>
> Whoever you pick I can envision a Method actor asking 'what is my
> motivation?'

Cool! I like it!

Jon

1731. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 18:57:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C447B90.52C8E63A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31242

Dave Heil wrote:
> How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> religion.

I know you would like to restrict r.r.a.p to posters who agree with
you, Dave, but it ain't gonna happen.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1732. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 18:59:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C447C09.B1FE2622@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31243

K0HB wrote:
> Perhaps the correct method is to FORBID the use of Morse Code in
> some way. The basic "Oh yeah?" instinct should take care of the problem.
> Then some hacker would "discover" the magic of sending encoded info
> through the audio channel - there would be a stampede.

I wonder how many hams would be law-abiding if CW were outlawed? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1733. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:08:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C447E3D.36D9248E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31247

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> > forward error correction is not a serious mode.
>
> Sounds more like an opinion than a fact.

Very few facts are posted to this newsgroup, Hans. You can assume
that every posting is an opinion and be pretty close to the facts.

> Define "serious mode". Show proof.

A mode that tends to overcome fades, interference, and phase shifts.
Any mode that does not overcome fades, interference, and phase shifts
is not very useful for HF digital. RTTY and PSK31 are examples.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1734. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:09:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C447E39.6D5E53AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31244

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> > > Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
> >
> > That's simply stupid, Cecil. My own opinion is that we do not know, nor
> > will be ever know what Ayn Rand's view of morse testing was.
>
> That's perfectly fine, Dave. Unlike you, I support freedom of choice
> in the possession of personal opinions.

You are perfectly free to choose believe in something stupid. You certainly won't be first. Just don't expect most folks to put much credence in your view. I'm sure your belief will provide ample opportunity for entertainment as you attempt to divine what Ayn Rand thought of rap music and HDTV.

Dave K8MN

1735. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:10:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C447EAC.690344AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31245

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> >
> > How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> > religion.
>
> Pot, meet Kettle
>
> Top 5 Posters Jan 2002 Month to date
> (from
> http://mygate.mailgate.org/report/rec/rec.radio.amateur.policy?date=01/2002)
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com>
> W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net>
> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com>

Cecil, as you'll recall, put out the call for moderation in all things.

Dave K8MN

1736. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:11:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C447EE0.3E99B92B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31246

CAM wrote:
>
> Arnie Macy wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" wrote ...
> > >
> > > I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your
> > > own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed
> > > to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that
> > > Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> > > Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
> >
> > I wasn't aware that the Libertarian Party had a plank in their platform
> > regarding Morse testing. Could you direct us to that URL?
>
> Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> requirements, and regulations.

...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.

Dave K8MN

1737. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:11:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C447EF4.4C4171D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31248

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
> although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).

I want Don Rickles to play me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1738. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:15:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C447FB5.7C0871C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31249

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the beliefs of
> > > people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime? How odd.
> >
> > I "relieve believe" that we can't divine something from the aether if a
> > person who has expired has not addressed a particular issue.
>
> Airplanes and radio waves had not been invented when The Constitution was
> written, Dave, yet it covers those aspects pretty well. Ayn Rand was a
> prolific writer. She stated her principles many times. That you are
> incapable of understanding and/or extending Ayn Rand's principles to
> concrete present day examples is a serious problem.

The Constitution isn't a being, Cecil. While we know what the
constitution covers, we don't know what Tom Jefferson or John Adams
thought of airplanes and radio waves. Ayn Rand's work was not done by a
group of men drafting a document which set up a government. Get real.

That you are capable of drawing a comparison between Ayn Rand and the
U.S. Constitution demonstrates a real problem.

Dave K8MN

1739. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:16:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C448015.776B83D6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31250

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> >Does it follow that atheists have higher
> > IQ's than agnostics? :-)
> >
>
> "Whoever undertakes to set himself up as judge in the field of Truth and
> Knowledge is shipwrecked by the laughter of the gods." --- Einstein

"Einstein didn't know what the hell he was talking about!" -- Ayn Rand
(as channeled through Cecil Moore)

1740. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:19:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4480AD.8E74D1DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31351

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> > religion.
>
> I know you would like to restrict r.r.a.p to posters who agree with
> you, Dave, but it ain't gonna happen.

I know you'd like to restrict an individual's participation in amateur radio but it ain't likely to happen. Go preach your moderation in all things to someone who doesn't care if you practice what you preach.

Dave K8MN

1741. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:20:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4480FF.3062D834@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31352

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> > > religion.
> >
> > I know you would like to restrict r.r.a.p to posters who agree with
> > you, Dave, but it ain't gonna happen.
>
> I know you'd like to restrict an individual's participation in amateur
> radio but it ain't likely to happen.

I have no desire to restrict anyone for doing anything other than
violating my rights and freedoms.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1742. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:24:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4481E5.E753AE95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31353

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > >
> > >Does it follow that atheists have higher
> > > IQ's than agnostics? :-)
> > >
> >
> > "Whoever undertakes to set himself up as judge in the field of Truth and
> > Knowledge is shipwrecked by the laughter of the gods." --- Einstein
>
> "Einstein didn't know what the hell he was talking about!" -- Ayn Rand
> (as channeled through Cecil Moore)

Sorry, Dave, I don't believe in a supernatural. And Ayn Rand doesn't
need channeling. She made it perfectly clear what she believed in
her abundant principled writings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1743. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:27:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4482AE.3BD30B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31354

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm sure your belief will provide ample
> opportunity for entertainment as you attempt to divine what Ayn Rand
> thought of rap music and HDTV.

You appear to believe that it is impossible to tell the meanings of
writings after the author dies. I feel sorry for you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1744. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:29:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44830B.5856249F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31356

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > requirements, and regulations.
>
> ...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.

Since their considerations are quite objective, I don't see anything
wrong with that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1745. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:31:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201151131.65e0f509@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31355

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<OS1ypodnBHA.1412@cpimsnntpa04>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote

> > I'd have to disagree with Carroll O'Connor (since he's SK),
>
> Jim said "You are not limited to the current crop of actors - you can
> pick actors from the past, at any time of their careers."

Yup. It's a game of imagination.

Minor Hollywood mods like changing hair color/length/amount are also allowed.
>
> Carroll O'Connor in his Archie Bunker role is soooooo right for
> you. Take off a little hair, and you even *look* like him!

Hans is getting GOOD at this game!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1746. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:31:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4483AB.D886A3A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31357

Dave Heil wrote:
> That you are capable of drawing a comparison between Ayn Rand and the
> U.S. Constitution demonstrates a real problem.

I drew a comparison between the authors of The Constitution and the
author of Ayn Rand's writings. Do you think Thomas Jefferson and
James Madison didn't believe in the first amendment?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1747. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 19:59:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201151159.335f7768@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31358

radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal) wrote in message
news:<20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the group.)
>
> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs as a
> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other words, what
> will be the purpose of NCI?

Mark,

Although I'm not a member of NCI, I think it's clear they would simply
continue the quest to reduce/eliminate code testing. If S25.5 survives
WRC 2003, there's always the next WRC.

> I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is finite and
> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then become
> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the other.)

Sure - but NCI doesn't want that! The way things are going, it looks
like the FCC wants to end code testing, so why take a chance with a
poll/survey that might upset the apple cart?

The MAJORITY of those who commented on 98-143 wanted AT LEAST 2 code
test speeds, but the FCC ignored them. (This is according to an NCI
count of the comments, too!)

Consider that NCI membership consists of, at most, a few thousand
folks who have bothered to click a few buttons on the website. No
dues, no expiration, no removal from the rolls unless the member
specifically decides to unjoin.

The way things are going, I'd be really surprised if S25.5 survived
WRC 2003. You can expect code testing in the USA and several other
countries to disappear shortly thereafter.

The interesting question is - what then for NCI once their avowed job
is done?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1748. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 20:51:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uSFfaVgnBHA.1668@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31359

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Sorry, Dave, I don't believe in a supernatural. And Ayn Rand doesn't
> need channeling. She made it perfectly clear what she believed in
> her abundant principled writings.

I find that someone like Cecil, who claims to reject the cult of religion, has been sucked into the cult of Objectivism. Now Cecil will object that Objectivism is not a cult (it's not religious) but religion is not a necessary component of a cult. Objectivism is a cult of personality. A cultic flaw in Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is its belief that absolute knowledge and "final Truth" (her words) are attainable through reason, that therefore that there are absolutes of right and wrong knowledge and of moral and immoral thought and action. For Objectivists, once a principle has been discovered by (their version) of reason to be True, the discussion is at an end. If you disagree with their principle, then your reasoning is flawed. This is the same circular argument found in the Bible -- this book is true because this book says that this book is true.

But perhaps Cecil is (again) putting us on. The evidence is in his oft asked question "What's wrong with live and let live?". Central to Ayn Rands philosophy is the opposite moral principle (in her words) "Judge, and be prepared to be judged."

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1749. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 21:02:49 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <78ed53aab501b26a3902f7dd51a7cbcd.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31360

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C447E3D.36D9248E@IEEE.org...

> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > > The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> > > forward error correction is not a serious mode.
> >
> > Sounds more like an opinion than a fact.
>
> Very few facts are posted to this newsgroup, Hans. You can assume
> that every posting is an opinion ......

But you specifically called it a fact, Cecil, so nothing was left
to "assume". You can't have it both ways, as by weasel wording
in the form of "Here are the opinions on which my facts are
based."

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1750. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 21:32:48 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <4e118.375851$W8.13700521@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31361

> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> >> I think the HF/MF of post-S25.5 Techs should be a LOT more
> > than the current Tech Plus. I'd say about half of the current
> >> General allocations is about right.

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

> >Which half do you mean? ;-)
> >Half the bands, half the spectrum, half the mode?

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> I mean significant parts of each HF/MF band. At least half as many kHz
> as Generals have. Modes: at least CW, RTTY, PSK31, SSB, AM and FM.

> Note the "at least" ;-)

Right, give them something significant, if they have to buy an HF radio they
should be able to use it. ;-)

> >> Tech is the entry level, with low power, a sampling of spectrum and
> >> modes, plus an easier test than today (focuses on operating and safety)

> >Less technical test without electronics but ALL the ARS rules pertaining
to
> >Technician class operation or amateur operation in general should be fair
> >game.

> Agreed - if a license class allows it, it should be tested.

> >> General is midrange, with more power, modes and a more technical test

> >> Extra is everything, with more emphasis on technical

> >> VE qualification is separate

> >> Nobody loses what they've got now, and nobody gets a big freebie
> > exacept maybe Techs get more HF.

> >the current allocations... ponder these...

> >15, 40, and 80 CW only (RTTY and data forbidden)

> >28.100 - 28.300 CW, RTTY and data (normal modes)

> >28.300 - 28.500 CW and SSB only (phone and image forbidden)

> >HF/MF contains two types of bands...

> >10, 12, 17, 30, and 160 meters no subbands between General, Advanced, and
> >Extra.

> >15, 20, 40, and 80 meters has subbands between General, Advanced, and
Extra.
> >General and Advanced have the same CW, RTTY, and data.
> >General and Advanced have different subbands for CW, phone, and image.

> >Well, how should Technician class be included here? What are the
arguments
> >on this? How can you come up with half that makes sense and thereby, will
> >fly?

> Let's take 'em one at a time. No changes to existing privs for Generals
and
> above. Please forgive/correct any typos.

And... no change for Novice we're talking Technician and Technician Plus
which, without Element 1, is the same class.

> To keep the Tech test simple, perhaps Techs should not get 160, 30, 17 or
12.
> Just an idea, opposing suggestions welcome. Perhaps Techs should get 160
and
> all of the WARC bands...

Right, seems there's are good arguments either way.

On the one hand, giving them 10, 12 ,17 ,30, and 160 meters could be done
without any subbands keeping it simple and yet meaningful. This protects
the 'old corps' on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters from any 'invasion'.

On the other hand, giving them 10, and 160 meters without any subbands and
15, 20, 40, and 80 meters with subbands is also meaningful. This allows
them to be able to buy old radios which are less likely to have the WARC
bands.

Any other pluses or minuses... anyone???

A couple of comments on the following tables. Does "digital" mean "RTTY and
data" as defined in Part 97?

If "digital" doesn't mean "RTTY and data", the subbands will look very
different then now...
You'll have a "CW only" subband and then
modify the "CW, RTTY, and data" subband to something different and
modify the "CW, phone, and image" subband to something different.

If "digital" means "RTTY and data", the subbands will look less different
then now...
You'll have a "CW only" subband and then
a "CW, RTTY, and data" subband and
a modified "CW, phone, and image" subband to add "RTTY and data".

What was your intention.

> 80 -
> 3500-3575 CW only,
> 3575-3725 CW/digital,
> 3725-4000 cw/digital/phone/image.

So does this mean the old subbands are gone?
What about 3675-3725 Novice "CW only"?

> Techs get 3550-3650, 3925-4000

Technicians don't overlap with the Novice.

> 40 -
> 7000-7050 CW only,
> 7050-7150 CW/digital,
> 7150-7300 cw/digital/phone/image.

What about 7100-7150 Novice "CW only"?

> Techs get 7025-7100

Technicians don't overlap with the Novice.

Did you mean to omit cw/digital/phone/image subband?

> 20 -
> 14000-14075 CW only,
> 14075-14150 CW/digital,
> 14150-14350 cw/digital/phone/image

> Techs get 14050-14125, 14275-14350

> 15 -
> 21000-21075 CW only,
> 21075-21200 CW/digital,
> 21200-21450 cw/digital/phone/image

What about 21100-21200 Novice "CW only"?

> Techs get 21050-21125, 21350-21450

Technicians don't overlap with the Novice except for 21100-21125.

> 10 -
> 28000-28100 CW only,
> 28100-28300 CW/digital,
> 28300-29700 cw/digitalphone/image
> Open to all classes.

So, Novice will pick up this whole band, good.

> If I inadvertently widened any of the 'phone bands, please correct.

> The idea is that Techs should have a serious sampling of HF bands and
> modes, not just 10 meters and a tiny slice of 80/40/15. I'm on the
> fence about 160 and the WARC bands for Techs - would be interesting
> to hear ideas pro and con.

I'd like to hear what comments would come out of this. I think it's a framework and if you clear up my questions I may draw a chart to see what it looks like.

Thanks

Rich

1751. Re: What is your real call, spammer?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 22:00:47 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a22fjmapub@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

```
Lardasssssss Lllllloyd aka
"Fwankie No Testicles" <Fwankie@BARFlittleBoy.com> wrote in message
news:a21o88$mv0$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a1tdnm$3nl$g@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Jackeats Shit" <Jack718@jqmza.net> slobbered in message
> > news:a1suqe$os$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:a1pive$8g1$2@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20109222559.19213.00@houston-hunks.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > On 11 Jan 2002 08:30:09 -0600, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net>
> > > wrote:
> > > > > : --
> > > > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
> > > > > : pschleck@novia.net
> > > > > : http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
> > > > > : Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key ...
> > > > >
> > > > > : 73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
> > > > > : pschleck@gonix.com
> > > > > : http://www.gonix.com/pschleck/
> > > > > : Finger pschleck@gonix.gonix.com for PGP Public Key
> > > > > :
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you even READ your own posts?
> > > >
> > > > Do you?
> > > >
> > > > Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> > > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> > > > revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> > > > news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
> > > >
> > > > "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own
> anonymous
> > > > status makes the story even less credible."
```

> > > >
> > > Roger, get off
> >
> > That's sick, even from a feltcher like you, Jackeats Shit.
> >
> > Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
> > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> > revealed what a hypocrite he is and has no credibilty in message
> > news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :
> >
> > "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> > status makes the story even less credible."
> >
> >
> Roger, tell us why the authorieties recently visited you and
> questioned you,

The"authorities"<sic>did? When was this? <snicker> Did the Athens, AL
ppolice catch you slurping nutsacks of winos again, lllardasssss Llllloyd,
N0VFP, the
unidentifed hillbilly-like voiced QRMer of 20 and 75 meters?

>or would you rather have us post it here
> unedited? because I am sure you will not be truthful with us.

Post it, fuckwit. Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha

Let's review one of Lllllllllllllllllllardassss
Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd's arrests:

The Great Pumpkin
Birmingham Post-Herald
October 14, 2000

Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies
will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
Courthouse Jail.
Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the
Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience
until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
he's... just working away at this pumpkin."

Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then looked me straight in the face and said,
'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"

Poor Llllardasssssss Lllllloyd, and he has other arrests because he was caught slurping nutsacks behind dumptsers.
That new church hasn't helped you, has it manic depression FATASS Lllllllllllllloyd?

1752. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 22:01:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201151401.3560b1df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31362

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C43615A.29AAF2C1@IEEE.org>...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Sorta like "what's the matter with live and let live." That never seems
> > to go away for very long either. It's nice to listen to new music every
> > once in a while, Cecil. Or to have a new thought.
>
> At my age, it's impossible to have a new thought. They just seem new.
>
>
"They'll never get it!!!"
>
>
. . crap: Yes they do.

1753. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 23:11:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FG218.103678$fe1.1473403@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31363

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0201151159.335f7768@posting.google.com...
> radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal) wrote in message
news:<20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> > Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> >
> > If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
amateurs as a
> > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other
words, what
> > will be the purpose of NCI?
>
> Mark,
>
> Although I'm not a member of NCI, I think it's clear they would simply
> continue the quest to reduce/eliminate code testing. If S25.5 survives
> WRC 2003, there's always the next WRC.
>
> > I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> > pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't
be a
> > difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is
finite and
> > a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then
become
> > the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
other.)
>
> Sure - but NCI doesn't want that! The way things are going, it looks
> like the FCC wants to end code testing, so why take a chance with a
> poll/survey that might upset the apple cart?
>
> The MAJORITY of those who commented on 98-143 wanted AT LEAST 2 code
> test speeds, but the FCC ignored them. (This is according to an NCI
> count of the comments, too!)
>
> Consider that NCI membership consists of, at most, a few thousand
> folks who have bothered to click a few buttons on the website. No
> dues, no expiration, no removal from the rolls unless the member
> specifically decides to unjoin.
>
> The way things are going, I'd be really surprised if S25.5 survived
> WRC 2003. You can expect code testing in the USA and several other

> countries to disappear shortly thereafter.
>
> The interesting question is - what then for NCI once their avowed job
> is done?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Then the rest of the agenda becomes clear and Squiggy and Cheers have
large swords protruding from their backs.

1754. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 23:22:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44B9B6.80C9B6A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31364

K0HB wrote:
> But you specifically called it a fact, Cecil, so nothing was left
> to "assume". You can't have it both ways, as by weasel wording
> in the form of "Here are the opinions on which my facts are
> based."

Let me repeat: It is my opinion that it is a fact that any HF digital
mode lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1755. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-15 23:56:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115185616.16238.00001420@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31366

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

>> Steve Robeson should be played by Patrick Labyorteaux.

>> Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?

Yes, Larry; I should be played by Woody Allen! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1756. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 00:08:12 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <qn318.42907$V55.2880250@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31367

"K0HB" wrote ...
>
> I find that someone like Cecil, who claims to reject the cult of religion,
> has been sucked into the cult of Objectivism. Now Cecil will object that
> Objectivism is not a cult (it's not religious) but religion is not a
> necessary component of a cult. Objectivism is a cult of personality. A
> cultic flaw in Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is its belief that
absolute
> knowledge and "final Truth" (her words) are attainable through reason,
that
> therefore that there are absolutes of right and wrong knowledge and of
moral
> and immoral thought and action. For Objectivists, once a principle has
been
> discovered by (their version) of reason to be True, the discussion is at
an
> end. If you disagree with their principle, then your reasoning is flawed.
> This is the same circular argument found in the Bible -- this book is true
> because this book says that this book is true.
>
> But perhaps Cecil is (again) putting us on. The evidence is in his oft
> asked question "What's wrong with live and let live?". Central to Ayn
Rands
> philosophy is the opposite moral principle (in her words) "Judge, and be
> prepared to be judged."
>

That was an excellent argument, Hans. I enjoyed reading it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1757. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 00:16:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <ZB318.44389$3x5.2571173@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31368

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> requirements, and regulations.
>

I was referring to a specific plank, Cecil. Republicans and Democrats have planks that are "specific" to certain issues. I've never seen a specific plank in the Libertarian Party that referenced CW testing (or did I miss it). The statement that you made above may be a "general" view of the party, but it certainly does not address the issue of Morse testing since many still believe that it is a necessary requirement. I'm sure there are a lot of Hams who espouse the views of the Libertarian Party in general, but who still think Morse testing should continue; or do you think every last Libertarian is against it?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1758. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 00:27:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C44C8EA.A96D9ADA@uci.edu>
Source record: 31370

K0HB wrote:

> I find that someone like Cecil, who claims to reject the cult of religion,
> has been sucked into the cult of Objectivism. Now Cecil will object that
> Objectivism is not a cult (it's not religious) but religion is not a
> necessary component of a cult. Objectivism is a cult of personality. A
> cultic flaw in Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is its belief that absolute
> knowledge and "final Truth" (her words) are attainable through reason, that
> therefore that there are absolutes of right and wrong knowledge and of moral
> and immoral thought and action. For Objectivists, once a principle has been
> discovered by (their version) of reason to be True, the discussion is at an
> end. If you disagree with their principle, then your reasoning is flawed.
> This is the same circular argument found in the Bible -- this book is true
> because this book says that this book is true.

Great food for thought, Hans. Circular reasoning would then seem to be
at the core of Objectivism. In other words, you must also be able to
deduce the premise from the conclusion. So as long as the logical chain
is unbroken, internally self-consistant, and returns to the original
premise, the conclusion is considered to be true whether or not the
premise is true.

The name given to this form of reasoning, 'Objectivism', seems to be a
kind of double-speak. It attempts to ensure the perception of
objectivity which may otherwise be lacking. It's greatest virtue being
apparently that it allows one to feel good about himself.

By the way, Hans. Your emailbox has exceeded it's disk allotment.

1759. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 00:43:47 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#HLeWXinBHA.1944@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31369

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Let me repeat: It is my opinion that it is a fact that any HF digital
> mode lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode.

Translation:

"Here is the opinion on which my fact is based."

Leaky logic, Cecil. Really leaky.

Ignoring the blatant untruth "Let me repeat", since your
original statement didn't include the qualifying clause "It is
my opinion", it seems that the term "logical consistency"
has not been translated into Texan.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

"The very arrogant and the very stupid have one thing in common.
Instead of altering their views to fit the facts, they alter the
facts to fit their views... which can be very uncomfortable if
you happen to be one of the facts that needs altering."
-- Doctor Who, Face of Evil

1760. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 00:50:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44cfdc$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31791

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114221751.01549.00001653@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Since you had no discussion of morse testing and since she didn't
> >address morse testing in any of here writing, we're left with Cecil
> >Moore telling us what the dead believed.
>
> And we have another telling us that it is not possible to infer a
conclusion
> from a long series of evidence.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

What's funny to me is that Dave H. is so "upset" (waaaaaaa) about this lady who sent him a letter outlining his responsibilities as a ham. Yet, he constantly makes attempts to tell me what my responsibility is as a ham... Go figure.

Kim W5TIT

1761. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:04:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44d2ee$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31792

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020115003643.05453.00000735@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >
> >Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
> >various characters?
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
> Tom Hanks. Bruce Willis would be an acceptable alternate if Tom
> weren't available...although, when offered the part, I'm sure he'd clear
> his calendar!
>
> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> No substitute would do.
>

Oh yuck...she's got such a dry sense of humor (though I like her
interpretation of a man's penis as a heat seeking missile). I'd be played
by the gal who plays Dharma. Or, Mimi, on Drew Carey. Yeah, kind of in
between those two.

Kim W5TIT

1762. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:05:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44d350_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31793

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C43C80F.F7276100@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >My view is that the ARRL is a non-profit membership organization which
> > >has no need for such a position. We all have to trim things from our
> > >budgets. Our wish list almost always defies the reality of our
pockets.
> >
> > Exactly the deficit that the ARRL is gambling she will be able to turn
around.
> > If it is your belief that the ARRL should not solicit funds from those
who are
> > willing to pay them, that is your belief. I disagree.
>
> The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
> them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
> raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, it's obvious the League has grown up a little more and gotten a lot
more business sense about it.

Kim W5TIT

1763. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:06:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44d385$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31794

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
> > Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> > No substitute would do.
>
> There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
>
> Dave K8MN

Yep, that's what I said. That or the chic who plays Dharma.

Kim W5TIT

1764. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:10:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44d4cf_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31795

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020115101511.17220.00000009@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> >> No substitute would do.
> >
> >There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Hmmm, I don't watch the Drew Carey show, but I'm sure Kim
> does.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

We know Dave does.

Kim W5TIT

1765. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:17:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44d64c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31796

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C4450F3.41FA14F4@earthlink.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C43CA00.44028AD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >> Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> > >> No substitute would do.
> > >
> > >There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave:
> >
> > Hmmm, I don't watch the Drew Carey show, but I'm sure Kim
> > does.
>
> It is worth one viewing to establish a Mimi-Roseanne baseline, Larry.
>
> Dave K8MN

A Mimi-Roseanne baseline? Could you try to explain that?

Kim W5TIT

1766. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:24:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44C9F5.D5CBA743@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31371

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
> > > spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
> > > of modes. Let the market decide.
> >
> > I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy mode...
>
> I will say freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society
> is the way to go, just as I always have said.

"Always"??? Don't think so! You have consistantly berated anyone who saw any true value in CW as a Luddide. Of course that's what we've long ago come to expect from you- conversation from both sides of your mouth.

1767. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:27:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CAA3.AB9E54B3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31372

K0HB wrote:

> KD0HG wrote
>
> > those $2 Radio Shack electret cartridges in a fancy box, otherwise called
> brand H mics ....
>
> Those "brand H" mics are not electret.
>
> Awwww, shit, I went and spoiled his rant!

OOps! One "Awshit" wipes out 1K "Attaboys". You got to go back and start all
over.

1768. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:29:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44db0e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31797

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C447FB5.7C0871C2@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the
beliefs of
> > > > people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime?
How odd.
> > >
> > > I "relieve believe" that we can't divine something from the aether if
a
> > > person who has expired has not addressed a particular issue.
> >
> > Airplanes and radio waves had not been invented when The Constitution
was
> > written, Dave, yet it covers those aspects pretty well. Ayn Rand was a
> > prolific writer. She stated her principles many times. That you are
> > incapable of understanding and/or extending Ayn Rand's principles to
> > concrete present day examples is a serious problem.
>
> The Constitution isn't a being, Cecil. While we know what the
> constitution covers, we don't know what Tom Jefferson or John Adams
> thought of airplanes and radio waves. Ayn Rand's work was not done by a
> group of men drafting a document which set up a government. Get real.
>
> That you are capable of drawing a comparison between Ayn Rand and the
> U.S. Constitution demonstrates a real problem.
>
> Dave K8MN

Aw, just because you didn't think of it first doesn't mean it's a problem.

Kim W5TIT

1769. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:29:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CB20.C48D6504@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31373

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Digital modes without forward error correction are NOT serious modes.
> >
> > And you have said that ham radio is not a serious endeavor, so that makes it
> > FB.
> >
> > You can't have it both ways. Either you must 'let the market decide" and
> > accept what it decides or you forget it. There is a reason why many Pactor and
> > other fans have gone to PSK31.
>
> Obviously, because it's fun. The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> forward error correction is not a serious mode.

Yep - outta both sides again. Still.

1770. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:31:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CB8D.34996A3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31374

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal all by itself.
> >
> > What's so amazing about it? DIGIPAN does that on PSK31
>
> It's called digital adaptive filtering, Dick, you know the techniques
> that you incessantly bad mouth.

Why do you have such an aversion to the truth? It's the techniques you SAY
I badmouth. The truth is they are not as good as you say.

1771. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:33:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CC14.A7A52AA4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31375

CAM wrote:

> Arnie Macy wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" wrote ...
> > >
> > > I know that you have a vehement dislike for any opinion except your
> > > own, Dave, but it is my opinion that Ayn Rand would have been opposed
> > > to the Morse code testing requirement for the same reason that
> > > Libertarians are opposed to the Morse code testing requirement. Ayn
> > > Rand's principles live on in the Libertarian Party.
> >
> > I wasn't aware that the Libertarian Party had a plank in their platform
> > regarding Morse testing. Could you direct us to that URL?
>
> Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> requirements, and regulations.
> --

And they get to decide what is and is not necessary. We see.

1772. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:35:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CC85.CD7986E0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31376

K0HB wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> > forward error correction is not a serious mode.
>
> Sounds more like an opinion than a fact.
>
> Define "serious mode". Show proof.

It's obvious, isn't it? No mode that came before FEC was ever a serious mode, in his view. I'd say he's probably alone out standing out in his field on that one, but there he is.

1773. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:36:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CCC7.A561B9BD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31377

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Do you relieve believe that we cannot infer anything about the beliefs of
> > > people from the beliefs that they have stated during a lifetime? How odd.
> >
> > I "relieve believe" that we can't divine something from the aether if a
> > person who has expired has not addressed a particular issue.
>
> Airplanes and radio waves had not been invented when The Constitution was
> written, Dave, yet it covers those aspects pretty well. Ayn Rand was a
> prolific writer. She stated her principles many times. That you are
> incapable of understanding and/or extending Ayn Rand's principles to
> concrete present day examples is a serious problem.

More like a serious accuracy.

1774. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:38:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c44db20_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31798

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C44C9F5.D5CBA743@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > There was a time when SSB voice was way behind. The consumers have
> > > > spoken and will speak in the future. There is a competitive market
> > > > of modes. Let the market decide.
> > >
> > > I wonder what he'll say when the market decides on an old legacy
mode...
> >
> > I will say freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society
> > is the way to go, just as I always have said.
>
> "Always"??? Don't think so! You have consistantly berated anyone who saw
any
> true value in CW as a Luddide. Of course that's what we've long ago come
to
> expect from you- conversation from both sides of your mouth.
>

To the contrary, Dick. If you'd raise your reading comprehension to
understable, you'd realize that the reaction to the proponents of CW have
not been against the mode--they have been against the sneering from you
toward those of us who don't care for the mode. So, in contrast to your
opinion of yourself, you don't love freedom for all--you love freedom only
for people like yourself.

Kim W5TIT

1775. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 01:45:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C44CEE5.7FD6FDEC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31378

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > > requirements, and regulations.
> >
> > ...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.
>
> Since their considerations are quite objective, I don't see anything
> wrong with that.

And of course they get to decide what is "objective".

1776. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 02:15:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115211502.12969.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31379

In article <a21a9h010pv@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>I would like Gary Busey to protray me.
>

Only newsgroup participants who identify by their full name and
call sign (if they have one) gets a speaking role. All others are just
"atmosphere."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1777. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:10:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020115221017.07935.00000212@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31380

In article <4e118.375851$W8.13700521@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I mean significant parts of each HF/MF band. At least half as many kHz
>> as Generals have. Modes: at least CW, RTTY, PSK31, SSB, AM and FM.
>
>> Note the "at least" ;-)
>
>Right, give them something significant, if they have to buy an HF radio they
>should be able to use it. ;-)

EXACTLY!

Add to this the limitations many face in antenna/rig choice and it's clear that
newcomers need more band choices.

>> >Well, how should Technician class be included here? What are the
>arguments
>> >on this? How can you come up with half that makes sense and thereby, will
>> >fly?
>
>> Let's take 'em one at a time. No changes to existing privs for Generals
>and
>> above. Please forgive/correct any typos.
>
>And... no change for Novice we're talking Technician and Technician Plus
>which, without Element 1, is the same class.

Maybe Novices should have their bands changed to match Technician CW/digital
segments.
>
>> To keep the Tech test simple, perhaps Techs should not get 160, 30, 17 or
>12.
>> Just an idea, opposing suggestions welcome. Perhaps Techs should get 160
>and
>> all of the WARC bands...
>
>Right, seems there's are good arguments either way.
>
>On the one hand, giving them 10, 12 ,17 ,30, and 160 meters could be done
>without any subbands keeping it simple and yet meaningful. This protects
>the 'old corps' on 15, 20, 40, and 80 meters from any 'invasion'.

Good point. It also helps occupancy of those bands.
>
>On the other hand, giving them 10, and 160 meters without any subbands and
>15, 20, 40, and 80 meters with subbands is also meaningful. This allows
>them to be able to buy old radios which are less likely to have the WARC
>bands.
>
I think the main thing is to allow a significant choice.

>Any other pluses or minuses... anyone???
>
>A couple of comments on the following tables. Does "digital" mean "RTTY and
>data" as defined in Part 97?
>
>If "digital" doesn't mean "RTTY and data", the subbands will look very
>different then now...
>You'll have a "CW only" subband and then
>modify the "CW, RTTY, and data" subband to something different and
>modify the "CW, phone, and image" subband to something different.
>
>If "digital" means "RTTY and data", the subbands will look less different
>then now...
>You'll have a "CW only" subband and then
>a "CW, RTTY, and data" subband and
>a modified "CW, phone, and image" subband to add "RTTY and data".
>
>What was your intention.

The idea is that at the bottom of the bands there is a CW-only segment. Then
there is a CW/digital shared segment. Then the 'phone subbands as we know them.

"digital" means RTTY, PSK31, PACTOR, you name it.btw, the rules need to change
so that occupied bandwidth is the deciding factor, not "symbol rate". What
matters is how much band a mode takes up, not how fast it is.
>
>> 80 -
>> 3500-3575 CW only,
>> 3575-3725 CW/digital,
>> 3725-4000 cw/digital/phone/image.
>
>So does this mean the old subbands are gone?

The old subbands-by-license-class stay, as long as there are Advanceds to need
them.

>What about 3675-3725 Novice "CW only"?

Moves and is expanded to match Tech CW/digital.

>> Techs get 3550-3650, 3925-4000
>
>Technicians don't overlap with the Novice.
>

Sorry it wasn't clear. Some may argue that Novices should have CW-only. That
makes some sense because otherwise there is no HF incentive to take Element 2.

>> 40 -
>> 7000-7050 CW only,
>> 7050-7150 CW/digital,
>> 7150-7300 cw/digital/phone/image.
>
>What about 7100-7150 Novice "CW only"?

Same as on 80 - moves to match Tech
>
>> Techs get 7025-7100
>
>Technicians don't overlap with the Novice.
>
>Did you mean to omit cw/digital/phone/image subband?

OOPS

thanks

7225-7300?
>
>> 20 -
>> 14000-14075 CW only,
>> 14075-14150 CW/digital,
>> 14150-14350 cw/digital/phone/image
>
>> Techs get 14050-14125, 14275-14350
>
>> 15 -
>> 21000-21075 CW only,
>> 21075-21200 CW/digital,
>> 21200-21450 cw/digital/phone/image
>
>What about 21100-21200 Novice "CW only"?

Match Tech
>
>> Techs get 21050-21125, 21350-21450
>
>Technicians don't overlap with the Novice except for 21100-21125.
>
ditto

>> 10 -
>> 28000-28100 CW only,
>> 28100-28300 CW/digital,
>> 28300-29700 cw/digitalphone/image
>> Open to all classes.
>

>So, Novice will pick up this whole band, good.
>
>> If I inadvertently widened any of the 'phone bands, please correct.
>
>> The idea is that Techs should have a serious sampling of HF bands and
>> modes, not just 10 meters and a tiny slice of 80/40/15. I'm on the
>> fence about 160 and the WARC bands for Techs - would be interesting
>> to hear ideas pro and con.
>
>I'd like to hear what comments would come out of this.

The basic idea is to give Techs a serious amount of HF/MF, not just tiny
slivers of a few bands.

> I think it's a
>framework and if you clear up my questions I may draw a chart to see what it
>looks like.
>
Hope I cleared it up.

The main point is the concepts. Details follow from them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1778. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:25:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F28C.4AE5B38E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31381

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I will say freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society
> > is the way to go, just as I always have said.
>
> "Always"??? Don't think so! You have consistantly berated anyone who saw any
> true value in CW as a Luddide.

I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word. The people I have berated, including yourself, are the people who see supernatural value in CW and worship the Morse Code Creed. CW is my favorite mode but it does not possess supernatural powers. CW deserves to be judged upon its real world merits which are many.

For years, I have consistently advocated freedom of choice of modes which includes the freedom to learn Morse code or not.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1779. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:27:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F331.F9BCB7DA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31382

K0HB wrote:
> Ignoring the blatant untruth "Let me repeat", since your
> original statement didn't include the qualifying clause "It is
> my opinion", it seems that the term "logical consistency"
> has not been translated into Texan.

Why should I be the only poster required to state that it is
my opinion? Virtually everything posted here is someone's
opinion. If you like, I can gather the names of some digital
communications experts who will agree that it is a fact that
a digital mode without FEC is a poor choice for HF RF.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1780. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:31:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F3FD.2539D5E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31383

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > > The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> > > forward error correction is not a serious mode.
> >
> > Sounds more like an opinion than a fact.
> >
> > Define "serious mode". Show proof.
>
> It's obvious, isn't it? No mode that came before FEC was ever a serious
> mode, in his view.

Please don't distort the meaning, Dick. RTTY was a serious digital mode
50 years ago. It is not today. At the present time, any HF digital mode
lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode. Do you think the
military uses FEC on their digital communications or not? Do you think
the military is serious about digital communications?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1781. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:32:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F456.66111E2F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31384

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Digital modes without forward error correction are NOT serious modes.
> > >
> > > And you have said that ham radio is not a serious endeavor, so that makes it
> > > FB.
> > >
> > > You can't have it both ways. Either you must 'let the market decide" and
> > > accept what it decides or you forget it. There is a reason why many Pactor and
> > > other fans have gone to PSK31.
> >
> > Obviously, because it's fun. The fact remains that any HF digital mode lacking
> > forward error correction is not a serious mode.
>
> Yep - outta both sides again. Still.

Dick, do you think the military uses plain RTTY or PSK31 for their digital
communications? Do you think the military is serious?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1782. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:37:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F595.A31A8D5D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31385

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > It is amazing to watch the PCT2e zero in on a signal all by itself.
> > >
> > > What's so amazing about it? DIGIPAN does that on PSK31
> >
> > It's called digital adaptive filtering, Dick, you know the techniques
> > that you incessantly bad mouth.
>
> Why do you have such an aversion to the truth? It's the techniques you SAY
> I badmouth. The truth is they are not as good as you say.

You deny badmouthing digital methods and in the very next sentence you badmouth
digital adaptive filtering. Digital adaptive filtering methods are as good as
they are. I have not exaggerated their capabilities.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1783. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:44:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F709.99B15BFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31386

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Great food for thought, Hans. Circular reasoning would then seem to be
> at the core of Objectivism. In other words, you must also be able to
> deduce the premise from the conclusion.

Absolutely untrue, Jim. Ayn Rand started with a few axioms, just like geometry does. She built the Objectivist Epistomology along the same structure as geometry.

A couple of the axioms that I remember are: Existence exists and consciousness is conscious. One has to start somewhere. You cannot prove the existence of a point yet most of your mathematics is based on the existence of a point. Nobody has proven the existence of a supernatural yet the great majority of human beings allow the concept of a supernatural in one form or another to rule their lives.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1784. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:46:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F7A8.119420C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31392

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > > > requirements, and regulations.
> > >
> > > ...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.
> >
> > Since their considerations are quite objective, I don't see anything
> > wrong with that.
>
> And of course they get to decide what is "objective".

They present arguments concerning subjects on an objective basis. Here
is an axiom: Existence exists. Are you going to argue that axiom is
not objective? Are you going to argue that it is false?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1785. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:47:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115224717.13551.00000003@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31390

In article <OS1ypodnBHA.1412@cpimsnntpa04>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> I'd have to disagree with Carroll O'Connor (since he's SK),
>
>Jim said "You are not limited to the current crop of actors - you can
>pick actors from the past, at any time of their careers."
>
>Carroll O'Connor in his Archie Bunker role is soooooooo right for
>you. Take off a little hair, and you even *look* like him!
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

Hans:

Without hair, I'd look more like Telly Savalas than Carroll O'Connor.
However, the late Mr. O'Connor was a very distinguished actor, and
I would have been proud to have been portrayed by him -- our political
differences aside.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1786. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:47:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115224717.13551.00000002@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31391

In article <b7c5262e.0201142137.6afffd51@posting.google.com>, k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB) writes:

>
>> Not according to my Southern Baptist preacher. Are you an atheist?
>
>BTW, have you noticed that as you encounter people with IQs above
>average you notice that the belief in the boogie man begins to wane,
>and by the time it reaches about 110 god-belief also starts to trend
>downward?
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hans:

What is the basis for this statement? Have there been any specific statistical studies made correlating IQ to religious beliefs? If so, could you provide some references? If not, are you saying that it is your own personal observation that people who believe in God tend not to also possess high intelligence?

My IQ was tested many years ago at 156. I believed in God then, and I believe in Him now. Some of the world's greatest scholars, in virtually every academic discipline, are or have been clergymen representing all faiths. How would you account for that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1787. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:47:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115224718.13551.00000005@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31387

In article <3C447EF4.4C4171D1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
>> although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).
>
>I want Don Rickles to play me.

Cecil:

Since I've just been informed that we can resurrect SK actors for
casting in the rrap movie, I think Don Knotts would be a better choice
to play you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1788. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:47:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115224718.13551.00000004@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31388

In article <3C4450F3.41FA14F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >There's always the gal who plays Mimi on the Drew Carey Show...
>> >
>> >Dave K8MN
>>
>> Dave:
>>
>> Hmmm, I don't watch the Drew Carey show, but I'm sure Kim
>> does.
>
>It is worth one viewing to establish a Mimi-Roseanne baseline, Larry.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Hmmm. I'll take that under advisement, as long as Carey doesn't
conflict with JAG, Law & Order (the original), The West Wing, CSI,
Enterprise, ER, or just about anything on The History Channel.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1789. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:47:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020115224719.13551.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31389

In article <20020115185616.16238.00001420@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Yes, Larry; I should be played by Woody Allen! :-)
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

One kilopardon requested, Ed! Your request that Woody be cast as your own good self is approved!

I also counted on my fingers and toes, and determined that I also forgot Hans Brakob, who I suggest be portrayed by John M. Jackson.

And speaking of lawyers (or those who play them on TV), I suggest that Phil Kane be portrayed by Ray Walston.

Casting seems to be complete; now all we need is a plot. Any suggestions?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1790. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:50:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F87D.4A986A85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31393

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > requirements, and regulations.
>
> I was referring to a specific plank, Cecil. Republicans and Democrats have
> planks that are "specific" to certain issues. I've never seen a specific
> plank in the Libertarian Party that referenced CW testing (or did I miss
> it). The statement that you made above may be a "general" view of the
> party, but it certainly does not address the issue of Morse testing since
> many still believe that it is a necessary requirement. I'm sure there are a
> lot of Hams who espouse the views of the Libertarian Party in general, but
> who still think Morse testing should continue; or do you think every last
> Libertarian is against it?

Every last real Libertarian is against it. Like any other party, there are
lunatics in the Libertarian party. The FCC has said that the only reason
to keep a Morse code exam for amateurs is the treaty. All true Libertarians
would agree with the FCC on that one issue.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1791. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 03:52:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44F901.8C9FC1EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31394

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > requirements, and regulations.
>
> And they get to decide what is and is not necessary. We see.

They assume an objective posture and then decide, Dick. They are not
driven by monsters from the Id like you are.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1792. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:04:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44FBD9.F24E6C91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31395

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> What is the basis for this statement? Have there been any specific
> statistical studies made correlating IQ to religious beliefs?

About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.
Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.
So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?
(Nope, CW is not evidence something supernatural. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1793. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:08:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a22ull$d6q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31396

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> >
> > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > get the job done.
>
> Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
Lugging
> a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and running
> in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what Dick
> was referring to.
> Arnie - KT4ST

How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
will get it done.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1794. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:09:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C44FCEE.AFD03AA3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31397

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Again, it is the "prepared" hams that will get it done.

Dick apparently likes the challenge of being completely
unprepared. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1795. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:14:08 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.15.23.14.00.186515.2521@arrl.org>
Source record: 31398

On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:

> I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1

1796. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:21:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31400

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > at the time and for the conditions.
>
> Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time of
> day.

If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
about it.

> The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
> were not favorable.

It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.

> Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more on 10
> meter propagation to understand that.

Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
operation.

> I guess that if you can't hear
> anything the bands aren';t crowded.

Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.

> Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> a few new high tech data modes then :-)

Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1797. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:21:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#w9XNRknBHA.1272@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31399

Larry Roll K3LT wrote in message

> If not, are you saying that it is your own personal observation
> that people who believe in God tend not to also possess high
> intelligence?

Nope. That isn't what I said. Send your newsreader back
and you will see what I said.

73, Hans, K0HB

1798. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:24:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31301

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C43DBA1.E57AA4EB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > One example that justifies the lower power limit can be
> > >
> > > > taken from the typical DXpedition to some remote
> > > > site where thousands of contacts are then made all
> > > > over the globe with the DX station usually only running
> > > > about 100 watts and the vast majority of those contacts
> > > > are with other stations running similar or even lower
> > > > power. The "big guns" running the KW rigs don't
> > > > do it because they need the power, they do it to
> > > > "over ride" or simply "blast through" other contending
> > > > stations. That is, IMHO, pretty poor operating
> > > > practice..
> > >
> > > That's because you don't know better. At times it takes lots of
power to
> > work
> > > those 100 watt DX stations. I had to turn on a full 1400 watts on CW
to
> > get the
> > > Heard Island group on a dying 20 meter band, they could tell I was
there
> > with
> > > the
> > > 100 watts but no copy. And when you become DX you see it firsthand.
It's a
> > real
> > > zoo out there as heard from across the pond.
> >
> > You give probably one of the few examples where the power
> > appears justified. MOST, however, of the power stations
> > routinely operate at high power to simply drown out the other
> > stations (IMHO).
> >

> > > Besides, FCC already worked out the deal on power. They found that
1.5KW
> > > caused almost no additional problems to consumer devices than 100
watts
> > did. And
> > > there has long been rules in place requiring hams to use the minimum
power
> > > required to complete the desired communication. I for one very rarely
turn
> > on my
> > > amp because I don't often need to.
> >
> > But you are (IMHO) an exception as many others just crank up the amp
> > and operate high power throughout the contest period or until they
> > are finally replied to by the DX station they are after.
> >
> > > Bill you should gain some HF experience before making sweeping
> > prouncements on
> > > operation there. An Extra Lite alone won't do it.
> >
> > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > at the time and for the conditions.
>
> So when he called CQ he knew that a station would answer him which he
didn't
> need high power to work. Right.

Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports. That
doesn't
mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1799. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:29:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45018C.4AAE3449@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31302

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > How about some moderation in the number of postings? Usenet ain't no
> > > > religion.
> > >
> > > I know you would like to restrict r.r.a.p to posters who agree with
> > > you, Dave, but it ain't gonna happen.
> >
> > I know you'd like to restrict an individual's participation in amateur
> > radio but it ain't likely to happen.
>
> I have no desire to restrict anyone for doing anything other than
> violating my rights and freedoms.

Then can the preachy admonitions to others, Pops.

Dave K8MN
```

1800. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:31:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4501FA.8D9002C6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31303

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > >Does it follow that atheists have higher
> > > > IQ's than agnostics? :-)
> > > >
> > >
> > > "Whoever undertakes to set himself up as judge in the field of Truth and
> > > Knowledge is shipwrecked by the laughter of the gods." --- Einstein
> >
> > "Einstein didn't know what the hell he was talking about!" -- Ayn Rand
> > (as channeled through Cecil Moore)
>
> Sorry, Dave, I don't believe in a supernatural. And Ayn Rand doesn't
> need channeling. She made it perfectly clear what she believed in
> her abundant principled writings.

In order for this to die a quick and merciful death, just point us to
the portion of her writings dealing with morse testing. Anything less
is simply another of your pointless mental meanderings.

Dave K8MN
```

1801. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:33:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a22vt1$g14$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31304

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com...
> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the group.)
>
> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs
as a
> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?

We will keep working to eliminate the code test.

> In other words, what
> will be the purpose of NCI?

The same as it is today.

> I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> pretty good.

As Ed Hare (ARRL) noted along with others, the government
just doesn't work that way.

> With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange.

The ARRL is free to "poll" all hams anytime they want. The cost to do
so is probably prohibitive.

> (After all, the database is finite and
> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then
become
> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
other.)

Which, again, the ARRL is free to undertake anytime. You'll
need to convince ARRL of doing it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1802. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:36:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C450314.82D04D5E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31305

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm sure your belief will provide ample
> > opportunity for entertainment as you attempt to divine what Ayn Rand
> > thought of rap music and HDTV.
>
> You appear to believe that it is impossible to tell the meanings of
> writings after the author dies. I feel sorry for you.

You amaze me with your ability to frequently misinterpret what others have written. You do it with what I write so I have little doubt that you'd do it with the writings of Ayn Rand. I don't believe that it is impossible to tell the meanings of writings after the author dies. I believe that it is impossible to tell what someone thought about an issue he or she never wrote about while living. You aren't discussing what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.

Dave K8MN

1803. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:36:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C450344.4ADD4C51@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31306

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > > requirements, and regulations.
> >
> > ...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.
>
> Since their considerations are quite objective, I don't see anything
> wrong with that.

I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.

Dave K8MN

1804. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:38:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C450390.A27DC7CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31307

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > That you are capable of drawing a comparison between Ayn Rand and the
> > U.S. Constitution demonstrates a real problem.
>
> I drew a comparison between the authors of The Constitution and the
> author of Ayn Rand's writings. Do you think Thomas Jefferson and
> James Madison didn't believe in the first amendment?

Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
general aviation will never be known.

Dave K8MN

1805. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:38:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2306kpib1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31308

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C442A98.3537F8E3@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Mark Pearsal wrote:
>
> > Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> >
> > If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs
as a
> > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other
words, what
> > will be the purpose of NCI? I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea
was
> > pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be
a
> > difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is
finite and
> > a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then
become
> > the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
other.)
> > Take care and 73.
>
> No sweat, Mark, the geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC has decided
that CW
> must go.

Sure tells us all how you think Dick. Your respect
for people whom you haven't met is pretty poor.

> The one think that you can't have if you're a digigeek or a government
> employee is to be viewed by the leading edge guys as "retro", holding
beliefs in
> anything but leading edge, ya know, stuff that can generate big bucks. Not
good for
> your career path. Plus Government guys gotta spend money, geeks gotta
constantly
> come up with "stuff" to sell us all, whether or not we "need" it. Makes
the world
> go round

Ditto my last comment.

> . So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting that CW
is a good
> real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has served as
such for
> over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into stone.
No
> matter what the facts really are.

DICK!
It isn't about how good or bad or indifferent CW is... The ISSUE
is the continued need to test prospective HF hams for morse
skill. Cecil has already stated how much he uses CW, others have
also. The use of CW by hams does not constitute any need to test
ALL prospective HF hams in the skill itself on an exclusive pass/fail
basis.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1806. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:42:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45048B.DE9F5259@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31309

CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > But you specifically called it a fact, Cecil, so nothing was left
> > to "assume". You can't have it both ways, as by weasel wording
> > in the form of "Here are the opinions on which my facts are
> > based."
>
> Let me repeat: It is my opinion that it is a fact that any HF digital
> mode lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode.

Glad you made that clear. Your opinion makes you sound like a crackpot.

Dave K8MN

1807. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:47:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2310q$r5t$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31310

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0201151159.335f7768@posting.google.com...
> radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal) wrote in message
news:<20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> > Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> > If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs
as a
> > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In other
words, what
> > will be the purpose of NCI?
>
> Mark,
> Although I'm not a member of NCI, I think it's clear they would simply
> continue the quest to reduce/eliminate code testing. If S25.5 survives
> WRC 2003, there's always the next WRC.

Correct!

> > I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> > pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be
a
> > difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is
finite and
> > a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then
become
> > the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
other.)
>
> Sure - but NCI doesn't want that! The way things are going, it looks
> like the FCC wants to end code testing, so why take a chance with a
> poll/survey that might upset the apple cart?

NCI has NO say one way or the other regarding the ARRL polling
every licensed ham. The point I have made is that the FCC doesn't
limit itself and has always relied (correctly IMHO) on interested
parties filling their comments.

> The MAJORITY of those who commented on 98-143 wanted AT LEAST 2 code
> test speeds, but the FCC ignored them. (This is according to an NCI
> count of the comments, too!)

You keep forgetting that the final decision is driven by public policy
considerations, not simply the majority opinion of licensed hams.

> Consider that NCI membership consists of, at most, a few thousand
> folks who have bothered to click a few buttons on the website. No
> dues, no expiration, no removal from the rolls unless the member
> specifically decides to unjoin.

Or, as I have noted, if the person comes up "missing" via email.

> The way things are going, I'd be really surprised if S25.5 survived
> WRC 2003. You can expect code testing in the USA and several other
> countries to disappear shortly thereafter.

Agree on WRC 2003 and we (NCI) will be right there to help push
the end of code testing in the USA and elsewhere once S25.5 is
gone.

> The interesting question is - what then for NCI once their avowed job
> is done?

Who knows. That'll be up to the BOD of NCI.
Conspiracy theory folks are free to let their imaginations
run amok on the possibilities :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1808. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:50:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45067F.317D2F14@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31311

Bill, KD0HG wrote:
>
> On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 16:00:41 -0000, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> >Those "brand H" mics are not electret.
> >Awwww, shit, I went and spoiled his rant
>
> Review the following easy-to-find URLs that clearly state the the mics I
> object to are electrets, Hans. The same ones that IMO don't sound all that
> that great, or as stated, possess less virtue than a cheap hamfest D-104.
>
> http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/mics/2418.html
> http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:yqz_H92JENoC:www.radioworld.co.uk/heil_access.htm+h
eil+microphones+%2Belectret&hl=en
>
> Thay can cure that case of cranio-rectalitis by mechanical means and the use
> of levers, Hans.
> The blindness might be another matter.
>
> With warmest regards to yourself,

Bill,

Before inserting the other brogran into your yap, you should really query Bob if you don't like the information you've gotten from Hans or that which I'm about to provide. With regard to the first URL you've provided, the only hand mike described with an electret element is the one for Icom radios (with the Icom electret element). With regard to the second URL, the adverstiser made an error. Click on the photo of the HC-4 and HC-5. Read down the page until you see (under specifications) that the elements are *dynamic*. Did you happen to notice how strange it is that these supposed electret elements require no polarizing voltage?

Dave K8MN

1809. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 04:52:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4506DA.C5A0FD5F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31312

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <a21a9h010pv@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >I would like Gary Busey to protray me.
> >
>
> Only newsgroup participants who identify by their full name and
> call sign (if they have one) gets a speaking role. All others are just
> "atmosphere."

I've got it! Krell can be played by the fellow who gave us "Carton the
doorman".

Dave K8MN

1810. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:03:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C450992.5A7BC11A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31313

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C43DBA1.E57AA4EB@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...

> > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > at the time and for the conditions.
> >
> > So when he called CQ he knew that a station would answer him which he
> didn't
> > need high power to work. Right.
>
> Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
> increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports. That
> doesn't
> mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
> be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).

Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?

Before you begin with the usual, "Your point?", my point is that You
really have no idea of what you're babbling about, do you?

Dave K8MN

1811. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:07:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450A9C.86E392D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31315

Dave Heil wrote:
> Then can the preachy admonitions to others, Pops.

What preachy admonitions? All I advocate is freedom.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1812. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:10:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116001006.05154.00001154@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31314

In article <20020114222247.01549.00001654@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
>>interfere with the adoption of a better mode.
>
>No, I am pointing out that back then, hams willingly exchanged spark for a
>better operating mode.

Think about WHY.

CW/tube transmission was demonstrated to them in the Transatlantic Tests and the 1923 transatlantic QSOs.

>Today, they can't exchange spectrally efficient
>digital-voice techniques for the scheme of allocating repeater pairs that sit
>idle 95% of the time.

Sure they can. They just don't want to because they don't have a clear path to follow. No demos.
>
>Why the difference?
>
For one thing, there is an ENORMOUS installed repeater infrastructure.

For another, homebrewing (as in building a rig from the ground up) has dwindled to a small percentage of ham stations. When the Ancient Ones wanted to get on the air with a new mode, they BUILT their rigs from scratch. Not just a few pioneers - almost everybody did it. That sort of thing decreased after WW2 and now is the exception rather than the rule.

The digital voice articles in QST are a start. But there needs to be a series of practical how-to articles on getting started. Look at the QSTs before about 1970 - lots and lots of articles on getting started.

Yet another reason is the mindset that 2 meters MUST be where things happen. Is 222-225 all full of repeaters? How about 900 MHz?

Finally, what we don't see is a frank, clear picture of what people think the way forward should be. What's the solution - force repeaters off the air?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1813. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:12:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450BB3.68A67A9A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31316

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:
>
> > I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1

The word was "Luddide", Jon, not Luddite. I have never used the
word "Luddide".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1814. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:13:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450C0E.4C2CD45F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31317

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Let me repeat: It is my opinion that it is a fact that any HF digital
> > mode lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode.
>
> Glad you made that clear. Your opinion makes you sound like a crackpot.

You obviously don't know a lot about HF digital communications, Dave.
Do you think the military uses FEC or not?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1815. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:15:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450C80.4DC6A434@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31318

Dave Heil wrote:
> In order for this to die a quick and merciful death, just point us to
> the portion of her writings dealing with morse testing. Anything less
> is simply another of your pointless mental meanderings.

Sorry, my ex-wife got all my Ayn Rand books. But it is common knowledge
that Ayn Rand was against unnecessary governmental regulations. Heck,
even the FCC is against unnecessary governmental regulations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1816. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:18:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450D15.E44A8490@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31319

Dave Heil wrote:
> You aren't discussing
> what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.

Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1817. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:18:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450D3B.3AA2D0D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31320

Dave Heil wrote:
> I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.

That's just your subjective opinion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1818. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:19:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450D7D.7B82A77B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31321

Dave Heil wrote:
> Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> general aviation will never be known.

Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
commerce.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1819. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:24:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C450E9A.50CC8E64@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31323

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > will get it done.
>
> How about everytime there is a disaster?

One shouldn't wait for a disaster to start preparing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1820. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:24:43 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <F6818.48258$3x5.2738249@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31322

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

Arnie wrote ...
> > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> Lugging
> > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
running
> > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what
Dick
> > was referring to.
> > Arnie - KT4ST
>
>
> How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> will get it done.
>

How about everytime there is a disaster?

1821. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:32:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45103B.3F4BFEC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31324

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Then can the preachy admonitions to others, Pops.
>
> What preachy admonitions? All I advocate is freedom.

...the ones concerning moderation in all things and ham radio not being a religion. The freedom you advocate would seem to be for you alone.

Dave K8MN

1822. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:32:49 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <ee818.48329$3x5.2742365@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31325

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> Every last real Libertarian is against it. Like any other party, there are
> lunatics in the Libertarian party. The FCC has said that the only reason
> to keep a Morse code exam for amateurs is the treaty. All true
Libertarians
> would agree with the FCC on that one issue.
>

I get it now. If they agree with ending Morse testing, they are "real"
Libertarians and if they don't, they are "lunatics". Thanks for clearing
that up.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1823. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:34:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4510BE.7715F902@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31326

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Let me repeat: It is my opinion that it is a fact that any HF digital
> > > mode lacking forward error correction is not a serious mode.
> >
> > Glad you made that clear. Your opinion makes you sound like a crackpot.
>
> You obviously don't know a lot about HF digital communications, Dave.
> Do you think the military uses FEC or not?

I know a good deal about what the military and other government agencies
use. Since you don't have a clearance or a need to know, you'll not
hear it from me.

Dave K8MN

1824. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:35:46 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <%g818.48356$3x5.2742900@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31327

"CAM" wrote ...

> Dave Heil wrote:

> > Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> > general aviation will never be known.
>
>
> Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
> commerce.

I get it now. Morse testing falls under the Commerce Department. I always thought the FCC had that one.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1825. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:36:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C451123.38504D60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31328

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You aren't discussing
> > what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.
>
> Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.

You spout so much BS that you can't even keep your own stories straight.
What you told us is what Ayn Rand would have thought about morse
testing. You didn't know what she thought about it then and you don't
know now.

Dave K8MN

1826. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:36:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C451146.D5A6C968@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31329

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
>
> That's just your subjective opinion.

That is only your subjective opinion of my statement.

Dave K8MN

1827. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:39:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4511D4.8D3D9C3B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31330

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> > general aviation will never be known.
>
> Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
> commerce.

Ah, but you make things up as you go along. Your attempt at yet another diversion is gone *poof*.

Dave K8MN

1828. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:41:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45125B.3645CB02@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31331

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > > > Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> > > > general aviation will never be known.
> > >
> > >
> > > Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
> > > commerce.
>
> I get it now. Morse testing falls under the Commerce Department. I always
> thought the FCC had that one.
>

Actually Arnie, before the creation of the FCC, amateur radio was administered by the Department of Commerce. This latest from Cecil is just another twist in the road which is his wandering mind.

Dave K8MN

1829. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:48:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4507B8.72C82596@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31332

CAM wrote:

>, I can gather the names of some digital

> communications experts who will agree that it is a fact that
> a digital mode without FEC is a poor choice for HF RF.

Why go to all the trouble? Even most experienced hams could tell you that, including yers truly. But that's not what you said. You said no non-FEC mode was a serious mode. That includes all pre-FEC modes. RTTY is still a in use, and is pretty darn good in weak signal conditions. I think it's a serious mode, still, even if not the mode of choice of the digigeek set.

1830. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:52:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4508BB.5192E53B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31333

CAM wrote:

Dick, do you think the military uses plain RTTY or PSK31 for their digital

> communications? Do you think the military is serious?

Why, of course not and of course! But do you think no other user -maybe no ham-is serious? There is a difference between serious and critical.

1831. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 05:55:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C450971.AD41C903@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31334

CAM wrote:

> You deny badmouthing digital methods and in the very next sentence you badmouth
> digital adaptive filtering. Digital adaptive filtering methods are as good as
> they are. I have not exaggerated their capabilities.

Do you really have to be such a simpleton? Your statement is that adaptive filterers work great. That means all of them work great. Not so. Not all of anything works great. Some are rather un-great.

1832. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 06:06:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C450C1A.A91790F7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31335

Richard Plourde wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
> "advantage"
> > over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy, that's
> OK
> > because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!
>
> We explained to you, a couple of years ago, when you tried to make this
> argument before. If you can't hear the PSK31 but you can copy the CWID it's
> because the power/bandwith of the MCW CWID is much higher and of course
> you'd have a better chance of hearing that.

Yeah, that was your excuse then as now, that was my point.
When your geekiness gets to the point that CW at the exact same poer level as
PSK31 will make copy when PSK31 will not, your argument in favor of the "more
efficient mode" is shot to hell, sorry about that.

> You should have tried QPSK at
> the time. Although, if you did get through you wouldn't be able to trash it
> now, right?
>

Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to print, a
group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I wasn't
attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could copy
their CWID's!

>
> If you keep relating that same story for years and years well what can we
> say....
>

Any story worth telling is worth retellihg to a new audience, and to
re-ragale old ones.

>
> > You dingaling.
>
> Loser... (hate to join in the name-calling but it's ALL you understand)
>

Nope. I'm the winner. You're the loser and have no clue. You see, I know and
use almost every mode in HF ham radio-including CW. Do you?

1833. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 06:16:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C450E70.B47A4159@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31336

CAM wrote:

I'm sure there are a

> > lot of Hams who espouse the views of the Libertarian Party in general, but
> > who still think Morse testing should continue; or do you think every last
> > Libertarian is against it?
>
> Every last real Libertarian is against it. Like any other party, there are
> lunatics in the Libertarian party. The FCC has said that the only reason
> to keep a Morse code exam for amateurs is the treaty. All true Libertarians
> would agree with the FCC on that one issue.

Ah. Now he gets to decide the qualifications of a "true" libertarian. And he
crirticises others who use the term "Real Hams".

1834. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 06:20:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C450F33.4B7EE191@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31337

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > What is the basis for this statement? Have there been any specific
> > statistical studies made correlating IQ to religious beliefs?
>
> About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.
> Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.
> So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?

So where is the evidence against it? No, I'm not talking about bible or religious credo. It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this just "happned". That supposes a power within oneself that he really doesn't have. If you do, make yourself immortal.

>
> (Nope, CW is not evidence something supernatural. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1835. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 06:23:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C450FE4.79C6C16A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31338

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > >
> > > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > > get the job done.
> >
> > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> Lugging
> > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and running
> > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what Dick
> > was referring to.
> > Arnie - KT4ST
>
> How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> will get it done.

Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra lite, will
do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out fine. But when

things really go in the toilet, when preplanning for an incident just isn't
possible,
the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools available.

1836. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 06:24:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C451041.9AE0F82C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31339

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:
>
> > I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1

Jon I think he was pretending to not know what my typo spelled.

1837. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:09:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c45512e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31902

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C44FBD9.F24E6C91@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > What is the basis for this statement? Have there been any specific
> > statistical studies made correlating IQ to religious beliefs?
>
> About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.
> Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.
> So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?
> (Nope, CW is not evidence something supernatural. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

One could quip that the existence of a supernatural "being" who is responsible for all creation yet possesses superior intelligence could certainly be--at a minimum--debatable, with the likes of Larry Roll, Dave Heil, et al around... :o

Kim W5TIT

1838. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:16:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c4552bc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31800

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C45018C.4AAE3449@earthlink.net...
>
> Then can the preachy admonitions to others, Pops.
>
> Dave K8MN

How 'bout you go first, Dave. You perpetuate this high opinion of yourself,
yet there's not a shred of evidence for it...

Kim W5TIT

1839. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:21:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c4553cd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31906

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2306kpib1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> DICK!
> It isn't about how good or bad or indifferent CW is... The ISSUE
> is the continued need to test prospective HF hams for morse
> skill. Cecil has already stated how much he uses CW, others have
> also. The use of CW by hams does not constitute any need to test
> ALL prospective HF hams in the skill itself on an exclusive pass/fail
> basis.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

sigh People like Dick may be fading away and they may be aware of that,
Bill. They're desperate, now.

Kim W5TIT

1840. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:31:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c4557f7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31901

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C450992.5A7BC11A@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and
then
> > increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports. That
> > doesn't
> > mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
> > be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
>
> Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
> babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?
>
> Before you begin with the usual, "Your point?", my point is that You
> really have no idea of what you're babbling about, do you?
>
> Dave K8MN

So, you are not a proponent of the FCC R&R, Dave? Bill makes the reasonable assumption--possibly based on personal opinion--that a better operator is one that would start with a probable--definitely based on personal opinion--power output of 100W. FCC Regulations require that no power is used than necessary to make the contact. If you're such a perfect--definitely based upon your personal opinion--operator, why don't you follow the FCC R&R? Hmmmm?

Kim W5TIT

1841. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:33:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455804_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31904

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C450A9C.86E392D3@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Then can the preachy admonitions to others, Pops.
>
> What preachy admonitions? All I advocate is freedom.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Freedom probably *is* a preachy admonition to Dave, Cecil. ;)

Kim W5TIT

1842. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:38:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455816_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31905

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C450D15.E44A8490@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You aren't discussing
> > what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.
>
> Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yeah, but see, Cecil. Dave's a "by the book" kind of person. He's never dreamt up anything that didn't go along with what is in black and white. He can't think outside the box. If this Ayn Rand never specifically said that she was against CW testing then, in Dave's mind...well, that's even a little hard for *me* to translate...LOL...but you get the picture? (As black and dark as it might be?)

Kim W5TIT

1843. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:49:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455a58_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31910

"Bill, KD0HG" <shoot@spammersonsight.org> wrote in message
news:574a4u82r4lgagt15c8tvh4j9r8ke90k7e@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 16 Jan 2002 04:50:38 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
> >Before inserting the other brogran into your yap, you should really
> >query Bob if you don't like the information you've gotten from Hans or
> >that which I'm about to provide.
>
> I'm not responsible for inaccurate information being disseminated
regarding
> the product.
> Further, I have no personal likes or dislikes about legitimate facts in
> themselves; I don't have a problem with someone pointing out where I'm in
> error, but I do dislike completely unnecessary ad hominems from you, Hans
or
> anyone else.
> Can you restate your points in a more respectful manner, Dave?
> If not, then I have nothing further to discuss with you.
>

Aw, when Dave gets on his soap box the only thing he has is insults, Bill.
You going to take away the sand in his sandbox; the milk for his cookies;
the 'p' in his perfectness? Oh yeah, forgot, it's only him who thinks he's
perfect.

> >
> >With regard to the first URL you've
> >provided, the only hand mike described with an electret element is the
> >one for Icom radios (with the Icom electret element).
>
> As I have specifically stated that IMO, the electret element mics don't
sound
> that great. If I've been instead hearing dynamic elements, and I'm
mistaken,
> then IMO they don't sound that great, either.
> Be careful of what you ask for.
>

There ya go. Now you're going to screw him all up...you allowed yourself to
be mistaken.

>
> And that opinion restated for your benefit is that the mics under
discussion
> don't seem to sound that great-- for reasons I've conjectured on- whether

> they're electret based, dynamic or made with homogenized bat guano. OK?
>
> All you need to do is acnowledge my general points have validity instead
of
> grasping at strawmen and we can get on to other things.
>
>
>
> Bill/HG
>

Without his "straw" Dave is nothing but fluff, you see... :)

Kim W5TIT

1844. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:50:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455ac8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31799

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C451041.9AE0F82C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:
> >
> > > I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.
> >
> >
http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7
406%40ibm.net&rnum=1
>
> Jon I think he was pretending to not know what my typo spelled.
>

Which, by the way Dick, are getting worse and worse. Do you like
deliberately no using a spellchecker? Don't you think that written
communication should be as clear and concise as possible, just as in verbal
communication? Or, do you make as many mistakes when you speak, also?

Kim W5TIT

1845. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:52:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455b2d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31903

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C450F33.4B7EE191@worldnet.att.net...
>
> So where is the evidence against it? No, I'm not talking about bible or
> religious credo. It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this
> just "happned". That supposes a power within oneself that he really
> doesn't have. If you do, make yourself immortal.
>

I read this a while ago, and I just read it again now. My whole mind is
going "HUH"???????????? ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

1846. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 10:55:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455d42_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31907

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C450C1A.A91790F7@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Nope. I'm the winner. You're the loser and have no clue. You see, I know
and
> use almost every mode in HF ham radio-including CW. Do you?
>

Wow, sounds like 'lil Dick is as popular as Dave H. Oh man, what a comic
relief!

Kim W5TIT

1847. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 11:04:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455e08_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31908

CORRECTION MADE BELOW with insertion of word 'more'

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@noone.net> wrote in message
news:3c4557f7_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C450992.5A7BC11A@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and
> then
> > > increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
That
> > > doesn't
> > > mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point
would
> > > be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
> >
> > Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
> > babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?
> >
> > Before you begin with the usual, "Your point?", my point is that You
> > really have no idea of what you're babbling about, do you?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> So, you are not a proponent of the FCC R&R, Dave? Bill makes the
reasonable
> assumption--possibly based on personal opinion--that a better operator is
> one that would start with a probable--definitely based on personal
> opinion--power output of 100W. FCC Regulations require that no [insert
word >"more"] power is
> used than necessary to make the contact. If you're such a
> perfect--definitely based upon your personal opinion--operator, why don't
> you follow the FCC R&R? Hmmmm?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1848. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 11:08:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c455ed5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31909

"W5TIT - Kim" <none@noone.net> wrote in message
news:3c455ac8_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C451041.9AE0F82C@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > > On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.
> > >
> > >
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7
> 406%40ibm.net&rnum=1
> >
> > Jon I think he was pretending to not know what my typo spelled.
> >
>
> Which, by the way Dick, are getting worse and worse. Do you like
> deliberately no using a spellchecker? Don't you think that written
> communication should be as clear and concise as possible, just as in
verbal
> communication? Or, do you make as many mistakes when you speak, also?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Whoops, now I'm getting like 'lil Dick. The word above should be not, not
no.

heh heh heh Looky, Dave, I'm mistaken.

Kim W5TIT

1849. Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:07:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116070724.13150.00002106@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31340

Good points all, Jim. I agree with all of them. The biggest reasons that things are not moving forward are social, and, IMHO, groups like ARRL and TAPR need to do more to get the word out. Right now, hams think that "digital" means "computer-to-computer" or "keyboard-to-computer" and that is only one facet of the potential for digital operation.

And the repeater problem is indeed a difficult problem, for the very factor you describe -- the existing infrastructure. If a new trunked system or spread-spectrum system were to be installed, which existing repeaters would be displaced to do it (a contiguous chunk of frequency would be needed), who would decide who gets the axe and how can it be justified in the short term to displace repeaters that are seeing some use in favor of a new system that, though it might be beneficial in the long run, in the short run would see virtually no users because of the lack of off-the-shelf equipment for ham radio.

A demo would help, but the only bands that I think could be initially used without affecting existing users would be 900, 1200 or 2400 MHz. And demo or not, those bands, too, have the problem of the lack of existing equipment.

I will have to check with Doug Smith (Ten Tec, QEX Editor, chairman of the Digital Voice Committee) to see if the committee is considering any of these issues. Right now, they are working on trying to identify which vocoding schemes are best for ham radio, HF and above. Alinco, btw, has added a digital voice option to one of its HTs. We have a couple of units in the Lab and are getting ready to test them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/16/02 12:10 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020116001006.05154.00001154@mb-fm.aol.com>
>
>In article <20020114222247.01549.00001654@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>writes:
>
>>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>
>>>I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
>>>interfere with the adoption of a better mode.
>>

>>No, I am pointing out that back then, hams willingly exchanged spark for a
>>better operating mode.
>
>Think about WHY.
>
>CW/tube transmission was demonstrated to them in the Transatlantic Tests and
>the 1923 transatlantic QSOs.
>
>>Today, they can't exchange spectrally efficient
>>digital-voice techniques for the scheme of allocating repeater pairs that
>sit
>>idle 95% of the time.
>
>Sure they can. They just don't want to because they don't have a clear path
>to
>follow. No demos.
>>
>>Why the difference?
>>
>For one thing, there is an ENORMOUS installed repeater infrastructure.
>
>For another, homebrewing (as in building a rig from the ground up) has
>dwindled
>to a small percentage of ham stations. When the Ancient Ones wanted to get on
>the air with a new mode, they BUILT their rigs from scratch. Not just a few
>pioneers - almost everybody did it. That sort of thing decreased after WW2
>and
>now is the exception rather than the rule.
>
>The digital voice articles in QST are a start. But there needs to be a series
>of practical how-to articles on getting started. Look at the QSTs before
>about
>1970 - lots and lots of articles on getting started.
>
>Yet another reason is the mindset that 2 meters MUST be where things happen.
>Is
>222-225 all full of repeaters? How about 900 MHz?
>
>Finally, what we don't see is a frank, clear picture of what people think the
>way forward should be. What's the solution - force repeaters off the air?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

1850. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:09:22 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <22e18.51104$3x5.2860676@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31341

"CAM" wrote ...
>
> One shouldn't wait for a disaster to start preparing.
>

We were talking about setting up field stations, Cecil. I said there was a
100% chance of that happening during every disaster. Bill seems to think
that it is not likely.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

1851. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:12:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116071212.13150.00002107@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31342

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
>babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?

I don't think he was speaking for NCI. Do you? If someone works for General Motors, are you going to ask them if they are the reasoned voice of General Motors if they are posting on a subject not related to automobiles? In what way do you think that his opinion that 100 watts represents a reasonable minimum level to obey the FCC rule on "minimum necessary power" to be a statement of NCI policy? As an aside, can you cite any examples where the FCC has cited anyone for using 100 watts where 5 watts would have worked?

As to the babbling, if you could explain what you think is wrong about his post, instead of calling it babble, you would not be babbling yourself...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1852. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:13:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116071346.13150.00002108@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31343

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick apparently likes the challenge of being completely
>unprepared. :-)

I wonder if Dick could cobble together a transceiver from the bits of electronic junque scattered about his neighborhood if the tornado hit. I wonder how many hams could. In that sense, we are all unprepared. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1853. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:15:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116071514.13150.00002109@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31344

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra lite, will
>do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out fine.

Most disasters ARE local.

> when preplanning for an incident just isn't
> possible, the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools
> available.

And what tool is used for 99% of emergency communications in ham radio, local
or regional?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1854. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:16:52 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31345

In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > at the time and for the conditions.
> >
> > Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time of
> > day.
>
> If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
> about it.

He was calling CQ, what more you you ask for. OOO I C, if he were
calling CQ DX, then it would have been OK? If he were calling CQ DX,
then you wouldn't have answered him because being in Jersey (not the
English Island) you shouldn't have answered.. ;-)

>
> > The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
> > were not favorable.
>
> It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.

My mistake. So why would it have been 20 meters and NOT 40? Wanna bet
a crayfish dinner you haven't an answer?? I knew you wouldn't

>
> > Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> > be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more on 10
> > meter propagation to understand that.
>

> Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
> operation.

Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the continent.

>
> > I guess that if you can't hear
> > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
>
> Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.

See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF you BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get the right?? You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings of your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed at this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes back up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work him. I need WVa on 30m ssb

>
> > Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> > a few new high tech data modes then :-)
>
> Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)

right you are, as usual

1855. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:19:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116071917.13150.00002110@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31347

From: "Bill, KD0HG" shoot@spammersonsight.org

>As I have specifically stated that IMO, the electret element mics don't sound
>that great. If I've been instead hearing dynamic elements, and I'm mistaken,
>then IMO they don't sound that great, either.

So you are saying that 99% of microphones don't sound all that great. :-)

The PCTA folks are gonna' love this one! :-) :-) :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1856. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:19:37 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16af80239301f3e2989697@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31346

In article <3C450992.5A7BC11A@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C43DBA1.E57AA4EB@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > > > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > > > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > > > at the time and for the conditions.
> > > >
> > > > So when he called CQ he knew that a station would answer him which he
> > > didn't
> > > > need high power to work. Right.
> > >
> > Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
> > increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports. That
> > doesn't
> > mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
> > be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
> >
> Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
> babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?
>
> Before you begin with the usual, "Your point?", my point is that You
> really have no idea of what you're babbling about, do you?
>
> Dave K8MN

You see Dave, Bill can't work enough Germans with his 100 watts.

You see as with all NCI Bored members..if it's not their whey, it's
wrong. Just kidding Bill, keep on rotating the wire dipole, you'll get
there

1857. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:20:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116072037.13150.00002111@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31348

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Do you really have to be such a simpleton? Your statement is that adaptive
>filterers work great. That means all of them work great. Not so. Not all of
>anything works great. Some are rather un-great.

Can you tell us which ones are not good? That way, those that want to try them
will know which ones to avoid.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1858. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:24:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116072403.13150.00002112@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31349

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
>> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange.

>The ARRL is free to "poll" all hams anytime they want. The cost to do
>so is probably prohibitive.

The times ARRL has polled hamdom, it has used Readex and a scientific sample size. Polls can generate useful data, if taken in the context of other factors.

Steve Ford, sford@arrl.org, is always looking for good ideas for the web-page poll ARRL does, btw.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1859. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:27:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116072743.13150.00002114@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31350

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> From some of the statements of the FCC, he might have to say, "Gee, I sure
>miss
>> ham radio." ...

> More geek-threats.

If you choose not to take such statements by the FCC seriously, that is your
business. They have gotten my attention.

> If they are determined to take ham radio away for that reason
>there's no saving it anyway, and what resulted would be so different it
>really wouldn't matter to me.

Just as one example, in what way would having trunked or spread-spectrum
systems to access VHF and up spectrum using the same operating techniques we
use to access repeater pairs make ham radio not matter to you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1860. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:31:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116073108.13150.00002116@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31401

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1

>The word was "Luddide", Jon, not Luddite. I have never used the
>word "Luddide".

Yeah, but Cecil, even you knew what Dick meant. Besides, it would have been more effective of you to have pointed out that google gave only one hit on you and the word "Luddite" -- not exactly meeting my definition of "consistently." Back to Debating 101 for you!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1861. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:41:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <yxe18.87$Cl5.21082@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31402

Oh.... okay. Got it. I missed that particular episode of the Simpsons, but as always there have been some wonderful snippets heard on that show.

Ryan

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3C44486F.2DF39C96@psu.edu...
> Naa, its a visual joke. Look at a map of Florida first, then a map of Michagan.
>
> Hint: In one episode of the Simpsons, Homer is distressed when finding
> out that Florida is one of the few states theat the family hasn't been
> kicked out of on vacation and says "Oh no, not Florida, that's America's
> wang!"
>
> - Mike -
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > I think you have that backwards slightly.... Florida is Michigan in a much
> > better mood (and warmer too) , but with more Cubans and Hatians. :)
> >
> > Ryan
> >
> > "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C433CF8.79E723F4@psu.edu...
> > > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:PdC08.553$9d.19965@newshog.newsread.com...
> > > > > And Michigan.... the Going Nowhere With Water Around It state....
> > > >
> > > Someone once wrote that Michagan was Florida in a much better mood.
> > >
> > > - mike -

1862. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:41:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <zxe18.88$Cl5.21018@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31404

Gee.... and they are the ONLY group that does that??????

Ryan

> Libertarians seek to eliminate all unnecessary governmental laws,
> > requirements, and regulations.
>
> ...after they decide which ones *they* consider to be unnecessary.
>
> Dave K8MN

1863. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:41:04 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Axe18.89$CI5.21131@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31403

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a21a9h010pv@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020115003643.05453.00000735@mb-mq.aol.com...
> > In article <9f4bfe89.0201131238.53ffe5a9@posting.google.com>,
n2ey@aol.com
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Or suppose a film were to be made of rrap - who would be cast as the
> > >various characters?
> > >
> > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > Well, there's absolutely no doubt that I would have to be played by
> > Tom Hanks. Bruce Willis would be an acceptable alternate if Tom
> > weren't available...although, when offered the part, I'm sure he'd clear
> > his calendar!
> >
> > Kim Walker would absolutely have to be played by Roseanne Barr.
> > No substitute would do.
> >
> > Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
> > although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).
> >
> > I suggest that you (Jim Miccolis) be played by Alan Alda.
> >
> > Dave Heil should be portrayed by Dan Akroyd.
> >
> > Dick Carroll should be played by William C. Macy.
> >
> > Dick McCollum should be played by Sam Waterston.
> >
> > Carl Stevenson should be played by Jerry Orbach.
> >
> > Steve Robeson should be played by Patrick Labyorteaux.
> >
> > Have I left anyone out? Any comments/gripes/suggestions?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

Forgot me, but then again there isn't anyone I look like at all that is famous in any sense of the word. Look me up on Qrz.com and see if you think I resemble anyone.....

(I personally do not believe anyone else could be that ugly! :)

Ryan

1864. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 12:41:05 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Bxe18.90$CI5.20718@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31405

I was thinking Sean Connery might be a little more appropriate..... :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C447EF4.4C4171D1@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Cecil would not provide much of a challenge to any competent actor,
> > although Rodney Dangerfield comes to mind (assuming he's not SK).
>
> I want Don Rickles to play me.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1865. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:09:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a23tu20126f@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31411

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020115211502.12969.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com...

> Only newsgroup participants who identify by their full name and
> call sign (if they have one) gets a speaking role. All others are just
> "atmosphere."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

20,000 plus newsgroups are on usenet. The semi-anonymous nature of Usenet is what makes it so great. Yet, the amateur radio newsgroups are the only ones that have people who want you to "identify" yourself. Usenet is not amateur radio, and therefore, does not require that I post a callsign.

1866. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116081002.17580.00000338@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31407

In article <20020114190303.20987.00001484@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>For SSB communications, adding a filter to the existing ~2500 Hz SSB filter
>already in the rig is not going to buy anything. 2500 Hz is pretty much the
>necessary bandwidth for SSB.

Shape factor may be imporved on some rigs.

>On CW, one can narrow up the bandwidth from the
>typical 500 Hz bandwidth in today's rigs to about 100 Hz, using either an
>internal or an outboard filter.

Yep. 500 Hz is the widest that should even be considered. Cascading filters helps, too.

> This can be either analog or DSP -- the
>effect
>will be the same.

Not as a general rule.

One of the most neglected factors is AGC. Too many hams and rig makers think that AGC is so necessary that they never turn it off. In my experience, AGC on a crowded band increases the apparent interference.

Suppose I have a receiver with a 500 Hz IF filter that has 4:1 shape factor. I'm trying to listen to an S5 signal when an S9 + 10 db signal shows up 600-700 Hz away. The interfering station takes over the AGC and drives the S5 station into the noise, even if I zero-beat the interfering station.

If I turn off the AGC, reduce RF and increase AF gain, the S5 station may become readable.

A sharper IF filter can reduce the S9+10 dB station's strength to the point that it no longer takes over the AGC. Audio DSP, or DSP that is not a part of the AGC control, can't do that.

Two really nice features of the K2: You can turn off the AGC, and you can set up the IF xtal filters in a wide variety of ways.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1867. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116081002.17580.00000337@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31408

In article <hgA08.101295$fe1.1325638@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Jim, N2EY (replying to my QRP/QRO rant) wrote:
>
>> There are times when 15 watts is more than enough, and
>> other times when 1500 watts isn't enough.
>
>Considering that a typical ionospheric path varies by
>20 dB over a period of less than a minute, both
>conditions are present practically simultaneously.

Nope. The appropriate power level is that which will be copyable at the bottom of the fade. Sometimes that's QRP, sometimes it's QRO.

>
>OTOH, there are times when 3 dB more transmitter power
>is all that is necessary to push the DSP algorithm from
>correlating noise and rejecting signal to correlating
>signal and rejecting noise.
>
Yup. Or the wetware.

In case you haven't noticed, I'm NOT against high power. I'm for "approrpiate power". If somebody can't hear my 10 watts, they don't have to work me.

>> Then again, I run almost all CW.
>
>That buys a whole bunch of dB margin, of course, but
>that detection threshold is still there.

Oh yes.

>A light-
>dimmer swishing across a 250 Hz bandwidth at a 120 Hz
>rate will still destroy a QSO that could be had if
>limited only by the quiet atmospheric noise of a
>winter's night.

If it's loud enough and the noise is such that a blanker can't handle it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1868. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116081003.17580.00000339@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31406

In article <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
>increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
> That
>doesn't
>mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
>be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).

Wrong.

"Reasonable power" depends on the situation. With good conditions and a decent
antenna, 1.5 watts is reasonable power. Under other circumstances 1500 watts is
reasonable power. And of course there are all sorts of variations in between.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1869. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:26:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116082643.09758.00001363@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31409

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> This can be either analog or DSP -- the
>> effect will be the same.

>Not as a general rule.

In the context of the discussion, the effect will be the same. I was addressing the statement that some hams don't want to have to run high power to overcome noisy conditions on the other end. I was thinking of local noise -- power line and such, and under those circumstances, receiver ACG and dynamic range are not apt to be factors. Under those circumstances, bandwidth is bandwidth is bandwidth, for the most part.

>One of the most neglected factors is AGC. Too many hams and rig makers think
>that AGC is so necessary that they never turn it off. In my experience, AGC
>on
>a crowded band increases the apparent interference.

Yes, and in the presence of strong signals elsewhere in the band, filter placement makes a BIG difference.

And, from our experience, most rigs today DO allow one to turn off AGC. In some cases, one has to drill through a menu or two, or hold the AGC button for 5 seconds or such, but it usually can be done. If it can't, ARRL Product Review testing has to measure gain compression with the AGC on, and that does NOT help give good dynamic range numbers. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1870. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 13:29:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116082925.09758.00001364@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31410

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Nope. The appropriate power level is that which will be copyable at the
>bottom
>of the fade. Sometimes that's QRP, sometimes it's QRO.

Not necessarily. It depends on whether one is willing to accept brief periods of lost data. Lost data can be recovered, with forward-error correction or repeats.

Some of the low-power communications I have done have relied on just the opposite effect. I expect to get through on only signal peaks. I will point out that I haven't worked Hans with 10 milliwatts on HF yet. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1871. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 15:34:04 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <M3h18.377127$W8.13780639@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31412

> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> > > Ah yes, you're the dipstick that insists that since PSK31 has an
> > "advantage"
> > > over CW, when I can hear the CWID but the PSK is too weak to copy,
that's
> > OK
> > > because PSK has an "advantage"! heh heh heh! Whatta dip!
> >
> Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > We explained to you, a couple of years ago, when you tried to make this
> > argument before. If you can't hear the PSK31 but you can copy the CWID
it's
> > because the power/bandwith of the MCW CWID is much higher and of course
> > you'd have a better chance of hearing that.
>
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Yeah, that was your excuse then as now, that was my point.
> When your geekiness gets to the point that CW at the exact same poer level
as
> PSK31 will make copy when PSK31 will not, your argument in favor of the
"more
> efficient mode" is shot to hell, sorry about that.

> > You should have tried QPSK at
> > the time. Although, if you did get through you wouldn't be able to trash
it
> > now, right?

> Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to
print, a
> group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I
wasn't
> attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could
copy
> their CWID's!

Yeah, right the bands nearly dead you could have worked them using QPSK.
But, no.... this wouldn't be 'in line' with your adgenda.

MCW is much wider than normal CW and can be heard when CW can't why don't
you use that mode? I'll tell you why because it's illegal that's why.

> > If you keep relating that same story for years and years well what can
we
> > say....

> Any story worth telling is worth retellihg to a new audience, and to
> re-ragale old ones.

> > > You dingaling.

> > Loser... (hate to join in the name-calling but it's ALL you understand)

> Nope. I'm the winner. You're the loser and have no clue. You see, I know
and
> use almost every mode in HF ham radio-including CW. Do you?

You even use and recommend the illegal MCW. In HF MCW is only legal in the
"CW, phone, image" subbands. It's illegal in the "CW, RTTY, and data"
subbands.

Rich

1872. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 15:40:39 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <X9h18.104805$fe1.1542173@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31413

Jim, N2EY posted:

> In case you haven't noticed, I'm NOT against high power.
> I'm for "appropriate power". If somebody can't hear my
> 10 watts, they don't have to work me.

My original point was a rebuttal, of sorts, to Steve, K4YZ's
proposal:

>> To go one further, I would support an overall
>> regulatory reduction in our authorized power levels
>> to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40, and no
>> more than 250W on the rest of our allocations,
>> including UHF and above.

The term "appropriate power" implies that power level
will be at the discretion of the operator. By limiting
the upper range of that power level control by government
fiat means that, in some cases, an inappropriately low
power level will be mandated by law. I would prefer that
not be the case.

K7JEB:

>>A light-
>>dimmer swishing across a 250 Hz bandwidth at a 120 Hz
>>rate will still destroy a QSO that could be had if
>>limited only by the quiet atmospheric noise of a
>>winter's night.

N2EY:

> If it's loud enough and the noise is such that a
> blanker can't handle it.

These little goodies are more like "birdies" -- the
high harmonics of a free-running oscillator in the
10's of kHz range used to "touch-sense" for a light
dimmer. It's very much like a frequency-modulated
signal and totally immune to noise-blanking. Or
they might be the unfiltered harmonics from a switching
power supply used to regulate the brightness of lawn
lights. Or....

Notice how I have been able to successfully hijack
a .policy thread into a technical discussion. ;-)

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1873. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 16:26:46 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a249n7$vg8$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 31415

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C44F709.99B15BFB@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Great food for thought, Hans. Circular reasoning would then seem to be
> > at the core of Objectivism. In other words, you must also be able to
> > deduce the premise from the conclusion.
>
> Absolutely untrue, Jim. Ayn Rand started with a few axioms, just like
> geometry does. She built the Objectivist Epistomology along the same
> structure as geometry.
>
> A couple of the axioms that I remember are: Existence exists and
> consciousness is conscious. One has to start somewhere. You cannot
> prove the existence of a point yet most of your mathematics is
> based on the existence of a point. Nobody has proven the existence
> of a supernatural yet the great majority of human beings allow the
> concept of a supernatural in one form or another to rule their lives.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Sorry to jump in on this but, this discussion reminds me of this story.

Religion 101...

One day a 6 year old girl was sitting in a classroom. The teacher was
going to explain evolution to the children.

The teacher asked a little boy: "Tommy do you see the tree outside?"

TOMMY: Yes.

TEACHER: Tommy, do you see the grass outside?

TOMMY: Yes.

TEACHER: Go outside and look up and see if you can see the sky.

TOMMY: Okay. (He returned a few minutes later) Yes, I saw the sky.

TEACHER: Did you see God?

TOMMY: No.

TEACHER: That's my point. We can't see God because he isn't there.
He doesn't exist.

A little girl spoke up and wanted to ask the boy some questions. The
teacher agreed and the little girl asked the boy: "Tommy, do you see
the tree outside?"

TOMMY: Yes.

LITTLE GIRL: Tommy do you see the grass outside?

TOMMY: Yesssss (getting tired of the questions by this time).

LITTLE GIRL: Did you see the sky?

TOMMY: Yesssss

LITTLE GIRL: Tommy, do you see the teacher?

TOMMY: Yes

LITTLE GIRL: Do you see her brain?

TOMMY: No

LITTLE GIRL: Then according to what we were taught today in school,
she must not have one!

"FOR WE WALK BY FAITH, NOT BY SIGHT" II CORINTHIANS 4:7

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Man will occasionally stumble over the truth,
but most of the time he will pick himself up
and continue on.
-Churchill's commentary on man

1874. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 16:30:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45AA4E.CB6F83@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31414

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
> >babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?
>
> I don't think he was speaking for NCI. Do you? If someone works for General
> Motors, are you going to ask them if they are the reasoned voice of General
> Motors if they are posting on a subject not related to automobiles?

In what way is amateur radio not related to amateur radio? Is Bill
talking about the need for change in a regulation which he doesn't
understand?

> In what
> way do you think that his opinion that 100 watts represents a reasonable
> minimum level to obey the FCC rule on "minimum necessary power" to be a
> statement of NCI policy? As an aside, can you cite any examples where the FCC
> has cited anyone for using 100 watts where 5 watts would have worked?

I not only recall the FCC citing anyone for using 100 when 5 watts would
have worked, I can't recall the FCC citing anyone for using 1500 watts
where 5 watts would have worked.

> As to the babbling, if you could explain what you think is wrong about his
> post, instead of calling it babble, you would not be babbling yourself...

Ed, I could but I'm not going to. I'm not going to spend the amount of
time required to discuss power levels with Bill. I won't be at all
upset if you'd like to take on the challenge and devote the time.

Dave K8MN

1875. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:11:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C45B440.F9623CF1@uci.edu>
Source record: 31420

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Great food for thought, Hans. Circular reasoning would then seem to be
> > at the core of Objectivism. In other words, you must also be able to
> > deduce the premise from the conclusion.

> Absolutely untrue, Jim.

It's a fact that it truly is my opinion. :-)

1876. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:15:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31416

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 14, 2002:

Novice - 40,117 (decrease of 9,212)
Tech - 234,661 (increase of 29,267)
Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
Advanced - 86,502 (decrease of 13,280)
Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)
Total - 683,043 (increase of 8,251)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1877. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:18:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C45B5F2.D5E7A06A@uci.edu>
Source record: 31421

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
>
> That's just your subjective opinion.

Presuming Ayn Rand's opinion of the issue of Morse code is less than
objective.

What's with the 'y'??

1878. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:22:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C45AA68.6F47BFF7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31417

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra lite, will
> >do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out fine.
>
> Most disasters ARE local.
>

Well..... Have you checked with the folks who rode through Hurricane Andrew,
for one, and there are many other similiar examples. Maybe we need to define
"local".

>
> > when preplanning for an incident just isn't
> > possible, the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools
> > available.
>
> And what tool is used for 99% of emergency communications in ham radio, local
> or regional?
>

Given that 99% of emergency communications is practice drill the answer would be
whatever the local hams want to use. There is no question that most "support"
comms are done on 2meter FM. So I guess we should just ignore the widearea
disasters where 2meter FM is useless, and HF SSB ineffective due band conditions
(a particularly common situation in hurricanes which are one of our most common
disaster threats).
We won't mention the West Coast "Big One" that scientists keep telling us is
coming.

1879. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:27:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C45AB8A.E09D7216@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31418

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Bill, KD0HG" shoot@spammersonsight.org
>
> >As I have specifically stated that IMO, the electret element mics don't sound
> >that great. If I've been instead hearing dynamic elements, and I'm mistaken,
> >then IMO they don't sound that great, either.
>
> So you are saying that 99% of microphones don't sound all that great. :-)
>
> The PCTA folks are gonna' love this one! :-) :-) :-)

Makes sense when you understand were Bill comes from - the broadcast indstry where sounding good is important. To many hams that isn't as strong consideration as "punch" to get through QRM. Of couse that doesn't excuse the transmitter mismanagement Bill notes. It does demonstrate that fact that lots of hams are putting transmitters on the air without knowing enough about what they're doing.

1880. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:30:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C45AC50.96205B3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31419

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Do you really have to be such a simpleton? Your statement is that adaptive
> >filterers work great. That means all of them work great. Not so. Not all of
> >anything works great. Some are rather un-great.
>
> Can you tell us which ones are not good?

No, I can't. I'm sure there are many I haven't tested, or even heard of. Have youU? If not, why not? that's part of your job at the lab, isn't it?

But I'd wager that some are good and some are not, just as almost every other manufactured device.

1881. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:48:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C45B089.2CD1C935@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31422

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> From some of the statements of the FCC, he might have to say, "Gee, I sure
> >miss
> >> ham radio." ...
>
> > More geek-threats.
>
> If you choose not to take such statements by the FCC seriously, that is your
> business. They have gotten my attention.
>
> > If they are determined to take ham radio away for that reason
> >there's no saving it anyway, and what resulted would be so different it
> >really wouldn't matter to me.
>
> Just as one example, in what way would having trunked or spread-spectrum
> systems to access VHF and up spectrum using the same operating techniques we
> use to access repeater pairs make ham radio not matter to you?

There are advantages to trunked systems *in some usage cases*. It is difficult to imagine a ham radio where those advantages would come into play. In a ham radio where most repeaters remain quiet nearly around the clock daily, I see no advantage whatever to being able to set up special access groups, which is used to advantage in law enforcement as an example. What I DO see is a lot of costly complexity for the sake of itself, "modernizing" for its own sake.
And in a environment where you state serious concern about spectral problems causecd by all the Part 15 devices it's difficult to imagine anything but more insidious elevation of the noise floor by universal adaption of spread spectrum. I know that I once did a lot of work tracking unintentional a wideband random noise generator that would wipe out a lowband VHF receiver which was used in a crossband Public Safety repeater. The signal would disappear in midsentence, taken out by noise which would activate the limiter but not open the squelch. Took some detective work, but I finally found the source, a machine shop about a block away that used very noisy power tools at random times, and it was such that it caused the repeater to be relocated to a less noisy area. This was in a tiny rural village, too not a metropolitian area. I can imagine what countless intentional noise sources might bring to the ARS in high density popupation centers. I expect it's coming.but I don't have to like it - nor support it.

1882. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:51:38 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <K4j18.274043$WW.13795059@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31423

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020115224719.13551.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <20020115185616.16238.00001420@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >Yes, Larry; I should be played by Woody Allen! :-)
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> One kilopardon requested, Ed! Your request that Woody be cast
> as your own good self is approved!
>
> I also counted on my fingers and toes, and determined that I also
> forgot Hans Brakob, who I suggest be portrayed by John M. Jackson.
>
> And speaking of lawyers (or those who play them on TV), I suggest
> that Phil Kane be portrayed by Ray Walston.
>
> Casting seems to be complete; now all we need is a plot. Any
> suggestions?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

What we need here Larry is a backbone story that will let us do skits and schtick. My first choice was something like the old Andy Hardy movies where Mickey Rooney and Judy Garland alternated saying "I know, let's put on a show!". But I think a better model is an old Randolph Scott epic I believe called Fort Worth in which people who never met in real life and in fact were not even alive at the same time rode thru town. Envision the following:

Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in Blazing Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry Rides Again.

Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since 1926 has come to him for legacy shoeses."

Down at the livery stable, Hans sings, "And I polished up the apple so care-ful-ly that now I'm the ruler of a Big R-V"

Over at the Opera House Jim has to be physically restrained from singing Springtime for Hitler and in the repertoire performance of the Sound of Muzak, like the Mother Superior in the original gets this glassy-eyed look and begins to bellow, "Build your own hardware, build every piece, follow every wild hair, til life itself should cease'.

Cecil is in the Men's Room I mean meeting room of the local Mensa chapter where a riot has begun and Cecil is beating hell out of all and sundry with a Funk and Wagnalls.

Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed is waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for which the planning commission has no player.

At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.

And the surface has yet to be scratched.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1883. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 17:58:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C45B2EE.B3DCD4FA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31424

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020115224719.13551.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > In article <20020115185616.16238.00001420@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Yes, Larry; I should be played by Woody Allen! :-)
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > One kilopardon requested, Ed! Your request that Woody be cast
> > as your own good self is approved!
> >
> > I also counted on my fingers and toes, and determined that I also
> > forgot Hans Brakob, who I suggest be portrayed by John M. Jackson.
> >
> > And speaking of lawyers (or those who play them on TV), I suggest
> > that Phil Kane be portrayed by Ray Walston.
> >
> > Casting seems to be complete; now all we need is a plot. Any
> > suggestions?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> What we need here Larry is a backbone story that will let us do skits and
> schtick. My first choice was something like the old Andy Hardy movies
> where Mickey Rooney and Judy Garland alternated saying "I know, let's put
> on a show!". But I think a better model is an old Randolph Scott epic I
> believe called Fort Worth in which people who never met in real life and
> in fact were not even alive at the same time rode thru town. Envision the
> following:
>
> Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in Blazing
> Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry Rides Again.
>
> Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
> Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
> slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
> spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since 1926

> has come to him for legacy shoeses."
>
> Down at the livery stable, Hans sings, "And I polished up the apple so
> care-ful-ly that now I'm the ruler of a Big R-V"
>
> Over at the Opera House Jim has to be physically restrained from singing
> Springtime for Hitler and in the repertoire performance of the Sound of
> Muzak, like the Mother Superior in the original gets this glassy-eyed look
> and begins to bellow, "Build your own hardware, build every piece, follow
> every wild hair, til life itself should cease'.
>
> Cecil is in the Men's Room I mean meeting room of the local Mensa chapter
> where a riot has begun and Cecil is beating hell out of all and sundry
> with a Funk and Wagnalls.
>
> Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
> Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed is
> waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
> which the planning commission has no player.
>
> At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has
> done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.
>
> And the surface has yet to be scratched.

'Zactly what I expected - The Theatre of the Absurd.

1884. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:22:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C4E3.771A692E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31425

Dave Heil wrote:
> The freedom you advocate would seem to be for you alone.

Nope, I advocate those same freedoms for all mankind.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1885. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:25:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C5A3.61D7E572@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31426

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Dick apparently likes the challenge of being completely
> >unprepared. :-)
>
> I wonder if Dick could cobble together a transceiver from the bits of
> electronic junque scattered about his neighborhood if the tornado hit. I
> wonder how many hams could. In that sense, we are all unprepared. :-)

One would think there would be higher priorities than ham radio - like
saving one's wife and kids from a collapsing house.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1886. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:29:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C685.E879FE7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31427

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
> >
> > One shouldn't wait for a disaster to start preparing.
>
> We were talking about setting up field stations, Cecil. I said there was a
> 100% chance of that happening during every disaster. Bill seems to think
> that it is not likely.

That's what I was talking about, Arnie. I have a spare HF rig in my gun
safe. Also three spare batteries and portable antennas at various locations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1887. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:34:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C7A2.CD30C63D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31428

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438
> F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1
>
> >The word was "Luddide", Jon, not Luddite. I have never used the
> >word "Luddide".
>
> Yeah, but Cecil, even you knew what Dick meant.

I was making fun of Dick's typo, Ed. Do I have to put a smiley face
on every joke?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1888. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:34:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C7CF.F63F5678@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31429

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > On Tue, 15 Jan 2002 22:25:00 -0500, CAM wrote:
> > > I don't even know what a Luddide is and have never used the word.
> >
> > http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1
>
> Jon I think he was pretending to not know what my typo spelled.

No, I was making fun of your typo, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1889. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:37:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C865.28B8A736@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31430

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I can gather the names of some digital
> > communications experts who will agree that it is a fact that
> > a digital mode without FEC is a poor choice for HF RF.
>
> Why go to all the trouble? Even most experienced hams could tell you
> that, including yers truly. But that's not what you said. You said no
> non-FEC mode was a serious mode. That includes all pre-FEC modes. RTTY
> is still a in use, and is pretty darn good in weak signal conditions. I
> think it's a serious mode, still, even if not the mode of choice of the
> digigeek set.

Dick, ask the military if they think RTTY is a serious mode. And RTTY
is NOT pretty darn good in weak signal conditions. It sucks under
weak signal conditions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1890. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:39:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45C8C6.2E9480A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31431

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You obviously don't know a lot about HF digital communications, Dave.
> > Do you think the military uses FEC or not?
>
> I know a good deal about what the military and other government agencies
> use. Since you don't have a clearance or a need to know, you'll not
> hear it from me.

Translation: Every knowledgable person knows the military uses FEC in
their HF digital communications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1891. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:46:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CA7E.4F7B1F3E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31432

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Why, of course not and of course! But do you think no other user -maybe no ham-is
> serious? There is a difference between serious and critical.

Uhhhhhh Dick, "critical" is "serious". For conversational purposes
those two words are interchangeable. From Webster's:
"serious - having possibly dangerous consequences"
"critical - characterized by risk"

Wouldn't you agree that depending only on RTTY during an emergency is
characterized by risk and may have possibly dangerous consequences?
You have said as much in the past.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1892. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:50:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CB5B.2F8D3309@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31433

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > You deny badmouthing digital methods and in the very next sentence you badmouth
> > digital adaptive filtering. Digital adaptive filtering methods are as good as
> > they are. I have not exaggerated their capabilities.
>
> Do you really have to be such a simpleton? Your statement is that adaptive
> filterers work great. That means all of them work great. Not so. Not all of
> anything works great. Some are rather un-great.

Like any other statement I make, it means that well-designed adaptive filters
work great when applied to a problem suitable for solution with well-designed
adaptive filters. Adaptive filters will not fix a flat tire. Are you capable
of anything except carping?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1893. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:50:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CB8F.15708D82@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31434

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Do you really have to be such a simpleton? Your statement is that adaptive
> >filterers work great. That means all of them work great. Not so. Not all of
> >anything works great. Some are rather un-great.
>
> Can you tell us which ones are not good?

The ones for which Dick wrote the algorithms.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1894. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 18:52:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CC03.E64C4772@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31435

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But I'd wager that some are good and some are not, just as almost every other
> manufactured device.

The bad ones usually don't make it to market and if they do, they
are soon discarded.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1895. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:01:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CDFA.899E582A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31437

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to print, a
> group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I wasn't
> attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could copy
> their CWID's!

I keep telling you, Dick, you need a digital mode with FEC. HF is notorious
for phase shifting an RF signal. Obviously, a mode that depends on phase
and has no error correction is going to fail under those circumstances.
The human ear is relatively immune to phase shifts encountered using CW.
If you had been using PACTOR II in a QSO, things would have been reversed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1896. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:07:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OE$C1$rnBHA.1732@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31436

God would like to thank you for your belief and patronage. In order to
better
serve your needs, He asks that you take a few moments to answer the
following
questions.

Please keep in mind that your responses will be kept completely
confidential,
and that you need not disclose your name or address unless you prefer a
direct
response to comments or suggestions.

1. How did you find out about your Deity?
___ Newspaper
___ Bible
___ Torah
___ Book of Mormon
___ Koran
___ Divine inspiration
___ Dead Sea Scrolls
___ My mama done tol' me
___ Near-death experience
___ Near-life experience
___ National Public Radio
___ Tabloid
___ Burning shrubbery
___ Other (specify): _____

2. Which model Deity did you acquire?
___ Yahweh
___ Father, Son & Holy Ghost [Trinity Pak]
___ Jehovah
___ Jesus
___ Krishna
___ Zeus and entourage [Olympus Pak]
___ Odin and entourage [Valhalla Pak]
___ Allah
___ Satan
___ Gaia/Mother Earth/Mother Nature
___ God 1.0a (hairy thunderer)
___ God 1.0b (cosmic muffin)
___ None of the above; I was taken in by a false god

3. Did your God come to you undamaged, with all parts in good working order
and

with no obvious breakage or missing attributes?
___ Yes
___ No
If no, please describe the problems you initially encountered here. Please indicate all that apply:
___ Not eternal
___ Finite in space/Does not occupy or inhabit the entire cosmos
___ Not omniscient
___ Not omnipotent
___ Not infinitely plastic (incapable of being all things to all creations)
___ Permits sex outside of marriage
___ Prohibits sex outside of marriage
___ Makes mistakes (Geraldo Rivera, Jesse Helms)
___ Makes or permits bad things to happen to good people
___ When beseeched, doesn't stay beseeched
___ Requires burnt offerings
___ Requires virgin sacrifices
___ Plays dice with the universe

4. What factors were relevant in your decision to acquire a Deity? Please check
all that apply.
___ Indoctrinated by parents
___ Needed a reason to live
___ Indoctrinated by society
___ Needed focus in whom to despise
___ Imaginary friend grew up
___ Wanted to know Jesus in the Biblical sense
___ Graduated from the tooth fairy
___ Hate to think for myself
___ Wanted to meet girls/boys
___ Fear of death
___ Wanted to piss off parents
___ Needed a day away from work
___ Desperate need for certainty
___ Like organ music
___ Need to feel morally superior
___ Thought Jerry Falwell was cool
___ My shrubbery caught fire and told me to do it

5. Have you ever worshipped a Deity before? If so, which false god were you fooled by? Please check all that apply.
___ Mick Jagger
___ Rajanish
___ Baal
___ The almighty dollar
___ Bill Gates
___ Left-wing liberalism
___ The radical right
___ Ra
___ Beelzebub

___ Barney T.B.P.D.
___ The Great Spirit
___ The Great Pumpkin
___ The sun
___ Elvis
___ Cindy Crawford
___ The moon
___ TV news
___ Burning shrubbery
___ Other: _____

6. Are you currently using any other source of inspiration in addition to God?
Please check all that apply.
__ Tarot __ Lottery __ Astrology
__ Television __ Fortune cookies __ Ann Landers
__ Psychic Friends Network __ Dianetics __ Palmistry
__ Playboy and/or Playgirl __ Self-help books __ Sex, drugs, rock and roll
__ Biorhythms __ Alcohol __ Bill Clinton
__ Tea leaves __ EST __ CompuServe
__ Mantras __ Jimmy Swaggert __ Crystals (not including Crystal Gayle)
__ Human sacrifice __ Pyramids __ Wandering in a desert
__ Burning shrubbery __ Barney T.B.P.D. __ Barney Fife
Other:_____

7. God employs a limited degree of divine intervention to preserve the balanced
level of felt presence and blind faith. Which would you prefer (circle one)?

a. More divine intervention

b. Less divine intervention

c. Current level of divine intervention is just right

d. Don't know...what's divine intervention?

8. God also attempts to maintain a balanced level of disasters and miracles.
Please rate on a scale of 1 - 5 his handling of the following

(1=unsatisfactory, 5=excellent):

Disasters:
flood 1 2 3 4 5
famine 1 2 3 4 5
earthquake 1 2 3 4 5
war 1 2 3 4 5
pestilence 1 2 3 4 5
plague 1 2 3 4 5
spam 1 2 3 4 5
AOL 1 2 3 4 5

Miracles:
rescues 1 2 3 4 5
spontaneous remissions 1 2 3 4 5
stars hovering over jerkwater towns 1 2 3 4 5
crying statues 1 2 3 4 5
water changing to wine 1 2 3 4 5
walking on water 1 2 3 4 5
VCRs that set their own clocks 1 2 3 4 5
Saddam Hussein still alive 1 2 3 4 5
getting any sex whatsoever 1 2 3 4 5

9. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for improving the quality
of God's services? (Attach an additional sheet if necessary.)

If you are able to complete the questionnaire and return it to one of our conveniently located drop-off boxes by October 31 you will be entered in the One Free Miracle of Your Choice drawing (chances of winning are approximately
one in 6.023 x 10 to the 23d power, depending on number of beings entered).

1897. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:09:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45CFCC.12C433AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31439

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.
> > Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.
> > So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?
>
> So where is the evidence against it?

Just proves my point. Virtually all intelligent people know that a
negative cannot be proven. The question is: How can you give
yourself permission to believe in something based on an *absence*
of evidence? There is an absence of evidence that someone named
Dick Carroll lives on Mars. So is there someone named Dick
Carroll living on Mars? If you have enough faith, will that
make it so?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1898. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:15:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eqn8bEsnBHA.1472@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31438

Larry Roll K3LT wrote

> forgot Hans Brakob, who I suggest be portrayed by John M. Jackson.

Nice promotion from E9 to O7. (I would have bitch-slapped that kid too.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

1899. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:15:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D16A.85548ACF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31440

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You aren't discussing
> > > what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.
> > >
> > Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> > on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.
>
> You spout so much BS that you can't even keep your own stories straight.
> What you told us is what Ayn Rand would have thought about morse
> testing. You didn't know what she thought about it then and you don't
> know now.

I have read virtually every word that Ayn Rand ever wrote. I have attended her lectures. I have chatted with her over a glass of wine. I have patterned my life based on her principles. It is my educated opinion that she would have been against Morse code testing and that all true Libertarians are against it. I would be pro Morse code testing if it were not for my Objectivist principles which were established by Ayn Rand.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1900. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:17:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D1C9.38DBC85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31442

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
> > >
> > That's just your subjective opinion.
>
> That is only your subjective opinion of my statement.

So you admit your opinion is subjective?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1901. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:26:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OwACaKsnBHA.1332@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31441

"Dick Carroll" wrote

> But I'd wager that some are good and some are not, just as almost every
other
> manufactured device.

Some are good and some are not.

I bought one of the expensive CW filters for my Icom. Doesn't seem to work,
as the CW is coming through even better than before I installed the filter.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1902. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:29:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31443

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
> >
> > That's just your subjective opinion.
>
> Presuming Ayn Rand's opinion of the issue of Morse code is less than
> objective.

How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?

> What's with the 'y'??

Ayn Rand was born a Russian Jewish girl. 'Ayn' is a two syllable
name resembling 'Ian' with a long 'I'.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1903. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:32:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D552.B2165FE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31444

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah. Now he gets to decide the qualifications of a "true" libertarian. And he
> crirticises others who use the term "Real Hams".

That's where Objectivism has the advantage, Dick. Non-Objectivists, like
you, have subjective opinions. Objectivists, like me, have objective opinions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1904. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:36:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D63D.4074AC1A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31445

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I get it now. Morse testing falls under the Commerce Department. I always
> thought the FCC had that one.

Morse code testing is the ultimate result of the interstate commerce
provision in The Constitution. The legal reason that the FCC gets to
control amateur radio is the interstate commerce provision.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1905. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:40:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C45D73F.FB44A143@uci.edu>
Source record: 31450

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
> > >
> > > That's just your subjective opinion.
> >
> > Presuming Ayn Rand's opinion of the issue of Morse code is less than
> > objective.

> How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?

But the 'founder' wasn't doing the 'presuming'. You were. How can that be objective? I believe you told us the founder never expressed an opinion about Morse code.

> > What's with the 'y'??

> Ayn Rand was born a Russian Jewish girl.

Steve Martin was born a poor black child. :-)

> 'Ayn' is a two syllable
> name resembling 'Ian' with a long 'I'.

My dad had an uncle Ian with a long 'I'.

1906. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:45:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D858.3AA09B1A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31446

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> > > general aviation will never be known.
> >
> > Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
> > commerce.
>
> Ah, but you make things up as you go along. Your attempt at yet another
> diversion is gone *poof*.

I'm surprised that a person like yourself is ignorant of the interstate commerce provisions in The Constitution. General aviation is controlled by the feds under the provisions of interstate commerce. Amateur radio is controlled by the feds under the provisions of interstate commerce. Thus the Morse code exam exists because of the interstate commerce provisions in The Constitution. And thus Jefferson and Adams agree in principle through their acceptance of the interstate commerce provisions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1907. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:52:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45D9F6.8EDADEFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31448

N2EY wrote:
> One of the most neglected factors is AGC. Too many hams and rig makers think
> that AGC is so necessary that they never turn it off. In my experience, AGC on
> a crowded band increases the apparent interference.

The AGC on the IC-706 cannot be turned off. :-(
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1908. Re: Hey Cecil, I'm wrong!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:55:08 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0201161155.1a72b7be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31447

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C3F3D90.171607D@IEEE.org>...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > QSL, on the other hand, with a ? -- QSL? -- means "Can you acknowledge
> > receipt?" The ARRL Scout Handbook indicates that a QSL (card, without
> > the ?) is to be exchanged to acknowledge a contact.
>
> "QSL?" doesn't necessarily have anything to do with a QSL card. It
> can mean, "Can you acknowledge receipt? (of the information that I
> just sent to you)" What does QSO mean in:?
> - -. -..- ..-. . .-. ..-. -... --.- ... ---

I'm wrong. QSL is, indeed as you have stated, properly used within a CW QSO to indicate understanding. My confusion apparently springs from looking at a QSL as a confirmation of a QSO. All that reasearch just confused me and the issue until my Monday night buddies walked me through it one more time.

I also heartily apologize for the "Sorry, Cecil" greeting on my original message. Looking back on it, it was smart-alec, though if I had been "saying" it face-to-face, I don't think it would've come across that way.

73

KB9RVB
Carl Zager
czager@mccsc.edu http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager/

1909. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 19:57:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45DB22.E5892058@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31449

KC8PMX wrote:
> I was thinking Sean Connery might be a little more appropriate..... :)

Funny you should say that. I have been accused multiple times of
looking like and acting like Sean Connery. We might have a
common ancestor. (doesn't everyone?)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1910. Re: Hey Cecil, I'm wrong!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 20:03:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C45DC97.AC1E0130@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31251

Carl Zager wrote:
> I also heartily apologize for the "Sorry, Cecil" greeting on my original
> message. Looking back on it, it was smart-alec, though if I had been
> "saying" it face-to-face, I don't think it would've come across that way.

Notice that I responded in kind. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1911. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 20:30:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uwQy04snBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31252

Dick Carroll wrote

> So where is the evidence against it? ....
> It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this just "happned".

In all seriousness, I can't find any evidence either "for" or "against", which is why I call myself agnostic (not atheist). I'll continue to search.

My natural inclination is to look at things in terms of "cause and effect" (i.e.., "deterministic") fashion. Thus, I share your mindset that all this didn't "just happen". Supposing for the moment that I had a monstrous Cray computer which could explain today's universe completely in terms of its state a billion years ago. I would really have accomplished nothing useful, except to move the mystery back a billion years. Then I suppose I could use my Cray to explain that state in terms of a billion years earlier, and so on, but the chain of cause and effect would go on and on until I'd reach an impasse -- a point beyond which my computer could not penetrate.

The issue then becomes whether or not some supernatural act is needed to kick-start the whole thing, from whence the "laws of physics" go into effect, and my giant Cray computer can apply those laws (Heisenberg notwithstanding) to reach our current state of the universe..... .....and continue forward to infinity and beyond, to quote Buzz Lightyear.

Unfortunately, that deterministic scenario is distinctly unattractive to religion, because it places god in the position of just "throwing a switch" and then having his role reduced, as Ilya Prigogine puts it, to "a mere archivist turning the pates of a cosmic history book already written".

I'll keep searching.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1912. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 20:49:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Oq1jC5snBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31253

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?
>

Objective?? How does Objectivism explain her personal behavior.

For many years Ayn and her follower, Nathaniel Branden, were involved in love affair that they kept secret from everyone except their respective spouses. By their reckoning the affair was ultimately "reasonable" since the two of them were, de facto, the two greatest intellects on the planet. Rand states (to her husband and Branden's wife) "By the total logic of what love and sex mean -- we *had* to love each other." Amazingly, both spouses bought into this line and agreed to allow Ayn and Nathaniel and afternoon and evening of sex once a week.

Then later (after their affair had fizzled) Branden became involved with another woman. Even though the affair was a decade in the past, the master of the absolute moral double standard would not tolerate such a breach of conduct by anyone else. She was furious, broke all ties with Branden, and declared to her followers that the excommunication was because of "ugly actions and irrational behavior in his private life, which was grossly contradictory of Objectivist morality." His second affair was judged immoral, his first not.

That seems decidedly less than objective!

Apparently her cult thought so too, because the organized Objectivist movement pretty much imploded after that.

73, Hans, K0HB

1913. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 21:39:03 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201162131150.4546-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31254

On 16 Jan 2002, N2EY wrote:
>...
>Yet another reason is the mindset that 2 meters MUST be where things happen. Is
>222-225 all full of repeaters? How about 900 MHz?

In my area, not only has 222MHz been filled with repeaters, until recently (about 1-2 years ago), there was still a waiting list for relocation of repeaters that got displaced when we lost the 220-222MHz segment. I believe that every repeater pair had a minimum of 3 co-channeled systems, with some having up to 6 or so.

Local Bandplan (Southern California):
222.000 - 222.015 Weak signal and non-FM modes
222.016 - 223.380 Repeater Inputs
223.400 - 223.520 FM Voice (Simplex)
223.540 - 223.700 Digital/Packet
223.720 - 223.740 Control Inputs/Misc.
223.760 - 224.980 Repeater Outputs

See http://www.220sma.org/ for greater detail.

As for 33cm (915MHz), that is a wasteland here. Cordless phone interference and that from other licensed users (905-912MHz and 918-925Mhz) higher up in the hierarchy (i.e. those services amateur radio is secondary to for this band) give us very little to work with.

1914. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 21:47:53 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201162142110.4546-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31255

On 16 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>Good points all, Jim. I agree with all of them. The biggest reasons that
>things are not moving forward are social, and, IMHO, groups like ARRL and TAPR
>need to do more to get the word out. Right now, hams think that "digital"
>means "computer-to-computer" or "keyboard-to-computer" and that is only one
>facet of the potential for digital operation.
>
>And the repeater problem is indeed a difficult problem, for the very factor you
>describe -- the existing infrastructure. If a new trunked system or
>spread-spectrum system were to be installed, which existing repeaters would be
>displaced to do it (a contiguous chunk of frequency would be needed), who would
>decide who gets the axe and how can it be justified in the short term to
>displace repeaters that are seeing some use in favor of a new system that,
>though it might be beneficial in the long run, in the short run would see
>virtually no users because of the lack of off-the-shelf equipment for ham
>radio.
>
>A demo would help, but the only bands that I think could be initially used
>without affecting existing users would be 900, 1200 or 2400 MHz. And demo or
>not, those bands, too, have the problem of the lack of existing equipment.

For trunking, 900 is more likely than the others, since there is equipment on
the 800/900 business/public-safety bands for this. However, cost is another
issue.

In my area, there might be some parts of 1200 open, but there's alot taken too.
Furthermore, the equipment that exists there is "traditional" amateur
equipment. It's not feasable to use this band.

For 2400, kill all the non-spread-spectrum part 15 devices off, and maybe SS
could work there. As I have noted earlier (last year), some cordless phones
operate up there as NON-SS, FM Wideband where wide means >1.5MHz. SS cannot
overcome such a signal unless it can hop outside of it.

>I will have to check with Doug Smith (Ten Tec, QEX Editor, chairman of the
>Digital Voice Committee) to see if the committee is considering any of these
>issues. Right now, they are working on trying to identify which vocoding
>schemes are best for ham radio, HF and above. Alinco, btw, has added a
>digital voice option to one of its HTs. We have a couple of units in the Lab
>and are getting ready to test them.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

>>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 1/16/02 12:10 AM Eastern Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20020116001006.05154.00001154@mb-fm.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20020114222247.01549.00001654@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>>(W1RFI)
>>writes:
>>
>>>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>>
>>>>I think Ed is pointing out that there were no spark testing requirements to
>>>>interfere with the adoption of a better mode.
>>>
>>>No, I am pointing out that back then, hams willingly exchanged spark for a
>>>better operating mode.
>>
>>Think about WHY.
>>
>>CW/tube transmission was demonstrated to them in the Transatlantic Tests and
>>the 1923 transatlantic QSOs.
>>
>>>Today, they can't exchange spectrally efficient
>>>digital-voice techniques for the scheme of allocating repeater pairs that
>>sit
>>>idle 95% of the time.
>>
>>Sure they can. They just don't want to because they don't have a clear path
>>to
>>follow. No demos.
>>>
>>>Why the difference?
>>>
>>For one thing, there is an ENORMOUS installed repeater infrastructure.
>>
>>For another, homebrewing (as in building a rig from the ground up) has
>>dwindled
>>to a small percentage of ham stations. When the Ancient Ones wanted to get on
>>the air with a new mode, they BUILT their rigs from scratch. Not just a few
>>pioneers - almost everybody did it. That sort of thing decreased after WW2
>>and
>>now is the exception rather than the rule.
>>
>>The digital voice articles in QST are a start. But there needs to be a series
>>of practical how-to articles on getting started. Look at the QSTs before
>>about
>>1970 - lots and lots of articles on getting started.
>>
>>Yet another reason is the mindset that 2 meters MUST be where things happen.
>>Is

>>222-225 all full of repeaters? How about 900 MHz?
>>
>>Finally, what we don't see is a frank, clear picture of what people think the
>>way forward should be. What's the solution - force repeaters off the air?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1915. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:06:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45F8C7.C1EA5CCE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31256

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You obviously don't know a lot about HF digital communications, Dave.
> > > Do you think the military uses FEC or not?
> >
> > I know a good deal about what the military and other government agencies
> > use. Since you don't have a clearance or a need to know, you'll not
> > hear it from me.
>
> Translation: Every knowledgable person knows the military uses FEC in
> their HF digital communications.

There is no translation necessary. You can take my words for what they meant. My dad is a pretty knowledgeable guy. He has no idea what the military does for communications.

Dave K8MN

1916. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:11:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45F9E4.59BFC1A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31257

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You aren't discussing
> > > > what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.
> > >
> > > Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> > > on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.
> >
> > You spout so much BS that you can't even keep your own stories straight.
> > What you told us is what Ayn Rand would have thought about morse
> > testing. You didn't know what she thought about it then and you don't
> > know now.
>
> I have read virtually every word that Ayn Rand ever wrote. I have attended
> her lectures. I have chatted with her over a glass of wine. I have patterned
> my life based on her principles.

You wasted your entire life as a groupie. Learn to think for yourself
before it is too late.

> It is my educated opinion that she would
> have been against Morse code testing and that all true Libertarians are
> against it. I would be pro Morse code testing if it were not for my
> Objectivist principles which were established by Ayn Rand.

I don't know about educated but it certainly seems to be your opinion so
you're stuck with it. You've based your opinion on morse testing on a
guess at what Ayn Rand might have believed had she ever considered it.
It is my opinion that you are a flake.

Dave K8MN

1917. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:12:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C45FA1A.9DF09ABE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31258

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I say they aren't objective. Stick that in your pipe.
> > >
> > > That's just your subjective opinion.
> >
> > That is only your subjective opinion of my statement.
>
> So you admit your opinion is subjective?

I'll admit that you've misinterpreted once again.

Dave K8MN
```

1918. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:19:12 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <A%m18.105360$fe1.1566077@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31259

> CAM wrote:

> > Ayn Rand was born a Russian Jewish girl.

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote

> Steve Martin was born a poor black child. :-)

> > 'Ayn' is a two syllable
> > name resembling 'Ian' with a long 'I'.

> My dad had an uncle Ian with a long 'I'.

Jim... you are too funny...

"Fortunate I'm wearing a corset for I fear my sides would split."
- Blackadder

Rich

1919. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:53:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116175308.11203.00001827@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31260

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

> There is an absence of evidence that someone named
>Dick Carroll lives on Mars. So is there someone named Dick
>Carroll living on Mars?

There is accepted modern physics that says that until it is observed whether there is a Dick Carroll living on Mars, there IS a Dick Carroll living on Mars... and there is not.

Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying Morse code operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1920. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:57:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116175714.11203.00001828@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31261

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Can you tell us which ones are not good?

> No, I can't. I'm sure there are many I haven't tested, or even heard of.
>Have you U? If not, why not? that's part of your job at the lab, isn't it?

Actually, it is not, Dick. The QST Product Review editor decides which products
should be reviewed and Mike Tracy tests them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1921. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 22:59:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4605C0.F1A8EF4B@uci.edu>
Source record: 31265

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> > There is an absence of evidence that someone named
> >Dick Carroll lives on Mars. So is there someone named Dick
> >Carroll living on Mars?
>
> There is accepted modern physics that says that until it is observed whether
> there is a Dick Carroll living on Mars, there IS a Dick Carroll living on
> Mars... and there is not.
>
> Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying Morse code
> operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)

:-) Probably only at the sub-atomic level. ;-)

ac6xg

1922. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 23:00:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116180007.11203.00001829@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31262

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> And what tool is used for 99% of emergency communications in ham radio,
>> local or regional?

>Given that 99% of emergency communications is practice drill the answer would
>be whatever the local hams want to use.
So, if you think that testing for the Amateur Radio Service should be based on the need for emergency communications, can we presume that you feel that they should be tested on whatever they want to use? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1923. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 23:01:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116180125.11203.00001831@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31263

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
>FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
>As of May 14, 2000:
>
>Novice - 49,329
>Tech - 205,394
>Tech Plus - 128,860
>General - 112,677
>Advanced - 99,782
>Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
>As of January 14, 2002:
>
>Novice - 40,117 (decrease of 9,212)
>Tech - 234,661 (increase of 29,267)
>Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
>General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
>Advanced - 86,502 (decrease of 13,280)
>Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)
>Total - 683,043 (increase of 8,251)
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as fast as
it has sometimes grown. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1924. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 23:06:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116180618.11203.00001834@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31264

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> I don't think he was speaking for NCI. Do you? If someone works for
>General
>> Motors, are you going to ask them if they are the reasoned voice of General
>> Motors if they are posting on a subject not related to automobiles?

>In what way is amateur radio not related to amateur radio? Is Bill
>talking about the need for change in a regulation which he doesn't
>understand?

In what way is Bill's opinion about what power level represents a reasonable
starting place to follow the rule to use the
minimum necessary power?

I agree with Bill. If one were to start with 100 watts of power on HF, that
would be a reasonable place to start. If I were going to try an afternoon of
hamming and didn't want to torture other hams with QRP, I would run barefoot
and if I were making QSOs, I would probably be happy.

How do you approach meeting the requirement to use the minimum necessary power?
What power do you generally start with?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1925. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 23:41:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.16.18.41.40.238357.20913@arrl.org>
Source record: 31266

On Wed, 16 Jan 2002 12:51:38 -0500, Richard McCollum wrote:
> Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in
> Blazing Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry Rides
> Again.

Thanks to Mel Brooks, I can never watch Marlene singing, "See what the
boys in the back room will have..." without thinking, "I'm so tired."

> Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
> Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
> slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
> spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since 1926
> has come to him for legacy shoeses."

Best done in the voices of Bullwinkle and Rocky.

> Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
> Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed
> is waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
> which the planning commission has no player.

Meanwhile, Larry Roll is tossing the CDs in the air and firing at them
with a Glock semi-auto pistol.

> At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has
> done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.

It's good to be the author.

Jon

1926. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-16 23:58:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a253v701jt9@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 31268

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org...
> > What's with the 'y'??
>
> Ayn Rand was born a Russian Jewish girl. 'Ayn' is a two syllable
> name resembling 'Ian' with a long 'I'.

...and she derived her last name from the Rand typewritter that she used.

1927. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 00:10:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C461685.F2011D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31267

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?
>
> Objective?? How does Objectivism explain her personal behavior.

It was a rhetorical question, Hans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1928. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 01:05:01 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#qzxCMvnBHA.1720@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31269

"CAM" wrote

>
> It was a rhetorical question, Hans.
>

Ya sure are a wiggly sucker, Cecil! When your convictions get challenged,
you just wiggle out with some lame disclaimer. Good job again!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1929. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 01:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116201003.02371.00001356@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31270

In article <20020116071346.13150.00002108@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>I wonder if Dick could cobble together a transceiver from the bits of
>electronic junque scattered about his neighborhood if the tornado hit.

I could. Not exactly a transceiver, but an operable station.

> I
>wonder how many hams could.

I've done it. Not after a disaster, of course, but you would be surprised what I've been able to put on the air.

> In that sense, we are all unprepared. :-)

Speak for yourself ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1930. Re: KV4FZ tries, then fails to get back on the air

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 02:12:49 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116211249.22282.00001559@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 31271

```
<< Subject: Re: KV4FZ tries, then fails to get back on the air
From: "Herbie" Herbie@KV4FZliveson14313.net
Date: Fri, Jan 11, 2002 4:02 PM
Message-id: <a1nnbn$tf6$0@pita.alt.net>

I shall return to 14313. My followers demand it, and
I shall grant their wishes, so that they can worship me.

Herb

>>

So speaks "lloyd da toid" herb's chief ass kisser!!!

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert
```

1931. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 02:31:36 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <clq18.105816$fe1.1588385@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31272

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.16.18.41.40.238357.20913@arrl.org...
> On Wed, 16 Jan 2002 12:51:38 -0500, Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in
> > Blazing Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry
Rides
> > Again.
>
> Thanks to Mel Brooks, I can never watch Marlene singing, "See what the
> boys in the back room will have..." without thinking, "I'm so tired."
>
> > Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
> > Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
> > slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
> > spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since
1926
> > has come to him for legacy shoeses."
>
> Best done in the voices of Bullwinkle and Rocky.
>
> > Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the
Historical
> > Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed
> > is waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom
for
> > which the planning commission has no player.
>
> Meanwhile, Larry Roll is tossing the CDs in the air and firing at them
> with a Glock semi-auto pistol.
>
> Jon

How many places can Larry be in? He is down at the smithy and shooting
holes in CDs. Personally, I think he is more likely to be down at the
saloon putting holes in the ceiling and yelling "Put it back on!"

1932. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 02:40:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O8TiSBwnBHA.1580@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31273

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Personally, I think he is more likely to be down at the
> saloon putting holes in the ceiling and yelling "Put it back on!"

Festus: "Mr Dillon, Mr. DILLON, Miss Kitty says get your ass down at the
Long Branch Salloon."

Matt: "I do, dammit, I do!"

1933. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 02:43:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c463ba7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31911

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C45AA4E.CB6F83@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill, Bill. You really have no idea of what you're
> > >babbling about, do you? Is this the reasoned voice of an NCI Director?
> >
> > I don't think he was speaking for NCI. Do you? If someone works for
General
> > Motors, are you going to ask them if they are the reasoned voice of
General
> > Motors if they are posting on a subject not related to automobiles?
>
> In what way is amateur radio not related to amateur radio? Is Bill
> talking about the need for change in a regulation which he doesn't
> understand?
>
> > In what
> > way do you think that his opinion that 100 watts represents a reasonable
> > minimum level to obey the FCC rule on "minimum necessary power" to be a
> > statement of NCI policy? As an aside, can you cite any examples where
the FCC
> > has cited anyone for using 100 watts where 5 watts would have worked?
>
> I not only recall the FCC citing anyone for using 100 when 5 watts would
> have worked, I can't recall the FCC citing anyone for using 1500 watts
> where 5 watts would have worked.
>

I think you meant to say that you *don't* recall the FCC citing anyone for
using 100 watts when 5 watts would have worked/1500 watts where 5 watts
would have worked. Is that what you meant? Why would that matter, Dave?
It is in the R&R and we are a "self-policing" entity--one left with trust to
behave ourselves and to be the "eyes and ears" for the FCC. Do you advocate
breaking the rules just because no one has been cited for breaking them?
Are you "kind of" saying that it's OK to break the rules as long as no one
is looking?

I don't recall that the FCC has cited anyone for the callsign W5TIT. Yet,
you continuously let me know that it is my responsibility as a ham to treat
the ARS with more respect (paraphrasing--and I'm sure you'll come up with
some lame argument that you never *meant* to say that).

Funny. The more you open your mouth, the deeper your foot sinks in.

> >
> > As to the babbling, if you could explain what you think is wrong about
his
> > post, instead of calling it babble, you would not be babbling
yourself...
>
> Ed, I could but I'm not going to. I'm not going to spend the amount of
> time required to discuss power levels with Bill. I won't be at all
> upset if you'd like to take on the challenge and devote the time.
>
> Dave K8MN

Of course you wouldn't. You just professed to being an advocate for
breaking rules as long as no one is looking. Yet, you insist I am wrong for
having a legal callsign. Somehow, Dave, your sense of reason is quite
distorted.

Kim W5TIT

1934. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 02:52:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c463ddb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31912

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C45AA4E.CB6F83@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > In what
> > way do you think that his opinion that 100 watts represents a reasonable
> > minimum level to obey the FCC rule on "minimum necessary power" to be a
> > statement of NCI policy? As an aside, can you cite any examples where
the FCC
> > has cited anyone for using 100 watts where 5 watts would have worked?
>
> I not only recall the FCC citing anyone for using 100 when 5 watts would
> have worked, I can't recall the FCC citing anyone for using 1500 watts
> where 5 watts would have worked.
>

I think you meant to say that you *don't* recall the FCC citing anyone for using 100 watts of power when 5 watts would have worked/1500 watts where 5 watts would have worked. So, you are now advocating that the FCC R&R be violated as long as no one is cited; as long as no one is looking!? Is that really what you are saying, Dave? It sure sounds that way to me. We are a self-policing entity, with the FCC condoning our activity as being their "eyes and ears." It is not meant for us to break the law just because no one's been caught.

You advocate, above, the violation of a US Government Office Rule, yet you remind me constantly of my legal callsign being a disgrace to the ARS [paraphrased by me, of course, and I am sure you'll come up with some lame retort]? You really want to tell me that I am disgraceful, and *you* are not, when you advocate breaking the rules; and I am fully within them?

Somehow, Dave, the more you open your mouth, the deeper your foot sinks in.

> >
> > As to the babbling, if you could explain what you think is wrong about
his
> > post, instead of calling it babble, you would not be babbling
yourself...
>
> Ed, I could but I'm not going to. I'm not going to spend the amount of
> time required to discuss power levels with Bill. I won't be at all
> upset if you'd like to take on the challenge and devote the time.
>
> Dave K8MN

Of course you won't. You're too busy telling people who act within the R&R that *they* are disgraceful, when you act disgracefully *and* break the R&R. Phew, go figure.

Kim W5TIT

1935. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221118.05154.00001185@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31274

In article <3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?

By being mistaken. She was often mistaken, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1936. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221118.05154.00001184@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31277

In article <K4j18.274043$WW.13795059@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Over at the Opera House Jim has to be physically restrained from singing
>Springtime for Hitler

I actually did that during a stage performance of "Sound of Music".

>and in the repertoire performance of the Sound of
>Muzak, like the Mother Superior in the original gets this glassy-eyed look
>and begins to bellow, "Build your own hardware, build every piece, follow
>every wild hair, til life itself should cease'.

Jimmy Stewart plays me, and Marni Nixon does Mother Superior.
>
>Cecil is in the Men's Room I mean meeting room of the local Mensa chapter
>where a riot has begun and Cecil is beating hell out of all and sundry
>with a Funk and Wagnalls.

Slim Pickens or Andy Devine in that role? Don't forget the Magic Twanger.

>Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
>Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed is
>waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
>which the planning commission has no player.
>
>At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has
>done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.

Sounds pretty good to me.
>
>And the surface has yet to be scratched.
>
--

Add to the list of authors like Vonnegut and Heller the ultimate modern
surrealist: the late Douglas Adams. The four books of the "Hitchhiker" trilogy
are must-reads.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1937. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221119.05154.00001186@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31276

In article <3C45D16A.85548ACF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> > Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
>> > on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.

So? Everybody's against unnecessary govt. regulation. Even the politicians - they are all dead set against 'em.

The toughie is deciding which ones are unnecessary, and getting folks to agree on it.

>> What you told us is what Ayn Rand would have thought about morse
>> testing. You didn't know what she thought about it then and you don't
>> know now.
>
>I have read virtually every word that Ayn Rand ever wrote.

Maybe. You have also repeatedly told us that you never post anything serious to rrap.

>I have attended her lectures.

Maybe. You have also repeatedly told us that you never post anything serious to rrap.

>I have chatted with her over a glass of wine.

Maybe. You have also repeatedly told us that you never post anything serious to rrap.

> I have patterned
>my life based on her principles.

Maybe - or maybe not. There is no reason for anyone to take you seriously on this, Cecil.

>It is my educated opinion that she would
>have been against Morse code testing and that all true Libertarians are
>against it.

Maybe she would have been against code testing and maybe not.

>I would be pro Morse code testing if it were not for my
>Objectivist principles which were established by Ayn Rand.

Now I KNOW you're not serious!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1938. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221120.05154.00001188@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31275

In article <3C45D9F6.8EDADEFA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> One of the most neglected factors is AGC. Too many hams and rig makers
>think
>> that AGC is so necessary that they never turn it off. In my experience, AGC
>on
>> a crowded band increases the apparent interference.
>
>The AGC on the IC-706 cannot be turned off. :-(

The same is true of most HF ham transceivers made for the past 40 years.
Collins started that nonsense in the KWM-2, and everybody followed like sheep.

The Kenwood TS-520 was one exception to the rule - you can turn its AGC off.
The TenTec Corsair family, Omni 5 and 6 and I think the Paragon have AGC off,
as do must of the high-end Yaecomwoods.

It sure seems odd that one must spend more money to get an AGC OFF switch.

It would be really interesting to see a list of all the current HF/MF ham rigs
selling for under $2000 that can have the AGC totally defeated. I'll start:

Elecraft K2

Any more?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1939. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221120.05154.00001187@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31278

In article <20020116082643.09758.00001363@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>> This can be either analog or DSP -- the
>>> effect will be the same.
>
>>Not as a general rule.
>
>In the context of the discussion, the effect will be the same. I was
>addressing
>the statement that some hams don't want to have to run high power to overcome
>noisy conditions on the other end. I was thinking of local noise -- power
>line
>and such, and under those circumstances, receiver ACG and dynamic range are
>not
>apt to be factors. Under those circumstances, bandwidth is bandwidth is
>bandwidth, for the most part.

OK - if the nosie doesn't take over the AGC
>
>>One of the most neglected factors is AGC. Too many hams and rig makers think
>>that AGC is so necessary that they never turn it off. In my experience, AGC
>>on
>>a crowded band increases the apparent interference.
>
>Yes, and in the presence of strong signals elsewhere in the band, filter
>placement makes a BIG difference.

Dig out your 1957 QSTs and look up an article by W1DX called "What's Wrong With Our Present Receivers?" or some such. Explained why the knothole needs to be close to the inhaler's input jack.
>
>And, from our experience, most rigs today DO allow one to turn off AGC. In
>some cases, one has to drill through a menu or two, or hold the AGC button
>for
>5 seconds or such, but it usually can be done.

In my experience it usually CANNOT be done on most of the lower-priced rigs. Care to make a list of the current under-$2000 HF/MF ham rigs with totally defeatable AGC?

> If it can't, ARRL Product
>Review testing has to measure gain compression with the AGC on, and that does
>NOT help give good dynamic range numbers. :-)

It would be nice if the Product Reviews told what rigs have AGC OFF and how hard it is to do. For example, can the AGC be defeated on the FT-817? If so, how is it done?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1940. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 03:11:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020116221123.05154.00001189@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 31279

In article <20020116070724.13150.00002106@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Good points all, Jim. I agree with all of them.

Tnx, Ed.

Better watch out, an actual policy discussion may break out on rrap.

>The biggest reasons that
>things are not moving forward are social, and, IMHO, groups like ARRL and
>TAPR
>need to do more to get the word out.

I would say it's more than "social". There's economic and practical considerations, too.

>Right now, hams think that "digital"
>means "computer-to-computer" or "keyboard-to-computer" and that is only one
>facet of the potential for digital operation.

Most hams, but not all hams. Not me, for one.
>
>And the repeater problem is indeed a difficult problem, for the very factor
>you
>describe -- the existing infrastructure. If a new trunked system or
>spread-spectrum system were to be installed, which existing repeaters would
>be
>displaced to do it (a contiguous chunk of frequency would be needed), who
>would
>decide who gets the axe and how can it be justified in the short term to
>displace repeaters that are seeing some use in favor of a new system that,
>though it might be beneficial in the long run, in the short run would see
>virtually no users because of the lack of off-the-shelf equipment for ham
>radio.

And the answer is....??

There's another problem that's even bigger: There is no perception of a driving need to replace good ol' FM with something else. If the repeaters in most areas were all busy 24/7, hams would say "We need to use our spectrum more efficiently". Heck, you don't even need digital - 1980s ACSSB technology will put something like 5 voice circuits where one FM voice circuit exists now!

But if the repeaters are, as you say, idle 95% of the time, the REAL problem is lack of use. The fuss seems to be over replacing an underused FM system with an

underused trunking or SS system.

Let's look at history for a moment. Tube rigs replaced spark because they worked better for less money. Stabilized PDC 1929 rigs replaced their crude predecessors for the same reason. Single signal superhets replaced rationalized autodynes because the increasing crowding made the investment worthwhile. Same for SSB replacing AM. FM/repeater VHF/UHF replaced gooney boxes because the results were so much more consistent. Transceivers replaced separates because they cost less and took up less room.

In each case the new technology offered hams more performance-per-dollar or -kilohertz than what was replaced. The same case has to be made for SS, trunked systems and digital voice. But the case has not been made to the ham community, yet.
>
>A demo would help, but the only bands that I think could be initially used
>without affecting existing users would be 900, 1200 or 2400 MHz. And demo or
>not, those bands, too, have the problem of the lack of existing equipment.

Lack of existing equipment did not stop any of the historical advances I cited. Hams built or adapted. The ham mags were full of how-to-do-it articles. That's where the effort needs to be.

The FCC quoted Kenwood repeatedly in the R&O, but does Kenwood make this stuff for hams now?
>
>I will have to check with Doug Smith (Ten Tec, QEX Editor, chairman of the
>Digital Voice Committee) to see if the committee is considering any of these
>issues.

Thanks.

>Right now, they are working on trying to identify which vocoding
>schemes are best for ham radio, HF and above. Alinco, btw, has added a
>digital voice option to one of its HTs. We have a couple of units in the Lab
>and are getting ready to test them.

Cool! But that brings up yet another issue:

One of the ways people have discovered ham radio over the years have been hearing hams on the air. Ask a group of hams licensed before about 1963 how they found out about ham radio, and a good percentage will tell of hearing "Fine Business Claude" on the SW band of the family's old Philco radio. Many, many hams were SWLs before they discovered ham radio. The move to SSB reduced this recruiting method greatly.
>
The coming of scanners and VHF/UHF FM ham repeaters revived it for the past couple decades. If we go to digital voice, most of the scanning world won't know we exist.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1941. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:22:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4650C1.DF66F914@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31280

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Stay on track. I say Jefferson and Adams views on morse testing or
> > > > general aviation will never be known.
> > >
> > > Ah, but they are known, Dave. They come under the heading of interstate
> > > commerce.
> > >
> > Ah, but you make things up as you go along. Your attempt at yet another
> > diversion is gone *poof*.
>
> I'm surprised that a person like yourself is ignorant of the interstate
> commerce provisions in The Constitution. General aviation is controlled
> by the feds under the provisions of interstate commerce. Amateur radio
> is controlled by the feds under the provisions of interstate commerce.
> Thus the Morse code exam exists because of the interstate commerce
> provisions in The Constitution. And thus Jefferson and Adams agree in
> principle through their acceptance of the interstate commerce provisions.

I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
I indicated that we do not know the views of Jefferson or Adams on those
two (and many, many more) things. We'll never know what they thought of
Bill Clinton, the internet or the telephone.

Bye now.

Dave K8MN

1942. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:23:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Jks18.274774$WW.13851219@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31281

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020116221118.05154.00001184@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article
<K4j18.274043$WW.13795059@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Over at the Opera House Jim has to be physically restrained from
singing
> >Springtime for Hitler
>
> I actually did that during a stage performance of "Sound of Music".
>
> >and in the repertoire performance of the Sound of
> >Muzak, like the Mother Superior in the original gets this glassy-eyed
look
> >and begins to bellow, "Build your own hardware, build every piece,
follow
> >every wild hair, til life itself should cease'.
>
> Jimmy Stewart plays me, and Marni Nixon does Mother Superior.
> >
> >Cecil is in the Men's Room I mean meeting room of the local Mensa
chapter
> >where a riot has begun and Cecil is beating hell out of all and sundry
> >with a Funk and Wagnalls.
>
> Slim Pickens or Andy Devine in that role? Don't forget the Magic
Twanger.
>
> >Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
> >Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed
is
> >waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
> >which the planning commission has no player.
> >
> >At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston
has
> >done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.
>
> Sounds pretty good to me.
> >
> >And the surface has yet to be scratched.
> >
> --

>
> Add to the list of authors like Vonnegut and Heller the ultimate modern
> surrealist: the late Douglas Adams. The four books of the "Hitchhiker"
trilogy
> are must-reads.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

No, not more pollution from the Infinite Improbability Drive. Think our
NCI guys would make good Telephone Sanitizers?

1943. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:26:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C465198.1C8A2336@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31282

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> > How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?
> >
>
> Objective?? How does Objectivism explain her personal behavior.
>
> For many years Ayn and her follower, Nathaniel Branden, were involved in
> love affair that they kept secret from everyone except their respective
> spouses. By their reckoning the affair was ultimately "reasonable" since
> the two of them were, de facto, the two greatest intellects on the planet.
> Rand states (to her husband and Branden's wife) "By the total logic of what
> love and sex mean -- we *had* to love each other." Amazingly, both spouses
> bought into this line and agreed to allow Ayn and Nathaniel and afternoon
> and evening of sex once a week.
>
> Then later (after their affair had fizzled) Branden became involved with
> another woman. Even though the affair was a decade in the past, the master
> of the absolute moral double standard would not tolerate such a breach of
> conduct by anyone else. She was furious, broke all ties with Branden, and
> declared to her followers that the excommunication was because of "ugly
> actions and irrational behavior in his private life, which was grossly
> contradictory of Objectivist morality." His second affair was judged
> immoral, his first not.
>
> That seems decidedly less than objective!
>
> Apparently her cult thought so too, because the organized Objectivist
> movement pretty much imploded after that.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Shhhhhhhhhhhh. The word hasn't reached Texas yet.

Dave K8MN

1944. QCAO Retirement Center

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:37:43 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <es8s8CxnBHA.1912@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31283

QCAO members, take note.

http://www.satirewire.com/features/siliconpines/acf.shtml

73, de Hans, K0HB

1945. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:44:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4655BE.2633536B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31284

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> I don't think he was speaking for NCI. Do you? If someone works for
> >General
> >> Motors, are you going to ask them if they are the reasoned voice of General
> >> Motors if they are posting on a subject not related to automobiles?
>
> >In what way is amateur radio not related to amateur radio? Is Bill
> >talking about the need for change in a regulation which he doesn't
> >understand?
>
> In what way is Bill's opinion about what power level represents a reasonable
> starting place to follow the rule to use the
> minimum necessary power?
>
> I agree with Bill. If one were to start with 100 watts of power on HF, that
> would be a reasonable place to start. If I were going to try an afternoon of
> hamming and didn't want to torture other hams with QRP, I would run barefoot
> and if I were making QSOs, I would probably be happy.
>
> How do you approach meeting the requirement to use the minimum necessary power?
> What power do you generally start with?

Now first, let's add the part of the reg about "to achieve the desired
communication". We need to define the desired communication:

Let's say the P5 shows up on 10m tomorrow evening. I won't want to
torture him with QRP and I'd like to be heard at some point in the
evening's proceedings. I'll start with all the law allows.

Let's say I'm not chasing a rare one. We're on 40m and I hear a SP5
CQing. I'll choose the barefoot rig. Let's say propagation on 40m is
poor and I hear my pal Hannu OH1XX. He is 439. I'm back to all the law
allows. Checking into the section net on 75? I'll opt for the barefoot
rig. Coming back to 75 later in the evening I find that there is heavy
auroral flutter and severe path degradation. I'm back to 1.5 kw.

Please note that I'm not going to 75w, 56.2w or 1235w. At no point do I
repeatedly ask the station I'm in QSO with, "Can you still read me?"
We could easily spend all of our time on the air in performing power
reductions or increases in this manner.

Tell you what: Next time I have time to burn and a rare one shows up,
I'll start by calling him with 50w and steadily increase power in 50w

increments until he responds.

Dave K8MN

1946. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 04:45:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C465630.C6D1C370@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31285

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org...
> > > What's with the 'y'??
> >
> > Ayn Rand was born a Russian Jewish girl. 'Ayn' is a two syllable
> > name resembling 'Ian' with a long 'I'.
>
> ...and she derived her last name from the Rand typewritter that she used.

She could have enjoyed a slinkier image as Ayn Olivetti.

Dave K8MN
```

1947. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117000953.06877.00001386@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 31286

In article <20020116180125.11203.00001831@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as fast
>as
>it has sometimes grown. :-)

Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years that only the abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in the 21st century. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1948. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:44:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C46585A.C635512E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31287

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=cecil+moore+luddites&hl=en&selm=345D438
> > F.7406%40ibm.net&rnum=1
> >
> > >The word was "Luddide", Jon, not Luddite. I have never used the
> > >word "Luddide".
> >
> > Yeah, but Cecil, even you knew what Dick meant.
>
> I was making fun of Dick's typo, Ed. Do I have to put a smiley face
> on every joke?

Only the funny ones. If you ever come up with any.

1949. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:45:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465895.93850E5F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31288

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >Dick apparently likes the challenge of being completely
> > >unprepared. :-)
> >
> > I wonder if Dick could cobble together a transceiver from the bits of
> > electronic junque scattered about his neighborhood if the tornado hit. I
> > wonder how many hams could. In that sense, we are all unprepared. :-)
>
> One would think there would be higher priorities than ham radio - like
> saving one's wife and kids from a collapsing house.

For most of us that's a given. I see you are finally learning.

1950. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:53:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465A75.38B070DB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31289

CAM wrote:

Dick, ask the military if they think RTTY is a serious mode.

So what do you think it is- trivial? Tell it to the military who used it so well for so long. Does that mean it's the mode of choice today? Not at all. Unless it happened to be the only mode available. You ask how that might happen to be? Who knows? Are you omnipotent?

And RTTY

> is NOT pretty darn good in weak signal conditions. It sucks under
> weak signal conditions.
>

As a non-FEC mode it does quite well in my experience. Better than PSK31 in fact. I was once printing a RTTY signal that faded down so low that I could no longer hear it, but it continued to print without error till the signal recovered from the fade. I don't see PSK31 doing any better, and normally not that well.

1951. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:55:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465AE6.CD3B71F1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31290

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You obviously don't know a lot about HF digital communications, Dave.
> > > Do you think the military uses FEC or not?
> >
> > I know a good deal about what the military and other government agencies
> > use. Since you don't have a clearance or a need to know, you'll not
> > hear it from me.
>
> Translation: Every knowledgable person knows the military uses FEC in
> their HF digital communications.

And that means that none but FEC modes are serious modes. Whatta dip.

1952. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 05:56:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465B3B.724F1337@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31291

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Why, of course not and of course! But do you think no other user -maybe no ham-is
> > serious? There is a difference between serious and critical.
>
> Uhhhhhh Dick, "critical" is "serious". For conversational purposes
> those two words are interchangeable. From Webster's:
> "serious - having possibly dangerous consequences"
> "critical - characterized by risk"

Uh Oh, here comes the bullshit dictionary again, I'm outta here!

1953. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:09:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465E43.7D5DE9E3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31292

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to print, a
> > group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I wasn't
> > attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could copy
> > their CWID's!
>
> I keep telling you, Dick, you need a digital mode with FEC. HF is notorious
> for phase shifting an RF signal.

So what is it that changed your mind? You were singing a completely different tune at that time. Of course we're accustomed to you're changing stories so no surprise.

> Obviously, a mode that depends on phase
> and has no error correction is going to fail under those circumstances.

That wasn't the point. You make a huge deal about how much more efficient PSK31 was over CW. But the CW was readable and the PSK31 was not. You made much of the fact that PSK31 was hugely more efficient than CW anyway. Now your story shifts to "The human ear is relatively immune..." Yep. That's one of the things that makes CW work so well in awful band condx. When there is a trained operator at work, that is.

he human ear is relatively immune to phase shifts encountered using CW.

> If you had been using PACTOR II in a QSO, things would have been reversed.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1954. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:16:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C465FCD.75DA688C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31293

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.
> > > Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.
> > > So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?
> >
> > So where is the evidence against it?
>
> Just proves my point. Virtually all intelligent people know that a
> negative cannot be proven. The question is: How can you give
> yourself permission to believe in something based on an *absence*
> of evidence? There is an absence of evidence that someone named
> Dick Carroll lives on Mars. So is there someone named Dick
> Carroll living on Mars? If you have enough faith, will that
> make it so?

Well, so much for "logic". If you have no evidence for it, and no evidence against it, it just can't be. Or can it?

Just as I suspected.

1955. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:18:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C466052.611F5CA0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31294

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You aren't discussing
> > > > what was written, you're discussing that which was never written.
> > >
> > > Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> > > on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.
> >
> > You spout so much BS that you can't even keep your own stories straight.
> > What you told us is what Ayn Rand would have thought about morse
> > testing. You didn't know what she thought about it then and you don't
> > know now.
>
> I have read virtually every word that Ayn Rand ever wrote. I have attended
> her lectures. I have chatted with her over a glass of wine. I have patterned
> my life based on her principles. It is my educated opinion that she would
> have been against Morse code testing and that all true Libertarians are
> against it. I would be pro Morse code testing if it were not for my
> Objectivist principles which were established by Ayn Rand.

Ah, the Grate Revelation. Or was it revolutiohn?

1956. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:48:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C46675C.556C1728@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31295

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> And what tool is used for 99% of emergency communications in ham radio,
> >> local or regional?
>
> >Given that 99% of emergency communications is practice drill the answer would
> >be whatever the local hams want to use.
> So, if you think that testing for the Amateur Radio Service should be based on
> the need for emergency communications, can we presume that you feel that they
> should be tested on whatever they want to use? :-)

With all the BS distilled out, that is the entire argument of the NCTAs.

1957. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:50:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4667ED.923F2ADF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31296

W1RFI wrote:

>No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as fast as

> it has sometimes grown. :-)

How could it fail to, with the ten year licenses? Does anyone out there really believe that all those Novice licenses are still alive and active? I doubt most of them are even aware of the restructuring.

1958. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 06:54:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4668DD.5FFB4FAB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31297

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2002.01.16.18.41.40.238357.20913@arrl.org...
> > On Wed, 16 Jan 2002 12:51:38 -0500, Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in
> > > Blazing Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry
> Rides
> > > Again.
> >
> > Thanks to Mel Brooks, I can never watch Marlene singing, "See what the
> > boys in the back room will have..." without thinking, "I'm so tired."
> >
> > > Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
> > > Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
> > > slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
> > > spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since
> 1926
> > > has come to him for legacy shoeses."
> >
> > Best done in the voices of Bullwinkle and Rocky.
> >
> > > Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the
> Historical
> > > Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed
> > > is waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom
> for
> > > which the planning commission has no player.
> >
> > Meanwhile, Larry Roll is tossing the CDs in the air and firing at them
> > with a Glock semi-auto pistol.
> >
> > Jon
>
> How many places can Larry be in? He is down at the smithy and shooting
> holes in CDs. Personally, I think he is more likely to be down at the
> saloon putting holes in the ceiling and yelling "Put it back on!"

I think he'd be shooting at the holes in the CDs.

1959. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 11:59:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117065900.11131.00001876@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31298

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>We'll never know what they thought of
>Bill Clinton, the internet or the telephone.

Okay, let's take it to an extreme. Are you saying that we cannot be correct if we speculate about what Christ would have thought about Bill Clinton?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1960. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:02:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117070241.11131.00001877@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31299

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>There's another problem that's even bigger: There is no perception of a
>driving
>need to replace good ol' FM with something else. If the repeaters in most
>areas
>were all busy 24/7, hams would say "We need to use our spectrum more
>efficiently".

Try to coordinate a repeater that you do want to use in most areas. The answer is generally that all of the pairs are already assigned. That looks like a driving need to me. With better spectrum sharing techniques, and there are several to choose from, the number of "repeaters" in a given area would not be limited by the number of potential users (tie up a pair of frequencies whether they are in use or not), but would be limited by the number of simultaneous users (have some sort of dynamic frequency allocation or other spectrum sharing scheme).

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1961. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:04:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117070449.11131.00001878@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31300

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>It would be nice if the Product Reviews told what rigs have AGC OFF and how
>hard it is to do.

In almost all cases, how to turn off the AGC is buried in the manual.

>For example, can the AGC be defeated on the FT-817? If so,
>how is it done?

I will check with Mike Tracy on the spate of current rigs to see if he recalls
how AGC is disabled.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1962. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:06:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117070646.11131.00001879@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31451

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Let's say the P5 shows up on 10m tomorrow evening. I won't want to
>torture him with QRP and I'd like to be heard at some point in the
>evening's proceedings. I'll start with all the law allows.

I think that Bill's statement was intended for his general operation, not this extreme. Using an extreme as an example of why a general statement was incorrect is not a reasonable comparison, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1963. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:08:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31452

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years that only
>the
>abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in the 21st
>century. ;-)

Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline into modest growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1964. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:09:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117070920.11131.00001881@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31453

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as fast
>>as it has sometimes grown. :-)

>How could it fail to, with the ten year licenses?

Those ten year licenses have been expiring for some time now. The number of
licencees is still increasing at a modest rate.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1965. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:10:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117071040.11131.00001882@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31454

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> With all the BS distilled out, that is the entire argument of the NCTAs.

If it is BS, it is equally BS when you try to use it to justify your postion,
Dick. All that does it make the entire concept of code testing appear to be
BS. I know that is not your intent.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1966. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:12:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117071243.11131.00001883@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31455

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying Morse code
>> operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)

>:-) Probably only at the sub-atomic level. ;-)

When Schroedinger sorta' knocked off his cat, that was at the macroscopic level. But I cede the point because I really can't bear the thought that there could be another Dick Carroll in the Universe. Dick feels the same about the equally (im)probable likelihood that there is another Ed Hare. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1967. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:43:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c46c6c0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31914

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C4655BE.2633536B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I agree with Bill. If one were to start with 100 watts of power on HF,
that
> > would be a reasonable place to start. If I were going to try an
afternoon of
> > hamming and didn't want to torture other hams with QRP, I would run
barefoot
> > and if I were making QSOs, I would probably be happy.
> >

You'd be happy but you're not following R&R, Dave. You enjoy putting yourself up on a pedastal...figuratively making yourself one of the perfect hams. A perfect ham would follow, allow for, and submit to the operating practices as dictated by the FCC.

> > How do you approach meeting the requirement to use the minimum necessary
power?
> > What power do you generally start with?
>
> Now first, let's add the part of the reg about "to achieve the desired
> communication". We need to define the desired communication:
>
> Let's say the P5 shows up on 10m tomorrow evening. I won't want to
> torture him with QRP and I'd like to be heard at some point in the
> evening's proceedings. I'll start with all the law allows.
>

Then, you haven't even tried to see what power level would actually "achieve the desired communication." You have just thrown the switch to the highest maximum power level. You don't even start at the middle of your rig's capabilities. Just go for the throat of the spectrum.

>
> Let's say I'm not chasing a rare one. We're on 40m and I hear a SP5
> CQing. I'll choose the barefoot rig. Let's say propagation on 40m is
> poor and I hear my pal Hannu OH1XX. He is 439. I'm back to all the law
> allows. Checking into the section net on 75? I'll opt for the barefoot
> rig. Coming back to 75 later in the evening I find that there is heavy
> auroral flutter and severe path degradation. I'm back to 1.5 kw.
>
> Please note that I'm not going to 75w, 56.2w or 1235w. At no point do I
> repeatedly ask the station I'm in QSO with, "Can you still read me?"
> We could easily spend all of our time on the air in performing power

> reductions or increases in this manner.
>
> Tell you what: Next time I have time to burn and a rare one shows up,
> I'll start by calling him with 50w and steadily increase power in 50w
> increments until he responds.
>
> Dave K8MN

You seem to be justifying your breaking of the R&R, Dave. Several wrongs remain a wrong. You're operating outside the best practice methods the FCC stipulates. What a ham.

Kim W5TIT

1968. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 12:47:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <none@noone.net>
Message-ID: <3c46c7b6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31913

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020117065900.11131.00001876@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >We'll never know what they thought of
> >Bill Clinton, the internet or the telephone.
>
> Okay, let's take it to an extreme. Are you saying that we cannot be
correct if
> we speculate about what Christ would have thought about Bill Clinton?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't think that is extreme, at all, Ed. It just brings up a point. But, Dave has "other heroes" and doesn't live by example of others, doesn't try to postulate on what life teaches us through the actions and thoughts of others. He lives for himself. Heck, he doesn't even follow the book with FCC Regulations. :o

Kim W5TIT

1969. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 13:09:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117080949.22158.00000236@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 31456

In article <20020116072743.13150.00002114@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Just as one example, in what way would having trunked or spread-spectrum
>systems to access VHF and up spectrum using the same operating techniques we
>use to access repeater pairs make ham radio not matter to you?

If the techniques and results are the same, why change?

Seems to me like we're in a lose-lose situation. If we stick to the tried-and-proven FM analog voice, we'll lose spectrum because we're not "state of the art", whatever that happens to be. If we go with new spectrum-conserving technologies and free up lots of spectrum, we'll lose it because we don't need it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1970. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 13:34:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117083406.11140.00001904@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31457

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Just as one example, in what way would having trunked or spread-spectrum
>>systems to access VHF and up spectrum using the same operating techniques we
>>use to access repeater pairs make ham radio not matter to you?

>If the techniques and results are the same, why change?

Ask your local coordinator if you can put up a repeater on 2 meters.

>Seems to me like we're in a lose-lose situation. If we stick to the
>tried-and-proven FM analog voice, we'll lose spectrum because we're not
>"state
>of the art", whatever that happens to be. If we go with new
>spectrum-conserving
>technologies and free up lots of spectrum, we'll lose it because we don't
>need
>it.

That is not too far off the mark, unfortunately. But which of those two
outcomes lets us continue to use the amount of spectrum we actually need?

Amateur Radio has always been seen by the FCC as contributing to the state of
the art. To any extent that this perception is changing, that is unfortunate,
and, in the long run, IMHO, will have unfortunate circumstances.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1971. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 15:49:54 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <iuC18.62508$3x5.3456340@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31459

Doncha think in 1952 there were old "buzzards" frumping and grumping because
it wasn't
done the way "they" did it in 1919? Sort of reminds me of my dear old Dad
at 88.

Rule #1. If it was invented after 1950, it isn't valid.
#2. If a man goes outside, he must wear a fedora hat.
#3 If he leaves the yard, he must wear a tie--even if he is only
going to the store.
#4. Always use 1930s dental floss--wooden toothpicks.
#5. A man must carry a handkerchief; travel packs of Kleenex are a
no-no.
#6. A man must be clean shaven; anyone wearing a beard is to be
suspected of Some-
thing!
#7. The Young'uns are taking us to hell in a handbasket--ever since
1950!!

Isn't that what you see with the "elder statesmen" of ham radio? Things
change--whether we
like it or not, and they have been since time began. So each modern
generation of Amateurs
will always have its curmudgeons being left behind--in fedoras, toothpick
and hankie, grumping
and frumping away because "if it came along since 19??, it ain't valid,
Goldang it!" LMAO!

73

Jerry
K4KWH
CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C3F3932.B0523857@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> > >This is gonna be another interesting RRAP traditionalists vs.
> > >"new-wavers" brawl. Looks like it already is . . .
> >
> > It doesn't need to be. Those that want to issue eqsls can and will do
so.
> > Those that want to issue paper QSLs can and will do so. Those that
choose to
> > work only eqsling stations, or only paper qsling stations can do so.

Those that
> > choose to use only eqsls or only paper qsls in pursuit of awards can do
so.
> >
> > Should there really be a brawl over complete freedom?
>
> Some hams have gone on record as being against freedom of
> choice of modes. Don't you know, "If it wasn't done that
> way 50 years ago, it's no damn good."? What good are
> traditions if they can't be fought over? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1972. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 15:55:04 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C46F3B6.B5F35E9E@psu.edu>
Source record: 31458

Heck no! It all depends on what version you subscribe to. With all the different versions of religion out there today, there has to be one in which his opinion matches yours, whatever that may be.

- mike -

W1RFI wrote:

> Okay, let's take it to an extreme. Are you saying that we cannot be correct if
> we speculate about what Christ would have thought about Bill Clinton?

1973. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:02:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C46F5AF.B26FA7EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31460

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> Dick, ask the military if they think RTTY is a serious mode.
>
> So what do you think it is- trivial? Tell it to the military who used it so
> well for so long. Does that mean it's the mode of choice today? Not at all.

My point exactly, Dick. Glad to see you agree. As I said previously, RTTY
was a serious mode in the past but has been rendered outdated as far as
performance goes, by more modern methods.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1974. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:04:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C46F61C.64EE10B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31461

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Translation: Every knowledgable person knows the military uses FEC in
> > their HF digital communications.
>
> And that means that none but FEC modes are serious modes.

It means that anyone who is serious about data transfer will use a mode
that incorporates FEC. Why are you so against technical progress?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1975. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:14:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C46F859.6D0283EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31462

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
> general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.

What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
valid after they die. I say yes. You say no.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1976. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:17:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#BcAFK3nBHA.1804@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31463

"CAM" wrote:

> CW is my favorite mode.....

and "CAM" also wrote:

> It means that anyone who is serious about data transfer will use a mode
> that incorporates FEC. Why are you so against technical progress?

Since CW, (which you have defined as your favorite mode) does not
incorporate FEC, can we therefore presume that "CAM" is not serious about
data transfer and, is also against technical progress?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1977. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:47:01 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C46FFE3.85BD0214@psu.edu>
Source record: 31464

How about *probably* yes? To assign a persons specific opinion on a subject on what they have said in the past about other subjects is a deduction, and like any deduction subject to significant error. Would she be against Morse Code testing? Very possibly. Was she against driving proficeincy tests before being allowed to have a license? was she against education before practicing a profession?

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
> > general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
>
> What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
> valid after they die. I say yes. You say no.

1978. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 16:54:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4701E3.AD542DC2@uci.edu>
Source record: 31466

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying Morse code
> >> operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)
>
> >:-) Probably only at the sub-atomic level. ;-)
>
> When Schroedinger sorta' knocked off his cat, that was at the macroscopic
> level. But I cede the point because I really can't bear the thought that there
> could be another Dick Carroll in the Universe. Dick feels the same about the
> equally (im)probable likelihood that there is another Ed Hare. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Rest easy. Schroedinger wasn't really predicting two cats. He would
have said that since no one has observed Carl enjoying CW, there is a
probability that he both enjoys and doesn't enjoy CW - at the same
time. Hence, one ea. Carl, Dick, and Ed.

1979. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 17:05:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31465

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<uSFfaVgnBHA.1668@cpimsnntpa04>...

> I find that someone like Cecil, who claims to reject the cult of religion,
> has been sucked into the cult of Objectivism. Now Cecil will object that
> Objectivism is not a cult (it's not religious) but religion is not a
> necessary component of a cult. Objectivism is a cult of personality.

Yup - even though Rand herself railed against such cultism.

> A
> cultic flaw in Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is its belief that absolute
> knowledge and "final Truth" (her words) are attainable through reason, that
> therefore that there are absolutes of right and wrong knowledge and of moral
> and immoral thought and action.

I think that part of the philosophy is 100% true and valid. The
trouble is, the objectivist philosphy is incomplete.

> For Objectivists, once a principle has been
> discovered by (their version) of reason to be True, the discussion is at an
> end. If you disagree with their principle, then your reasoning is flawed.
> This is the same circular argument found in the Bible -- this book is true
> because this book says that this book is true.

EXACTLY!

The problem is not whether absolute knowledge and final truth exist.
The problem is recognizing them as such when discovered. The cultic
flaw is that once folks with objective-compulsive "philosophy" claim
to have found a Truth, they shut off any possibility of new
information. That's just about a dictionar definition of cultic
behavior.

Let us take a lesson from science.

Isaac Newton & Co. developed a lovely explanation for the physical
world that included such phemonena as gravity, light, time and space.
Newtonian physics derives from a few axioms and pure reason.
Everyhting about it makes perfect sense. And for hundreds of years it
was the unassailed foundation of science and engineering. Many thought
they had discovered the beginnings of Ultimate Truth in physics.

Then, just about 100 years ago, a very strange fellow comes along with
some really wacky ideas. Like "time slows down when you go real fast"
and "energy and matter have an equivalence relation". Worst of all:
"Newton was wrong - his ideas are incomplete".

The true scientists of the day did not condemn the very strange fellow and his ideas, nor did they ostracize him. They tested his ideas and found that reality confirmed them and contradicted Newton. Thanks to the very strange fellow named Albert Einstein, a whole new way of thinking about the universe came to be. Science, engineering and our whole world was transformed by his ideas and the things that derived from them.

Of course many people said his ideas were nutso, but they were not true scientists. They were cultists who claimed to have the Ultimate Truth. Just another form of objective-compulsive thinking. Ayn Rand had it in a BIG way. The whole Nathaniel Branden affair showed that.

> But perhaps Cecil is (again) putting us on.

I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.

> The evidence is in his oft
> asked question "What's wrong with live and let live?".

Also in the fact that he has told us many times that he never posts anything serious here in rrap.

> Central to Ayn Rands
> philosophy is the opposite moral principle (in her words) "Judge, and be
> prepared to be judged."

Yup. Judged all the time, by everybody, for everything. But don't dare judge the judges!

Thanks for a BRILLIANT post, Hans. You made some things very clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1980. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 17:42:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4700BF.88AA8BBA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31467

K0HB wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> > So where is the evidence against it? ....
> > It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this just "happned".
>
> In all seriousness, I can't find any evidence either "for" or "against",
> which is why I call myself agnostic (not atheist). I'll continue to search.
>
> My natural inclination is to look at things in terms of "cause and effect"
> (i.e.., "deterministic") fashion. Thus, I share your mindset that all this
> didn't "just happen". Supposing for the moment that I had a monstrous Cray
> computer which could explain today's universe completely in terms of its
> state a billion years ago. I would really have accomplished nothing useful,
> except to move the mystery back a billion years. Then I suppose I could use
> my Cray to explain that state in terms of a billion years earlier, and so
> on, but the chain of cause and effect would go on and on until I'd reach an
> impasse -- a point beyond which my computer could not penetrate.
>
> The issue then becomes whether or not some supernatural act is needed to
> kick-start the whole thing, from whence the "laws of physics" go into
> effect, and my giant Cray computer can apply those laws (Heisenberg
> notwithstanding) to reach our current state of the universe..... .....and
> continue forward to infinity and beyond, to quote Buzz Lightyear.
>
> Unfortunately, that deterministic scenario is distinctly unattractive to
> religion, because it places god in the position of just "throwing a switch"
> and then having his role reduced, as Ilya Prigogine puts it, to "a mere
> archivist turning the pates of a cosmic history book already written".
>
> I'll keep searching.
>

Hans, that's probably as conscise a description of the problem as has ever been
put forth.

1981. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 17:43:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4700EC.316DAC9F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31468

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?
>
> By being mistaken. She was often mistaken, Cecil.

Ah. So that's where Cecil gets it.

1982. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 17:49:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C470254.41309B3B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31469

W1RFI wrote:

> Try to coordinate a repeater that you do want to use in most areas. The answer
> is generally that all of the pairs are already assigned. That looks like a
> driving need to me

Not to me. Rather it shows a definite lack of a broader view of what amateur spectrum managment should be. The repeater coordination mess results from the fact that there's no way to take a frequency assignment back once it's issued. THere are many which are so underused they should shut down and the pair be assigned where it might be used. Instead every one of them is grandfathered.

1983. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 17:58:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C470485.4CEBB53A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31470

W1RFI wrote:

Amateur Radio has always been seen by the FCC as contributing to the state of

> the art. To any extent that this perception is changing, that is unfortunate,
> and, in the long run, IMHO, will have unfortunate circumstances.

What is unfortunate is that FCC today has the propensity to listen to advocates of nothing BUT latest technology (a couple of extreme cases show up here in the form of Cecil and Carl), and base their opinions and statements on that alone. A bit of history will soon show that the advante garde of ham radio has always been the few who were basically working in advanced technique fields anyway, as it is today. There are as many or more new communications techniques in use in ham radio today as ever. The push, nay, * shove *, to rid ham radio of "legacy" modes is not

only wrong it is biased against the history of the ARS. Time, need, attraction to new modes and the desires of hams will produce the desired changes in due course. That assumes that ARS isn't overtaken by people with a CB mindset.

1984. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:03:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C470583.BEE0A8CD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31471

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick, ask the military if they think RTTY is a serious mode.
> >
> > So what do you think it is- trivial? Tell it to the military who used it so
> > well for so long. Does that mean it's the mode of choice today? Not at all.
>
> My point exactly, Dick. Glad to see you agree. As I said previously, RTTY
> was a serious mode in the past but has been rendered outdated as far as
> performance goes, by more modern methods.
> --

Since by your own account you never post anything serious here we can conclude
that you are merely trolling againk, still, forever.

1985. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:04:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4705F0.8FBAA233@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31472

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Translation: Every knowledgable person knows the military uses FEC in
> > > their HF digital communications.
> >
> > And that means that none but FEC modes are serious modes.
>
> It means that anyone who is serious about data transfer will use a mode
> that incorporates FEC. Why are you so against technical progress?

So do you still beat your wife, exwife, mother, octegenarian aunt? Yes, you do, to the exact same extent that I am against technical progress. I could post reams of proof but you aren't anywhere near worth the effort.

1986. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:07:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47066F.32BBA5BB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31473

As the history of rrap will clearly show, Cecil is prone to significant errors.
In significant amounts.

mike coslo wrote:

> How about *probably* yes? To assign a persons specific opinion on a
> subject on what they have said in the past about other subjects is a
> deduction, and like any deduction subject to significant error

1987. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:10:13 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eeYb2I4nBHA.1788@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31474

"N2EY" wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com...

>
> I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.
>

I disagree.

I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious" gambit as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he paints himself into.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1988. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:26:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C470AF9.6DF40136@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31475

K0HB wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com...
>
> >
> > I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.
> >
>
> I disagree.
>
> I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and
> only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious" gambit
> as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he
> paints himself into.

I believe that to be the Way it Is. However, in so doing he has supplied
plenty of ammunition with which to shoot down his many gaffes.

1989. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 18:47:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201171047.3bc7bf1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31476

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020113160956.20967.00001219@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

> >>Did anyone that is an ARRL member vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's
> >>position to not oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement?

Some of us let our Directors know how we thought in the very short
time period between when the BOD meeting agenda was announced and the
meeting itself. I think most ARRL members did not know it was even up
for discussion.
>
> >Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a direct
> >result of that one particular shift in position?
>
> It would be interesting to see a run for the Directorship on a "preserve code
> testing" platform.

Just a plank, not a platform.

How many Directors who voted to change the policy will be up for
reelection before WRC 2003? Afterwards is too late - FCC will drop
code testing before the ink is dry on treaty without S25.5.
>
> As to the current international position, I very much want to see ARRL spend
> its limited resources (staff time and money) doing something concrete about the
> 40 meter issue than I want to see it expend some of those resources fighting a
> battle to maintain an international treaty requiring code testing for HF access
> in the Amateur Radio Service.

40 meters has been an issues since before most of today's hams were
even born.
>
> Think about it for a bit -- right now, we have an international treaty
> requiring code testing for HF access in the Amateur Radio Service -- an
> international treaty.

No, we don't, Ed.

We have an international telecommunications treaty. A tiny part of
that treaty regulates ham radio. A tiny part of that part requires a
code test. One paragraph.

> Limiting (or eliminating) ICBMs, global warming,
> overfishing, extradition -- THESE warrant international treaties.

Sure. But the ITU isn't involved with them. Nor is ham radio.

Please explain how code testing is connected to nuclear disarmament or
greenhouse gas emission controls.

> When Morse
> code was THE primary mode in all radio, or at least part of the mainstream, I
> could understand the reasons for an international treaty. But frankly, with all
> of the problems the world faces right now, just about the last thing they need
> to be debating, IMHO, is the need for an international treaty on Morse code
> testing in Amateur Radio.

Will the ITU reps be debating ICBMs, global warming, overfishing or
extradition? I don't think so.

Your argument is the logical equivalent of the driver pulled over for
speeding who tells a law enforcement officer that the officer should
be spending his time catching violent criminals instead of ticketing
law-abiding citizens for going a little fast.
>
> If the League were to spend any significant part of its spectrum-protection
> resources fighting such a cause, they would lose me as a member.

Which would mean they'd lose your member dollars that support spectrum
protection. And you'd lose your vote for director. Noses spiting faces
comes to mind.

> I have told
> Tom Frenaye that, in so many words.

How did HE vote on the ARRL code test policy change? How did ALL the
directors vote? WHY was the vote kept secret even though it was moved
and seconded to record the vote?

How is the membership supposed to know who to vote for, and who to
comment to, if they don't know how the directors voted?

> But your views may differ, so I encourage
> you do do the same with YOUR Director.

Been there, done that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1990. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 19:26:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C47254C.75591148@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31477

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote:
> > CW is my favorite mode.....
>
> and "CAM" also wrote:
>
> > It means that anyone who is serious about data transfer will use a mode
> > that incorporates FEC. Why are you so against technical progress?
>
> Since CW, (which you have defined as your favorite mode) does not
> incorporate FEC, ...

Ohhhhh Hans, how can you say such a thing? Manual CW does indeed, include
forward error correction. That's one reason that manual CW is superior to
machine CW which does not include FEC. When you hear on CW, "QTH is
-. . .-- -.- --- .-. -.- " you don't actually believe the
guy is from New Kork, do you?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1991. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 19:52:04 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <EXF18.106848$fe1.1652680@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31478

> W1RFI wrote:

> >No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as fast as
> > it has sometimes grown. :-)

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> How could it fail to, with the ten year licenses? Does anyone out there really
> believe that all those Novice licenses are still alive and active? I doubt most of
> them are even aware of the restructuring.

Dick, Think about it, you haven't applied logic and elementary mathematics to it. 10 year licenses were in effect long before and the growth rate was negative. Now, the growth rate is positive and you attribute that to deaths in the Novice ranks. Novice growth rate is negative but it's ALMOST ENTIRELY attributable to UPGRADES. Are you insinuating that dead Novices are getting upgrades? Have you been subscribing to Cecil logic?

Rich

1992. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 19:53:58 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <qZF18.106850$fe1.1651619@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31479

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> > With all the BS distilled out, that is the entire argument of the NCTAs.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> If it is BS, it is equally BS when you try to use it to justify your postion,
> Dick. All that does it make the entire concept of code testing appear to be
> BS. I know that is not your intent.

With Carroll, logic need not apply.

Rich

1993. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:13:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C47306A.E55A0C40@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31480

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3C45D485.376B0229@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >How could the founder of Objectivism be less than objective?
> >
> > By being mistaken. She was often mistaken, Cecil.
>
> Ah. So that's where Cecil gets it.

Unlike you who already knows everything, I make mistakes and
learn from them.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1994. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:16:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C47310E.A320658D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31481

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The push, nay, * shove *, to rid ham radio of "legacy" modes is not
> only wrong it is biased against the history of the ARS.

Nobody is pushing to eliminate legacy modes, Dick. You are again
confusing CW, the mode, with Morse code testing, the governmental
requirement.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1995. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:21:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C473252.53B6A967@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31482

K0HB wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com...
>
> > I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.
>
> I disagree.
>
> I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and
> only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious" gambit
> as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he
> paints himself into.

Egads, Hans, how can you misunderstand me so completely?

Didn't you get a laugh out of, "How can the founder of Objectivism
be anything except objective?" I thought that tongue-in-cheek humor
would be obvious to anyone with an IQ higher than 65.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1996. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:23:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4732C8.A572EE1D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31483

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com...
> >
> > >
> > > I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.
> > >
> >
> > I disagree.
> >
> > I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and
> > only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious" gambit
> > as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he
> > paints himself into.
>
> I believe that to be the Way it Is. However, in so doing he has supplied
> plenty of ammunition with which to shoot down his many gaffes.

Just for you people with limited senses of humor, I will put smiley faces
on my non-serious remarks from now on.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

1997. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:32:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117153220.17074.00000003@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31484

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/16/2002 11:15 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>

>Here are some numbers to think about

SNIP

>As of January 14, 2002:

>Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
>General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
>Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)

I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras almost
(and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'

73

Steve, K4YZ

1998. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:38:38 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#RSTyb5nBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31485

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras
almost
> (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'

Interesting, indeed.

I've always said that if we could find a way to degrease them, then they
would probably upgrade.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1999. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:43:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201171243.3cddc465@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31486

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020117083406.11140.00001904@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>Just as one example, in what way would having trunked or spread-spectrum
> >>systems to access VHF and up spectrum using the same operating techniques we
> >>use to access repeater pairs make ham radio not matter to you?
>
> >If the techniques and results are the same, why change?
>
> Ask your local coordinator if you can put up a repeater on 2 meters.

There are two possibilities:

1) The answer will be yes. No problem

2) The answer will be no, all the pairs are already assigned.

Now I'll ask you one:

If I live in an area where all the 2 meter repeater pairs are already
assigned, why would I want to put up yet another repeater? By a quick
count, I get that there are something like 53 pairs from 146 to 148
MHz alone.

> >Seems to me like we're in a lose-lose situation. If we stick to the
> >tried-and-proven FM analog voice, we'll lose spectrum because we're not
> >"state
> >of the art", whatever that happens to be. If we go with new
> >spectrum-conserving
> >technologies and free up lots of spectrum, we'll lose it because we don't
> >need
> >it.
>
> That is not too far off the mark, unfortunately. But which of those two
> outcomes lets us continue to use the amount of spectrum we actually need?

Both - it all depends on how much we actually need.
>
> Amateur Radio has always been seen by the FCC as contributing to the state of
> the art. To any extent that this perception is changing, that is unfortunate,
> and, in the long run, IMHO, will have unfortunate circumstances.

I agree 100%.

But think about WHY the perception is changing. Is it because of code
tests? Nope. We've had no code tests for full VHF/UHF privs for over a

decade, yet we still use basically the same FM technology as 25 years ago. My old HW-2036 hasn't been outdated.

One thing I've learned from ham radio is to fix the right problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2000. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 20:44:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117154444.17074.00000010@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31487

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 1/17/2002 2:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020117153220.17074.00000003@mb-ct.aol.com>

> I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras
>almost
>(and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'

Well....crap....Busted by the Hansmeister.

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

Interesting, indeed.

I've always said that if we could find a way to degrease them, then they would probably upgrade.

With all kind wishes,

2001. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:10:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117161034.02067.00000464@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31489

In article <3C46F859.6D0283EE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
>> general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
>
>What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
>valid after they die.

Heck, it wasn't even valid when she was alive.

>I say yes. You say no.

Nice changing of the boundaries there, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2002. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:10:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117161035.02067.00000465@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31488

In article <20020117065900.11131.00001876@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
>>We'll never know what they thought of
>>Bill Clinton, the internet or the telephone.
>
>Okay, let's take it to an extreme. Are you saying that we cannot be correct
>if
>we speculate about what Christ would have thought about Bill Clinton?
>
You can speculate all you want. Claiming to KNOW what JC would have thought about Slick Willy is another matter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2003. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:10:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117161036.02067.00000466@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31490

In article <20020117070241.11131.00001877@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>There's another problem that's even bigger: There is no perception of a
>>driving
>>need to replace good ol' FM with something else. If the repeaters in most
>>areas
>>were all busy 24/7, hams would say "We need to use our spectrum more
>>efficiently".
>
>Try to coordinate a repeater that you do want to use in most areas. The
>answer
>is generally that all of the pairs are already assigned. That looks like a
>driving need to me.

In many METRO areas, sure. But that's only a driving need if you want to put a repeater on the air. Most hams aren't trying to do that.

If the existing repeater pairs are idle 95% of the time, as is alleged, why are more repeaters needed??

>With better spectrum sharing techniques, and there are
>several to choose from, the number of "repeaters" in a given area would not
>be
>limited by the number of potential users (tie up a pair of frequencies
>whether
>they are in use or not), but would be limited by the number of simultaneous
>users (have some sort of dynamic frequency allocation or other spectrum
>sharing
>scheme).

Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous users is allegedly very small.

THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2004. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:26:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C474066.974E0B53@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31491

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >We'll never know what they thought of
> >Bill Clinton, the internet or the telephone.
>
> Okay, let's take it to an extreme. Are you saying that we cannot be correct if
> we speculate about what Christ would have thought about Bill Clinton?

Are you saying that Ayn Rand was the Messiah?

Dave K8MN

2005. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:27:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C47409A.4AF7FF25@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31492

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Let's say the P5 shows up on 10m tomorrow evening. I won't want to
> >torture him with QRP and I'd like to be heard at some point in the
> >evening's proceedings. I'll start with all the law allows.
>
> I think that Bill's statement was intended for his general operation, not this
> extreme. Using an extreme as an example of why a general statement was
> incorrect is not a reasonable comparison, IMHO.

It was not my only example.

Dave K8MN

2006. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:27:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4741D8.14AAC43D@uci.edu>
Source record: 31496

N2EY wrote:
> Looks like the change made the growth rate go DOWN.

I wonder if the growth rate went down more, or less than it would have
had the change not occurred?

2007. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:31:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C474196.12FA7BDF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31493

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
> > general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
>
> What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
> valid after they die. I say yes. You say no.

That is absolutely incorrect. What we were arguing about is your claim that Ayn Rand would have disapproved of morse testing--that and that only. Since she didn't talk of it or write of it, you can only guess or attend a seance.

Dave K8MN

2008. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:47:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201171347.56e271eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31494

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years that only
> >the
> >abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in the 21st
> >century. ;-)
>
> Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline into modest
> growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...

The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
review on that xtal ball? ;-)

The Speroni figures contradict what you say, Ed.

Consider the period from September 1998 to March 2000. Since AH0A
figures are for the end of the month, March 2000 pretty close to the
end of the 3 code test speeds era.

In the 18 months from September 1998 (672,678) to March 2000
(677,784), the total number of US hams grew by 5,116 - 284 per month.
From March 2000 to December 2001 (683,037) the total grew by 5,253 -
250 per month!

Looks like the change made the growth rate go DOWN.

According to AH0A, the total number peaked in March 2001 (684,359).
Considering the period from March 2000 to March 2001 we get growth of
6,575 - 548 per month. But that growth has not been sustained and the
total has sagged since March.

What numbers are you using, Ed?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2009. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 21:55:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201171252390.172-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31495

On Thu, 17 Jan 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
>W1RFI wrote:
>> Try to coordinate a repeater that you do want to use in most areas. The answer
>> is generally that all of the pairs are already assigned. That looks like a
>> driving need to me
>
>Not to me. Rather it shows a definite lack of a broader view of what amateur
>spectrum managment should be. The repeater coordination mess results from the
>fact that there's no way to take a frequency assignment back once it's issued.
>There are many which are so underused they should shut down and the pair be
>assigned where it might be used. Instead every one of them is grandfathered.

So, a group wants to add another repeater, when the existing ones are already idle? Why not approach the owner of an idle system and ask if he minds if the group may run its nets or whatever on it? If he says "yes," no problem. If he says "no," then one has to wonder why he has the system in the first place if it's not being used? This certainly should be less of an issue if the repeater shows up coordinated as "open" instead of "closed" or "private."

I am a repeater owner and also monitor a repeater owned by an acquaintance when he is out of town. The usage on mine has fallen lately due to some of the users (who used it during commuting) losing their jobs. My friend's repeater, even though it is installed at a U.S. Gov't installation as an emergency communications device, is even more idle than mine. In fact, on his, I've only heard perhaps 2 people in the past 6 months (other than him and myself). Granted, his system is on 23cm (1270/1282MHz), but it's there, available, and coordinated as "open." It's my understanding that his 6m repeater (which I do NOT monitor) is even more idle. (Our area has unassigned 6m and 23cm pairs available too, so the issue of an idle repeater "hogging" a pair doesn't come up, let alone the fact that pairs could be shared but aren't yet.)

Is the problem that everyone wants a 2m repeater, and in the absence of that, a 70cm repeater, and gives no consideration to 6m, 33cm, or 23cm? (I skipped 125cm (222MHz) intentionally because in my area, it is fully populated with 3+ systems per pair. I skipped 10m because it only offers 4 pairs.) Is this an equipment problem (since most VHF/UHF radios made are for 2m & 70cm)?

2010. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 22:02:29 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a27hlp$3c5cr$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 31497

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201171347.56e271eb@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com>...

> The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
> less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
> review on that xtal ball? ;-)

We'll see more Extras now that they're giving the licenses away.

Actually, I question the validity of all "VEC" issued licenses. If you
didn't take the test at an FCC field office, your license is suspect.

2011. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 22:49:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5yI18.379014$W8.13907097@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31498

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a27hlp$3c5cr$1@rn.area.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0201171347.56e271eb@posting.google.com...
> > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
> news:<20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com>...
>
> > The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
> > less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
> > review on that xtal ball? ;-)
>
> We'll see more Extras now that they're giving the licenses away.
>
> Actually, I question the validity of all "VEC" issued licenses. If you
> didn't take the test at an FCC field office, your license is suspect.
>
>
>

By Whom?? Some undidentified nimnal?

Dick N&#65533;BK

2012. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 23:41:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117184130.21767.00000070@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31499

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>How many Directors who voted to change the policy will be up for
>reelection before WRC 2003? Afterwards is too late - FCC will drop
>code testing before the ink is dry on treaty without S25.5.

As far as S25.5 is concerned, I think that even if ARRl fought a change tooth and nail (not that I think it should, mind you), the outcome will still be that Morse code will not remain as a matter of international treaty. ARRL's decision was not to expend ARRL resources on the matter. When I consider the issues that ARRL must face on an international level, I think the decision to be reasonable.

Now, speaking as a member, I was somewhat disappointed that the stand was not more firm.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2013. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 23:43:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117184316.21767.00000072@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31500

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Rest easy. Schroedinger wasn't really predicting two cats. He would
>have said that since no one has observed Carl enjoying CW, there is a
>probability that he both enjoys and doesn't enjoy CW - at the same
>time. Hence, one ea. Carl, Dick, and Ed.

We can all rest easier now! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2014. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-17 23:45:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117184559.21767.00000073@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31551

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The AGC on the IC-706 cannot be turned off. :-(

And the evidence supports the claim that AGC can't be disabled in most
medium-priced rigs today.

Starting with the next expanded report they do, the ARRL Lab will start adding
data to the expanded test reports that indicate whether the measurements were
made with AGC off or on.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab Supervisor

2015. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:14:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4768FD.5973E872@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31552

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
> > > general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
> > >
> > What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
> > valid after they die. I say yes. You say no.
>
> That is absolutely incorrect.

No it isn't! I know what my side of the argument says.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2016. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:15:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C476927.791F70B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31553

N2EY wrote:
> Nice changing of the boundaries there, Cecil.

If you think I changed the boundaries, you didn't understand
what I said.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2017. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:18:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4769E9.A57A4B0F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31554

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So where is the evidence against it? No, I'm not talking about bible or
> religious credo. It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this
> just "happned". That supposes a power within oneself that he really
> doesn't have. If you do, make yourself immortal.

As far as I know, I am immortal, Dick. I've never died.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2018. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:37:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27qpkqf1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31555

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:5yI18.379014$W8.13907097@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
> news:a27hlp$3c5cr$1@rn.area.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0201171347.56e271eb@posting.google.com...
> > > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
> > news:<20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> >
> > > The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
> > > less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
> > > review on that xtal ball? ;-)
> >
> > We'll see more Extras now that they're giving the licenses away.
> >
> > Actually, I question the validity of all "VEC" issued licenses. If you
> > didn't take the test at an FCC field office, your license is suspect.
>
> By Whom?? Some undidentified nimnal?
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK

Dick,
On this one we agree...the "license is suspect" can only have
been posted by a clown.

Cheers (but not to the clown),

Bill K2UNK

2019. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:40:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27r0jshg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31556

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020117153220.17074.00000003@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 1/16/2002 11:15 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>
>
> >Here are some numbers to think about
>
> SNIP
>
> >As of January 14, 2002:
>
> >Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
> >General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
> >Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)
>
> I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras
almost
> (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'
> Steve, K4YZ

If I recall, the Tech pluses can only decrease now because those
that are simply being renewed are then only identified as Techs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2020. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:47:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27rdp$2dp$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31557

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:F6818.48258$3x5.2738249@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> Arnie wrote ...
> > > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> > Lugging
> > > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
> running
> > > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what
> Dick
> > > was referring to.
> > > Arnie - KT4ST
> >
> >
> > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > will get it done.
> >
>
> How about everytime there is a disaster?

Far more of the "disastor" reports I have seen written up didn't
involve makeshift stations. They were far and away usually
mase stations that already existed, mobiles, and/or hand held.
Even when "makeshift" is called for, being prepared gets the job done
quicker. That may simply mean a predetermined availability of
portable equipment and some prewired antennas, etc. Isn't
that what field day is all about?

Waiting for a disastor before you make sure you have antenna wire, etc
is (IMHO) too late.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2021. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 00:50:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27rjcmji1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31558

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C450FE4.79C6C16A@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> > news:_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > > >
> > > > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > > > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > > > get the job done.
> > >
> > > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> > Lugging
> > > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
running
> > > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what
Dick
> > > was referring to.
> > > Arnie - KT4ST
> >
> > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > will get it done.
>
> Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra lite,
will
> do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out fine.
But when
>
> things really go in the toilet, when preplanning for an incident just
isn't
> possible,
> the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools available.

Dick,

I agree and that IS what being prepared is about. One can also
be prepared by having the resources ready so that "setting up"
a field station isn't that difficult at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2022. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 01:05:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27sn7ong1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31559

```
"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > > > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > > > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > > > at the time and for the conditions.
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time of
> > > > day.
> > >
> > > If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
> > > about it.
> >
> > He was calling CQ, what more you you ask for. OOO I C, if he were
> > calling CQ DX, then it would have been OK? If he were calling CQ DX,
> > then you wouldn't have answered him because being in Jersey (not the
> > English Island) you shouldn't have answered.. ;-)
> >
> >
> > >
> > > > The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
> > > > were not favorable.
> > >
> > > It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.
> >
> > My mistake. So why would it have been 20 meters and NOT 40? Wanna bet
> > a crayfish dinner you haven't an answer?? I knew you wouldn't
```

Why should it make any difference to the situation
of using too much power in the first place?

> > > Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> > > be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more on
10
> > > meter propagation to understand that.
> >
> > Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
> > operation.
>
> Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you
> haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement
> stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make
> the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the
> continent.

IF he wanted to work Europe, he should have been specific in
how he called CQ. Poor operating on his part and more likly just
another abuse of power levels.

> > > I guess that if you can't hear
> > > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
> >
> > Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.
>
> See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF you
> BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get the
> right??

Depending on the circumstances, that is exactly correct.
Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
busy during normal business hours.

> You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those
> WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings of
> your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed at
> this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes back
> up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work him.
> I need WVa on 30m ssb

Misc rambling that offers nothing to your argument or
any credibility to your statements.

> > > Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> > > a few new high tech data modes then :-)
> >
> > Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)
>
> right you are, as usual

Glad you agree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2023. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 01:11:53 UTC
From: Itsame <gottahaveit@now.net>
Message-ID: <3c4777bf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31915

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:qZF18.106850$fe1.1651619@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > > With all the BS distilled out, that is the entire argument of the
> NCTAs.
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> > If it is BS, it is equally BS when you try to use it to justify your
> postion,
> > Dick. All that does it make the entire concept of code testing appear
to
> be
> > BS. I know that is not your intent.
>
> With Carroll, logic need not apply.
>
> Rich
>
>

Uh, with Carroll, no one need apply :o

2024. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 01:17:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a27t5u$m3f$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31560

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020116081003.17580.00000339@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
> >increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
> > That
> >doesn't
> >mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
> >be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
>
> Wrong.
>
> "Reasonable power" depends on the situation. With good conditions and a
decent
> antenna, 1.5 watts is reasonable power. Under other circumstances 1500
watts is
> reasonable power. And of course there are all sorts of variations in
between.

I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
air. The exception would only be (IMHO) an emergency.
My comment as to 100 watts being reasonable is focused
at a starting point. If 100 watts doesn't get the results, then
add power. If 100 watts is too much, then reduce. If your
interest is QRP, then start at 1.5 watts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2025. Where is that

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 01:39:19 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020117203919.14686.00001838@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 31561

Sawed Off, Pot Bellied, Drunken, Lying Asshole KT4TR?

Probably busy concocting up another series of lies to tell his Cabin Boy K3QAM.

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

2026. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211855.06375.00000033@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31562

In article <3C450D15.E44A8490@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
>on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.

Cecil:

To me, she sounds like she could just as easily be a Republican as
a Libertarian.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2027. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211855.06375.00000034@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31568

In article <3C44FBD9.F24E6C91@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> What is the basis for this statement? Have there been any specific
>> statistical studies made correlating IQ to religious beliefs?
>
>About half of the members of Mensa are either agnostic or atheist.

Cecil:

Which must mean that the other half are the real geniuses.

>Intelligent people generally require evidence for their beliefs.

Well, I have all the evidence in the existence of God that I need.
Sorry for you're poor luck.

>So where is the evidence for the existence of anything supernatural?
>(Nope, CW is not evidence something supernatural. :-)

How do you know it isn't? BTW -- I think that God is perfectly
natural. After all, He created nature.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2028. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211856.06375.00000035@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31563

In article <#w9XNRknBHA.1272@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> If not, are you saying that it is your own personal observation
>> that people who believe in God tend not to also possess high
>> intelligence?
>
>Nope. That isn't what I said. Send your newsreader back
>and you will see what I said.

Hansl:

Send my newsreader back -- where? I'm not sure that once it got
there, that anyone would want it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2029. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211856.06375.00000037@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31564

In article <Axe18.89$Cl5.21131@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>
>Forgot me, but then again there isn't anyone I look like at all that is
>famous in any sense of the word. Look me up on Qrz.com and see if you think
>I resemble anyone.....
>
>
>(I personally do not believe anyone else could be that ugly! :)

Ryan:

I apologize for yet another unintended omission. Yes, you do look
like a famous actor. It happens to be Lon Chaney, but he's a famous
actor, right?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2030. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211856.06375.00000036@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31566

In article <3C4506DA.C5A0FD5F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Only newsgroup participants who identify by their full name and
>> call sign (if they have one) gets a speaking role. All others are just
>> "atmosphere."
>
>I've got it! Krell can be played by the fellow who gave us "Carton the
>doorman".
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Suggestion noted. The casting dept. is in the process of contacting
Mr. Music's agent to see if he is interested in the project.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2031. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211857.06375.00000038@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31567

In article <a23tu20126f@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020115211502.12969.00000006@mb-dh.aol.com...
>
>> Only newsgroup participants who identify by their full name and
>> call sign (if they have one) gets a speaking role. All others are just
>> "atmosphere."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>20,000 plus newsgroups are on usenet. The semi-anonymous nature of Usenet is
>what makes it so great. Yet, the amateur radio newsgroups are the only ones
>that have people who want you to "identify" yourself. Usenet is not amateur
>radio, and therefore, does not require that I post a callsign.

Krell:

That's right -- identifying yourself is not required. However, those of
us who DO identify ourselves are morally and intellectually superior
to those who don't -- with one notable exception, which we would
prefer to remain *unidentified.*

73 de Larry, K3LT

2032. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211858.06375.00000040@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31565

In article <eqn8bEsnBHA.1472@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote
>
>> forgot Hans Brakob, who I suggest be portrayed by John M. Jackson.
>
>Nice promotion from E9 to O7. (I would have bitch-slapped that kid too.)
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I would have kicked him in the groin until he could chew on his
own balls. But that would have been AFTER I found out that he
lied about his father being KIA in 'Nam.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2033. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:18:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117211858.06375.00000039@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31569

In article <K4j18.274043$WW.13795059@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>What we need here Larry is a backbone story that will let us do skits and
>schtick. My first choice was something like the old Andy Hardy movies
>where Mickey Rooney and Judy Garland alternated saying "I know, let's put
>on a show!". But I think a better model is an old Randolph Scott epic I
>believe called Fort Worth in which people who never met in real life and
>in fact were not even alive at the same time rode thru town. Envision the
>following:
>
>Stroll over to the saloon where Kim is spoofing the Madlyn Kahn in Blazing
>Saddles spoof of the Marlene Detrich performance in Destry Rides Again.
>
>Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
>Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
>slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
>spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since 1926
>has come to him for legacy shoeses."
>
>Down at the livery stable, Hans sings, "And I polished up the apple so
>care-ful-ly that now I'm the ruler of a Big R-V"
>
>Over at the Opera House Jim has to be physically restrained from singing
>Springtime for Hitler and in the repertoire performance of the Sound of
>Muzak, like the Mother Superior in the original gets this glassy-eyed look
>and begins to bellow, "Build your own hardware, build every piece, follow
>every wild hair, til life itself should cease'.
>
>Cecil is in the Men's Room I mean meeting room of the local Mensa chapter
>where a riot has begun and Cecil is beating hell out of all and sundry
>with a Funk and Wagnalls.
>
>Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
>Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed is
>waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
>which the planning commission has no player.
>
>At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has
>done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.
>
>And the surface has yet to be scratched.
>

>Dick Nï¿½BK

Dick:

True creative genius cannot be denied -- and you've got 'em.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2034. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:27:23 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b19855b7cb8649989698@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31570

```
In article <a27sn7$ong$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >
> > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > > > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > > > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not in
> > > > > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was "booming"
> > > > > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > > > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > > > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > > > > at the time and for the conditions.
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time of
> > > > > day.
> > > >
> > > > If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
> > > > about it.
> > >
> > He was calling CQ, what more you you ask for. OOO I C, if he were
> > calling CQ DX, then it would have been OK? If he were calling CQ DX,
> > then you wouldn't have answered him because being in Jersey (not the
> > English Island) you shouldn't have answered.. ;-)
> >
> >
> > >
> > > > The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
> > > > were not favorable.
> > > >
> > > > It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.
> > >
> > My mistake. So why would it have been 20 meters and NOT 40? Wanna bet
```

> > a crayfish dinner you haven't an answer?? I knew you wouldn't
>
> Why should it make any difference to the situation
> of using too much power in the first place?

All depends on propagation there> Just because Bill "Mr DX" Solh states
it, makes it fact?? I thin knots

>
> > > > Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> > > > be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more on
> 10
> > > > meter propagation to understand that.
> > >
> > > Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
> > > operation.
> >
> > Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you
> > haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement
> > stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make
> > the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the
> > continent.
>
> IF he wanted to work Europe, he should have been specific in
> how he called CQ. Poor operating on his part and more likly just
> another abuse of power levels.
>

Of course and if he were calling CQ DX, then he'd be accused of ignoring
the US contacts...can't win. Just more speculation from a know nothing
at all when it comes to the DX.

> > > > I guess that if you can't hear
> > > > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
> > >
> > > Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.
> >
> > See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF you
> > BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get the
> > right??
>
> Depending on the circumstances, that is exactly correct.
> Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
> busy during normal business hours.

Business hours there Bill?? When are business hours when it comes to
international contacts? Oh, that's right, the world revolves around
Bill Mr DX Sohl. So if it's 10 am here in the US, that makes it
business hours, so therefore, it must be 10 am and business hours all
around the world? wow, what a concept. YES BILL, the HF bands are very
busy during business hours because somewhere allk around the world it's
either before or after business hours. Before you prove to us that you

haven't any clues as to this topic, check out a few of the telnet
clusters and see that the HF bands are VERY BUSY during your so called
business hours.

>
> > You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those
> > WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings of
> > your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed at
> > this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes back
> > up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work him.
> > I need WVa on 30m ssb
>
> Misc rambling that offers nothing to your argument or
> any credibility to your statements.

Well, if you are going to play Mr DX Wizard, you better have the
credentials other than the standard IMHO or IMNSHO...

You have put your size 13's right in that oral orifice of yours Bill.
Better quit while your shoes still have some SOHL left

>
> > > > Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> > > > a few new high tech data modes then :-)
> > >
> > > Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)
> >
> > right you are, as usual
>
> Glad you agree.

Only that you have absolutely no clues to what you speak of sorry, but
that's a fact and not an opinion

2035. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:41:20 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <XOL18.3289$Ee7.205441@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31571

"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>
> Far more of the "disastor" reports I have seen written up didn't
> involve makeshift stations. They were far and away usually
> mase stations that already existed, mobiles, and/or hand held.
> Even when "makeshift" is called for, being prepared gets the job done
> quicker.
>

Let's go back to the original point, Bill because I think we have strayed from the issue here. The issue *wasn't* being prepared (we all agree on that), it was having to lug a bunch of equipment (more and more as computers, etc get involved) out to the field site. There will *always* be field sites in disasters (they are absolutely necessary) otherwise, who would the EOC talk to? My point was, and *is*, "less is always better" There isn't a "pre-prepared" field site that I know of that has the HF and associated equipment sitting there ready for use. That's the stuff I'm talking about having to lug out there. Again, less is better, and faster to get up and running.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2036. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 02:46:42 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <YTL18.3314$Ee7.214039@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31572

"Richard Plourde" wrote ...
>
> With Carroll, logic need not apply.
>

Not so, "Plourde", Just because you don't agree with his positions, doesn't mean Dick leaves out logic to make his points.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2037. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:31:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C479712.9CA797D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31573

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> How do you know it isn't? BTW -- I think that God is perfectly
> natural. After all, He created nature.

So you're back to believing in the Sun God, eh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2038. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:33:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C47976F.FA4E94E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31574

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C450D15.E44A8490@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >Nope, I'm discussing unnecessary governmental regulations. Ayn Rand went
> >on record *in writing* as being opposed to such.

> To me, she sounds like she could just as easily be a Republican as
> a Libertarian.

Actually, she was much too progressive for Republicans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2039. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:47:37 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <tVM18.276267$WW.13947133@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31575

> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

> > >Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years that only
> > >the
> > >abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in the 21st
> > >century. ;-)

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote

> > Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline into modest
> > growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
> less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
> review on that xtal ball? ;-)

> The Speroni figures contradict what you say, Ed.

> Consider the period from September 1998 to March 2000. Since AH0A
> figures are for the end of the month, March 2000 pretty close to the
> end of the 3 code test speeds era.

> In the 18 months from September 1998 (672,678) to March 2000
> (677,784), the total number of US hams grew by 5,116 - 284 per month.
> From March 2000 to December 2001 (683,037) the total grew by 5,253 -
> 250 per month!

> Looks like the change made the growth rate go DOWN.

> According to AH0A, the total number peaked in March 2001 (684,359).
> Considering the period from March 2000 to March 2001 we get growth of
> 6,575 - 548 per month. But that growth has not been sustained and the
> total has sagged since March.

> What numbers are you using, Ed?

Jim, You have to watch the change in the change in these numbers with an eye on what took place 10 years earlier. We all know there was a bump back then because of the introduction of the No-code license. What that means is now there are more license expirations and if the re-up rate is the same you'll be losing more licensees in absolute terms.

We could run the numbers and prove it if necessary.

Rich

2040. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:55:57 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <h1N18.276286$WW.13947983@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31576

> > >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >Date: 1/16/2002 11:15 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>

> > >Here are some numbers to think about

> > SNIP

> > >As of January 14, 2002:

> > >Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
> > >General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
> > >Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)

> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message

> > I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras
> almost
> > (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'
> > Steve, K4YZ
>

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> If I recall, the Tech pluses can only decrease now because those
> that are simply being renewed are then only identified as Techs.

We can still see them renew to Technician Class from Technician Plus class
so they are not hidden.

The number of Technician Plus that renew is very low... about 6 per month.
The expirations aren't that many, it's almost entirely upgrades.

Rich

2041. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:58:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117225833.06375.00000042@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31577

In article <20020116082925.09758.00001364@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Some of the low-power communications I have done have relied on just the
>opposite effect. I expect to get through on only signal peaks. I will point
>out
>that I haven't worked Hans with 10 milliwatts on HF yet. :-)
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I worked Silver Spring, MD from Altus AFB, OK on 7 mw. mobile, CW *and* SSB! The driver transistor on my ICOM IC-730 had blown on me, leaving me with just the attenuated mixer output to work with at the time. When I got back home, a friend of mine fixed the rig for me, and measured my total RF output (pre-repair) at seven milliwatts! However, I had made myself heard at that power level on a 15-meter sked I had with a couple of friends of mine in MD (N3CBX and KR8C). Antenna was standard Hustler mobile whip. This was in Nov. '81; I was TDY to Altus at the time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2042. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:58:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117225833.06375.00000043@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31578

In article <a27sn7ong1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>> You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those
>> WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings of
>> your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed at
>> this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes back
>> up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work him.
>> I need WVa on 30m ssb

Since when is SSB authorized on 30-meters?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2043. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 03:58:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020117225834.06375.00000044@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 31579

In article <pan.2002.01.16.18.41.40.238357.20913@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>> Down at the village blacksmith shop, one Larry Roll recites "Under the
>> Spreading Chestnut Tree the Village smithy stands, the smith a big fat
>> slob is he with dirty arms and hands." while Carl reprises, Under the
>> spreading chestnut tree the village smithy snoozes, no horse since 1926
>> has come to him for legacy shoeses."

Jon:

I like it!

>Best done in the voices of Bullwinkle and Rocky.
>
>> Dick is chairing a meeting of the planning commission in the Historical
>> Society building trying to finalize the plan from three years ago. Ed
>> is waiting to present next year's plan which Jon has put on a CD rom for
>> which the planning commission has no player.
>
>Meanwhile, Larry Roll is tossing the CDs in the air and firing at them
>with a Glock semi-auto pistol.

Hmmm. Memo to the Prop dept: If I'm going to be shooting at hand-
thrown aerial targets, I'd prefer a 12-ga. Beretta O/U shotgun. That way,
I might even occasionally hit one! I'll save the Glock for the saloon
scene. Also, write a scene where I get to use my Winchester Model '94
lever-action rifle (in .357 Magnum) for some Cowboy Action shootin'!

>> At the theatre, I am doing Mark Twain (which I believe Sam Waterston has
>> done) to thunderous applause. Hey, this is my vision isn't it.

Hal Holbrook was a much better Mark Twain. Do it in *his* style.

>It's good to be the author.
>
>Jon

Keep up the good work. You'll get the screenplay credit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2044. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 04:10:38 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <2fN18.276322$WW.13949351@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31580

> "Richard Plourde" wrote ...

> > With Carroll, logic need not apply.

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote

> Not so, "Plourde", Just because you don't agree with his positions,
doesn't
> mean Dick leaves out logic to make his points.

Thank you, Macy, for the specificity. I stand in awe of your superior
'vision'.

Well, I was referring to his arguments about MCW getting through when PSK31
wasn't making it. Then I tell him MCW is illegal in that subband and he just
crawls into a corner with no response because he has no response. Maybe you
could enlighten us since you've taken to his position.

Rich

2045. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 04:51:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C47A9DB.A952B46E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31581

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to print, a
> > > group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I wasn't
> > > attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could copy
> > > their CWID's!
> >
> > I keep telling you, Dick, you need a digital mode with FEC. HF is notorious
> > for phase shifting an RF signal.
>
> So what is it that changed your mind?

I didn't change my mind. Shannon's theorem still holds.

> > Obviously, a mode that depends on phase
> > and has no error correction is going to fail under those circumstances.
>
> That wasn't the point. You make a huge deal about how much more efficient PSK31 was
> over CW. But the CW was readable and the PSK31 was not. You made much of the fact
> that PSK31 was hugely more efficient than CW anyway.

It is still true. When you can read CW through a 50Hz filter, then the playing
field will be level. If a PSK type mode used the bandwidth of a CW signal,
then it could run circles around CW as does PACTOR II. Your experiment is with
apples and oranges and therefore is meaningless.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2046. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:10:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118001021.07935.00000278@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31586

In article <a1r9ni$t1m$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >> But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not use
>> >> most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
>> >> General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
>> >> are as "necessary" as the Morse test.
>> >
>> >So you now want to end written testing, theory testing?
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is not
>> necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written tests -
>> particularly the General and Extra written tests.
>
>Let them, IMHO, look the fools for raising such an argument.

Why will they "look the fools"? FCC may agree with them.
>
>> >Take it to the FCC if you want.
>>
>> I won't. But somebody else will.
>
>Ditto my last comment.

Same thing was said about those who opposed code testing. Look what happened.
>
>> > I and the most other NCI
>> >BOD believe theory knowledge is good.
>>
>> So do I. But why MUST it be tested? Why MUST the FCC force it down
>people's
>> throats with all that written testing just to get a license?
>
>IF you believe it shouldn't be, then petition the FCC for the
>change.

I don't. I'm simply pointing out that the same methods used against the code
test can be used against the writtens.

> I am not here to provide those answeres for you.

That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will you
defend the theory tests?

>IF it ever came up via the FCC, I'd spend the time and effort
>to defend the theory as being needed. For now, your
>question is just an academic waste of my time.

I don't think it's a waste of time to point out the obvious parallels.
>
>> > I don't have to
>> >defend that unless the FCC suddenly
>> >wanted to change that.
>>
>> At which time you will be listened to the same way the procodetest folks
>were
>> listened to.
>
>You have so little faith in the FCC.

Why should I have faith in the FCC?

>The fact
>that the procode test advocates did not prevail is
>not an indication that the FCC didn't listen to them.
>In fact, the R&O went into considerable
>detail to address the specific arguments raised
>for preservation of code testing. Did the FCC
>miss any procode test arguments in their reply?

You missed the point, Bill. FCC simply disagreed with all the procodetest
arguments. They can do EXACTLY the same thing with all of the protheorytest
arguments.

>> >The FCC has already accepted the
>> >idea that morse testing is no longer needed.
>>
>> And they've already accepted the idea that less written testing is needed.
>
>We disagree that such is the conclusion to be reached
>because of the changed testing and licenseing.

Three writtens totalling 120 questions is less testing than 5 writtens
totalling 190 questions.
>
>> >> > > Are not the
>> >> > > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
>> >> > > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of the
>> >> > > questions?
>> >>
>> >> That depends on one's background.
>> >>
>> >> Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
>> >> current amateur exams is not very high.
>> >
>> >Would you expect otherwise?
>>

>> I would expect the top license to require somewhat more knowledge of radio
>than
>> it does.
>
>Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
>easy for anyone that has an EE or above?
>
Sure. I didn't have an EE or even a high school diploma when I got mine.

>> >> Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
>> >> to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you know
>> >> a bit of radio.
>> >
>> >How do you define HARD? What is the measurement?
>>
>> I define it as how much you actually have to know about radio to pass the
>test.
>> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs from
>scratch
>> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it didn;t
>> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
>
>Nor did it 50 years ago.

Did you take the Extra 50 years ago? I took the Extra 32 years ago.

>It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
>needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
>learn on their own if they wanted to.

Same is true of the code.
>
>> >> > The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
>> >> > some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
>> >> > send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
>> >>
>> >> In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
>> >> obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.
>> >
>> >The parrallel doesn't exist...it is that simple.
>>
>> Of course it exists - you just don't see it, or don't want to see it.
>
>No, you want to play this game of "if you are in favor of
>ending morse testing, you must be also working to make
>the written harder".

Nope. That's not what I'm saying at all. And it's not a game.

> I won't play...although I have on
>severla occasions submitted comments to the VCCs as to how
>to make the testing better (not easier, better).

Iand many others put similar suggestions on the writtens in my comments to the FCC. They did the exact opposite. Tells ya something.
>
>> >Disagree all you
>> >want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.
>>
>> Not yet.
>
>I doubt they ever will.

They already do.
>
>> My point is simply this: When someone preaches about "eliminating
>unnecessary
>> barriers to a license" they cannot logically say the Morse test is a
>barrier
>> but the written tests above Technician are not. That the FCC or others
>don't
>> see it is immaterial.
>
>It is your crusade, not mine.

Logic is a lonely crusade.
>
>> A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to
>operate a
>> transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter
>on
>> 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate a
>> transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME transmitter
>on
>> 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid answer.
>
>I have already agreed with you in another set of posting
>that the Extra privileges are inconsistent with the
>content of what is tested for.

But you have not answered the question. If you can't, how will we defend the higher level writtens?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2047. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:10:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118001022.07935.00000280@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31582

In article <20020114070231.11155.00001437@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB voice
>>wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.
>
>I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO.
>
Not on amateur HF/MF!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2048. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:10:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118001022.07935.00000279@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31584

In article <20020117184130.21767.00000070@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>How many Directors who voted to change the policy will be up for
>>reelection before WRC 2003? Afterwards is too late - FCC will drop
>>code testing before the ink is dry on treaty without S25.5.
>
>As far as S25.5 is concerned, I think that even if ARRl fought a change tooth
>and nail (not that I think it should, mind you), the outcome will still be
>that
>Morse code will not remain as a matter of international treaty.

That's not the question, Ed.

> ARRL's
>decision was not to expend ARRL resources on the matter.
> When I consider the
>issues that ARRL must face on an international level, I think the decision to
>be reasonable.
>
Then why was it done so quietly?

>Now, speaking as a member, I was somewhat disappointed that the stand was not
>more firm.

That's my point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2049. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:10:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118001023.07935.00000282@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31583

In article <20020117184559.21767.00000073@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>The AGC on the IC-706 cannot be turned off. :-(
>
>And the evidence supports the claim that AGC can't be disabled in most
>medium-priced rigs today.

I've been preaching this for decades.
>
>Starting with the next expanded report they do, the ARRL Lab will start
>adding
>data to the expanded test reports that indicate whether the measurements were
>made with AGC off or on.
>
Great! How about including in the regular report whether or not the AGC can be defeated?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2050. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:10:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118001023.07935.00000281@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 31585

In article <3C473252.53B6A967@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>K0HB wrote:
>>
>> "N2EY" wrote in message
>> news:9f4bfe89.0201170905.7fb1f6fc@posting.google.com...
>>
>> > I have little doubt that he is NOT serious.
>>
>> I disagree.
>>
>> I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and
>> only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious"
>gambit
>> as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he
>> paints himself into.
>
>Egads, Hans, how can you misunderstand me so completely?

You didn't use forward error correction, Cecil.
>
>Didn't you get a laugh out of, "How can the founder of Objectivism
>be anything except objective?"

Nope. Wasn't funny.

>I thought that tongue-in-cheek humor
>would be obvious to anyone with an IQ higher than 65.

First rule of comedy: If you have to explain to the audience that it's a joke,
it's NOT FUNNY.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2051. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:37:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a28cdl$8hg$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31587

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:XOL18.3289$Ee7.205441@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
> > Far more of the "disastor" reports I have seen written up didn't
> > involve makeshift stations. They were far and away usually
> > mase stations that already existed, mobiles, and/or hand held.
> > Even when "makeshift" is called for, being prepared gets the job done
> > quicker.
>
> Let's go back to the original point, Bill because I think we have strayed
> from the issue here. The issue *wasn't* being prepared (we all agree on
> that), it was having to lug a bunch of equipment (more and more as
> computers, etc get involved) out to the field site. There will *always*
be
> field sites in disasters (they are absolutely necessary) otherwise, who
> would the EOC talk to? My point was, and *is*, "less is always better"
> There isn't a "pre-prepared" field site that I know of that has the HF and
> associated equipment sitting there ready for use. That's the stuff I'm
> talking about having to lug out there. Again, less is better, and faster
to
> get up and running.

I agree to a point. There really are two types of "field sites". Those
that need
to be the "less is better" as you suggest...which probably implies short
range,
voice and the more permananent field site which gets set up as a focal point
or "base" that becomes a relay point. In this latter (relay) site, the
preparation
can and should incorporate on the "more is better" approach. Some EOC
operations prepare for this by outfitting mobile communications vehicles.
In such an arrangement, you can accomodate multiple operators, multiband
operations and multiple modes...including CW ops if the local EOC folks
wish to do so.

Also in the latter, redundancy can easily be worked into the planning.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2052. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:46:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a28cu9$g0l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31588

```
"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b19855b7cb8649989698@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a27sn7$ong$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net...
> > > In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > >
> > > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > > > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > > > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not
in
> > > > > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was
"booming"
> > > > > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > > > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > > > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > > > > at the time and for the conditions.
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time
of
> > > > > day.
> > > >
> > > > If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
> > > > about it.
> > >
> > > He was calling CQ, what more you you ask for. OOO I C, if he were
> > > calling CQ DX, then it would have been OK? If he were calling CQ DX,
> > > then you wouldn't have answered him because being in Jersey (not the
> > > English Island) you shouldn't have answered.. ;-)
> > >
> >
> >
> > > > > The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
```

> > > > > were not favorable.
> > > >
> > > > It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.
> > >
> > > My mistake. So why would it have been 20 meters and NOT 40? Wanna
bet
> > > a crayfish dinner you haven't an answer?? I knew you wouldn't
> >
> > Why should it make any difference to the situation
> > of using too much power in the first place?
>
> All depends on propagation there> Just because Bill "Mr DX" Solh states
> it, makes it fact?? I thin knots
>
>
> >
> > > > > Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> > > > > be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more
on
> > 10
> > > > > meter propagation to understand that.
> > > > >
> > > > Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
> > > > operation.
> > >
> > > Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you
> > > haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement
> > > stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make
> > > the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the
> > > continent.
> >
> > IF he wanted to work Europe, he should have been specific in
> > how he called CQ. Poor operating on his part and more likly just
> > another abuse of power levels.
> >
>
> Of course and if he were calling CQ DX, then he'd be accused of ignoring
> the US contacts...can't win. Just more speculation from a know nothing
> at all when it comes to the DX.
>
>
> > > > > I guess that if you can't hear
> > > > > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
> > > > >
> > > > Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.
> > >
> > > See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF
you
> > > BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get
the

> > > right??
> >
> > Depending on the circumstances, that is exactly correct.
> > Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
> > busy during normal business hours.
>
> Business hours there Bill?? When are business hours when it comes to
> international contacts? Oh, that's right, the world revolves around
> Bill Mr DX Sohl. So if it's 10 am here in the US, that makes it
> business hours, so therefore, it must be 10 am and business hours all
> around the world? wow, what a concept. YES BILL, the HF bands are very
> busy during business hours because somewhere allk around the world it's
> either before or after business hours. Before you prove to us that you
> haven't any clues as to this topic, check out a few of the telnet
> clusters and see that the HF bands are VERY BUSY during your so called
> business hours.

Sorry Jay, your mind is in another place. The fact is that during
traditional business
hours in the USA, you will not (if you are in the USA which is where the
bozo in Ohio was) find the bands busy.

> > > You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those
> > > WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings
of
> > > your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed
at
> > > this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes
back
> > > up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work
him.
> > > I need WVa on 30m ssb
> >
> > Misc rambling that offers nothing to your argument or
> > any credibility to your statements.
>
> Well, if you are going to play Mr DX Wizard, you better have the
> credentials other than the standard IMHO or IMNSHO...
>
> You have put your size 13's right in that oral orifice of yours Bill.
> Better quit while your shoes still have some SOHL left

I have never claimed to be an DX wizard, but I can see a poor operator...
and I'll say it again, IF you have no particular intent to contact anyone or
any specific area (e.g. Europe, etc.) then just getting on the air with
a KW is POOR operating practice unttil you have determined
that a more reasonable (100w for example) won't cut it.

> > > > > Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> > > > > a few new high tech data modes then :-)
> > > >

> > > > Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)
> > >
> > > right you are, as usual
> >
> > Glad you agree.
>
> Only that you have absolutely no clues to what you speak of sorry, but
> that's a fact and not an opinion

You have only an opinion. You are entitled to it.
My comments were on abuse of power...whatever the
claimed need. Seems that most of the rest of the world
of amateur population gets by fine with lower power
limits.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2053. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 05:55:13 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <aLO18.6223$Y17.241121@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31589

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road and agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2054. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:08:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a28e6igjc1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31591

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020118001021.07935.00000278@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a1r9ni$t1m$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >> But what IS a valid comparison is the fact that most hams will not
use
> >> >> most of the knowledge tested on the writtens - particularly the
> >> >> General and Extra writtens. In other words, most of those questions
> >> >> are as "necessary" as the Morse test.
> >> >
> >> >So you now want to end written testing, theory testing?
> >>
> >> Nope.
> >>
> >> I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is not
> >> necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written tests -
> >> particularly the General and Extra written tests.
> >
> >Let them, IMHO, look the fools for raising such an argument.
>
> Why will they "look the fools"? FCC may agree with them.

That's my opinion...yours may differ then.

> >> >Take it to the FCC if you want.
> >>
> >> I won't. But somebody else will.
> >
> >Ditto my last comment.
>
> Same thing was said about those who opposed code testing. Look what
happened.

Same "what" was said?

> >> > I and the most other NCI
> >> >BOD believe theory knowledge is good.
> >>
> >> So do I. But why MUST it be tested? Why MUST the FCC force it down
> >people's
> >> throats with all that written testing just to get a license?
> >
> >IF you believe it shouldn't be, then petition the FCC for the
> >change.

>
> I don't. I'm simply pointing out that the same methods used against the
code
> test can be used against the writtens.

Won't know that unless/until it happens. We
can speculate to all sorts of doom and gloom
predictions.

> > I am not here to provide those answeres for you.
>
> That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will you
> defend the theory tests?

IF and when the need arises...I don't need to do so now.
Are you worried I (we) won't be prepared to do so.

> >IF it ever came up via the FCC, I'd spend the time and effort
> >to defend the theory as being needed. For now, your
> >question is just an academic waste of my time.
>
> I don't think it's a waste of time to point out the obvious parallels.

Feel free to do so, as I said, I have better things
to do with my time.

> >> > I don't have to
> >> >defend that unless the FCC suddenly
> >> >wanted to change that.
> >>
> >> At which time you will be listened to the same way the procodetest
folks
> >were
> >> listened to.
> >
> >You have so little faith in the FCC.
>
> Why should I have faith in the FCC?

OK, don't have faith then.

> >The fact
> >that the procode test advocates did not prevail is
> >not an indication that the FCC didn't listen to them.
> >In fact, the R&O went into considerable
> >detail to address the specific arguments raised
> >for preservation of code testing. Did the FCC
> >miss any procode test arguments in their reply?
>
> You missed the point, Bill. FCC simply disagreed with all the procodetest
> arguments.

But they gave their explanation as to WHY they disagreed.
The FCC didn't just say...sorry we don't agree.

>They can do EXACTLY the same thing with all of the protheorytest
> arguments.

Guess you'll have to wait and see.

> >> >The FCC has already accepted the
> >> >idea that morse testing is no longer needed.
> >>
> >> And they've already accepted the idea that less written testing is
needed.
> >
> >We disagree that such is the conclusion to be reached
> >because of the changed testing and licenseing.
>
> Three writtens totalling 120 questions is less testing than 5 writtens
> totalling 190 questions.

Irrelevent as long as the overall sylklabus is the same.
No different than being given a list of 200 spelling words
to memorize and then being tested on 20 of them
or 50 of them. The studying still requires the same effort
to pass with the same degree of confidence.

> >> >> > > Are not the
> >> >> > > writtens challenging to the point on causing "people to spend
> >> >> > > considerable (for some) time with no real purpose" wrt some of
the
> >> >> > > questions?
> >> >>
> >> >> That depends on one's background.
> >> >>
> >> >> Speaking as someone with BSEE and MSEE, the technical level of the
> >> >> current amateur exams is not very high.
> >> >
> >> >Would you expect otherwise?
> >>
> >> I would expect the top license to require somewhat more knowledge of
> >> radio than it does.
> >
> >Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
> >easy for anyone that has an EE or above?
> >
> Sure. I didn't have an EE or even a high school diploma when I got mine.

I agree. I passed the General theory myself before having a
high school diploma.

> >> >> Speaking as an Extra who passed the ancient secret tests all the way
> >> >> to Extra way back in 1968-70, the tests are not that hard IF you
know

> >> >> a bit of radio.
> >> >
> >> >How do you define HARD? What is the measurement?
> >>
> >> I define it as how much you actually have to know about radio to pass
the
> >test.
> >> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs from
> >scratch
> >> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it
didn;t
> >> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
> >
> >Nor did it 50 years ago.
>
> Did you take the Extra 50 years ago? I took the Extra 32 years ago.

Nope, there was no reason to take anything beyond General
when I passed the General test.

> >It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
> >needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
> >learn on their own if they wanted to.
>
> Same is true of the code.

But there is NO reason to test mode skills.
It is not simply knowledge that CW tests at all...it is
a specific skill. No other mode requires that.

> >> >> > The written is a composite of knowledge. If YOU disagree with
> >> >> > some of the subject areas...or questions, you are free to
> >> >> > send comments to the VCs that create the question pools.
> >> >>
> >> >> In other words, don't expect Bill or Carl to see or acknowledge the
> >> >> obvious parallels between the writtens and the morse test.
> >> >
> >> >The parrallel doesn't exist...it is that simple.
> >>
> >> Of course it exists - you just don't see it, or don't want to see it.
> >
> >No, you want to play this game of "if you are in favor of
> >ending morse testing, you must be also working to make
> >the written harder".
>
> Nope. That's not what I'm saying at all. And it's not a game.

We'll just agree to disagree on that then.

> > I won't play...although I have on
> >severla occasions submitted comments to the VCCs as to how
> >to make the testing better (not easier, better).

>
> Iand many others put similar suggestions on the writtens in my comments to
the
> FCC. They did the exact opposite. Tells ya something.

The written tests are in the hands of the VCCs and that is
where the changes take place as long as the changes don't
require rules changes. The VCCs could double the question
pools tomorrow with no impact on the rules. I have
suggested that specifically as it relates to formula questions
(i.e. double or triple the possible sets of variables).

> >> >Disagree all you
> >> >want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.
> >>
> >> Not yet.
> >
> >I doubt they ever will.
>
> They already do.

And you make that assessment based on what specifically
from the FCC?

> >> My point is simply this: When someone preaches about "eliminating
> >unnecessary
> >> barriers to a license" they cannot logically say the Morse test is a
> >barrier
> >> but the written tests above Technician are not. That the FCC or others
> >don't
> >> see it is immaterial.
> >
> >It is your crusade, not mine.
>
> Logic is a lonely crusade.

Such is life ffor crusaders :-)

> >> A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to
> >operate a
> >> transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
transmitter
> >on
> >> 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate a
> >> transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
transmitter
> >on
> >> 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid
answer.
> >
> >I have already agreed with you in another set of posting
> >that the Extra privileges are inconsistent with the

> >content of what is tested for.
>
> But you have not answered the question. If you can't, how will we defend
the
> higher level writtens?

You have changed the paradyme of your query.
You now ask for justification based solely on privileges...
which is a more narrowly defined approach. I would counter
that there is significant general knowledge that can and should
be a part of an advanced license that is irrespective of
privileges specifically. That said, until there's
a challenge to writtens, it iremains an academic mind game.
Crusade to your heart's content.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2055. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:09:45 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <jSO18.4530$Ee7.309057@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31590

"Richard Plourde" wrote ...
>
> Thank you, Macy, for the specificity. I stand in awe of your superior
> 'vision'.
>
> Well, I was referring to his arguments about MCW getting through when
PSK31
> wasn't making it. Then I tell him MCW is illegal in that subband and he
just
> crawls into a corner with no response because he has no response. Maybe
you
> could enlighten us since you've taken to his position.
>

It's obvious (logically) that you used Dick's last name in a blatant attempt to insult him. (bad Rich, bad Rich). We have all been around this NG long enough to use first names even when we disagree. (don't you agree?) (agree) (disagree) (strongly agree) (strongly disagree) please check one.

Logic has nothing to do with understanding where MCW can or cannot be used within the ARS. It's a simple matter of interpreting the rules.

And thanks for recognizing my superior "vision". Even *I* amaze myself sometimes. Your awe has been duly noted and a follow-up letter will be sent as a reminder for future reference. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2056. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:12:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a28ehv$fa9$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31592

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:h1N18.276286$WW.13947983@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > >Date: 1/16/2002 11:15 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>
>
> > > >Here are some numbers to think about
>
> > > SNIP
>
> > > >As of January 14, 2002:
>
> > > >Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
> > > >General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
> > > >Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> > > I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and
Extras
> > almost
> > > (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > If I recall, the Tech pluses can only decrease now because those
> > that are simply being renewed are then only identified as Techs.
>
> We can still see them renew to Technician Class from Technician Plus class
> so they are not hidden.

True, but we can't specifically identify those that did so.

> The number of Technician Plus that renew is very low... about 6 per month.

In reality, there shouldn't be any.

> The expirations aren't that many, it's almost entirely upgrades.

I'm not certain that is so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2057. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:42:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47B78A.67BA5D01@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31593

Richard Plourde wrote:

> > W1RFI wrote:
>
> > >No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing as
> fast as
> > > it has sometimes grown. :-)
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > How could it fail to, with the ten year licenses? Does anyone out there
> really
> > believe that all those Novice licenses are still alive and active? I doubt
> most of
> > them are even aware of the restructuring.
>
> Dick, Think about it, you haven't applied logic and elementary mathematics
> to it. 10 year licenses were in effect long before and the growth rate was
> negative. Now, the growth rate is positive and you attribute that to deaths
> in the Novice ranks. Novice growth rate is negative but it's ALMOST ENTIRELY
> attributable to UPGRADES.

Look - Why would any novice NOT upgrade if he was still breathing and still involved with ham radio beyond holding a license for a hobby for which he no longer held an interest? My point was that novice upgrades would be much higher if it was not for the fact that so many novices (as well as techs) have simplyu lost their interest. Some might regain enough to want to go ahead and upgrade, but they have lost all contact with current happenings in ham radio and are not even aware there was such a thing as restructuring. I know some people in that situation.

>Are you insinuating that dead Novices are getting

> upgrades

No. I guess I need to spell it out for you. With ten year license terms there will be many silent keys who will be shown active in the database for long periods after their demise. Five years longer than when we had five year licenses.

2058. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:44:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47B7E8.3EBEC8E2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31594

Richard Plourde wrote:

> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > > With all the BS distilled out, that is the entire argument of the
> NCTAs.
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> > If it is BS, it is equally BS when you try to use it to justify your
> postion,
> > Dick. All that does it make the entire concept of code testing appear to
> be
> > BS. I know that is not your intent.
>
> With Carroll, logic need not apply.

With Plourde, BS sure does.

2059. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 06:49:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47B91A.96F66AA5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31595

K0HB wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and Extras
> almost
> > (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'
>
> Interesting, indeed.
>
> I've always said that if we could find a way to degrease them, then they
> would probably upgrade.
>

Turns out those slimey folks didn't need to be degreased, after all.They
just needed tests they could pass.

2060. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 07:02:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47BC19.A7A120BB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31596

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So where is the evidence against it? No, I'm not talking about bible or
> > religious credo. It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this
> > just "happned". That supposes a power within oneself that he really
> > doesn't have. If you do, make yourself immortal.
>
> As far as I know, I am immortal, Dick. I've never died.

Sounds about right, for your logic.

2061. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 07:13:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47BEC7.C8835110@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31597

Richard Plourde wrote:

, I was referring to his arguments about MCW getting through when PSK31

> wasn't making it. Then I tell him MCW is illegal in that subband and he just
> crawls into a corner with no response because he has no response.

Umm, that is a case where my lack of response saves you from embarrasment yet
again. The CWID on PSK31 is *not* MCW.

2062. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 07:18:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C47BFF7.1CBB7A5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31598

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Guess your memory is shot, too, I was copying only, or attemptinjg to print, a
> > > > group of weak European PSK31 stations on a nearly dead 20 meter band. I wasn't
> > > > attempting to work them and couldn't have in any case. But I sure could copy
> > > > their CWID's!
> > >
> > > I keep telling you, Dick, you need a digital mode with FEC. HF is notorious
> > > for phase shifting an RF signal.
> >
> > So what is it that changed your mind?
>
> I didn't change my mind. Shannon's theorem still holds.

Sure it does. And your ill advised conclusion shows your lack of understanding of real world communications issues. If one watt PSK31 can't be copied but it's 1 watt CW signal can, that is what is of interest to communicators. We're perfectly willing to leave the theoretical comparison of efficiencies to those of you who really believe the mode that won't work is superior to the one that does under that set of circumstances. You clearly cannot understand or appreciate the difference.

2063. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 11:39:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118063948.26419.00001388@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 31599

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 1/17/2002 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a27r0jshg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>If I recall, the Tech pluses can only decrease now because those
>that are simply being renewed are then only identified as Techs.

They changed that, Bill...remember?...A person with a "Plus" prior to April 15 00 can be ID'd in the database. Simply look at the category "Previous Class"

However a person holding a "Tech" but exercising "Plus" by virtue of a 5WPM CSCE cannot. A lot of those "Techs" on Jim's accounting could really be "Pluses" by virtue of a CSCE. That number is indeterminate.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2064. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 11:56:52 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b21dcd57fb618b989699@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31600

```
In article <a28cu9$g0l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b19855b7cb8649989698@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a27sn7$ong$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >
> > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > > > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > > > > My pronouncements are, in general, still accurate for most high
> > > > > > > > power operators. I recall one day whan I answered a CQ from
> > > > > > > > a station in Ohio during the week about 10am. The band was not
> in
> > > > > > > > any way crowded, congested, noisy, etc. The station was
> "booming"
> > > > > > > > in. I commented at the S level and he replied "of course, I'm
> > > > > > > > running a KW." My comment to myself "What for". Truly a poor
> > > > > > > > operator as there was absolutely no reason for such high power
> > > > > > > > at the time and for the conditions.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Perhaps he was trying for Europe or Asia, especially at that time
> of
> > > > > > > > day.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If he wanted Europe or Asia, he wasn't at all specific
> > > > > > > > about it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He was calling CQ, what more you you ask for. OOO I C, if he were
> > > > > > > calling CQ DX, then it would have been OK? If he were calling CQ DX,
> > > > > > > then you wouldn't have answered him because being in Jersey (not the
> > > > > > > English Island) you shouldn't have answered.. ;-)
> > > > > > >
```

> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > > The condx you describe, especially on 10 show that band conditions
> > > > > > were not favorable.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It was 10 am... I wasn't on 10m, I believe it was either 40 or 20m.
> > > > >
> > > > > My mistake. So why would it have been 20 meters and NOT 40? Wanna
> bet
> > > > > a crayfish dinner you haven't an answer?? I knew you wouldn't
> > > >
> > > > Why should it make any difference to the situation
> > > > of using too much power in the first place?
> > >
> > All depends on propagation there> Just because Bill "Mr DX" Solh states
> > it, makes it fact?? I thin knots
> >
> >
> > >
> > > > > > Just because he was loud for you doesn't mean he'd
> > > > > > be as loud for outside the US. Seems you need to understand more
> on
> > > > 10
> > > > > > meter propagation to understand that.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Seems you need to read what I said, rather than conclude 10 meter
> > > > > > operation.
> > > > >
> > > > > Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you
> > > > > haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement
> > > > > stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make
> > > > > the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the
> > > > > continent.
> > > >
> > > > IF he wanted to work Europe, he should have been specific in
> > > > how he called CQ. Poor operating on his part and more likly just
> > > > another abuse of power levels.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Of course and if he were calling CQ DX, then he'd be accused of ignoring
> > > the US contacts...can't win. Just more speculation from a know nothing
> > > at all when it comes to the DX.
> > >
> > >
> > > > > > > I guess that if you can't hear
> > > > > > > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.
> > > > >
> > > > > See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF

> you
> > > > BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get
> the
> > > > > right??
> > > >
> > > > Depending on the circumstances, that is exactly correct.
> > > > Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
> > > > busy during normal business hours.
> > >
> > > Business hours there Bill?? When are business hours when it comes to
> > > international contacts? Oh, that's right, the world revolves around
> > > Bill Mr DX Sohl. So if it's 10 am here in the US, that makes it
> > > business hours, so therefore, it must be 10 am and business hours all
> > > around the world? wow, what a concept. YES BILL, the HF bands are very
> > > busy during business hours because somewhere allk around the world it's
> > > either before or after business hours. Before you prove to us that you
> > > haven't any clues as to this topic, check out a few of the telnet
> > > clusters and see that the HF bands are VERY BUSY during your so called
> > > business hours.
> >
> > Sorry Jay, your mind is in another place. The fact is that during
> > traditional business
> > hours in the USA, you will not (if you are in the USA which is where the
> > bozo in Ohio was) find the bands busy.
>
> Thanks for proving my point Bill. 'preciate it. You are absolutely
> wrong 99 44/100 percent of the time wrong!!! Check the various Dx
> telnet dx clusters (the US ones and the foreign)
>
> >
> > > > > You must have one of those W3LPL type stations or one of those
> > > > > WA2VUY type stations that allow you to hear anything on the fillings
> > of
> > > > > your back teeth. Wow, you must have at least 389 countries confirmed
> > at
> > > > > this point. Can I come over and use your station when the P5 comes
> > back
> > > > > up. Better yet, when Dave Heil gets on, let me know and I can work
> > him.
> > > > > I need WVa on 30m ssb
> > > >
> > > > Misc rambling that offers nothing to your argument or
> > > > any credibility to your statements.
> > >
> > > Well, if you are going to play Mr DX Wizard, you better have the
> > > credentials other than the standard IMHO or IMNSHO...
> > >
> > > You have put your size 13's right in that oral orifice of yours Bill.
> > > Better quit while your shoes still have some SOHL left
> >
> > I have never claimed to be an DX wizard, but I can see a poor operator...

> and I'll say it again, IF you have no particular intent to contact anyone or
> any specific area (e.g. Europe, etc.) then just getting on the air with
> a KW is POOR operating practice unttil you have determined
> that a more reasonable (100w for example) won't cut it.

Then call the man, Bill. You are one of the whiniest people I've seen
here BUT, be sure to be the best operator and NEVER EVER make mistakes
Bill. Remember to ID every 10 minutes cause sometimes you forget and
that's poor operating

>
> > > > > > Perhaps some better "ears"? Maybe
> > > > > > a few new high tech data modes then :-)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Perhaps some reading glasses? :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > right you are, as usual
> > > >
> > > > Glad you agree.
> > >
> > Only that you have absolutely no clues to what you speak of sorry, but
> > that's a fact and not an opinion
>
> You have only an opinion. You are entitled to it.
> My comments were on abuse of power...whatever the
> claimed need. Seems that most of the rest of the world
> of amateur population gets by fine with lower power
> limits.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

2065. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:06:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118070639.16239.00000521@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31651

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will you
>defend the theory tests?

Perhaps by stating that electronics theory is more relevant to modern radio
technology than is Morse code.

Had Amateur Radio started out by being not relevant to modern radio technology,
it never would have gotten off the ground.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2066. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:08:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118070856.16239.00000522@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31652

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO.

>Not on amateur HF/MF!

I don't think there is more CW activity on HF than there is SSB activity.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2067. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:14:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118071411.16239.00000523@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31653

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Waiting for a disastor before you make sure you have antenna wire, etc
>is (IMHO) too late.

Some might say that learning CW when you need it for a disaster is too late,
too, Bill. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2068. Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:15:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118071535.16239.00000524@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31654

>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net

>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road and
>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.

Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2069. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:18:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118071809.16239.00000525@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31655

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> Now, speaking as a member, I was somewhat disappointed that the stand was
>> not more firm.

>That's my point.

Yes, but I am pretty convinced we see that point from an opposite direction.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2070. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:20:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118072032.16239.00000526@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 31656

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>And the evidence supports the claim that AGC can't be disabled in most
>>medium-priced rigs today.

>>Starting with the next expanded report they do, the ARRL Lab will start
>>adding
>>data to the expanded test reports that indicate whether the measurements
>were
>>made with AGC off or on.

>Great! How about including in the regular report whether or not the AGC can
>be
>defeated?

I will pass this suggestion on to the QST Product Review editor. It could be as simple as noting in the test results whether the dynamic range testing was done with AGC on or off. Our convention is to turn it off for those tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2071. The rules of gud DX'ing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:40:00 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b227dfe44644b998969a@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31657

Per Bill Sohl

If I can't hear anything, the bands must be dead.

If you are calling CQ and want to talk to Europe, be sure to specifically state that or else people like me will come back to you and then whine about the power you have but I don't

It's poor operating procedures if at first you don't try for a contact using only the electrical waves of your brain and then increase the output to 100 watts (the maximum power I have)

10am in the US is the within the traditional business hours of the world, therefore no one will be on HF because I can't hear anything.

Be sure to whine about everything DX on a newsgroup thereby showing just a very very VERY small segment of the amateur world that I am indeed clueless how propagation works, especially on HF since I, Bill Sohl, am a VHF FM type of guy.

Be sure to apply US rules and regulations to everyone around the world because after all, the US IS the center of the amateur universe (according to Carl Stevenson, another major DXer)

and finally,

make sure that all the world knows that Bill Sohl is bsolutely perfect in a Mary Poppins type of way when it comes to his operating policies..he starts at 5 watts and then increases his power until the guy next door can hear him

and remember, when you get that vaunted K2UNK card in the mail, without SASE/Greenstamp/IRC, etc, return via the buro with the NIL all over it because you..the DX don;t need another know it not type telling you how to operate in good Pollyanna form

73 es DX IS (for those that can hear any since there is rarely any in the morning here in the good ol USA)

just a few spots (starting at 10 am somewhere in the world. Not all of them..about 15% Note the preponderance of US spots (actually this is a foreign telnet cluster)

17-Jan-02 15:00 KC4VV 21353 SSB IZ1AEL BEPI - NEW BERN K
17-Jan-02 15:02 RN3DB 28472 SSB VE3EFX-15 UA
17-Jan-02 15:04 OZ1CKI 28461.5 SSB VE3EFX-15 OZ
17-Jan-02 15:06 WA6CWM 7009.9 CW RA6BE LP
K

17-Jan-02 15:07 OH0JFP 50189.9 SSB AA1K KP00-FM29 NO. 83! TNX
K2NJ
17-Jan-02 15:07 W9UAL 28495 SSB UA6LA 59! K
17-Jan-02 15:07 WA7CWM 7009.9 CW RA6BE CORR CALL LP
K
17-Jan-02 15:12 3W2XK 14245 SSB K2KGB ON 245 NET
17-Jan-02 15:12 F1DUO 50130 SSB N2YEV JN26 > FN34HS
17-Jan-02 15:12 FO5JV 14243 SSB IV3TMM FO
17-Jan-02 15:12 JT1BV 7005.6 CW N6OC JT
17-Jan-02 15:12 YJ8DZ/AM 14245 SSB K2KGB ON 245 NET AERONOTICAL MOBILE
17-Jan-02 15:14 CX4GL 28012.6 CW OK1MLP CX
17-Jan-02 15:14 YL3AG 50108 SSB W4ML
17-Jan-02 15:15 9K2KA 24940.2 SSB UA6LA 59! OP.AD 9K
17-Jan-02 15:15 IK1MNJ 24970 SSB KB9KEG ENRICO IN ITALY
I
17-Jan-02 15:15 OE3GCU 28480 SSB VA3HYK OE
17-Jan-02 15:16 LY2BH 50109 SSB AA1K KO25DR >
17-Jan-02 15:17 9K2RA 24940 SSB K6KS 9K
17-Jan-02 15:18 4Z4BS 28022.6 CW NR1R
17-Jan-02 15:18 5B4AGU 7003 CW VE6WZ 5B
17-Jan-02 15:18 I2PJA 28491 SSB WW4K TONY LOUD I
17-Jan-02 15:18 T77C 28020 CW OK1MLP T7
17-Jan-02 15:22 K9EL 24950.1 SSB UA6LA 59! OP. JOHN K
17-Jan-02 15:22 RA3AF 24961 SSB K6KS UA
17-Jan-02 15:23 DL0EUR 14030 CW DJ3WM DL
17-Jan-02 15:24 9A3OS 28400 SSB K6TA 9A
17-Jan-02 15:26 ON5TN 50281 SSB N1RZ > FN44EI
17-Jan-02 15:29 DL7PR 7006 CW K6KYJ CQ DX LP VY STNG HERE DL
17-Jan-02 15:29 SP9KDA 24945.9 SSB K6KS SP
17-Jan-02 15:30 F5HA 50104.6 SSB K2NJ IN95
17-Jan-02 15:30 PP8ZAC 28011.9 CW NR1R
17-Jan-02 15:31 TF8ITT 50160.3 SSB WA3WUL HP94>FM29 F2 WKD
W/5WATTS
17-Jan-02 15:34 DJ4AX 50115 SSB AA1K CQ
17-Jan-02 15:36 K0CIY 28400 SSB 9A7V 59+ WITH 9A3OS K
17-Jan-02 15:37 GW7SMV 50212 SSB AA1K CQ
17-Jan-02 15:38 F8ZW 50211.8 SSB WA1ECF JN38 > FN41 NEW ONE !
17-Jan-02 15:40 WW2QQ 28478 SSB UA3ARC 59/59 K
17-Jan-02 15:43 OM5MZ 24952.6 SSB K6KS OM
17-Jan-02 15:44 AP2JZB 21270 SSB ON7EE BOB KARACHI AP
17-Jan-02 15:45 OY9JD 50110.5 SSB W1CKA S REPORTS ONLY.NO GRID S
17-Jan-02 15:46 9Q0AR 14303 SSB IK2WSA 9Q
17-Jan-02 15:46 G0UYC 50237.8 SSB AA1K JO02-FM29
17-Jan-02 15:46 KE6BWR 28400 SSB 9A7V CAL,FRED K
17-Jan-02 15:46 VG3RJ 28008 CW OK1MLP QSL VIA VA3RJ VE
17-Jan-02 15:48 M0BKL/M 28575 SSB K6KS 50 W MOBILE G
17-Jan-02 15:52 GJ3RAX 50260 SSB AA1K
17-Jan-02 15:53 YC2VTO 21260 SSB IZ8CCW IOTA OC-021
YB
17-Jan-02 15:56 4X4WN 28007 CW OK1MLP DAVID 4X

```
17-Jan-02 15:56 A52OM 7009 CW OK2ZU UP A5
17-Jan-02 15:57 KC5JSO 28400 SSB 9A7V JOSIP, LA K
17-Jan-02 15:58 F4UQL 50233 SSB K2NJ FN09
```

2072. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:44:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C481730.469E7071@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31658

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I'm surprised at the lengths you'll go to. We're not arguing whether
> > > > general aviation or morse code testing fall under interstate commerce.
> > >
> > > What we are arguing is whether a person's published philosophy is still
> > > valid after they die. I say yes. You say no.
> >
> > That is absolutely incorrect.
>
> No it isn't! I know what my side of the argument says.

You're pathetic. Your side of your argument changes with the wind.

Dave K8MN

2073. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:53:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C481920.3EE752D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31659

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16af7f80de75124d989696@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a22vcp$20u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >
> > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16adaf07dfab3b64989695@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > In article <a204fs$bq5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C42400C.6C970FEC@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:

> > Seems it couldn't also be 40 meters at 10 am. Still, all in all you
> > haven't a clue as to propagation effects. The original statement
> > stands, chances are he was working Europe at that time, it would make
> > the most sense needed the power to get a reasonable signal into the
> > continent.
>
> IF he wanted to work Europe, he should have been specific in
> how he called CQ. Poor operating on his part and more likly just
> another abuse of power levels.

You have created an interesting new theory, Bill: If he's loud, he's a
poor op and a power abuser. Sounds like a case for NPI (No power
International).

> > > I guess that if you can't hear
> > > anything the bands aren';t crowded.
> > >
> > > Pretty true in NJ/NY metro area on any weekday around 10am.
> >
> > See above. So let me get this straight MR EXTRA class license. IF you
> > BILL SOHL can't hear anything, the bands aren't crowded? Did I get the
> > right??
>
> Depending on the circumstances, that is exactly correct.
> Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
> busy during normal business hours.

Whose normal business hours on which continent, Mr. Bill?

Dave K8MN

2074. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 12:58:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C481A7B.E77C1DF2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31660

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020116081003.17580.00000339@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
> > >increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
> > > That
> > >doesn't
> > >mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
> > >be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
> >
> > Wrong.
> >
> > "Reasonable power" depends on the situation. With good conditions and a
> decent
> > antenna, 1.5 watts is reasonable power. Under other circumstances 1500
> watts is
> > reasonable power. And of course there are all sorts of variations in
> between.
>
> I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
> whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
> air. The exception would only be (IMHO) an emergency.
> My comment as to 100 watts being reasonable is focused
> at a starting point. If 100 watts doesn't get the results, then
> add power. If 100 watts is too much, then reduce. If your
> interest is QRP, then start at 1.5 watts.

I'd suggest that you are talking through your hat. My interest is QRO.
Now what? Get back to us when the FCC mandates a starting power and
frequent circuit quality checks and power adjustments during a QSO or
series of QSOs. Are you running out of anti-morse testing rants?

Dave K8MN

2075. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:08:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2972p$k2j$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31662

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020118071411.16239.00000523@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Waiting for a disastor before you make sure you have antenna wire, etc
> >is (IMHO) too late.
>
> Some might say that learning CW when you need it for a disaster is too
late,
> too, Bill. :-)

Yes they might and they are free to do so. I disagree as to the
importance of CW in emergencies to begin with. IF an EOC wants
to integrate morse into their preperations, they are free to do
so. I haven't opposed that...rather the track record of actual
readiness preparations seem to have already defaulted from
using morse for a number of reasons...e.g. ONLY the ham
can listen, copy and read morse while other modes allow
the ham to be the control op and non-hams to "fill-in" at
the mike or keyboard.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2076. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:08:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C481CAE.3BEACBCE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31661

Bill Sohl wrote:

> You have only an opinion. You are entitled to it.
> My comments were on abuse of power...whatever the
> claimed need. Seems that most of the rest of the world
> of amateur population gets by fine with lower power
> limits.

I'm not interested in getting by. If it is instances of abuse of power you'd like to investigate, start with the Clinton administration.

Dave K8MN

2077. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:10:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118081007.02371.00001364@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31665

In article <a28e6igjc1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >> I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is not
>> >> necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written tests -
>> >> particularly the General and Extra written tests.
>> >
>> >Let them, IMHO, look the fools for raising such an argument.
>>
>> Why will they "look the fools"? FCC may agree with them.
>
>That's my opinion...yours may differ then.

History favors my opinion over yours.

>> > I am not here to provide those answeres for you.
>>
>> That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will you
>> defend the theory tests?
>
>IF and when the need arises...I don't need to do so now.
>Are you worried I (we) won't be prepared to do so.

Your responses tell me that you don't have the answers.

Simple challenge: Come up with reasons to defend the need for theory tests
beyond what's in the
Tech, and I'll come up with FCC-type replies showing why that stuff should not
be tested. Note that
I'm only talking about theory - regs and safety are a different matter.

> >You have so little faith in the FCC.
>>
>> Why should I have faith in the FCC?
>
>OK, don't have faith then.

This is the FCC that gave us "incentive licensing", which NCI Executive
Director WA6VSE and others have called
"a dismal failure". This is the FCC that continues to prohibit things like many
designs of external RF power amplifiers - not because
of what hams do, but because of what bootleggers and cbers do. This is the FCC
that couldn't even write a coherent
NPRM or errata to it!

This is the same FCC that approved the new Extra Q&A pool, then had to remove
three questions from the

APPROVED pool because of blatantly obvious errors.

WHY should I "have faith" in the FCC?
>>
>> You missed the point, Bill. FCC simply disagreed with all the procodetest
>> arguments.
>
>But they gave their explanation as to WHY they disagreed.
>The FCC didn't just say...sorry we don't agree.

And they will tell you WHY they disagree with the theory tests, too.

I can do their style. See challenge above.

>> >Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
>> >easy for anyone that has an EE or above?
>> >
>> Sure. I didn't have an EE or even a high school diploma when I got mine.
>
>I agree. I passed the General theory myself before having a
>high school diploma.

I passed the General and Advanced theory before entering high school. Also 13
wpm code, sending and receiving. And That was nowhere near a record.

>> >> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs from
>> >scratch
>> >> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it
>didn;t
>> >> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
>> >
>> >Nor did it 50 years ago.
>>
>> Did you take the Extra 50 years ago? I took the Extra 32 years ago.
>
>Nope, there was no reason to take anything beyond General
>when I passed the General test.

Which I took 34 years ago.
>
>> >It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
>> >needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
>> >learn on their own if they wanted to.
>>
>> Same is true of the code.
>
>But there is NO reason to test mode skills.
>It is not simply knowledge that CW tests at all...it is
>a specific skill. No other mode requires that.

Then what are the reasons to test theory knowledge beyond safety and
regulations? Why must Extras know about phase angles and Thevenin equivalents?
Those are good things to know, but why MUST they be tested?

>> >> >Disagree all you
>> >> >want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.
>> >>
>> >> Not yet.
>> >
>> >I doubt they ever will.
>>
>> They already do.
>
>And you make that assessment based on what specifically
>from the FCC?

Their long history of reducing the level and amount of written testing.

>> >> A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to
>> >operate a
>> >> transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
>transmitter
>> >on
>> >> 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate a
>> >> transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
>transmitter
>> >on
>> >> 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid
>answer.
>> >
>> >I have already agreed with you in another set of posting
>> >that the Extra privileges are inconsistent with the
>> >content of what is tested for.
>>
>> But you have not answered the question. If you can't, how will we defend
>the
>> higher level writtens?
>
>You have changed the paradyme of your query.
>You now ask for justification based solely on privileges...
>which is a more narrowly defined approach. I would counter
>that there is significant general knowledge that can and should
>be a part of an advanced license that is irrespective of
>privileges specifically.

But you haven't said WHY it MUST be part of the test. You're making the same
argument as "every ham should know the code".

>That said, until there's
>a challenge to writtens, it iremains an academic mind game.

W5YI has already challenged them. He's not alone.

73 de Jim, N2EY>

2078. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118081008.02371.00001365@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31664

In article <a27t5u$m3f$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020116081003.17580.00000339@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and then
>> >increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
>> > That
>> >doesn't
>> >mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point would
>> >be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
>>
>> Wrong.
>>
>> "Reasonable power" depends on the situation. With good conditions and a
>decent
>> antenna, 1.5 watts is reasonable power. Under other circumstances 1500
>watts is
>> reasonable power. And of course there are all sorts of variations in
>between.
>
>I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
>whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
>air. The exception would only be (IMHO) an emergency.

I disagree. There are plenty of situations where 1500 watts is the reasonable
level. It all depends on the conditions, station setup and what the hams
involved are trying to do. I say leave it to the operators to decide.

>My comment as to 100 watts being reasonable is focused
>at a starting point. If 100 watts doesn't get the results, then
>add power. If 100 watts is too much, then reduce. If your
>interest is QRP, then start at 1.5 watts.

Why not start at the bottom and work up? The difference between 1500 W and 100
W is LESS than the difference between 100 W and 5 W.

Would you like it if the feds brought back the 55 mph speed limit and strictly
enforced it? 55 is a reasonable speed. How about if they enacted new horsepower
limitations on cars, specifying no more than a certain number of HP per 100
pounds of car? 40 pounds per HP is a reasonable number.

Same difference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2079. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:10:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118081009.02371.00001366@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31663

In article <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201171252390.172-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Thu, 17 Jan 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
>>W1RFI wrote:
>>> Try to coordinate a repeater that you do want to use in most areas. The
>answer
>>> is generally that all of the pairs are already assigned. That looks like
>a
>>> driving need to me
>>
>>Not to me. Rather it shows a definite lack of a broader view of what amateur
>>spectrum managment should be. The repeater coordination mess results from
>the
>>fact that there's no way to take a frequency assignment back once it's
>issued.
>>There are many which are so underused they should shut down and the pair be
>>assigned where it might be used. Instead every one of them is grandfathered.
>
>So, a group wants to add another repeater, when the existing ones are already
>idle? Why not approach the owner of an idle system and ask if he minds if
>the
>group may run its nets or whatever on it? If he says "yes," no problem. If
>he
>says "no," then one has to wonder why he has the system in the first place if
>it's not being used? This certainly should be less of an issue if the
>repeater
>shows up coordinated as "open" instead of "closed" or "private."

BINGO!

That's EXACTLY the problem!

One the one hand, I am told "there are no pairs available". On the other, I am told they sit idle 95% of the time!

Huh?
>
>I am a repeater owner and also monitor a repeater owned by an acquaintance
>when
>he is out of town. The usage on mine has fallen lately due to some of the
>users (who used it during commuting) losing their jobs. My friend's
>repeater,
>even though it is installed at a U.S. Gov't installation as an emergency
>communications device, is even more idle than mine. In fact, on his, I've
>only

>heard perhaps 2 people in the past 6 months (other than him and myself).
>Granted, his system is on 23cm (1270/1282MHz), but it's there, available, and
>coordinated as "open." It's my understanding that his 6m repeater (which I
>do
>NOT monitor) is even more idle. (Our area has unassigned 6m and 23cm pairs
>available too, so the issue of an idle repeater "hogging" a pair doesn't come
>up, let alone the fact that pairs could be shared but aren't yet.)

If there are idle open repeaters with good coverage, why would anyone want to
put more repeaters on the air?

>Is the problem that everyone wants a 2m repeater, and in the absence of that,
>a
>70cm repeater, and gives no consideration to 6m, 33cm, or 23cm? (I skipped
>125cm (222MHz) intentionally because in my area, it is fully populated with
>3+
>systems per pair. I skipped 10m because it only offers 4 pairs.) Is this an
>equipment problem (since most VHF/UHF radios made are for 2m & 70cm)?
>
Maybe. Here's another idea:

I remember when there were only a few repeaters around here. They acted as
"watering holes" - everybody went there. And they were usually busy because of
the attention they received. If you wanted a QSO, you either announced your
presence on a quiet machine or joined an ongoing one. If you wanted to find a
particular person, you only needed to look a few places to find him/her. One of
the attractions of the repeater was the large numbner and wide range of folks
that hung out on each one.

The proliferation of repeaters diluted all this. End result is less usage from
the same number of users. And the resources to support a repeater are similarly
diluted.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2080. Re: The rules of gud DX'ing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:11:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a29702$1j3$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31666

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b227dfe44644b998969a@news.earthlink.net...
>
> Per Bill Sohl
>
> If I can't hear anything, the bands must be dead.
>
> If you are calling CQ and want to talk to Europe, be sure to
> specifically state that or else people like me will come back to you and
> then whine about the power you have but I don't
>
> It's poor operating procedures if at first you don't try for a contact
> using only the electrical waves of your brain and then increase the
> output to 100 watts (the maximum power I have)
>
> 10am in the US is the within the traditional business hours of the
> world, therefore no one will be on HF because I can't hear anything.
>
> Be sure to whine about everything DX on a newsgroup thereby showing just
> a very very VERY small segment of the amateur world that I am indeed
> clueless how propagation works, especially on HF since I, Bill Sohl, am
> a VHF FM type of guy.
>
> Be sure to apply US rules and regulations to everyone around the world
> because after all, the US IS the center of the amateur universe
> (according to Carl Stevenson, another major DXer)
>
> and finally,
>
> make sure that all the world knows that Bill Sohl is bsolutely perfect
> in a Mary Poppins type of way when it comes to his operating
> policies..he starts at 5 watts and then increases his power until the
> guy next door can hear him
>
> and remember, when you get that vaunted K2UNK card in the mail, without
> SASE/Greenstamp/IRC, etc, return via the buro with the NIL all over it
> because you..the DX don;t need another know it not type telling you how
> to operate in good Pollyanna form

Your exagerration of my comments shows your total lack
of credible discussion.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2081. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:23:05 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <vcV18.4952$Ee7.440973@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31668

"W1RFI" wrote ...
>
> Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
>

I know what you mean, Ed. My hands were shaking as I typed the message
: -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2082. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:23:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a297vs$9v3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31669

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020118081007.02371.00001364@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <a28e6igjc1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >> I am simply pointing out that the same charge of "Morse testing is
not
> >> >> necessary" can be made against most of what is in the written
tests -
> >> >> particularly the General and Extra written tests.
> >> >
> >> >Let them, IMHO, look the fools for raising such an argument.
> >>
> >> Why will they "look the fools"? FCC may agree with them.
> >
> >That's my opinion...yours may differ then.
>
> History favors my opinion over yours.
>
> >> > I am not here to provide those answeres for you.
> >>
> >> That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will
you
> >> defend the theory tests?
> >
> >IF and when the need arises...I don't need to do so now.
> >Are you worried I (we) won't be prepared to do so.
>
> Your responses tell me that you don't have the answers.

Not at all. My response clearly only stated I am not interested
in articulating those answers now. I will do so, if and
when the need arises.

> Simple challenge: Come up with reasons to defend the need for theory tests
> beyond what's in the
> Tech, and I'll come up with FCC-type replies showing why that stuff should
not
> be tested. Note that
> I'm only talking about theory - regs and safety are a different matter.

As I said yesterday, I'm not going to play the academic game...
until there is clearly a need to do so.

> > >You have so little faith in the FCC.
> >>
> >> Why should I have faith in the FCC?
> >
> >OK, don't have faith then.
>
> This is the FCC that gave us "incentive licensing", which NCI Executive
> Director WA6VSE and others have called
> "a dismal failure". This is the FCC that continues to prohibit things like
many
> designs of external RF power amplifiers - not because
> of what hams do, but because of what bootleggers and cbers do. This is the
FCC
> that couldn't even write a coherent
> NPRM or errata to it!

The FCC has changed dramatically over time. The FCC is
people doing their jobs. People change, attitudes, change,
etc. Frankly, Jim, at this point, I am not at all worried about
the FCC doing away with theory tests because I just don't
believe it will happen.

> This is the same FCC that approved the new Extra Q&A pool, then had to
remove
> three questions from the
> APPROVED pool because of blatantly obvious errors.
>
> WHY should I "have faith" in the FCC?

YOU don't, we can again disagree on that.

> >> You missed the point, Bill. FCC simply disagreed with all the
procodetest
> >> arguments.
> >
> >But they gave their explanation as to WHY they disagreed.
> >The FCC didn't just say...sorry we don't agree.
>
> And they will tell you WHY they disagree with the theory tests, too.
> I can do their style. See challenge above.

See my "not going to play" comments on that above.

> >> >Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
> >> >easy for anyone that has an EE or above?
> >> >
> >> Sure. I didn't have an EE or even a high school diploma when I got
mine.
> >
> >I agree. I passed the General theory myself before having a
> >high school diploma.
>
> I passed the General and Advanced theory before entering high school. Also

13
> wpm code, sending and receiving. And That was nowhere near a record.

Your point...are you saying that even 30/40 years ago the theory wasn't
that difficult?

> >> >> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs
from
> >> >scratch
> >> >> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it
> >didn;t
> >> >> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
> >> >
> >> >Nor did it 50 years ago.
> >>
> >> Did you take the Extra 50 years ago? I took the Extra 32 years ago.
> >
> >Nope, there was no reason to take anything beyond General
> >when I passed the General test.
>
> Which I took 34 years ago.

Point?

> >> >It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
> >> >needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
> >> >learn on their own if they wanted to.
> >>
> >> Same is true of the code.
> >
> >But there is NO reason to test mode skills.
> >It is not simply knowledge that CW tests at all...it is
> >a specific skill. No other mode requires that.
>
> Then what are the reasons to test theory knowledge beyond safety and
> regulations? Why must Extras know about phase angles and Thevenin
equivalents?
> Those are good things to know, but why MUST they be tested?

Wait until someone pettitions to end the theory then.
Ditto my "I ain't got time or inclination to play now."

> >> >> >Disagree all you
> >> >> >want, the FCC doesn't see the parrallel either.
> >> >>
> >> >> Not yet.
> >> >
> >> >I doubt they ever will.
> >>
> >> They already do.
> >
> >And you make that assessment based on what specifically

> >from the FCC?
>
> Their long history of reducing the level and amount of written testing.

That is YOUR analysis...one on which I disagree.

> >> >> A simple question: Why is the material in the General test needed to
> >> >operate a
> >> >> transmitter on 28.150 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
> >transmitter
> >> >on
> >> >> 50.150 MHz? Why is the material in the Extral test needed to operate
a
> >> >> transmitter on 21.020 MHz but not needed to operate the SAME
> >transmitter
> >> >on
> >> >> 50.050 MHz or 21.050 MHz? "Because the FCC says so" is not a valid
> >answer.
> >> >
> >> >I have already agreed with you in another set of posting
> >> >that the Extra privileges are inconsistent with the
> >> >content of what is tested for.
> >>
> >> But you have not answered the question. If you can't, how will we
defend
> >the
> >> higher level writtens?
> >
> >You have changed the paradyme of your query.
> >You now ask for justification based solely on privileges...
> >which is a more narrowly defined approach. I would counter
> >that there is significant general knowledge that can and should
> >be a part of an advanced license that is irrespective of
> >privileges specifically.
>
> But you haven't said WHY it MUST be part of the test. You're making the
same
> argument as "every ham should know the code".

Not at all...UNLESS you firmly believe that hams need know NOTHING
about theory at all. The discussion, if it ever gets to the FCC
might surround what the appropriate syllabus should be for each
license class, but until it does, I need defend nothing.

> >That said, until there's
> >a challenge to writtens, it iremains an academic mind game.
>
> W5YI has already challenged them. He's not alone.

Where's the NPRM then from the FCC to open the subject
to rules changes?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2083. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:26:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a297sfuec1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31670

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C481CAE.3BEACBCE@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > You have only an opinion. You are entitled to it.
> > My comments were on abuse of power...whatever the
> > claimed need. Seems that most of the rest of the world
> > of amateur population gets by fine with lower power
> > limits.
>
> I'm not interested in getting by.

We can agree to disagree then on that.

> If it is instances of abuse of power
> you'd like to investigate, start with the Clinton administration.

Couldn't agree more. The one thing that at least will be
old Billie C's legacy will always be that he will never
be documented anywhere/anytime in any media without
his "I did NOT have sex withh that woman...." being
rolled out again for public consumption.

Cheers to that.
Bill K2UNK

2084. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:31:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201180531.55955eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31667

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<tVM18.276267$WW.13947133@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> > > >Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years that
> only
> > > >the
> > > >abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in the
> 21st
> > > >century. ;-)
>
> > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote
>
> > > Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline into
> modest
> > > growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > The Big Date was April 15, 2000. Two years from that date is a little
> > less than three months from now. When are we gonna see a product
> > review on that xtal ball? ;-)
>
> > The Speroni figures contradict what you say, Ed.
>
> > Consider the period from September 1998 to March 2000. Since AH0A
> > figures are for the end of the month, March 2000 pretty close to the
> > end of the 3 code test speeds era.
>
> > In the 18 months from September 1998 (672,678) to March 2000
> > (677,784), the total number of US hams grew by 5,116 - 284 per month.
> > From March 2000 to December 2001 (683,037) the total grew by 5,253 -
> > 250 per month!
>
> > Looks like the change made the growth rate go DOWN.
>
> > According to AH0A, the total number peaked in March 2001 (684,359).
> > Considering the period from March 2000 to March 2001 we get growth of
> > 6,575 - 548 per month. But that growth has not been sustained and the
> > total has sagged since March.
>
> > What numbers are you using, Ed?
>
> Jim, You have to watch the change in the change in these numbers with an eye

> on what took place 10 years earlier. We all know there was a bump back then
> because of the introduction of the No-code license.

The change to 10 year licenses took place in 1984. Grace period went
to 2 years.

By 1989, all US hams had 10 year licenses.]

From 1989 to 1994, there were no expirations of US amateur licenses.

After 1994 (years before restructuring) the 10 year licenses began to
expire.

Somewhere in the mid-90s the vanity callsign rules changed.

Vanity callsign request gives you a renewal even if you are not within
90 days of license expiration.

> What that means is now
> there are more license expirations and if the re-up rate is the same you'll
> be losing more licensees in absolute terms.

That effect began 8 years ago.
>
> We could run the numbers and prove it if necessary.

I'd like to see them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2085. ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:32:11 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31671

Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he hadn't anyone of DX consequence come back to him?

Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??

Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without sin..casting of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)

2086. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:33:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2989o$sr2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31672

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020118081008.02371.00001365@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <a27t5u$m3f$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020116081003.17580.00000339@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> In article <a22vcq$20u$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Seems to me the better operator starts out with reasonable power and
then
> >> >increases it if he is getting no contacts or poor signal reports.
> >> > That
> >> >doesn't
> >> >mean starting at QRP levels... Seems a reasonable starting point
would
> >> >be 100 watts (typical HF transciever output).
> >>
> >> Wrong.
> >>
> >> "Reasonable power" depends on the situation. With good conditions and a
> >decent
> >> antenna, 1.5 watts is reasonable power. Under other circumstances 1500
> >watts is
> >> reasonable power. And of course there are all sorts of variations in
> >between.
> >
> >I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
> >whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
> >air. The exception would only be (IMHO) an emergency.
>
> I disagree. There are plenty of situations where 1500 watts is the
reasonable
> level. It all depends on the conditions, station setup and what the hams
> involved are trying to do. I say leave it to the operators to decide.
>
> >My comment as to 100 watts being reasonable is focused
> >at a starting point. If 100 watts doesn't get the results, then
> >add power. If 100 watts is too much, then reduce. If your
> >interest is QRP, then start at 1.5 watts.
>
> Why not start at the bottom and work up? The difference between 1500 W and
100

> W is LESS than the difference between 100 W and 5 W.

My comments were and still are directed at REASONABLE.
Most barefoot transcievers are in the 100 watt range.
If starting at 5 w is something someone wants to do, that
is certainly OK with me. Starting with 1500 w isn't. I just
can not fathom anyone turning on their rig, listening for a bit
and then starting out immediately with 1500 watts except,
as noted above, under very few (emergent) exceptions.
That's MY opinion.

> Would you like it if the feds brought back the 55 mph speed limit and
strictly
> enforced it? 55 is a reasonable speed. How about if they enacted new
horsepower
> limitations on cars, specifying no more than a certain number of HP per
100
> pounds of car? 40 pounds per HP is a reasonable number.

The analogy is totally false. High speed does not cause problems to other
vehicles...assuming one is not driving above road conditions. Under
certain traffic conditions, driving 55 on a posted 65 mph road can
be dangerous and a cause for a summons for reckless driving.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2087. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:39:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31673

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not
> started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a
> business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he hadn't
> anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
>
> Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??

Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you are
free to consider otherwise.

> Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without sin..casting
> of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)

If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion, dialog,
debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit. You
are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

comments.

2088. Re: The rules of gud DX'ing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 13:42:43 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b23694af2373c98969c@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31674

In article <a29702$1j3$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b227dfe44644b998969a@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Per Bill Sohl
> >
> > If I can't hear anything, the bands must be dead.
> >
> > If you are calling CQ and want to talk to Europe, be sure to
> > specifically state that or else people like me will come back to you and
> > then whine about the power you have but I don't
> >
> > It's poor operating procedures if at first you don't try for a contact
> > using only the electrical waves of your brain and then increase the
> > output to 100 watts (the maximum power I have)
> >
> > 10am in the US is the within the traditional business hours of the
> > world, therefore no one will be on HF because I can't hear anything.
> >
> > Be sure to whine about everything DX on a newsgroup thereby showing just
> > a very very VERY small segment of the amateur world that I am indeed
> > clueless how propagation works, especially on HF since I, Bill Sohl, am
> > a VHF FM type of guy.
> >
> > Be sure to apply US rules and regulations to everyone around the world
> > because after all, the US IS the center of the amateur universe
> > (according to Carl Stevenson, another major DXer)
> >
> > and finally,
> >
> > make sure that all the world knows that Bill Sohl is bsolutely perfect
> > in a Mary Poppins type of way when it comes to his operating
> > policies..he starts at 5 watts and then increases his power until the
> > guy next door can hear him
> >
> > and remember, when you get that vaunted K2UNK card in the mail, without
> > SASE/Greenstamp/IRC, etc, return via the buro with the NIL all over it
> > because you..the DX don;t need another know it not type telling you how
> > to operate in good Pollyanna form
>
> Your exagerration of my comments shows your total lack
> of credible discussion.

I can only reply in like kind. If you start something that PROVES a total lack of credible discussion, be prepared for similar responses.

And I did not do any exagerration of your comments. Your comments, by proof of their total lack of understanding of HF and propagation were exagerrated enough

The only thin going for you right now is the fact you haven't started trotting out a story for all occasions a la Cecil.

Maybe a story about when you were dx'ing in your antique toy car, trailing a 160 full wave wire suspended from several weather balloons, running less than 100 watts and you got hit by lightening and were teleported back to the late 1880's where you tried to prevent Sammie M from developing Morse code by pretending to be Alfred V and inventing the microphone and hitting Sammie on the head with a bottle of champagne, inserting 3 dimes and you see..he we are..Wait a minute. Am I seeing double. there are 2 of everyone but me

sorry a Nick Danger flashback

2089. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 14:03:39 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31675

In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not
> > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a
> > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he hadn't
> > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> >
> > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??
>
> Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you are
> free to consider otherwise.

What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down the
power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is a
rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?

HUH.

>
> > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without sin..casting
> > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
>
> If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion, dialog,
> debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.

Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.

You
> are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

> comments.

yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit

Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas

BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor operating

2090. Re: Hans' rants on eQSL (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 15:18:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201180718.6f53a227@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31676

"Jerry Oxendine" wrote:
> Doncha think in 1952 there were old "buzzards" frumping and grumping because
> it wasn't
> done the way "they" did it in 1919?

Sure. 33 years between 1952 and 1919 - same as between 2002 and 1969.

> Sort of reminds me of my dear old Dad
> at 88.
>
> Rule #1. If it was invented after 1950, it isn't valid.
> #2. If a man goes outside, he must wear a fedora hat.
> #3 If he leaves the yard, he must wear a tie--even if he is only
> going to the store.
> #4. Always use 1930s dental floss--wooden toothpicks.
> #5. A man must carry a handkerchief; travel packs of Kleenex are a
> no-no.
> #6. A man must be clean shaven; anyone wearing a beard is to be
> suspected of Some-
> thing!
> #7. The Young'uns are taking us to hell in a handbasket--ever since
> 1950!!
>
> Isn't that what you see with the "elder statesmen" of ham radio?

Nope.

> Things
> change--whether we
> like it or not, and they have been since time began.

SOME things change. Some change must be accepted, but other change
must be
resisted.

Two words: New Coke.

> So each modern
> generation of Amateurs
> will always have its curmudgeons being left behind--in fedoras, toothpick
> and hankie, grumping
> and frumping away because "if it came along since 19??, it ain't valid,
> Goldang it!" LMAO!

Some new stuff ISN'T valid. And the real message is that we forget
history at our peril.

Back in '96 the "Little LEO" satellites were a real threat to our
bands, including 2 meters. Should we have simply accepted that "change
happens"
and not fought the loss of spectrum? Note that the Little LEOs turned
out
to be a colossal flop, too.

A few years ago many pundits were saying that the old business cycle
rules
no longer applied to the new era of ebusiness. "Change happens", they
said.
Then came boom-dot-bust and you can buy fancy Aeon (sp?) chairs for a
song.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2091. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 15:25:38 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <S7X18.276924$WW.13987570@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31677

> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> > > If I recall, the Tech pluses can only decrease now because those
> > > that are simply being renewed are then only identified as Techs.

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote

> > We can still see them renew to Technician Class from Technician Plus
class
> > so they are not hidden.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> True, but we can't specifically identify those that did so.

Why not??? The databases are very well known. You can mine any information
you desire out of them. I'm not only talking about the FCC's running
(current) one. There are CD-ROM snapshots all along the way. You can write
programs to find out anything you want to know about the flow of individuals
or the total flow of changes in license statuses of any group you define.

> > The number of Technician Plus that renew is very low... about 6 per
month.

> In reality, there shouldn't be any.

Why not? Are they supposed to be thrown out of the ARS when the 'sell by
date' arrives. ;-)

> > The expirations aren't that many, it's almost entirely upgrades.

> I'm not certain that is so.

I posted on this subject December 5th 2001...
(Note: this was as of November 2001 numbers)
---

1) Technician Plus licensees decreased by 41,660. (your previous post)

2) 5,691 Technician Plus license expirations

3) 180 Technician Plus license cancelations

4) 73 Technician Plus license renewals (on time)

5) 7 Technician Plus license renewals (during grace period)

So... let's see...

We lost 41,660 but...
5,691 were expirations, so subtract them...
we know where they went...
that leaves 35,969 unaccounted for...

180 were cancelations, so subtract them...
we know where they went...
that leaves 35,789 unaccounted for...

80 (73 + 7) wer renewals, so add them...
we know where they came from...
that means 35,869 are unaccounted for...
hmmmm.... could they be upgrades???? :^

So, Bill, considering that 86% of the Technician Plus, who don't have Technician Plus privileges anymore, have upgraded... I would characterize the decline of Technician Plus numbers as a good thing... almost entirely upgrades.

Rich

2092. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 15:38:09 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <BjX18.276938$WW.13988937@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31678

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C47B78A.67BA5D01@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > >No, no, Jim. Amateur Radio is still dying because it is not growing
as
> > fast as
> > > > it has sometimes grown. :-)
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
> >
> > > How could it fail to, with the ten year licenses? Does anyone out
there
> > really
> > > believe that all those Novice licenses are still alive and active? I
doubt
> > most of
> > > them are even aware of the restructuring.
> >
> > Dick, Think about it, you haven't applied logic and elementary
mathematics
> > to it. 10 year licenses were in effect long before and the growth rate
was
> > negative. Now, the growth rate is positive and you attribute that to
deaths
> > in the Novice ranks. Novice growth rate is negative but it's ALMOST
ENTIRELY
> > attributable to UPGRADES.
>
> Look - Why would any novice NOT upgrade if he was still breathing and
still
> involved with ham radio beyond holding a license for a hobby for which he
no
> longer held an interest? My point was that novice upgrades would be much
higher
> if it was not for the fact that so many novices (as well as techs) have
simplyu
> lost their interest. Some might regain enough to want to go ahead and
upgrade,
> but they have lost all contact with current happenings in ham radio and

are not
> even aware there was such a thing as restructuring. I know some people in
that
> situation.

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> >Are you insinuating that dead Novices are getting upgrades

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> No. I guess I need to spell it out for you. With ten year license terms
there
> will be many silent keys who will be shown active in the database for long
> periods after their demise. Five years longer than when we had five year
> licenses.

Don't 'spell it out'... it's your math we're talking about, not your
spelling. Actually it's only 2.5 years longer. With a 5 year license term
the average SK would be dead for 2.5 years before the license expired. With
a 10 year license term the average is 5 years. The difference is 2.5 years
(5 -2.5 + 2.5). ;-)

Rich

2093. 10am traditional business hours time

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 16:44:49 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b261432123933398969e@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31679

from just 1 of the literally 100's of telnet clusters available to the
savoy DXer types (excluding the TIT and UNK types)

18-Jan-02 15:00 4Z8GZ 14087.8 RTTY K7XB RTTY 4X
18-Jan-02 15:00 HS0/OZ1H 14025 CW JA2XYO CQ
HS
18-Jan-02 15:00 YU1AU 50100.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:01 G0EGG 29620 SSB WB4IUY INTO NC RPTR FB! G
18-Jan-02 15:01 S52QM 28564 SSB W0HT S5
18-Jan-02 15:03 EX8F 7009.7 CW N6DKP LP EX
18-Jan-02 15:03 HS0/OZ1HET 14025 CW JA2XYO SRI
HS
18-Jan-02 15:03 XK0XN/P 28003.2 CW G0UKX VE
18-Jan-02 15:06 OZ1DPR 50125.8 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:07 EA4JW 28007.1 CW OH2AWK CQ CQ
EA
18-Jan-02 15:10 9A2GF 21260 SSB EA4JW IS.BRAC EU-016 9A
18-Jan-02 15:10 DL7QY 50220 SSB N2YEV JN59BD > FN34HS
18-Jan-02 15:13 7X2DG 24976.3 SSB K6KS 7X
18-Jan-02 15:13 IZ3BSU 7060 CW IK4IRZ-2 DAMMI FREQ.
I
18-Jan-02 15:13 W1ZT 28088.2 RTTY ON4HF RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:15 IK0OER 28605 SSB WA6IPD STEVE ROME
I
18-Jan-02 15:16 UN7MO 28026.5 CW G0PSE CALLING CQ VIA EA7FTR UN
18-Jan-02 15:16 V63RF 18069.5 CW S58AL IOTA OC...??? 73 AL V6
18-Jan-02 15:17 I6LVT 28016.9 CW N8NRG CALLING CQ, NOT MANY TAK I
18-Jan-02 15:17 OC010 18069.5 CW ON4ASG OA
18-Jan-02 15:17 OH2PM 7010.9 CW N6DKP OH
18-Jan-02 15:23 G0NVY 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 G
18-Jan-02 15:25 LA4LN 50130 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:26 W8PHZ 21275.8 SSB UA6LA RALPH! ON THIS FR 59!!! K
18-Jan-02 15:27 AP2JZB 14245 SSB K6TA DX NET AP
18-Jan-02 15:28 F1EBE 50160 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:28 ZS6PJK 28549 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:29 9K2ZZ 24935.1 SSB N3ATQ
18-Jan-02 15:29 S52QM 24941 SSB K6YUI TOM S5
18-Jan-02 15:32 5R8FL 28686 SSTV DH1ME-6 SSTV 5R
18-Jan-02 15:32 CT4GD 24962.5 SSB K6KS CT
18-Jan-02 15:32 SM7BAE 50107 SSB K1SG
18-Jan-02 15:32 W1AW 14087 RTTY NJ1Q RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:33 9K2RA 14180 SSB 9K2YJ CQING BY AHMAD 9K2AI 9K
18-Jan-02 15:34 A45WD 28030.4 CW K9WA SRI, CORR QRG A4
18-Jan-02 15:34 J79TUY 28499.9 SSB M0CCQ WKD5/9 3 UP

J7
18-Jan-02 15:36 GI6ATZ 50183.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:36 GJ3RAX 50243 SSB N1RZ IN89VE > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 ON1DHF 50254.7 SSB N1RZ JO20 > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 YV5ENI 28450 SSB SP2OFK-2 VIA IK6SNR
YV
18-Jan-02 15:38 G0SBW/PM 24977 SSB K6KS PED MOBILE !! YB
18-Jan-02 15:39 Z31CZ 7007 CW N6DKP LP Z3
18-Jan-02 15:41 SM3AF 14070 PSK3 PD0IAZ CQ-PSK31 SM
18-Jan-02 15:42 A41LD 29620 SSB WB4IUY OMAN VIA NC RPTR. A4
18-Jan-02 15:42 OH6MRD 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16
OH
18-Jan-02 15:43 4X4BO 28510 SSB P0LIC BAD OPERATOR 4X
18-Jan-02 15:45 ZB2JO 28560 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:47 EI3IX 50150 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:47 SP8GQU 14193.6 SSB K6ZG SP
18-Jan-02 15:51 GD3SKZ 24957.9 SSB W6OAT KEITH
GD
18-Jan-02 15:52 GW0SSB 28535 SSB K1TTT-6 OVER TRUCKERS!
18-Jan-02 15:53 K0PQ 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 K
18-Jan-02 15:53 ZF2LM 28021 CW VE7RG ZF
18-Jan-02 15:54 KB0IWN 28565 SSB N3YZT TERRY; MN K
18-Jan-02 15:54 ZL2AGY 18077 CW DJ3AS ZL
18-Jan-02 15:55 A52OM 18078.8 CW OM7AG UP 1 A5
18-Jan-02 15:55 G4YTB 24957.9 SSB K4VE DAVE BEAMING U.S. G
18-Jan-02 15:55 UR8IF 29620 SSB WB4IUY VIC, VIA NC RPTR UR
18-Jan-02 15:56 5B4AGC 24950 SSB N2JBO

at least 1 per minute being posted, excluding the 6 meter spots.
Including them and the average is better than 3 per minute. This
particluar cluster nly posts about 60% of all the internet spots, so
there are considerably more out there. And this is just what is being
posted, so there are even more people out there on a traditional
business day in the US at 10am BST (bill sohl time)

Guess Bill needs a better pair of ears (read antennae) cause I hear
almost 90%of all these posts plus a lot more

Just remember..it's 10am somewhere in the world. That leaves 23 other
hours to be elsewhere. The fact Mr. Bill OOOOHHHH NOOOOO categorically
states that when it's 10am business time in the US that the rest of the
world is also experiencing business hours shows a total lack of
understanding in things DX

2094. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 17:35:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C485CC4.4312950D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31680

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I know what my side of the argument says.
>
> You're pathetic.

Coming from a guy like you, I'll consider that to be
a compliment.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2095. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 17:37:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C485114.606CEC35@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31681

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:F6818.48258$3x5.2738249@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> >
> > Arnie wrote ...
> > > > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> > > Lugging
> > > > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
> > running
> > > > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what
> > Dick
> > > > was referring to.
> > > > Arnie - KT4ST
> > >
> > >
> > > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > > will get it done.
> > >
> >
> > How about everytime there is a disaster?
>
> Far more of the "disastor" reports I have seen written up didn't
> involve makeshift stations. They were far and away usually
> mase stations that already existed, mobiles, and/or hand held.
> Even when "makeshift" is called for, being prepared gets the job done
> quicker. That may simply mean a predetermined availability of
> portable equipment and some prewired antennas, etc. Isn't
> that what field day is all about?
>
> Waiting for a disastor before you make sure you have antenna wire, etc
> is (IMHO) too late.

Where in the world did you get the *incorrect* idea that anyone disagrees with being prepared?? Not from me. Oh, you believe that anyone who holds the view that CW is a viable emergency communications mode is automatically unprepared. Just as I thought. You simply don't know any better.

2096. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 17:43:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C485264.BCDE066B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31682

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C450FE4.79C6C16A@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> > > news:_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > > > >
> > > > > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > > > > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > > > > get the job done.
> > > >
> > > > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on that.
> > > Lugging
> > > > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
> running
> > > > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is what
> Dick
> > > > was referring to.
> > > > Arnie - KT4ST
> > >
> > > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > > will get it done.
> >
> > Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra lite,
> will
> > do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out fine.
> But when
> >
> > things really go in the toilet, when preplanning for an incident just
> isn't
> > possible,
> > the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools available.
>
> Dick,
>
> I agree and that IS what being prepared is about. One can also
> be prepared by having the resources ready so that "setting up"
> a field station isn't that difficult at all.

So what happens when you don't get to decide about the preparations? Is everyone -every licensed ham- expected to maintain the exact same level of preparation at all times?? What if, due to circumstances completely beyond your control, you are thrust into a situation where you are forced to use gear other
than your own, and you must make do with what is there?? What it it is capable of only SSB and CW operation, and atmospheric conditions are so poor that SSB won't get the job done? I guess you're just out of luck. I'll fire up on CW and fervently hope that you aren't on the other end of the circuit.

""The best laid plans of mice and men......"

2097. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 17:57:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4855BD.3C17EFA5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31683

Dave Heil wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Please don't try to convince us that HF bands on weekdays are at all
> > busy during normal business hours.
>
> Whose normal business hours on which continent, Mr. Bill?

Ah, so. Anytime after 5pm in New Joisey Bill prounounces anyone west of
Indianapolis a violator.

2098. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:07:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C486473.BAAE73D3@psu.edu>
Source record: 31685

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

<snippage>

> > Would you like it if the feds brought back the 55 mph speed limit and
> strictly
> > enforced it? 55 is a reasonable speed. How about if they enacted new
> horsepower
> > limitations on cars, specifying no more than a certain number of HP per
> 100
> > pounds of car? 40 pounds per HP is a reasonable number.
>
> The analogy is totally false. High speed does not cause problems to other
> vehicles...assuming one is not driving above road conditions. Under
> certain traffic conditions, driving 55 on a posted 65 mph road can
> be dangerous and a cause for a summons for reckless driving.

No problems to other vehicles until they run into one or another! Then
the difference between 55 and 80 is significant to say the least!

Actually seems a pretty good analogy to me.

- mike -

2099. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:16:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C485A0F.D07DDAA3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31684

Richard Plourde wrote:

> > Look - Why would any novice NOT upgrade if he was still breathing and
> still
> > involved with ham radio beyond holding a license for a hobby for which he
> no
> > longer held an interest? My point was that novice upgrades would be much
> higher
> > if it was not for the fact that so many novices (as well as techs) have
> simplyu
> > lost their interest. Some might regain enough to want to go ahead and
> upgrade,
> > but they have lost all contact with current happenings in ham radio and
> are not
> > even aware there was such a thing as restructuring. I know some people in
> that
> > situation.
>
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > >Are you insinuating that dead Novices are getting upgrades
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > No. I guess I need to spell it out for you. With ten year license terms
> there
> > will be many silent keys who will be shown active in the database for long
> > periods after their demise. Five years longer than when we had five year
> > licenses.
>
> Don't 'spell it out'... it's your math we're talking about, not your
> spelling. Actually it's only 2.5 years longer. With a 5 year license term
> the average SK would be dead for 2.5 years before the license expired. With
> a 10 year license term the average is 5 years. The difference is 2.5 years
> (5 -2.5 + 2.5). ;-)

Ah. I keep forgetting you studied the "new math". That 'splains it.

5 + 5 doesn't = 10. Got it.

2100. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:23:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201181023.3d7facda@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31686

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020118070856.16239.00000522@mb-cr.aol.com>...

W1RFI:
> >>I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO.
>
N2EY:
> >Not on amateur HF/MF!
>
> I don't think there is more CW activity on HF than there is SSB activity.

Nor do I. The two are pretty close, though. Often I can near more amateur CW
stations than SSB stations on the HF/MF ham bands.

FM activity is nowhere near the level of SSB or CW on the HF/MF ham bands.

But you wrote:

"I don't know whether FM or SSB voice is #1, but CW is behind both, IMHO."

even though I had specified the amateur HF/MF bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2101. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:41:02 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a29qck$78q$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 31689

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C473252.53B6A967@IEEE.org...
<SNIP> >
> > I think CAM is serious everytime he scribes something to the newsgroup, and
> > only uses that "Awww shucks, well y'all know I wasn't really serious" gambit
> > as a device to extract himself from the many (il)logical corners that he
> > paints himself into.
>
> Egads, Hans, how can you misunderstand me so completely?
>
> Didn't you get a laugh out of, "How can the founder of Objectivism
> be anything except objective?" I thought that tongue-in-cheek humor
> would be obvious to anyone with an IQ higher than 65.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

Cam
Maybe you should start using the K.I.S.S. theory
(Keep It Simple Stupid) when doing humor. ;)

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

For every action,
there is an equal
and opposite criticism.
-Harrison's Postulate

2102. ARNewsline 1275 - Jan 18 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:43:23 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118134323.25519.00003279@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31687

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1275 - January 18 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1275 with a release date of
Friday, January 18th 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A new ham antenna on the I-S-S and a new microwave record down-under are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1275 coming your way right now!

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW ANTENNAS INSTALLED ON THE ISS

An American astronaut and a Russian cosmonaut ventured into space on Monday January 14th to move a construction crane and install a new set of ham radio antennas on the International Space Station. Roy Neal, K6DUE, has the details.

--

THERE IT WAS, ON NASA TELEVISION, TWO WHITE SPACE SUITED CHARACTERS, DWARFED BY THE IMMENSITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION. FOR THE 32ND TIME ASTRONAUTS AND COSMONAUTS WERE OUTSIDE THE HUGE SPACECRAFT TO ASSEMBLE HARDWARE.

THEIR PRIMARY OBJECTIVE WAS TO MOVE A BIG CARGO CRANE FROM ITS TEMPORARY BERTH ON THE UNITED STATES SIDE OF THE ORBITING OUTPOST TO A PERMANENT LOCATION OUTSIDE THE DOCKING COMPARTMENT OF THE RUSSIAN CONTROL MODULE.

THAT ACCOMPLISHED, THEY WENT ON TO UNFURL A HAM RADIO ANTENNA. ASTRONAUT CARL WALTZ, KC5TIE AND COSMONAUT YURI ONUFRIENKO, RK3DUO, DEPLOYED THE RIBBON OF TAPE THAT SOON WILL BE IN USE ON A HAM RADIO STATION IN THE SERVICE MODULE,. WHERE THE CREWS LIVE AND SLEEP. A SECOND STATION HAS BEEN IN SERVICE FOR SOME TIME INSIDE THE SO CALLED FUNCTIONAL CARGO BLOCK, ANOTHER SECTION OF THE I S S.

FRANK BAUER, KA3HDO, THE CHAIRMAN OF ARISS, THE GROUP THAT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR AMATEUR RADIO ON THE SPACE STATION, CONGRATULATED THE INTERNATIONAL TEAM OF LICENSED HAMS FOR THE SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION TO MONTHS OF HARD WORK.

ON JANUARY 25th ONUFRIENKO IS SCHEDULED TO GO OUTSIDE AGAIN, WITH FLIGHT ENGINEER DAN BURSCH, KD5PNU, TO INSTALL 3 MORE HAM RADIO ANTENNAS OUTSIDE THE MODULE THEY CALL ZVEZDA, THE CREW COMPARTMENT THAT'S THE SIZE OF A PASSENGER BUS HERE ON EARTH.

HAM RADIO IS GROWING RAPIDLY IN SPACE, ALONG WITH THE INTERNATIONAL STATION ON WHICH IT'S INSTALLED.

FOR THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE, ROY NEAL, K6DUE

--

The Expedition 4 crew will remain on board the ISS until May. And according to Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, another important task is to bring the automatic packet system back on line. He says that ground technicians are working with the astronauts and cosmonaut on that project and that task will continue as crew time permits. (ARNewsline from information provided by ARISS, NASA.)

**

HAM RADIO RECORDS: 24 GHZ DOWN-UNDER

A new distance record is set on a band where even commercial interests are only now starting to tread. And its a group of Australian hams who have set it. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the details:

--

A new Queensland distance record on 24.048.1 GHz USB was established morning of Tuesday 08 January over a 72.8 Km path. Location 1 was at Wellington Point, with VK3ZQB and VK4ZHL portable. Location 2 was at Caloundra, with VK3XPD and VK5DK portable operating.

Signals strengths up to 5x5 after initial optimization with typical daytime QSB. The visiting team are continuing with local propagation experiments. The challenges of building and operating microwave amateur radio equipment are wonderfully rewarding in many ways!

From Q-News Australia, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Further experimentation is expected to bring even more record setting contacts in this very microwave ham radio band. (Q-News)

**

RESTRUCTURING: BIG LICENSING SUCCESS IN THE UK

A new slow-code license recently introduced in the United Kingdom is also setting records. This in the area of people flocking to get it. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, days that the new British Foundation License is on its way to becoming a major success:

--

The Radio Licensing Center reports that, as of the 7th of January, exactly 600 of the new M3 Foundation Licenses had been issued.

In the 'QSO Party' for Foundation Licensees that took place on the 1st of January it is estimated that about 100 M3 stations were active. Many joined the one-minute-past-midnight 80-meter net and many more were heard working DX during the subsequent days.

One person active on the 1st of January was Mike Marsden, M3BQH, who also holds the callsign G8BQH. Mike reports that he worked Alex, UR5EDU, in the Ukraine at

two seconds past midnight, using 10 watts on 40 meters. The report was 59+10dB. After a few hours' sleep M3BQH worked 66 stations on the first day, with only two short CQ calls.

"The pile-up queue was never ending, I even managed to work seven other M3s", Mike said.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

To put this in perspective. The UK has 57,814 hams so 600 is about 1%. Here in the United States we have close to 625,000 licensees. That’s the equivalent of getting 6250 hams signing up for a new license class here in the USA in only a few short days. (GB2RS)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, including the W8GK repeater serving Charleston West Virginia.

(5 Sec Pause Here)

**

RADIO REGULATIONS: FCC'S APPROVES DRAFT WRC PROPOSALS

The FCC’s Advisory Committee for the year 2003 World Radiocommunications Conference has approved its preliminary draft proposals. The document has been assigned as D-A-02-101 and deals mainly with satellite and terrestrial allocations in the UHF and microwave bands. Amateur Radio is only briefly mentioned in the area of 890 to 1350 MHz allocations.

The Advisory Committee itself was formed in January of 2001 to assist in the development of United States proposals for WRC 2003. DA-02-101 is based primarily on the committee report. Comments on it are due on it no later than January 28th.

The complete of 55 page text of DA-02-101 is on the FCC website at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-02-101A1.txt (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: CLEAN UP THE INTERFERENCE - PLEASE

The FCC has written to an A-M radio station and an electric power provider to help resolve an unusual and long-standing interference situation. One affecting local amateurs in the Cincinnati and Mason Ohio areas. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, brings us up to date:

--

The letter suggests that multiple sources may be involved in this interference case. Also that two that are possibilities are Cinergy Corporation and radio station WLW. Cinergy is the electric company to the affected area and WLW is a Clear Channel Communications owned power-house AM station serving the greater Cincinnati area from a transmitter in Mason.

WLW operates on 700 kHz with 50,000 Watts into a single element diamond shaped half-wave vertical tower. This is only one of two such towers left in the United States, the other belonging to WSM AM in Nashville Tennessee. Both were constructed in the early 1930's by the now defunct Blaw Knox Construction Corporation.

One of the amateurs affected is Bob Reiff, WA8ULW, of Mason. Reiff told the ARRL Letter that while the noise is most noticeable on 160 meters, it's showing up elsewhere. He says that some local hams suspect it is even causing problems even on a two meter repeater.

In its letters, the Commission says that it recognizes this to be an unusual case. It says that the source of the interference could turn out to be something else unexpected. But the Commission adds that it is turning to the radio station and electric utility company and asking for their help in finding the source of the noise plaguing the Mason ham community. It's also asking that both cooperate with the technical experts from the American Radio Relay League in solving the problem.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA.

--

By the way, More information on this very interesting Blaw Knox diamond tower design and the ones installed at both WLW and WSM is available on-line. Simply take your browser to http://www.wsmonline.com/w_homepage/tower/index.html. Its very interesting reading. (FCC, ARRL, Amateur News Weekly)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNLICENSED OPERATOR TOLD TO EXPLAIN

A former ham that the FCC says may have been on the air without a license has been asked by the agency to provide an explanation. The person posing the questions is FCC chief ham radio rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH. And in a recent Rain Enforcement log, Hollingsworth outlined the situation:

--
Hollingsworth: "We requested clarifying information from Brian Bailey, ex-KD5PXQ. His license was set aside by the Wireless Bureau on October 19th. We want to know his exact whereabouts on two specific days in September. Bailey has been in touch with us and is deciding weather to provide the information."
--

According to Hollingsworth, the information that the FCC wants from Bailey relates to allegations of unlicensed operations and malicious interference. (FCC, RAIN)

**

HELPING HAMS: HAMDIHAMS NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS

This note: The Courage HandiHam System has a new electronic mail address. You can now reach the group at handiham@courage.org. You may also contact its Director Pat Tice directly at wa0tda@arrl.net. (HandiHams)

**

CONVENTIONS: HAMVENTION SAYS BRING YOUR BUS AND LAVE THE PARKING SPOT TO US

Free parking at the HARA Arena for Hamvention? Well, kind of. Its free if you leave your car at home and charter a bus to bring in a pretty large group of people to the event. Amateur News Weekly's Phil Thomas, W8RMJ has the not so complex details:

--

For Amateurs who charter a bust to make the annual journey to Hamvention, the Dayton Hamvention Committee will reserve a parking place for your chartered bus for the entire three days of Hamvention. The reserved parking will be close to the HARA Arena Complex, allowing not only a place to secure your valued purchases, but also a place to rest those weary feet after walking many, many miles of Hamvention. Space is limited for the new charter bus parking area. Pre registration is required. Availability is on a first come, first served basis.

--

For more information on the new on-site charter bus parking offer or to reserve a space, please contact the Dayton Hamvention office. It's open normal business hours Eastern Standard Time at are code (937) 276-6930. You can also fax your request toll free at
1-800-491-4267. (Amateur News Weekly)

**

CONFERENCES: SE VHF SOCIETY IN APRIL

Greg Robinson KB4NVD says over the VHF Reflector that the Sixth Annual Southeastern VHF Society Conference will take place April 26th through the 27 Th. in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The conference, hosted by the Southeastern VHF Society, promises to be an interesting and exciting event with presentations from accomplished VHF and up amateur radio enthusiasts from several parts of the country. Registration, program details, hotel and travel information can be found in cyberspace at www.svhfs.org. (SE VHF Society)

**

HAM RADIO EVENTS: KIDS DAY A BIG MID-WEST SUCCESS

The first Kids Day operating event for 2002 was a rousing success in many venues. But in one Mid-West city a bit of coverage on a local T-V station helped to make it even better. Again to Amateur News Weekly and reporter Jack Parker, W8ISH:

--

Kids Day at the Indianapolis Chapter of the American Red Cross got a boost when event coordinator Stece Wendt, KB9RDS, made an appearance on a local TV news program. During the two minute segment. Wendt told viewers that all kids and their parents were welcome to share in the Amateur Radio experience, including an introduction to Morse Code, VHF repeaters and HF:

--
Wendt: “And then we turn around tand take them over to the big radios -- the big base station radios where they can talk -- literally -- around the world.”
--

This is the second year the local Red Cross chapter has shown young people how to tune in the world.

Reporting from Indianapolis Indians for Amateur News Weekly, This is Jack Parker, W8ISH.

--

This is just one of many Kids Day success stories. We will have more in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (Amateur News Weekly)

**

BREAK 2

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ARNEWSLINE(tm) FINANCIAL UPDATE WITH N6TCQ

It’s time for a report on the financial situation here at Amateur Radio Newsline. With it is our Support Fund Administrator and Corporate Treasurer, Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--

It is January of 2002. A brand new year for ham radio. And the beginning of another year for us here at the Amateur Radio Newsline. And as we start off the new year, here are the current finances.

Looking in the new corporate checkbook, the balance shows us at about $700 give or take a few bucks. Not very much when you consider that it takes over a thousand dollars a month to produce these weekly 20 minute Q-S-T’s.

Obviously, Amateur Radio Newsline is going to need your help -- and -- need it quickly to keep it from going away and to keep the news of ham radio coming your way.

We have done all that is possible from our side to keep costs under control. But, some fixed expenses like the telephone and long distance calling are a must have. So are electronic mail and world wide web access. There is the cost of the routine maintenance on the tape machines and editing gear. And in a few months the Newsline sponsored Young Ham of the Year Award will be rolling our way. All of this adds up and some costs just keep going up. When you add it all up and average it out, it comes to that $1000 a month figure I just mentioned.

So now is the time when Amateur Radio Newsline has to ask to ask that you help to keep its newscasts coming your way. Your tax deductible contributions can be sent to the Newsline Support Fund, Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California. The Zipcode is 91066.

Ill be back within the next few weeks with an update on how things are going. For now from the Amateur Radio Newsline support center, I'm Andy Jarema, N6-Tiny-California-Quake.

--

Don't worry if you missed the address. It will be repeated in a few minutes at the end of this weeks newscast. (ARNewsline(tm) Support Fund)

**

ARNEWSLINE(tm): WE ARE GOING MP3

One other piece of news concerning Amateur Radio Newsline. As of March 1st, we will be dropping Real Audio and going exclusively MP3. Why the change? Well ever since we began posting a downloadable MP3 file at our own FTP site along side the Real Audio file, 9 out of 10 people have chosen the MP3. And with good reason. MP3 simply sounds a lot better than Real Audio to most of you. And by dropping the Real Audio, we can make the MP3 sound even better by encoding at a higher bit rate.

Right now, you can still compare the two formats if you like. Until February 22nd we will continue to post both Real Audio and MP3. Take the time to download both. And don't worry. Most modern media players including Real Audio, Microsoft Media and Winamp play MP3 so the chances are that you are already equipped to cover of the digital format change. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: THE NOISE OF EARTH

According to Space Daily, researchers have known for three decades that the Earth is a potent radio transmitter, but they were never able to pinpoint where the noise was coming from. Recently, by using data from the four spacecraft of the European Space Agency's Cluster mission, NASA-funded scientists have precisely located the source of the radio noise along the magnetic field lines. The noise originates several thousand miles above bright regions in the Earth's
northern lights. (AMSAT, Space Daily)

**

INTERNATIONAL-CANADA: ARE AGREEMENT IN B.C.

Turning to international news, Radio Amateurs of Canada which sponsors that nation’s Amateur Radio Emergency Service has signed a Letter Of Understanding and the British Columbia Provincial Emergency Radio Communication Service. The letter represents the collaboration between Radio Amateurs of Canada’s British Columbia Section Manager Fred Orsetti VE7IO and Supervisor of Information and Communications Technology for the Provincial Emergency Program Andrew Bryan VE7KSN, to provide a cooperative plan to carry out emergency communication. The letter also further enhances the work of the Canadian ARES program and compliments the Memorandum of Understanding signed May of 1994 between Radio Amateurs of Canada and Red Cross. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CANADA: VE1AWA RESIGNS AS MARITIME PROVENCES SM

Due to personal reason Roy MacIntosh, VE1AWA has stepped down from the position of Section Manager for the Maritimes. Tom Caithness, VE1GTC has been appointed acting Section Manager pending outcome of the upcoming election call. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: AMSAT-UK COLLOQUIUM

The 17th AMSAT-UK Colloquium will be held at Surrey University in Guildford from the 26th to 28th of July this year. AMSAT-UK is now inviting speakers to submit papers about amateur radio space and associated activities for this event and for the Proceedings document. Offers of papers should be submitted as soon as possible and should be sent only to Richard Limebear, G3RWL. His e-mail goes to g3rwl@amsat.org. (AMSAT-UK)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: WEBSITE UPDATE

AMSAT reports that IK8XLD has updated his website with information about satellite operations, EME, the ham radio operation on the International Space Station, ATV and homebrew equipment. You can visit Rocco’s website at www.qsl.net/ik8xld. (ANS)

**

DX

In DX, DJ4KW and DK9GG are active from Belize as V31YN and V31GW respectively until about the 2nd of February. Activity is on CW, RTTY and PSK 31. (GB2RS)

And KE1F will be active on 10 to 160 meters CW, SSB and perhaps RTTY as ZF2LM from Grand Cayman Island from the 14th to 30th of January. (GB2RS)

Also R1ANF began operations as CE9 slash R1ANF on the 29th of December from a Chilean base in the South Shetland Islands. He is active on 10 to 28 MHz with 100 watts to an R6000 vertical. For all three, QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX)

Last but by no means least, word that JX7DFA, is on a job assignment to Jan Mayen. He is operating as LA7DFA. QSL via his home call. He will reply when he returns home in the Spring. (Modern DX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A CALL FOR ARDF HUNTERS FOR THE WORLD GAMES

And finally this week, 2002 may be the biggest year yet for fans of hidden transmitter hunts, especially the ones that are all on foot. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Joe Moell K0OV helps coordinate happenings like these and has news of two major events.
--

Every two years, hams from around the world gather to see who is best at on-foot hidden transmitter hunting, also called foxtailing, radio-orienteering and ARDF. There are separate events on eighty meters and two meters, each with five transmitters scattered in a forest that can encompass 1000 acres or more.

Competitors are divided into five categories for males and four categories for females. Each country may have up to three persons per category on its team.

Back in Y2K, the championships were in China, with a dozen stateside hams among the competitors from 26 countries. This year, the excitement moves to Slovakia and takes place from September 2 through 7. Once again, ARDF Team USA will be there.

Would you like to be on that team? If so, contact me right away, because USA must submit its Letter of Intent to the Slovakian hosts by the end of January.

Of course you'll need lots of practice beforehand, and you can get plenty by attending USA's own national ARDF championships, which will be April 19-21 in Pine Mountain, Georgia, near Atlanta.

Find out about both championships -- Slovakia and Pine Mountain -- by visiting my Web site: www.homingin.com. Homingin is one word. Then apply for the Team USA roster at my e-mail address on that site, or by postal mail to my callbook address.

Maybe you'll bring home a medal this year. From southern California, where this year's local radio-orienteering training sessions will begin soon, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

In case you missed it, Joe’s website is www.homingin.com. “homeingin” is one word. (K0OV, ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More

information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating season for the Dayton Hamvention Radio Amateur of the Year, Technical Achievement and Special Achievement Awards closes January 31st. Nominations should be sent to Post Office Box 964 Dayton Ohio 45401. They can also be filed using the e-form at the Hamvention website. Its at www.hamvention.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm _____ saying welcome to the year 2002, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

**

Terminal Break

**
RAIN promo
**

2103. Re: Is the ARRL still screwed up?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 18:49:57 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a29quq$vtcp1$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 31688

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Urq%7.348356$W8.13136042@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Too bad I'm no longer anywhere near being a teenager or
> I'd sign up for life membership.

They have a pretty cool plan now, where you can get a life time membership
and pay for it in 8 quarterly installments of 122 each. I have a few bills
that will be paid off this spring, then I plan to sign up for it. Will save
me money in the long run, and I won't have to remember to renew each year.
(I had forgotten last year, and wound up calling on my cell phone while
driving back from holiday vacation on Dec. 28th.)

73's,

Robert / N4IXT

2104. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 19:07:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C48725D.4B4CC853@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31690

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > I agree and that IS what being prepared is about. One can also
> > be prepared by having the resources ready so that "setting up"
> > a field station isn't that difficult at all.
>
> So what happens ...
> What if, ...
> What if ...

What if the aliens land and confiscate all the CW keys?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2105. ARRL - Right and Wrong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 19:10:29 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a29s62$vr088$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 31692

This stems out of the "Is the ARRL still screwed up?" thread. Everyone seems to have passionate opinions about the ARRL, pro and con.

So, out of curiosity, name one thing you think the ARRL does right, AND one thing they do wrong. I'll kick one off...

Right - Fighting for spectrum. I must say they do a good job of keeping in there, fighting to protect our current spectrum, and get more. Most recently the fight over low power devices in the 440 band, and the quest for a 60 meter band come to mind.

Wrong - Advertising. The ARRL does a horrible job of letting the community know Hams exist. After 9/11 calmed down, the ARRL top brass should have been on every news outlet and talking head show, touting the benefits of Ham radio and the part hams played during the crisis. Same goes for a large scale occurrences such as hurricanes, etc.

It'd also be nice to have more materials available to hand out to folks. The training materials they have (Now You're Talking, videos, etc) are good, but we need something to get people interested in the first place. How about a series of posters we can hang on our walls, or 8x10s we can put in our cubes at work. Tasteful artwork perhaps, that would prompt people to ask about it and give you an opening to discuss amateur radio.

Flyers to place at the local rat shacks (maybe with a blank space for local club name/address info) would be nice too. I've seen a few things on the ARRL web, but they could stand to get a LOT more.

73's,

Robert / N4IXT

2106. 10am traditional business hours time

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 19:13:14 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b2840e82e5bca498969f@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31691

from just 1 of the literally 100's of telnet clusters available to the
savoy DXer types (excluding the TIT and UNK types)

18-Jan-02 15:00 4Z8GZ 14087.8 RTTY K7XB RTTY 4X
18-Jan-02 15:00 HS0/OZ1H 14025 CW JA2XYO CQ
HS
18-Jan-02 15:00 YU1AU 50100.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:01 G0EGG 29620 SSB WB4IUY INTO NC RPTR FB! G
18-Jan-02 15:01 S52QM 28564 SSB W0HT S5
18-Jan-02 15:03 EX8F 7009.7 CW N6DKP LP EX
18-Jan-02 15:03 HS0/OZ1HET 14025 CW JA2XYO SRI
HS
18-Jan-02 15:03 XK0XN/P 28003.2 CW G0UKX VE
18-Jan-02 15:06 OZ1DPR 50125.8 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:07 EA4JW 28007.1 CW OH2AWK CQ CQ
EA
18-Jan-02 15:10 9A2GF 21260 SSB EA4JW IS.BRAC EU-016 9A
18-Jan-02 15:10 DL7QY 50220 SSB N2YEV JN59BD > FN34HS
18-Jan-02 15:13 7X2DG 24976.3 SSB K6KS 7X
18-Jan-02 15:13 IZ3BSU 7060 CW IK4IRZ-2 DAMMI FREQ.
I
18-Jan-02 15:13 W1ZT 28088.2 RTTY ON4HF RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:15 IK0OER 28605 SSB WA6IPD STEVE ROME
I
18-Jan-02 15:16 UN7MO 28026.5 CW G0PSE CALLING CQ VIA EA7FTR UN
18-Jan-02 15:16 V63RF 18069.5 CW S58AL IOTA OC...??? 73 AL V6
18-Jan-02 15:17 I6LVT 28016.9 CW N8NRG CALLING CQ, NOT MANY TAK I
18-Jan-02 15:17 OC010 18069.5 CW ON4ASG OA
18-Jan-02 15:17 OH2PM 7010.9 CW N6DKP OH
18-Jan-02 15:23 G0NVY 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 G
18-Jan-02 15:25 LA4LN 50130 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:26 W8PHZ 21275.8 SSB UA6LA RALPH! ON THIS FR 59!!! K
18-Jan-02 15:27 AP2JZB 14245 SSB K6TA DX NET AP
18-Jan-02 15:28 F1EBE 50160 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:28 ZS6PJK 28549 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:29 9K2ZZ 24935.1 SSB N3ATQ
18-Jan-02 15:29 S52QM 24941 SSB K6YUI TOM S5
18-Jan-02 15:32 5R8FL 28686 SSTV DH1ME-6 SSTV 5R
18-Jan-02 15:32 CT4GD 24962.5 SSB K6KS CT
18-Jan-02 15:32 SM7BAE 50107 SSB K1SG
18-Jan-02 15:32 W1AW 14087 RTTY NJ1Q RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:33 9K2RA 14180 SSB 9K2YJ CQING BY AHMAD 9K2AI 9K
18-Jan-02 15:34 A45WD 28030.4 CW K9WA SRI, CORR QRG A4
18-Jan-02 15:34 J79TUY 28499.9 SSB M0CCQ WKD5/9 3 UP

J7
18-Jan-02 15:36 GI6ATZ 50183.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:36 GJ3RAX 50243 SSB N1RZ IN89VE > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 ON1DHF 50254.7 SSB N1RZ JO20 > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 YV5ENI 28450 SSB SP2OFK-2 VIA IK6SNR
YV
18-Jan-02 15:38 G0SBW/PM 24977 SSB K6KS PED MOBILE !! YB
18-Jan-02 15:39 Z31CZ 7007 CW N6DKP LP Z3
18-Jan-02 15:41 SM3AF 14070 PSK3 PD0IAZ CQ-PSK31 SM
18-Jan-02 15:42 A41LD 29620 SSB WB4IUY OMAN VIA NC RPTR. A4
18-Jan-02 15:42 OH6MRD 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16
OH
18-Jan-02 15:43 4X4BO 28510 SSB P0LIC BAD OPERATOR 4X
18-Jan-02 15:45 ZB2JO 28560 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:47 EI3IX 50150 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:47 SP8GQU 14193.6 SSB K6ZG SP
18-Jan-02 15:51 GD3SKZ 24957.9 SSB W6OAT KEITH
GD
18-Jan-02 15:52 GW0SSB 28535 SSB K1TTT-6 OVER TRUCKERS!
18-Jan-02 15:53 K0PQ 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 K
18-Jan-02 15:53 ZF2LM 28021 CW VE7RG ZF
18-Jan-02 15:54 KB0IWN 28565 SSB N3YZT TERRY; MN K
18-Jan-02 15:54 ZL2AGY 18077 CW DJ3AS ZL
18-Jan-02 15:55 A52OM 18078.8 CW OM7AG UP 1 A5
18-Jan-02 15:55 G4YTB 24957.9 SSB K4VE DAVE BEAMING U.S. G
18-Jan-02 15:55 UR8IF 29620 SSB WB4IUY VIC, VIA NC RPTR UR
18-Jan-02 15:56 5B4AGC 24950 SSB N2JBO

at least 1 per minute being posted, excluding the 6 meter spots.
Including them and the average is better than 3 per minute. This
particluar cluster nly posts about 60% of all the internet spots, so
there are considerably more out there. And this is just what is being
posted, so there are even more people out there on a traditional
business day in the US at 10am BST (bill sohl time)

Guess Bill needs a better pair of ears (read antennae) cause I hear
almost 90%of all these posts plus a lot more

Just remember..it's 10am somewhere in the world. That leaves 23 other
hours to be elsewhere. The fact Mr. Bill OOOOHHHH NOOOOO categorically
states that when it's 10am business time in the US that the rest of the
world is also experiencing business hours shows a total lack of
understanding in things DX

2107. 10am traditional business hours time

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 20:31:51 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b2967c4123e9b99896a0@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31693

from just 1 of the literally 100's of telnet clusters available to the
savoy DXer types (excluding the TIT and UNK types)

18-Jan-02 15:00 4Z8GZ 14087.8 RTTY K7XB RTTY 4X
18-Jan-02 15:00 HS0/OZ1H 14025 CW JA2XYO CQ
HS
18-Jan-02 15:00 YU1AU 50100.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:01 G0EGG 29620 SSB WB4IUY INTO NC RPTR FB! G
18-Jan-02 15:01 S52QM 28564 SSB W0HT S5
18-Jan-02 15:03 EX8F 7009.7 CW N6DKP LP EX
18-Jan-02 15:03 HS0/OZ1HET 14025 CW JA2XYO SRI
HS
18-Jan-02 15:03 XK0XN/P 28003.2 CW G0UKX VE
18-Jan-02 15:06 OZ1DPR 50125.8 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:07 EA4JW 28007.1 CW OH2AWK CQ CQ
EA
18-Jan-02 15:10 9A2GF 21260 SSB EA4JW IS.BRAC EU-016 9A
18-Jan-02 15:10 DL7QY 50220 SSB N2YEV JN59BD > FN34HS
18-Jan-02 15:13 7X2DG 24976.3 SSB K6KS 7X
18-Jan-02 15:13 IZ3BSU 7060 CW IK4IRZ-2 DAMMI FREQ.
I
18-Jan-02 15:13 W1ZT 28088.2 RTTY ON4HF RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:15 IK0OER 28605 SSB WA6IPD STEVE ROME
I
18-Jan-02 15:16 UN7MO 28026.5 CW G0PSE CALLING CQ VIA EA7FTR UN
18-Jan-02 15:16 V63RF 18069.5 CW S58AL IOTA OC...??? 73 AL V6
18-Jan-02 15:17 I6LVT 28016.9 CW N8NRG CALLING CQ, NOT MANY TAK I
18-Jan-02 15:17 OC010 18069.5 CW ON4ASG OA
18-Jan-02 15:17 OH2PM 7010.9 CW N6DKP OH
18-Jan-02 15:23 G0NVY 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 G
18-Jan-02 15:25 LA4LN 50130 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:26 W8PHZ 21275.8 SSB UA6LA RALPH! ON THIS FR 59!!! K
18-Jan-02 15:27 AP2JZB 14245 SSB K6TA DX NET AP
18-Jan-02 15:28 F1EBE 50160 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:28 ZS6PJK 28549 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:29 9K2ZZ 24935.1 SSB N3ATQ
18-Jan-02 15:29 S52QM 24941 SSB K6YUI TOM S5
18-Jan-02 15:32 5R8FL 28686 SSTV DH1ME-6 SSTV 5R
18-Jan-02 15:32 CT4GD 24962.5 SSB K6KS CT
18-Jan-02 15:32 SM7BAE 50107 SSB K1SG
18-Jan-02 15:32 W1AW 14087 RTTY NJ1Q RTTY K
18-Jan-02 15:33 9K2RA 14180 SSB 9K2YJ CQING BY AHMAD 9K2AI 9K
18-Jan-02 15:34 A45WD 28030.4 CW K9WA SRI, CORR QRG A4
18-Jan-02 15:34 J79TUY 28499.9 SSB M0CCQ WKD5/9 3 UP

J7
18-Jan-02 15:36 GI6ATZ 50183.7 SSB AA1K CQ
18-Jan-02 15:36 GJ3RAX 50243 SSB N1RZ IN89VE > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 ON1DHF 50254.7 SSB N1RZ JO20 > FN44EI
18-Jan-02 15:36 YV5ENI 28450 SSB SP2OFK-2 VIA IK6SNR
YV
18-Jan-02 15:38 G0SBW/PM 24977 SSB K6KS PED MOBILE !! YB
18-Jan-02 15:39 Z31CZ 7007 CW N6DKP LP Z3
18-Jan-02 15:41 SM3AF 14070 PSK3 PD0IAZ CQ-PSK31 SM
18-Jan-02 15:42 A41LD 29620 SSB WB4IUY OMAN VIA NC RPTR. A4
18-Jan-02 15:42 OH6MRD 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16
OH
18-Jan-02 15:43 4X4BO 28510 SSB P0LIC BAD OPERATOR 4X
18-Jan-02 15:45 ZB2JO 28560 SSB N2JBO
18-Jan-02 15:47 EI3IX 50150 SSB W3EP
18-Jan-02 15:47 SP8GQU 14193.6 SSB K6ZG SP
18-Jan-02 15:51 GD3SKZ 24957.9 SSB W6OAT KEITH
GD
18-Jan-02 15:52 GW0SSB 28535 SSB K1TTT-6 OVER TRUCKERS!
18-Jan-02 15:53 K0PQ 28080 CW KF4HOU MFSK16 K
18-Jan-02 15:53 ZF2LM 28021 CW VE7RG ZF
18-Jan-02 15:54 KB0IWN 28565 SSB N3YZT TERRY; MN K
18-Jan-02 15:54 ZL2AGY 18077 CW DJ3AS ZL
18-Jan-02 15:55 A52OM 18078.8 CW OM7AG UP 1 A5
18-Jan-02 15:55 G4YTB 24957.9 SSB K4VE DAVE BEAMING U.S. G
18-Jan-02 15:55 UR8IF 29620 SSB WB4IUY VIC, VIA NC RPTR UR
18-Jan-02 15:56 5B4AGC 24950 SSB N2JBO

at least 1 per minute being posted, excluding the 6 meter spots.
Including them and the average is better than 3 per minute. This
particluar cluster nly posts about 60% of all the internet spots, so
there are considerably more out there. And this is just what is being
posted, so there are even more people out there on a traditional
business day in the US at 10am BST (bill sohl time)

Guess Bill needs a better pair of ears (read antennae) cause I hear
almost 90%of all these posts plus a lot more

Just remember..it's 10am somewhere in the world. That leaves 23 other
hours to be elsewhere. The fact Mr. Bill OOOOHHHH NOOOOO categorically
states that when it's 10am business time in the US that the rest of the
world is also experiencing business hours shows a total lack of
understanding in things DX

2108. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 21:10:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020118161014.20370.00000686@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 31694

In article <20020118071535.16239.00000524@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>
>>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road and
>>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.
>
>Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
>
No it doesn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2109. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 21:18:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201181318.76aa1976@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31695

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020118070639.16239.00000521@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will you
> >defend the theory tests?
>
> Perhaps by stating that electronics theory is more relevant to modern radio
> technology than is Morse code.

Even if true, that's NOT necessarily a reason to require that it be
tested
for an amateur license.

I'm being devil's advocate here, of course. But it's interesting to
see how this line of arguing would go.

There are many more hams using Morse code today than there are hams
building
their own "modern radio technology". Yet the FCC has clearly stated
that while
Morse code is good to know, there is no regulatory reason to TEST for
it other
than a treaty provision.

They could just as easily say that while electronics theory is good to
know,
there is no reason to TEST for it beyond the level necessary for rules
compliance and public safety considerations.

The FCC could say that there is no correlation between taking more
theory tests
and being a better amateur radio operator, as evidenced by who gets
the NALs.

There was a time in the past when some theory knowledge was necessary
because the "modern radio technology" of that time required that
transmitters be
carefully adjusted to avoid spurious and out-of-band emissions. That's
not
the case today. FCC could cite that simple fact.

I remember when commercial radio licensing included a whole array of
licenses and endorsements, like First, Second and Third 'phone and the
radar endorsement. Not to mention the Telegraph licenses. What's left
besides the

GROL today? FCC could argue that amateurs are expected to use good
technical judgement and leave it at that.

Come up with more arguments and there are counterarguments that the
FCC can use.
>
> Had Amateur Radio started out by being not relevant to modern radio technology,
> it never would have gotten off the ground.

History does not bear that out, Ed.

How was early amateur radio "relevant to modern radio technology" in
1912, when the first real radio laws were written? Or in 1919, when it
took a serious battle to get the govt. to reactivate ham radio?

Most of the other services wanted ham radio to go away - that's why we
got banished to "200 meters and down".

Of course hams made great strides in radio in the early days, and
often led the way to better methods. But that isn't what got amateur
radio "off the ground".

--

The real question is this: Does multiple-level theory testing cause
today's
ham radio to be more modern technologically than it would be without
such
testing?

And if a serious challenge to theory testing does arise, how will we
defend
most of what's in the writtens?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2110. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 21:37:24 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C489594.9A652DC4@uci.edu>
Source record: 31697

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20020118071535.16239.00000524@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> >
> >>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road and
> >>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.
> >
> >Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
> >
> No it doesn't.

That's not an argument.

ac6xg

2111. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 21:47:39 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201182143290.2028-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31696

On Fri, 18 Jan 2002, Bill, KD0HG wrote:
>On Thu, 17 Jan 2002 17:49:32 GMT, Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>> Rather it shows a definite lack of a broader view of what amateur
>>spectrum managment should be.
>
>I'll agree with this assessment.
>
>Why are our amateur repeater channel assignments still geographically
>exclusive?
>For many years, commercial repeaters have shared pairs by the use of tone
>squelch. SOP has always been that the user first listens to the channel with
>open carrier squelch, if there's no traffic, you're free to get on your own
>repeater.
>
>You can call this concept manual trunking, or whatever, but it's worked for
>taxis, truckers and trash collection companies for decades. They haven't had
>the luxury of exclusive VHF/UHF repeater pairs for 40 years in many areas.
>
>I'd hope that licensed amateurs could make it work as well as the drivers and
>dispatchers for any of the above, and this is really little different than the
>situation on HF. If the frequency is in use, you stand by or even QSY.
>If we can't manually make it work, there's been commercial situations where
>the use of one repeater locks out use of the other one sharing the channel.
>
>It's past time that ham repeaters get rid of carrier squelch in congested
>areas, they need to use mandatory tone or digital squelch and share pairs
>within the same metropolitan areas. For emergency situations, all repeaters
>could respond to a secondary PL tone common to all.
>That largely changes the matter from one of under use of any given frequency
>pair to the under use of a given repeater, something no one would care about.

Where is this coming from? I live in what is probably the MOST congested area
(Los Angeles) and 98% of all repeaters in this area use PL/CTCSS as part of
their normal operations. This is across ALL bands where a repeater pair is
shared - and often where a pair isn't shared, a repeater still uses PL (or
some other access method such as DCS).

If you're saying that your area hasn't figured this out, you're 20+ years
behind the rest of us.

>25 years ago a company was manufacturing a counter that would document the
>hits on a VHF frequency by PL tone. Coordinators could document the least-used
>repeater pairs in an area and those would be the first to have to share the
>channel.

>
>Man- Would that ever piss some people off.
>Tough.
>
>Want to have a closed repeater for a 10 member club? Fine. However, you're not
>going to reserve that pair for your exclusive use for an hour or less out of a
>24 hour day. Imagine that concept on HF net frequencies!
>
>Yes, no one's looking at the big picture and there's smarter ways to do it-
>maybe my suggestion is one of them, maybe it's not, but we need to change our
>past ways of doing business. We're decades behind the commercial VHF users.

Apparently, you're also decades behind other amateurs - at least those in high
population areas.

>And whatever happened to ACSSB on VHF?

2112. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 22:38:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2a8gonit1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31698

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C485264.BCDE066B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C450FE4.79C6C16A@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:_ET08.29714$V55.2578285@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Which goes to the heart of "being prepared" beforehand.
> > > > > > Frankly, it is the people (hams) that are ready that will
> > > > > > get the job done.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Being prepared (at the EOC) is one thing, and we all agree on
that.
> > > > Lugging
> > > > > > a bunch of equipment to a field site, then trying to get it up and
> > running
> > > > > > in a short period of time is another animal altogether. That is
what
> > Dick
> > > > > > was referring to.
> > > > > > Arnie - KT4ST
> > > > >
> > > > How often is that likly? Again, it is the "prepared" hams that
> > > > will get it done.
> > >
> > > Oh, we know.....the Shack on the Belt guys, whether NCT or Extra
lite,
> > will
> > > do all the parades and get all the press. Locally, that works out
fine.
> > But when
> > >
> > > things really go in the toilet, when preplanning for an incident just
> > isn't
> > > possible,

> > > the people who get it done are the ones with the most tools available.
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > I agree and that IS what being prepared is about. One can also
> > be prepared by having the resources ready so that "setting up"
> > a field station isn't that difficult at all.
>
> So what happens when you don't get to decide about the preparations? Is
> everyone -every licensed ham- expected to maintain the exact same level of
> preparation at all times??

You are not expected to do anything. You are free to prepare and
participate to whatever degree you want.

> What if, due to circumstances completely beyond your
> control, you are thrust into a situation where you are forced to use gear
> other
> than your own, and you must make do with what is there??

You do then whatever you can.

> What it it is capable
> of only SSB and CW operation, and atmospheric conditions are so poor that
SSB
> won't get the job done? I guess you're just out of luck. I'll fire up on
CW and
> fervently hope that you aren't on the other end of the circuit.

I knew you'd come around to the CW is needed scenario again.
Fine if it suits you. So far the disastor reports haven't shown any
absolute need where CW was THE only means possible. Some have
used it and that's OK...you do whatever you want.

> ""The best laid plans of mice and men......"

We each approach "being prepared" as we chose. I see very little
need, if any, to consider morse...YOU can do as you like.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2113. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 22:41:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2a8kj$21f$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31699

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C486473.BAAE73D3@psu.edu...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> <snippage>
>
> > > Would you like it if the feds brought back the 55 mph speed limit and
> > strictly
> > > enforced it? 55 is a reasonable speed. How about if they enacted new
> > horsepower
> > > limitations on cars, specifying no more than a certain number of HP
per
> > 100
> > > pounds of car? 40 pounds per HP is a reasonable number.
> >
> > The analogy is totally false. High speed does not cause problems to
other
> > vehicles...assuming one is not driving above road conditions. Under
> > certain traffic conditions, driving 55 on a posted 65 mph road can
> > be dangerous and a cause for a summons for reckless driving.
>
> No problems to other vehicles until they run into one or another! Then
> the difference between 55 and 80 is significant to say the least!
>
> Actually seems a pretty good analogy to me.

Piss poor analogy because the guy going 55 shouldn't be anywhere
near the guy going 80. That is of course unless the guy going
55 is one of the left lane jerks that don't believe in keep right.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2114. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 23:08:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C48AAF9.B80BEDCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31700

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Sure it does. And your ill advised conclusion shows your lack of understanding of real
> world communications issues. If one watt PSK31 can't be copied but it's 1 watt CW signal
> can, that is what is of interest to communicators. We're perfectly willing to leave the
> theoretical comparison of efficiencies to those of you who really believe the mode that
> won't work is superior to the one that does under that set of circumstances. You clearly
> cannot understand or appreciate the difference.

It's obvious that you still do not understand Shannon's theorem. If PSK31 is 50Hz wide and CW is 250Hz wide, the comparison is not a fair one. The only fair way to compare PSK31 and CW is to copy CW through a 50Hz filter. Do that and get back to us on your ability to copy it. (P.S. You won't be able to copy it unless it is dog slow.)

When two modes are compared you must compare not only power but also bandwidth and throughput.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2115. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 23:09:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C48AB41.93E1D8CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31501

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > As far as I know, I am immortal, Dick. I've never died.
>
> Sounds about right, for your logic.

Are you prepared to prove that you are not immortal?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2116. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-18 23:42:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C48B2D2.712DEFCB@uci.edu>
Source record: 31503

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure it does. And your ill advised conclusion shows your lack of understanding of real
> > world communications issues. If one watt PSK31 can't be copied but it's 1 watt CW signal
> > can, that is what is of interest to communicators. We're perfectly willing to leave the
> > theoretical comparison of efficiencies to those of you who really believe the mode that
> > won't work is superior to the one that does under that set of circumstances. You clearly
> > cannot understand or appreciate the difference.
>
> It's obvious that you still do not understand Shannon's theorem. If PSK31 is 50Hz wide
> and CW is 250Hz wide, the comparison is not a fair one. The only fair way to compare
> PSK31 and CW is to copy CW through a 50Hz filter. Do that and get back to us on
> your ability to copy it. (P.S. You won't be able to copy it unless it is dog slow.)

> When two modes are compared you must compare not only power but also bandwidth and
> throughput.

Are you talking about comparing a 50 Hz PSK31 audio filter with a 50 Hz
IF filter at 455 KHz? Or are you talking about running 50 Hz audio
bandpass filters, both centered on the audio tone/note?

2117. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 00:08:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gq5jgk7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 31502

On Fri, 18 Jan 2002 02:41:50 GMT, Bill, KD0HG wrote:

>And whatever happened to ACSSB on VHF?

It never worked properly. It was a toy on 20 meters where it was developed by Tommy Lott, and neither Aerotron nor MACOM, the latter under under the "leadership" of Tio Carlos, the ex-FCC Bureau Chief, could never get it to work in a commercial setting on the "liberated" 220 MHz channels taken from amateur use and set aside for it.

It died a natural death.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2118. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 03:36:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c48e950_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31917

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020117211857.06375.00000038@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <a23tu20126f@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
> >
> >20,000 plus newsgroups are on usenet. The semi-anonymous nature of Usenet
is
> >what makes it so great. Yet, the amateur radio newsgroups are the only
ones
> >that have people who want you to "identify" yourself. Usenet is not
amateur
> >radio, and therefore, does not require that I post a callsign.
>
> Krell:
>
> That's right -- identifying yourself is not required. However, those of
> us who DO identify ourselves are morally and intellectually superior
> to those who don't -- with one notable exception, which we would
> prefer to remain *unidentified.*
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, and we all know how popular he wishes he were.

Kim W5TIT

2119. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 03:53:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c48ed57_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31918

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C481A7B.E77C1DF2@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
> > whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
> > air. The exception would only be (IMHO) an emergency.
> > My comment as to 100 watts being reasonable is focused
> > at a starting point. If 100 watts doesn't get the results, then
> > add power. If 100 watts is too much, then reduce. If your
> > interest is QRP, then start at 1.5 watts.
>
> I'd suggest that you are talking through your hat. My interest is QRO.
> Now what? Get back to us when the FCC mandates a starting power and
> frequent circuit quality checks and power adjustments during a QSO or
> series of QSOs. Are you running out of anti-morse testing rants?
>
> Dave K8MN

The FCC *has* mandated a starting power, Dave. It is the minimum power necessary to establish a contact. Is it within reason to guess that if a station is in Europe, Australia, or some remote IOTA expedition, that 1500 watts is the minimum power necessary? If so, then why are so many other similar stations able to make the same contact under the same band conditions with much less? You are making unfounded, and out of bounds, assertions when you decide to just pump it up when you don't know you need to.

Kim W5TIT

2120. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 03:54:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c48ed9f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31919

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C481CAE.3BEACBCE@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > You have only an opinion. You are entitled to it.
> > My comments were on abuse of power...whatever the
> > claimed need. Seems that most of the rest of the world
> > of amateur population gets by fine with lower power
> > limits.
>
> I'm not interested in getting by. If it is instances of abuse of power
> you'd like to investigate, start with the Clinton administration.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ah yes, direct the finger of fault to another area rather than
oneself...mmmm hmmmm.

Kim W5TIT

2121. Re: 10am traditional business hours time

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:03:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c48efca_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31920

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b2614321239333989 69e@news.earthlink.net...
> from just 1 of the literally 100's of telnet clusters available to the
> savoy DXer types (excluding the TIT and UNK types)
>

I am not a DXer type at all. Savvy, yes. DXer, no.

Kim W5TIT

2122. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:10:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c48f13a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31921

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C485264.BCDE066B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> So what happens when you don't get to decide about the preparations? Is
> everyone -every licensed ham- expected to maintain the exact same level of
> preparation at all times?? What if, due to circumstances completely beyond
your
> control, you are thrust into a situation where you are forced to use gear
> other
> than your own, and you must make do with what is there?? What it it is
capable
> of only SSB and CW operation, and atmospheric conditions are so poor that
SSB
> won't get the job done? I guess you're just out of luck. I'll fire up on
CW and
> fervently hope that you aren't on the other end of the circuit.
>
> ""The best laid plans of mice and men......"
>

Well, let's see now. Dick's getting close to the Larry
Roll-type-impossible-scenarios, but let's entertain his drone, above.
Nearly everyone--ham or not--recognizes SOS. Nearly *any* ham can DF a
signal, and quickly at that. If Bill's close enough to Dick as Dick hammers
out an SOS, then poor 'lil Dick will be rescued.

On the other hand, I'll hope that the rig he gets near in a disaster isn't
SSB only. He'd probably waste precious time trying to rig up something for
CW.

Kim W5TIT

2123. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:31:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2at31jgk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31504

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not
> > > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a
> > > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he
hadn't
> > > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> > >
> > > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??
> >
> > Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> > at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> > being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you are
> > free to consider otherwise.
>
> What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down the
> power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
> turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
> current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
> is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is a
> rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
> hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
> on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?

See comment below.

> > > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without
sin..casting
> > > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
> >
> > If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion,
dialog,
> > debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.
>
> Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
> people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.

You have no clue as to what positions I hold or have held...But,
once again your exagerration shows you up.

> >You
> > are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> > of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > comments.
>
> yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit
>
> Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people
> actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas
>
> BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are
> broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as
> this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor operating

I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all that difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks seem to
be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.

2124. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:42:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C48ECEF.5207BB1F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31505

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > I agree and that IS what being prepared is about. One can also
> > > be prepared by having the resources ready so that "setting up"
> > > a field station isn't that difficult at all.
> >
> > So what happens ...
> > What if, ...
> > What if ...
>
> What if the aliens land and confiscate all the CW keys?

Typically of one who has all the answers, you have no clue to the
questions.

2125. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:51:24 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b30ba1a904af649896a1@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31506

```
In article <a2at31$jgk$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >
> > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not
> > > > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a
> > > > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he
> hadn't
> > > > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> > > >
> > > > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??
> > >
> > > Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> > > at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> > > being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you are
> > > free to consider otherwise.
> >
> > What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down the
> > power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
> > turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
> > current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
> > is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is a
> > rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
> > hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
> > on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?
>
> See comment below.
>
> > > > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > > > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without
> sin..casting
> > > > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
> > >
> > > If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion,
> dialog,
> > > debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.
> >
> > Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
```

> > people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.
>
> You have no clue as to what positions I hold or have held...But,
> once again your exagerration shows you up.
>
> > >You
> > > are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> > > of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > > comments.
> >
> > yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit
> >
> > Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people
> > actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas
> >
> > BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are
> > broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as
> > this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor operating
>
> I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all that
> difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks seem
> to
> be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in
> question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all
> your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.

SUGGEST?? SUGGEST Are you even speaking from experience? I seriously doubt that Bill. You have no clue do you other than your vaunted opinion that amounts to zip. Poor station set up huh? This coming from an appliance rice box owner no doubt.

Better yet, go ahead a describe what it takes for going from 1500 watts (which is 1/2 again as much as you originally stated)..down to 100, cause just turning off the amp ain't the answer Bill, but then again you wouldn't know that would you Bill?? Sounds like power envy to me. Poor Bill ain't gots no amp so everyone who has one is a poor operator...you are your parties candidate.

OK BILL you win. Be like the rest of monkeys. Hang onto your banana and keep screaming loud. Sooner or later someone will answer you and you can whine to them about poor operators

What an a**

2126. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:54:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C48EFCC.26AF36A4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31507

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure it does. And your ill advised conclusion shows your lack of understanding of real
> > world communications issues. If one watt PSK31 can't be copied but it's 1 watt CW
signal
> > can, that is what is of interest to communicators. We're perfectly willing to leave the
> > theoretical comparison of efficiencies to those of you who really believe the mode that
> > won't work is superior to the one that does under that set of circumstances. You
clearly
> > cannot understand or appreciate the difference.
>
> It's obvious that you still do not understand Shannon's theorem. If PSK31 is 50Hz wide
> and CW is 250Hz wide, the comparison is not a fair one. The only fair way to compare
> PSK31 and CW is to copy CW through a 50Hz filter. Do that and get back to us on
> your ability to copy it. (P.S. You won't be able to copy it unless it is dog slow.)
>
> When two modes are compared you must compare not only power but also bandwidth and
> throughput.

Are you really that clueless? Of course we know Shannon's plan, but that has nothing to do
with real world communications. Are you rationally suggesting that when someone can copy
the
CW but not the PSK31 that he should kill the CW too by running it through a 50 hz filter?
That
just shows how far out of contact you really are.

Once again- that this all proves is that, like the race doesn't alway go to the fastest,
the
communciations doesn't always get done by the most theoretically efficient.

2127. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 04:57:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C48F08A.6879C705@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31508

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > As far as I know, I am immortal, Dick. I've never died.
> >
> > Sounds about right, for your logic.
>
> Are you prepared to prove that you are not immortal?

In finishing my 6th decade on the planet, I find that mother nature is in the process of accomplishing that on her own time schedule. I am sure you find the same.

2128. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 05:10:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119001013.02067.00000495@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31509

In article <3C489594.9A652DC4@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20020118071535.16239.00000524@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>>
>> >>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>> >
>> >>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road
>and
>> >>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.
>> >
>> >Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
>> >
>> No it doesn't.
>
>That's not an argument.

Yes it is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2129. Re: ARRL - Right and Wrong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 06:33:40 UTC
From: shadow person <vanishingact1003@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8r828.7404$X4.547455@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31510

"N4IXT" <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote in message news:a29s62$vr088$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de...

> So, out of curiosity, name one thing you think the ARRL does right, AND one
> thing they do wrong. I'll kick one off...
> 73's,
>
> Robert / N4IXT

Robert, Amateur Radio started going into the toilet in a flying leap
as soon as the ARRL petetitioned the FCC to publish the Exam
Question Pools. The reason for this was ARRL was losing revenue
from their testing study guides to the infamous "Bash Books".
In short, the ARRL screwed Amateur radio in the USA just so they
could put Dick Bash Publishing out of business. Their mentality at
the time of this was: "How dare he! We are the ARRL and WE are
the Gatekeepers of Ham Radio". In their rush to save face and act
like a child having a temper-tantrum, they SCREWED ham radio for
good. As a result today's "hams" can't even comprehend Ohm's Laws
let alone calculate Power Factors or (glub forbid) interpret a Smith Chart.

It's now 'plug and play' ham radio - although the kids are LONG GONE
to the internet. After all who want's to spend a kilobuck and put up
unsightly antennas when for about $400 you can get a Pentium-III and
interact with the world over the telephone line or thru the cable tv..??

Stick a fork into it Rob. It's cooked and ready for dinner.

Ken (callsign lapsed in disgust in 91)

2130. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 07:25:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201190725220.340-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31511

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Fri, 18 Jan 2002 02:41:50 GMT, Bill, KD0HG wrote:
>>And whatever happened to ACSSB on VHF?
>
> It never worked properly. It was a toy on 20 meters where it was
> developed by Tommy Lott, and neither Aerotron nor MACOM, the latter
> under under the "leadership" of Tio Carlos, the ex-FCC Bureau Chief,
> could never get it to work in a commercial setting on the "liberated"
> 220 MHz channels taken from amateur use and set aside for it.
>
> It died a natural death.

And if it's dead, then why can't we get 220-222 back?

2131. Re: What Makes Roger?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 12:29:49 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2bvj3ska3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 31521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Repeater jammer and "JizzswallowingRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote
in message news:3C4959C4.23F1FA5C@mailcity.net...
>
>
> At least I could pass a 2test, unlike Jizzswallowing Recepticle, KC8JBO
wrote:
>
> >
> > Poor baby, why are you ashamed of being fired twice from the FCC,
Georgie
> > Girl. You've been jamming 3.901 with Orass and jamming your local
repeaters
> > with music.
>
> Rather difficult to get fired from the FCC when I have never
> worked for the FCC.

Liar.

> Rather difficult to jam local repeaters when I
> don't even own a VHF/UHF rig and I never operate on 75 meters.

That's not what the monitoring station says.

> Woger, you don't have a clue you 2test moron.

Get back on your HZT, HIV positive crybaby.
And get some testicles and post under your name/callsign chickenshit punk.

--
Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
news:3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

2132. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:06:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119080657.17218.00000004@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 31512

In article <20020118161014.20370.00000686@mb-mb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>>>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>>
>>>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle road and
>>>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.
>>
>>Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
>>
>No it doesn't.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Ed/Jim/Arnie:

RRAP is far from "dead." Heck, you haven't even seen the demise of the "...one step closer to extinction" thread -- there's plenty more where that came from! rec.radio.amateur.policy will probably outlast the ARS itself. More on this later, gotta get ready for work -- snowstorm predicted for later this afternoon -- yuck!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2133. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:11:46 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119081146.21442.00000340@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 31513

>No sweat, Mark, the geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC has decided that
>CW
>must go. The one think that you can't have if you're a digigeek or a
>government
>employee is to be viewed by the leading edge guys as "retro", holding beliefs
>in
>anything but leading edge, ya know, stuff that can generate big bucks.

Hey Dick,

What's wrong with "retro?" I personally think there's room for both. By all means, include PSK31 questions on the written exams. But to completely remove Morse testing? What's next...Ohm's law? I know that's a little extreme, but I hope that you get my meaning. I agree that NCI's "justifiable" mission was already accomplished with the NCT ticket. (I don't even know if NCI's been around since 91?) I don't particularly agree with the "total" reduction in code speeds either. (Probably should've kept 13 w.p.m. for the extra.) But at least you could get a ticket without having to demonstrate CW proficiency and had 50mhz & above as your playground. If I remember correctly there were actually entire magazines devoted to MF & above. (Maybe VHF) Sorry for the pseudo-rant, just MHO.

>Not good for
>your career path.

I've seen this in my former state of NJ...as long as you keep your nose fairly clean (i.e. not committing murder.) your "G" job's safe.

>Plus Government guys gotta spend money, geeks gotta constantly
>come up with "stuff" to sell us all, whether or not we "need" it. Makes the
>world
>go round
>.

How about that nifty little gizmo that's supposed to "shield" you from the harmful RF radiation that's emitted from your cell phone? Work of technological wonder, eh?

>So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting that CW is a
>good
>real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has served as
>such for
>over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into stone. No
>matter what the facts really are.

I still think that if the FCC were petitioned via the RM process by 700K ARO's, (+/-) they might be influenced. .-. .-. .-. re. the actual decision vs. what

the "majority" wants. Remember my little rant on RM-9807? (Remove the 250km distance limit on CB.) The FCC admitted that the "majority" of CBers were in favor of dropping the rule, however...? (At least they had S25.5 to fall back on.) I think it'd be really interesting if such a "retain 5 w.p.m.testing for HF privs" petition were set up via internet and paper ballot. Unique callsigns preclude any "stuffing" of the <electronic> ballot box. I don't think it'd cost THAT much and it just might "make" some aspiring ARRL hotshot's career. (Even if it failed. the mere attempt would likely be widely applauded.)

The really interesting thing would be if the code were dropped despite an overwhelming protest thereof by the "affected constituency." Then bend the ears of your local congressmen (or women) and senators and ask them why the democratic process was completely ignored? Oh well, I apologize again for the pseudo-rant. Not bad for a pro-11 meter guy, eh? Take care and 73.

Mark

2134. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:23:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2bs20$v3$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31514

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b30ba1a904af649896a1@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2at31jgk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net...
> > > In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > >
> > > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had
not
> > > > > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am
on a
> > > > > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he
> > hadn't
> > > > > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> > > > >
> > > > > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq
cq??
> > > >
> > > > Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> > > > at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> > > > being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you
are
> > > > free to consider otherwise.
> > >
> > > What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down
the
> > > power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
> > > turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
> > > current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
> > > is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is
a
> > > rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
> > > hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
> > > on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?
> >
> > See comment below.
> >
> > > > > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > > > > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without

> > sin..casting
> > > > > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
> > > >
> > > > If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion,
> > dialog,
> > > > debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.
> > >
> > > Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
> > > people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.
> >
> > You have no clue as to what positions I hold or have held...But,
> > once again your exagerration shows you up.
> >
> > > >You
> > > > are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> > > > of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > > comments.
> > >
> > > yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit
> > >
> > > Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people
> > > actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas
> > >
> > > BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are
> > > broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as
> > > this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor
operating
> >
> > I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all
that
> > difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks
seem
> > to
> > be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in
> > question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all
> > your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.
>
> SUGGEST?? SUGGEST Are you even speaking from experience? I seriously
> doubt that Bill. You have no clue do you other than your vaunted
> opinion that amounts to zip. Poor station set up huh? This coming from
> an appliance rice box owner no doubt.
>
> Better yet, go ahead a describe what it takes for going from 1500 watts
> (which is 1/2 again as much as you originally stated)..down to 100,
> cause just turning off the amp ain't the answer Bill, but then again you
> wouldn't know that would you Bill?? Sounds like power envy to me. Poor

> Bill ain't gots no amp so everyone who has one is a poor operator...you
> are your parties candidate.
>
> OK BILL you win. Be like the rest of monkeys. Hang onto your banana
> and keep screaming loud. Sooner or later someone will answer you and
> you can whine to them about poor operators
>
> What an a**

Once again, your exagerrated comments and perjorative name
calling reveal you for what you are.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2135. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:38:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119083854.12409.00002147@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31515

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Oh, you believe that anyone who holds the view
>that CW is a viable emergency communications mode is automatically
>unprepared.

If one learns Morse code, but does not put together a station, he or she is not prepared to conduct emergency communications.

If one puts together a station, but does not learn Morse code, he or she is prepared to conduct emergency communications.

If the issue really is emergency communications, it would be better for the FCC to mandate that hams have stations than for the FCC to mandate that hams learn Morse code.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

2136. Re: ARRL - Right and Wrong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:41:42 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f68z3u.1uw9waq1s1vtz8N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 31516

N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote:

> This stems out of the "Is the ARRL still screwed up?" thread. Everyone seems
> to have passionate opinions about the ARRL, pro and con.
>
> So, out of curiosity, name one thing you think the ARRL does right, AND one
> thing they do wrong. I'll kick one off...
>
> Right - Fighting for spectrum. I must say they do a good job of keeping in
> there, fighting to protect our current spectrum, and get more. Most recently
> the fight over low power devices in the 440 band, and the quest for a 60
> meter band come to mind.
>
> Wrong - Advertising. The ARRL does a horrible job of letting the community
> know Hams exist. After 9/11 calmed down, the ARRL top brass should have been
> on every news outlet and talking head show, touting the benefits of Ham
> radio and the part hams played during the crisis. Same goes for a large
> scale occurrences such as hurricanes, etc.
>
> It'd also be nice to have more materials available to hand out to folks. The
> training materials they have (Now You're Talking, videos, etc) are good, but
> we need something to get people interested in the first place. How about a
> series of posters we can hang on our walls, or 8x10s we can put in our cubes
> at work. Tasteful artwork perhaps, that would prompt people to ask about it
> and give you an opening to discuss amateur radio.
>
> Flyers to place at the local rat shacks (maybe with a blank space for local
> club name/address info) would be nice too. I've seen a few things on the
> ARRL web, but they could stand to get a LOT more.
>
> 73's,
>
> Robert / N4IXT

Agree 100%, they missed a great chance to promote after 9/11. I did see
a ham artical in our local paper shortly after 9/11 though touting ham
comms during disasters. A local club must have called the paper.

--
What's the difference between light & hard?
You can sleep with a light on...

2137. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:42:23 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119084223.21442.00000345@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 31517

>> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the group.)
>>
>> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US amateurs
>as a
>> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?
>
>We will keep working to eliminate the code test.

But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in college to use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd be society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too? Poll the AR community. I think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it away." Oh, you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go poll high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the "up"coming graduating class. Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing the "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.

>> I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
>> pretty good.
>
>As Ed Hare (ARRL) noted along with others, the government
>just doesn't work that way.

Nothing ventured...

>> With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
>> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange.
>
>The ARRL is free to "poll" all hams anytime they want. The cost to do
>so is probably prohibitive.

I disagree. I bet ARO's would gladly contribute to a "save the code" campaign, don't you? ;-)

>> (After all, the database is finite and
>> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then
>become
>> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
>other.)
>
>Which, again, the ARRL is free to undertake anytime. You'll
>need to convince ARRL of doing it.

I betcha somebody's already there. I'd keep checking my six o'clock if I were NCI. Take care and 73.

Mark

2138. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:42:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119084253.12409.00002149@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31518

Bill Sohl wrote:

> I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
> whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
> air.

I think that someone calling CQ is well warranted to use 1500 watts. It is what happens once contact is made that determines whether the law to use the mininumum necessary power is followed.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2139. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 13:46:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119084651.12409.00002151@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31519

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>even though I had specified the amateur HF/MF bands.

I had missed that. I may have jumped in mid thread.

73, Ed

>

2140. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 14:10:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2burh$bs7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31520

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119084223.21442.00000345@mb-fk.aol.com...
> >> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> >> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
amateurs
> >> as a result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?
> >
> >We (NCI) will keep working to eliminate the code test.
>
> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill?

You don't have to get it. The FCC is the one that counts.
Agree or not, there simply is NO reason for a separate
morse skill test anymore...at any speed.

Add fundamental morse/CW character knowledge to
the written if you want (e.g. The morse characters for the word
HELP are?: and have 4 answers to pick). The int. phonetic alphabet is
part of the question pool on the same basis.

> What if we encouraged kids in college to
> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd
be
> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?

Frankly, I don't care if history was dropped from doctor's academic
requirements (it probably isn't there anyway as history wouldn't
be a med school class, but rather an undergrad class). Regardless,
that's a social/academic issue...take it up with those folks. The issue
as you see it (IMHO) is one of having requirements just for the
effort needed, rather than for a valid reason.

> Poll the AR community. I
> think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it away."
Oh,
> you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go
poll
> high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college
> diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the
"up"coming
> graduating class.

Did employers get upset when engineering colleges stopped teaching
use of the slide rule once calculators/computers became "standard."

> Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing the
> "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.

YOU can poll anyone you want. The FCC makes the decision and that
is the process. As to an OT sharing the bottom 20 with a codeless
extra...so what...they do that now with 5 wpm extras. This isn't
about OT "feelings" it is about what are the proper requirements
for a license...and morse isn't one of them anymore (IMHO).

> >> I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> >> pretty good.
> >
> >As Ed Hare (ARRL) noted along with others, the government
> >just doesn't work that way.
>
> Nothing ventured...

But it is the government YOU need to convince...not NCI.

FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?

> >> With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
> >> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange.
> >
> >The ARRL is free to "poll" all hams anytime they want. The cost to do
> >so is probably prohibitive.
>
> I disagree. I bet ARO's would gladly contribute to a "save the code"
campaign,
> don't you? ;-)

Nope. But you are free to try.

> >> (After all, the database is finite and
> >> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could
> >> then become the single largest petition the FCC has ever received.
> >> (One way or the other.)
> >
> > Which, again, the ARRL is free to undertake anytime. You'll
> > need to convince ARRL of doing it.
>
> I betcha somebody's already there. I'd keep checking my six o'clock if I
were
> NCI. Take care and 73.

No worries mate.

2141. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:08:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C498BEB.C4227E94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31522

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So what happens ...
> > > What if, ...
> > > What if ...
> >
> > What if the aliens land and confiscate all the CW keys?
>
> Typically of one who has all the answers, you have no clue to the
> questions.

What if your "what if" speculations never happen?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2142. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:11:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C498C98.1BAB6C81@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31523

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Are you really that clueless? Of course we know Shannon's plan, but that has nothing to do
> with real world communications.

Shannon's theorem has nothing to do with real world communications????????

> Are you rationally suggesting that when someone can copy the
> CW but not the PSK31 that he should kill the CW too by running it through a 50 hz filter?

That's what it would take to do a fair comparison between the modes.
Otherwise, you are comparing apples and oranges akin to comparing
QRP CW with KW SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2143. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:19:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C498E87.93319000@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31524

Mark Pearsal wrote:
> What's wrong with "retro?" I personally think there's room for both. By all
> means, include PSK31 questions on the written exams. But to completely remove
> Morse testing? What's next...Ohm's law?

If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other mode,
there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the Morse
exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur radio
is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.

> The really interesting thing would be if the code were dropped despite an
> overwhelming protest thereof by the "affected constituency." Then bend the ears
> of your local congressmen (or women) and senators and ask them why the
> democratic process was completely ignored?

It wouldn't be a democratic process if only hams were allowed to vote.
That would be a republican process. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2144. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:26:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C49902A.4925264F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31525

Mark Pearsal wrote:
> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in college to
> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd be
> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?

A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
if the car won't start during an emergency?"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2145. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:30:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49927c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31922

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2at31jgk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all
that
> difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks seem
> to
> be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in
> question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all
> your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.
>

And, not that you need or want my reinforcement Bill, but I agree with you. Good station installation considers first the rules, then the convenience of how to work within those rules. If tuning is required with a carrier because one does not have a dummy load (and I know few hams who do), then just be sure to ID (and I know many hams who don't) when you've completed each step of tuning. Listen to a MARS frequency prior to net time some evening. One carrier after another. Listen to a DX pileup. You'll hear the intermittent carrier tones.

I don't know why this Jay person has chosen to take up the cause of ignoring the FCC R&R, but I do know that they are there and we are bound to them if we are to operate properly. It's as simple as that, no matter how much of an inconvenience they may be at times. If the ARRL gets on the air at full power without, shame on their station. Is there some set-aside that makes allowance for that? I only wonder because I don't think their station is trying to establish contact, is it, when they are running bulletins, etc.?

Kim W5TIT

2146. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 15:34:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c499366_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31923

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b30ba1a904af649896a1@news.earthlink.net...
>
> SUGGEST?? SUGGEST Are you even speaking from experience? I seriously
> doubt that Bill. You have no clue do you other than your vaunted
> opinion that amounts to zip. Poor station set up huh? This coming from
> an appliance rice box owner no doubt.
>
> Better yet, go ahead a describe what it takes for going from 1500 watts
> (which is 1/2 again as much as you originally stated)..down to 100,
> cause just turning off the amp ain't the answer Bill, but then again you
> wouldn't know that would you Bill?? Sounds like power envy to me. Poor
> Bill ain't gots no amp so everyone who has one is a poor operator...you
> are your parties candidate.
>
> OK BILL you win. Be like the rest of monkeys. Hang onto your banana
> and keep screaming loud. Sooner or later someone will answer you and
> you can whine to them about poor operators
>
> What an a**

Jay: with all due respect, you keep protesting following FCC R&R for the sake of "inconvenience" when operating. It doesn't matter "what it takes" to meet the FCC R&R, it matters that we meet them.

Why would you be so vehemently opposed to someone who is SUGGESTING that rules be followed? It has nothing to do with envy. It has everything to do with knowing the R&R and following them.

Kim W5TIT

2147. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 16:14:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c499d35_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31924

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119084223.21442.00000345@mb-fk.aol.com...
> >> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> >>
> >> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
amateurs
> >as a
> >> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?
> >
> >We will keep working to eliminate the code test.
>
> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
college to
> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd
be
> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
>

IMNSHO, I believe it's a bad analogy in these debates to begin comparing educational requirements to those of getting an amateur radio license. While the ARS is in the *avocation* [read: sideline] of providing community services, there is absoulutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham radio operator do so. While the ARS is in the *avocation* of experimenting with electronic theory, there is absolutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham radio operator do so.

An MD is not in *any* avocation, as related to his education. An MD is in the *business* of diagnosing, preventetive medicine, and treatment--on *HUMAN BEINGS* for the sake of this discussion (not counting those who are veterinarians, etc.)

Most people who take formal education are taking that education to then apply what they have learned to some area of professional life.

The ARS should *not* be in the business of being so discretionary when judging how important one is by how they got their license or what they do with it once they get it. Just as we, as people, should not be in the business of saying that someone who joined the Boy Scouts but never became an Eagle Scout is some kind of moron for not having done so. Or, that a gardener who has never introduced a new rose because they've never experimented with grafting isn't a *real* gardener. Or, that someone who simply drinks herbal teas and has never studied any further is simply just not worthy of the flavor or experience of those teas. All these things are,

basically, hobbies--and we decide when entering these hobbies just how "devoted" we will be to them.

The ARS is not a measure of intelligence, success, or even influence. It is a hobby, gentlemen, first and foremost. Be it good or bad, I believe the FCC is recognizing this more and more. In earlier times, there was certainly a lot more to being a ham. It was still a hobby, but those who engaged certainly were among the elite. The knowledge it took to create a signal that was received in distance just wasn't commonplace. Nor is it today. But, and I say this with great dread to the anger this inspires, it is not needed today. Before you begin to defame someone the next time you get angry because they worked differently than you did to get your license, just think about all the new things that have come out since you got your license. Then, ask yourself if you understand so well how those "new" modes work, and how to experiment with them.

>
> Poll the AR community. I
> think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it away." Oh,
> you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go poll
> high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college
> diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the "up"coming
> graduating class. Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing the
> "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.
>

Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed curriculums to get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start turning out pure genius in their field. BUT, the hobby arena is not the place to demand such stringent things of people. The hobby arena is the place people come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The more you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more you'll find the youth staying away. They've got enough, without hearing and listening to how incompetent they are because they only want a hobby and nothing more.

Why is it that great philosophers, inventers, speakers, scientists, musicians, etc., why are they almost always *not* from the United States? Everything here in the United States is so very judged--we demand perfection in everything we do; when sometimes all we need and want is to just "pick up a microphone and argue, or chat, or frolic" [in the case of amateur radio]. I know many Europeans who come over here and are at first amazed, then feared by, our work ethic; our harried lifestyles; and the way we choose to "enjoy" ourselves.

> >>
> >> (After all, the database is finite and
> >> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could then

> >become
> >> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or the
> >other.)
> >
> >Which, again, the ARRL is free to undertake anytime. You'll
> >need to convince ARRL of doing it.
>
> I betcha somebody's already there. I'd keep checking my six o'clock if I
were
> NCI. Take care and 73.
>
> Mark
>

I don't have much of a stake in this debate. I've already got my license, I have fun with the privileges I have, I haven't even tapped the many things I could be doing with what I've got. I don't care if amateur radio grows or not. In fact, better that it does not, in my opinion, because the spectrum is crowded enough as it is (I am more saying that as Devil's Advocate than anything, but it *does* have some truth), and I don't believe that our children are going to miss anything by choosing to be engaged in other things than amateur radio--in fact they've a better chance of interesting Mother and Father, and church and community, if they *do* get more involved with computers, networking, etc., than with amateur radio.

All that having been said, the CW debate has become, IMNSHO, the pariah of amateur radio. I believe that if we wish to interest people in ham radio for the benefit of either getting them involved, or simply to help them understand the importance of the hobby, their former knowledge of the CW issue brings to surface the worst in ham radio. And, when you think of where we probably draw our greatest interest from (scanner listening, our affiliation with public service groups, police and fire organizations, and forums like this), we've shot ourselves in the foot. Just my two cents worth.

Kim W5TIT

2148. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 16:16:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c499d36$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31925

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119084253.12409.00002149@mb-mf.aol.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
> > whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
> > air.
>
> I think that someone calling CQ is well warranted to use 1500 watts. It
is
> what happens once contact is made that determines whether the law to use
the
> mininumum necessary power is followed.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hmmmmm, good point, Ed. I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
anyway) start with minimal and go up.

Kim W5TIT

2149. NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 16:36:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49a1d2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31526

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C411723.4A4B6CAD@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > NCI is an small, loose membership organization
> > > > with a non-elected board

First, I don't consider thousands of members in over
60 countries, with active National Chapters in a number,
to be "small." (Admittedly, we're not as large as, for
example, the ARRL, but we haven't had 70+ years to
achieve that level of growth either ... and we don't try
to be "everything to everybody," which is also a factor)

Additionally, I feel compelled to comment on Dave's
assertion that NCI has a "non-elected board" ...

The original board was selected from volunteers by
the founders. (necessary to get things started ... and
not uncommon in theformation of new organizations)

Subsequently, when the original terms outlined in the
Bylaws were due to expire, the entire membership was
solicited for nominations in preparation for an election
(if necessary) of board members.
(This was done by notice on the NCI website, as well
as direct e-mail to the membership.)

Apparently, the membership was happy with the policies
and performance of the original board members, as nobody
from the membership chose to contest the re-election of ANY
of the incumbent board members.

Before Dave (or someone else) goes off on this, I'd hasten to
point out that the ARRL does things the same way ... if an
incumbent seeks re-election, and at the end of the noticed
nomination period there are no additional candidates, the
unopposed incumbent is automatically declared re-elected.

> > > > and no membership votes on anything. It can't love or hate
anything.
> > > > Its views are the views of the directors.

The membership of NCI has been polled on several occasions
by e-mail, soliciting their views on issues.

Also, the e-mail addresses of the NCI Directors are published
on the website and it has always been made clear to the
membership that they are encouraged to write with questions,
comments, suggestions and (yes) any criticisms.

This is consistent with the way ARRL "does business" ...
I don't recall being asked to vote on specific issues ... the
ARRL board is elected and makes decisions, presumably
based on some combination of their judgement and input
received from the membership. NCI has the "luxury" of
not trying to be an "everything to everyone" organization,
thus, the membership views on the Morse issue are pretty
consistent (otherwise, they wouldn't have joined in the
first place).

To be candid and honest, member comment has always
been quite postitive and the membership continues to
support the organization financially as well. (through
completely voluntary donations ... not mandatory dues and
a popular magazine subscription that is inseparable from
membership ...)

> > That's all well and good but if the directors go off on a tangent
and
> > begin addressing other issues which are not part of posted policy,
they
> > are not being given a voice as to whether they are in agreement.

> Why do you think an NCI member has no voice. We (the NCI
> BOD members) do recieve input from the members throughout
> the year...as does ARRL directors.

Again, the e-mail addresses of the NCI Directors are published
on the website and it has always been made clear to the
membership that they are encouraged to write with questions,
comments, suggestions and (yes) any criticisms.

> > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".

> Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
> by email or snail mail will suffice.

I guess Dave doesn't (or doesn't think others) know how
to send an e-mail.

And something on the order of 5-10 individuals have
done so over the past several years, out of thousands
of members worldwide.

Any member who asked to be removed from the
membership rolls was personally queried by me
by e-mail as to *why* they wished to resign their

membership in NCI (because the board CARES
about member's views) and asked politely if there
was anything that could be done to resolve any
issues to their satisfaction.

A few indicated that now that 5 wpm is in effect, they're
happy enough ... a few were upset that NCI felt that
5 wpm as an interim measure was "the best we could
expect at the time," stating they joined "No Code Intl."
not "5 wpm Intl." A couple were just trying to trim e-mail
traffic or were concerned about the privacy of their e-mail
address.

Everyone whose issue was not resolved to their satisfaction
has had their request honored though, as stated, the numbers
have been vanishingly small.

And NCI's membership continues to grow steadily ... the
establishment of National Chapters in other countries has
had a particularly postive effect ... for example, membership
in the Netherlands (which was already pretty good) doubled
rapidly after the establishment of a National Chapter there
(and continues to grow).

All of this tells me that the NCI board is doing a pretty
darned good job of following the wishes of the membership.
(Which is something I'm proud of every time I receive an
e-mail from a member saying, "Keep up the good work,
thanks for your efforts.")

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEmgcJe+N6+q84HiEQK7GwCeM0XK3on9/qOYUVlv5KUyVaLUNMEAnj3b
CGv6+a0NCM9aixVOGJaTfyUD
=y/Xs

```
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2150. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 16:53:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119115327.01585.00002370@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 31527

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Before Dave (or someone else) goes off on this, I'd hasten to
>point out that the ARRL does things the same way ... if an
>incumbent seeks re-election, and at the end of the noticed
>nomination period there are no additional candidates, the
>unopposed incumbent is automatically declared re-elected.

That happens in government elections, too, Carl. It is the normal way of handling these sorts of things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2151. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 16:56:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119115612.01585.00002371@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 31528

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other mode,
>there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the Morse
>exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur radio
>is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.

One can get all of the safety questions wrong and still be given a license.
One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license.

There have been proposals put forth to treat Morse code the same as other modes
in the exam process, but those proposals do not have the support of either
side. The NCTA folks believe that their view will prevail and the NCTA folks
believe they have compromised enough, by my read.

The end result is that it will be one way or the other is my guess. Too bad,
because those compromise positions that keep some code testing have merit,
IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2152. NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:05:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31531

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C41DDDA.36A18370@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C411723.4A4B6CAD@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > There is no known mechanism for "unjoining".
> >
> > Anyone that wants to "unjoin" is free to do so. A simple request
> > by email or snail mail will suffice.
>
> So even the dead can remain as members until they speak up?

The e-mail addresses of SKs tend to become invalid rather
promptly ... there are some SKs in the membership database,
marked as such under "license class" sort of "in memorium."
(The numbers are small, and there is every reasonable effort
made to identify SKs and mark their member record as
such)

It is NOT NCI's intent to missrepresent numbers on
the basis of the "votes" of SKs ... this is not Chicago :-)

(I wonder how many ARRL members are SK without the
ARRL knowing it? I suspect the number would be much
larger both in absolute terms and as a percentage.)

One of NCI's SKs in particular, a ham in the Netherlands,
died of cancer a year or so ago, shortly after joining NCI.
When I was notified of his terminal condition by the National
Chapter Chairman, special arrangements were made to
send an electronic copy of his membership certificate to
our National Chapter Chairman for local printing and personal
delivery in his hospital room by the National Chapter Chairman
a few days before he passed away.

The National Chapter Chairman later indicated that his XYL
had asked that the message be relayed back to me that
this special effort meant a lot to him.

Yes, we DO care about our members ...
```

> > > I don't know of any other
> > > membership organization which operates in the same manner.
> > >
> > Except for the annual dues that many other organizations
> > have... whereby failure to pay results in a member being
> > dropped, NCI operates on very similar processes as do other
> > organizations.
>
>
> That's a BIG exception.

What's so "BIG" about it, Dave? In my view, the idea
that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
subscribers."

I obviously don't know the exact extent of this
phenomenon, but I personally know quite a few folks
who only renew their ARRL membership to keep
getting QST ... I am NOT one, BTW, and this is NOT
meant to be a "dig" at the ARRL ... just pointing out
the flaws in your argument that the fact that NCI doesn't
have mandatory, fixed dues is somehow a "negative
indicator."

> > Most BODs for other orgs (eg. ARRL) are
> > free to set policy. Did anyone that is an ARRL member
> > vote to approve the ARRL shifting it's position to not
> > oppose an end to code as a treaty requirement? Most any
prganization
> > establishes a range of allowed policy setting to the BOD rather
> > than calling for an all member vote on every action/issue.
>
> Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a
direct
> result of that one particular shift in position?

Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
the ARRL's former policy on Morse???

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE

Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEmnApe+N6+q84HiEQI7SQCfaSk38BY80i6R5SM4mEvzZBziNnAAmwdw
AeOfGzib9cLsmVsJ9ShDPEy5
=2Pmv
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2153. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:07:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C499B9B.8BB6BC5A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31529

W1RFI wrote:

> If the issue really is emergency communications, it would be better for the FCC
> to mandate that hams have stations than for the FCC to mandate that hams learn
> Morse code.

That's like saying you can be required to own a car because you are issued a
drivers license after being tested to prove you can drive a car. Silly boy, Ed.

2154. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:10:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119121024.06877.00001441@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 31532

In article <3C4741D8.14AAC43D@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Looks like the change made the growth rate go DOWN.
>
>I wonder if the growth rate went down more, or less than it would have
>had the change not occurred?

No way to tell.

What we've really got is a mess of different effects all overlapping:

- Change to 10 year licenses & 2 year grace period (1984)
- Code waivers (1990)
- Tech loses its code test (1991)
- Vanity calls for all (1994?)
- Restucturing (2001)
- Renewal/no renewal with upgrade/modification (?ongoing)
- Renewals only allowed within 90 days of expiration (?)
- TIN/ULS/FRN 610/605 and other alphanumeric soup (ongoing)

With all that going on, who's to say what's what?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2155. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:10:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119121025.06877.00001442@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 31530

In article <20020118071809.16239.00000525@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>> Now, speaking as a member, I was somewhat disappointed that the stand was
>>> not more firm.
>
>>That's my point.
>
>Yes, but I am pretty convinced we see that point from an opposite direction.
>
Not really.

What bothers me most is the way the BoD came to their decision, and their soft-peadling of it. If they think it's the right way to go, let them stand up and be counted.

But what the heck do I know - I'm just a long-time (34 years) member.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2156. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:10:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119121026.06877.00001443@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 31533

In article <a297vs$9v3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >> > I am not here to provide those answeres for you.
>> >>
>> >> That's an odd answer, Bill. If you don't have those answers, how will
>you
>> >> defend the theory tests?
>> >
>> >IF and when the need arises...I don't need to do so now.
>> >Are you worried I (we) won't be prepared to do so.
>>
>> Your responses tell me that you don't have the answers.
>
>Not at all. My response clearly only stated I am not interested
>in articulating those answers now. I will do so, if and
>when the need arises.

By then it may be too late. FCC can say "We've been doing this for years and
you didn't complain".
>
>> Simple challenge: Come up with reasons to defend the need for theory tests
>> beyond what's in the
>> Tech, and I'll come up with FCC-type replies showing why that stuff should
>not
>> be tested. Note that
>> I'm only talking about theory - regs and safety are a different matter.
>
>As I said yesterday, I'm not going to play the academic game...
>until there is clearly a need to do so.

Suit yourself. But it sure looks to me like you KNOW there is some
merit in what I say.
>
>> > >You have so little faith in the FCC.
>> >>
>> >> Why should I have faith in the FCC?
>> >
>> >OK, don't have faith then.
>>
>> This is the FCC that gave us "incentive licensing", which NCI Executive
>> Director WA6VSE and others have called
>> "a dismal failure". This is the FCC that continues to prohibit things like
>many
>> designs of external RF power amplifiers - not because

>> of what hams do, but because of what bootleggers and cbers do. This is the
>FCC
>> that couldn't even write a coherent
>> NPRM or errata to it!
>
>The FCC has changed dramatically over time.

AGREED!

>The FCC is
>people doing their jobs. People change, attitudes, change,
>etc. Frankly, Jim, at this point, I am not at all worried about
>the FCC doing away with theory tests because I just don't
>believe it will happen.

I'm not talking about a total elimination. I'm talking about reduction in size
and scope.
>
>> This is the same FCC that approved the new Extra Q&A pool, then had to
>remove
>> three questions from the
>> APPROVED pool because of blatantly obvious errors.
>>
>> WHY should I "have faith" in the FCC?
>
>YOU don't, we can again disagree on that.

This is the same FCC that did nothing about enforcement for years. The same FCC
that gave us an NPRM with four license classes and better written tests, then
chucked it all in the R&O. The same FCC that renews Tech Pluses as Techs. The
same FCC that will give Element 1 credit to anyone who can show they held a
Novice at one time, even 50+ years ago, but WON'T give the same credit for
any other license class beyond the grace period, or a CSCE for Element 1 that
is 366 days old.

The list goes on and on, but you tell me I should "have faith in the FCC".
Right.

>> >> >Should that "more knowledge" not still be relatively
>> >> >easy for anyone that has an EE or above?
>> >> >
>> >> Sure. I didn't have an EE or even a high school diploma when I got
>mine.
>> >
>> >I agree. I passed the General theory myself before having a
>> >high school diploma.
>>
>> I passed the General and Advanced theory before entering high school. Also
>13
>> wpm code, sending and receiving. And That was nowhere near a record.
>
>Your point...are you saying that even 30/40 years ago the theory wasn't

>that difficult?

Yup. In 1968 I was a self-taught 14 year old Advanced between 8th and 9th
grade.
No big deal - I knew of younger hams with Extras.

Today the Extra has been done by at least one third-grader. And that's the OLD
Extra.
>
>> >> >> From the POV of someone who has designed and built more ham rigs
>from
>> >> >scratch
>> >> >> than I have owned ready-made, the test just wasn't that hard - it
>> >didn;t
>> >> >> require that much radio knowledge. Nor does it today.
>> >> >
>> >> >Nor did it 50 years ago.
>> >>
>> >> Did you take the Extra 50 years ago? I took the Extra 32 years ago.
>> >
>> >Nope, there was no reason to take anything beyond General
>> >when I passed the General test.
>>
>> Which I took 34 years ago.
>
>Point?

That the writtens are no big deal IF one knows a little about radio.
>
>> >> >It is easy for me to see that the knowledge
>> >> >needed 50 years ago was well within the ability of most people to
>> >> >learn on their own if they wanted to.
>> >>
>> >> Same is true of the code.
>> >
>> >But there is NO reason to test mode skills.
>> >It is not simply knowledge that CW tests at all...it is
>> >a specific skill. No other mode requires that.
>>
>> Then what are the reasons to test theory knowledge beyond safety and
>> regulations? Why must Extras know about phase angles and Thevenin
>equivalents?
>> Those are good things to know, but why MUST they be tested?
>
>Wait until someone pettitions to end the theory then.
>Ditto my "I ain't got time or inclination to play now."

Translation: You know there is merit in what I say.

>> But you haven't said WHY it MUST be part of the test. You're making the
>same
>> argument as "every ham should know the code".

>
>Not at all...UNLESS you firmly believe that hams need know NOTHING
>about theory at all.

I don't. But there are other folks who do.

>The discussion, if it ever gets to the FCC
>might surround what the appropriate syllabus should be for each
>license class, but until it does, I need defend nothing.
>
>> >That said, until there's
>> >a challenge to writtens, it iremains an academic mind game.
>>
>> W5YI has already challenged them. He's not alone.
>
>Where's the NPRM then from the FCC to open the subject
>to rules changes?

98-143 was one. More will come.

Ask Fred. And Stew.

Look at the UK "Foundation" class.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2157. NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:14:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49aae3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31536

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020114071439.11155.00001440@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> I encourage the living NCI members to drop Bill a note.
>
> >Good point. One other way we "lose" members is when we
> >send out a communication. We do "lose" members when they
> >don't keep us (NCI) updated on their current email address.
>
> Do you deduct those former members from the count when you reference
the number
> of members NCI has when you file comments with the FCC?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed,

Due to the fact that the exact number of NCI members varies
literally on a daily basis (substantially more by new members
joining than by the handful of those who have "dropped out"),
NCI has never quoted a specific number to the FCC ... nor do
I believe does the ARRL in its filings ... however, we have
never missrepresented the general magnitude of NCI's
membership, either to the FCC or in any other forum.

The FCC and other national regulatory agencies know
we're not as big as the ARRL and we've never tried to
"BS" them that we are ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE

Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEmpX5e+N6+q84HiEQI9/QCgylOOO8mveRF3rPAUua2PY8vNqgoAoIrU
rTte1FJdr4or/0qsYzzsdcVE
=ehpz
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2158. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:15:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C499D4E.89220034@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31534

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > So what happens ...
> > > > What if, ...
> > > > What if ...
> > >
> > > What if the aliens land and confiscate all the CW keys?
> >
> > Typically of one who has all the answers, you have no clue to the
> > questions.
>
> What if your "what if" speculations never happen?

You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of technical support.

2159. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:16:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49ab46$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31926

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C499D4E.89220034@worldnet.att.net...
>
> You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> technical support.
>

So, you agree that the voice mode would be the best. I agree.

Kim W5TIT

2160. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:19:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C499E74.C9256C69@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31535

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Are you really that clueless? Of course we know Shannon's plan, but that has nothing to do
> > with real world communications.
>
> Shannon's theorem has nothing to do with real world communications????????
>
> > Are you rationally suggesting that when someone can copy the
> > CW but not the PSK31 that he should kill the CW too by running it through a 50 hz filter?
>
> That's what it would take to do a fair comparison between the modes.
> Otherwise, you are comparing apples and oranges akin to comparing
> QRP CW with KW SSB.

Look, simpleton cum genius, what *I* want is the system that works when I need it to work. If I
have a transmitter with X watts capable of working a PSK mode and CW, and the PSK won't fill the
communications requirement when the CW will, it doesn't take a lot of comparing or rationalizing to decide which to use. The decision is already made for you.

2161. NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:24:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49ad0a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31539

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C412921.CB96820D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> All the current directors have
>
> > been re-elected by the membership.
>
> So how do they get "re" elected when they were never elected in
the first
> place?
>

That's a really idiotic word game, Dick ...

The point is that the original board was elected to another
term (following the intial one) without ANY opposition ...
following the (publicly viewable) procedures outlined in
the Bylaws ...

Tilt at another windmill ... this one's quite sound and
won't collapse.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPEmrrJe+N6+q84HiEQLObQCgwzXQPJR+8ujWyekP9B3aGiyoqqkAmQEv
OIRW7nIt98O8GuRA8J6hF7oY
=LiBW
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2162. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:24:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C499F91.32DE2B81@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31537

CAM wrote:

If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other mode,

> there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the Morse
> exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur radio
> is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.

Which is really NOT a problem when one considers that radiotelegraphy is the most basic radiocommunications mode which should be a required skill at SOME minimal level for ham radio ops, at least at HF.Personally I believe it should be required of all hams.
Of course in this jimmy-gimme, plug-and-play society anything that requires effort is taboo.

2163. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:27:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C49A034.538FF0D5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31538

CAM wrote:

> Mark Pearsal wrote:
> > But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
> > thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in college to
> > use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd be
> > society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
>
> A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
> vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
> if the car won't start during an emergency?"

Use the pickup truck. You do have vehicle redundancy, don't you?
Or what the hey, just call the neighbors. The phone still works.

2164. NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:39:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49b0a1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31540

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113121724.11155.00001252@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >The same as happens in most any organization...
> >1. A nomination period is opened,
> >2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
> >3. nominations are closed,
> >4. The mebership is asked to vote.
> >
> >NCI has been there/done that.
>
> Almost. As I recall, when the nominations wer e closed, there were
no nominees
> other than the existing Directors, so there was no need to vote. I
see nothing
> wrong with declaring unopposed candidates elected, mind you; it
happens often
> enough in elections. But, for at least the one election I know
about, that is
> what the outcome was. When did that happen? Has NCI held an election
since that
> time?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed,

You are exactly right ... there were no contested seats on
the NCI board, despite the membership being duly noticed
that nominations were open for any member who wished
to serve on the board.

Since there were no contested seats, the unopposed
incumbents were declared elected to another term,
per the provisions of the Bylaws (much the same thing
takes place in the ARRL when an incumbent is unchallenged.)

As you point out, there is absolutely nothing wrong with this.

In fact, based on the lack of challenges, the (fairly
considerable) amount of positive feedback from the
membership, and our continued membership growth,
I'd say that all indications are that the the NCI board
is representing its members' views and desires rather
well (something I'm proud of and I believe the other
NCI directors also take some pride in ...).

As far as election procedures are concerned,
it's not yet time for another election. Members
will be duly notified when it's time, and the provisions
of the bylaws will be followed as before.

73,

- - --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- - ----------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- - ----------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEmvJZe+N6+q84HiEQKtWgCbBB4mY7ygkZRNchM+oAziz7ok5JMAoJgL
wANULc73OUTurktTyt0bV4CK
=yFpX
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2165. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 17:55:16 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119125516.05494.00004700@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31541

>>If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other mode,
>>there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the Morse
>>exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur radio
>>is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.

But it does not preclude getting an amateur radio license.

>One can get all of the safety questions wrong and still be given a license.
>One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license.

Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute period of the 5-wpm exam? I'm guessing approx. 150. (...and that's being really conservative.) Let's divide 100 by 150 and multiply the result by 25, which is the amount one must get in a row within said 150 to pass. Kind of puts it in perspective, doesn't it. Gosh, I don't think I'd be too proud of fighting for the removal of an exam for which the passing grade was a 16.7. (Yuck!)

>The end result is that it will be one way or the other is my guess. Too bad,
>because those compromise positions that keep some code testing have merit,
>IMHO.

Agreed...sadly. :-(

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2166. Re: Question re. NCI? (From USENET newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:02:35 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119130235.05494.00004704@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31542

>>> With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it wouldn't be a
>>> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange.
>
>>The ARRL is free to "poll" all hams anytime they want. The cost to do
>>so is probably prohibitive.
>
>The times ARRL has polled hamdom, it has used Readex and a scientific sample
>size. Polls can generate useful data, if taken in the context of other
>factors.
>
>Steve Ford, sford@arrl.org, is always looking for good ideas for the web-page
>poll ARRL does, btw.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

That's a terrific idea! How about it, Steve? H E L P!!!

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2167. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:05:01 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119130501.05494.00004705@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31543

>The really interesting thing would be if the code were dropped despite an
>overwhelming protest thereof by the "affected constituency." Then bend the
>ears
>of your local congressmen (or women) and senators and ask them why the
>democratic process was completely ignored? Oh well, I apologize again for the
>pseudo-rant. Not bad for a pro-11 meter guy, eh? Take care and 73.
>
>Mark

No, not bad t'all.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2168. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:13:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49b8ac_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31546

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020113100744.17515.00001165@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >Date: 1/12/2002 8:37 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c404cb0_1@news7.fast.net>
>
> >I also agree with Larry on keeping the lower power limit in at
> >least those parts of the bands. As I've said many times before,
> >there's much more to be gained with better modulation and
> >coding techniques than through brute force power.
>
> To go one further, I would support an overall regulatory
reduction in our
> authorized power levels to NO MORE than 500W PEP on 160, 80 and 40,
and no more
> than 250W on the rest of our allocations, including UHF and above.

I *personally* (not as an NCI position, because it's NOT) would
support a reduction in power limits, though I don't see why 500W
would apply to the lower frequencies and 250W for everything
above 40m ... path loss increases with frequency, so I don't see
why you're advocating higher power for 40m and below ...

I *personally* could be satisfied with a 250W limit ... as I've said
(over and over :-) there is far more "bang for the buck" in better
modulation and coding techniques (and antennas, as you point
out) than in brute force power.

However, if you propose this seriously to the FCC, I'd
recommend that you have a consierable amount of
suitable solvent on hand to remove the liberal amount
of tar and feathers I expect would be applied to you
by those whose "God-given right" to run (the current)
legal limit to talk a few miles on 80m (despite the
"minimum necessary power" rule) you propose to take
away :-)

[snip]

> >However, it's inaccurate on Larry's part to assert that "the
> >main argument used by those seeking to eliminate (Morse
> >testing) ws the fact that digital modes were the future of the

> >ARS" ... the MAIN argument for eliminating Morse testing
> >is and always was that it is no longer justified as a legitimate
> >regulatory requirement for obtaining a license with full HF
> >privileges.
>
> It's still a legitimate application, Carl. And he was right on
the
> digital modes arguement. One of the leading "justifications" was
the
> proliferation of digital modes and technilogical advances in that
field over
> manual telegraphy.

One (and only one) of the points discussed was that Morse
is no longer the only mode more robust than SSB (many
digital modes are, with even better performance than Morse).

Again, the MAIN (and most compelling from a regulatory
perspective) argument for eliminating Morse testing
is and always was that it is no longer justified as a legitimate
regulatory requirement for obtaining a license with full HF
privileges.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEm3Bpe+N6+q84HiEQLX5gCfeJ02kwbzG9iNsia/60QkreVvvNoAoNlj
4sYwDXtrD1hzv7NAyHEUaKbb
=TerH
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2169. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:17:47 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119131747.05494.00004706@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31545

>Mark Pearsal wrote:
>> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
>> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
>college to
>> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd be
>> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
>
>A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
>vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
>if the car won't start during an emergency?"
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Actually Cecil, that IS a better analogy. But you forgot to mention that it applies to the equestrian hobby, or perhaps a rescue worker trying to "earn" (Key word alert!) additional endorsements who happens to work in rough forboding terrain. Not society at large.

This happens to be about the radio hobby. So given your analogy, I'd say "earning" some additional "privileges" via a not-so-challenging 5-wpm is quite reasonable. Thanks Cecil.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

P.S. Vote Republican! ;-)

2170. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:18:19 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b3c8c09dfb57fe9896a2@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31544

```
In article <a2at31$jgk$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >
> > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had not
> > > > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am on a
> > > > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he
> hadn't
> > > > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> > > >
> > > > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq cq??
> > >
> > > Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> > > at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> > > being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you are
> > > free to consider otherwise.
> >
> > What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down the
> > power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
> > turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
> > current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
> > is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is a
> > rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
> > hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
> > on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?
>
> See comment below.
>
> > > > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > > > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without
> sin..casting
> > > > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
> > >
> > > If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion,
> dialog,
> > > debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.
> >
> > Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
```

> > people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.
>
> You have no clue as to what positions I hold or have held...But,
> once again your exagerration shows you up.

You're an open book councilman, or is that ex-councilman. My exaggerations are nothing like yours MR DX, Mr Politician. Next thing we'll hear is how you saved your town from a fate worse than death.

>
> > >You
> > > are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> > > of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > > comments.
> >
> > yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit
> >
> > Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people
> > actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas
> >
> > BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are
> > broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as
> > this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor operating

Still ducking this issue huh Mr Bill? I have yet to see you accuse the ARRL of poor operating conditions. Their bulletins meet the very letter of the Mr Bill poor station operating laws as set down by the DX KING BILL SOHL!!!!!

>
> I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all that
> difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks seem
> to
> be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in
> question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all
> your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.

CLUELESS AND CLUELESS and your humble opinion don't mean doodle if you haven't any idea as to what is involved. no ifs ands or big butts (sorry kim)

Better yet Councilman, send a complaint to Riley. I am sure he'll act on it immediately seeing as you are such great friends with the FCC. Take along your pal from Pa, the two of you should be able to get the job done.

NAI (No amps international) An organization whereby people who have no amps are able to have those with amps involuntarily surrender them to

the have nots so that can play big gun crunch em at any costs.

Sort of the like the Star belly Screeches and those that have no stars on thars

I doubt it went anything like that Bill or perhaps we can call you Baron Munchuaesen (sic)

Keep hanging on to that banana Bill and the monkeys keep screeching louder still. Keep dreaming those dreams Bill. Someday you might wake up to reality.

Better yet, get on some of the DX reflectors and let those bad boys know just how you feel. I am sure they'll all flock to you POV. The DX-LIST run by KH2D is a perfect starting place. Go to it boy...pontificate away

2171. Re: Is this the end or rec.radio.amateur.policy? (was Re: Hey Carl . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:23:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a2cd61$18u$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 31547

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119001013.02067.00000495@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3C489594.9A652DC4@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20020118071535.16239.00000524@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> >(W1RFI)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> >> >
> >> >>I'm not going to quote anything because we have reached the middle
road
> >and
> >> >>agree on all points. Thanks for the reply.
> >> >
> >> >Surely this sort of thing spells the demise of rrap. :-)
> >> >
> >> No it doesn't.
> >>
> >That's not an argument.
>
> Yes it is.

http://www.montypython.net/cgi-bin/dl2/full.cgi?arguskit.wav

2172. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:29:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49bc87_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31927

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c49ad0a_2@news7.fast.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C412921.CB96820D@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > So how do they get "re" elected when they were never elected in
> the first
> > place?
> >
>
> That's a really idiotic word game, Dick ...
>
> The point is that the original board was elected to another
> term (following the intial one) without ANY opposition ...
> following the (publicly viewable) procedures outlined in
> the Bylaws ...
>
> Tilt at another windmill ... this one's quite sound and
> won't collapse.
>
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

This doesn't even account for the apparent attitude Dick C. has that it's OK for him to point up wordplay and terminology, but not for anyone else. But, in terms of what I've come to expect to see in Dick C.'s posts, it's also nothing of surprise.

Kim W5TIT

2173. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:48:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a2cem0$1sr$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 31548

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net...
> In my view, the idea
> that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
> in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
> since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
> are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
> subscribers."

How can you minimize the significance of paid membership
in the ARRL without minimizing to an even further extent, the
significance of the unpaid "membership" of NCI?

2174. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:54:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49c276_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31602

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:enPu00EnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > > I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this
inducement
> would
> > > foster more experimentation in antenna design.
> >
> > Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
> > would be just about impossible.
> >
>
> Uh, yup, right, fer shure good buddy. How is it that you're
> going to enforce power output, but you can't enforce ERP?

Output power *could* be "enforced" by making it
a prima facia violation to possess a transmitter
capable of producing more than the allowable
output power ... antenna gain is measurable,
of course, but with more difficulty.

> And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes
> from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP
> on the air, so all your high sounding bias against "big guns"
> is just so much envy, it would seem.

I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
mentality ... I know *I'm* not jealous of that sort of behavior
(and I don't believe Bill is either, though I don't want to
put words in his mouth as he's perfectly capable of speaking
his peace).

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnA85e+N6+q84HiEQLJMwCgnI2NW/U3zo/UkcHjXykr3iuWrHYAmwWF
iBSZX5oDj7BJcS8rCaXjlx2X
=wVxd
```

```
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2175. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:56:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49c2d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31928

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a2cem0$1sr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net...
> > In my view, the idea
> > that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
> > in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
> > since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
> > are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
> > subscribers."
>
> How can you minimize the significance of paid membership
> in the ARRL without minimizing to an even further extent, the
> significance of the unpaid "membership" of NCI?
>

I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST. I get my QST and it lays around. When we shifted Section Managers I at first kept going straight to the back to see what was being posted there. It got so boring I've even stopped looking.

Don't take this necessarily as a slam to QST magazine, I just don't read it. My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say "you're not even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my membership is for. Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have learned that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.

Kim W5TIT

2176. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:57:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119135710.09750.00001813@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31549

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

> path loss increases with frequency, so I don't see
>why you're advocating higher power for 40m and below ...

Free space path loss increases with frequency because the aperture of the reference, typically either isotropic or dipole, decreases with frequency. Typically, however, the gain of antennas used in practice goes up with frequency. If the capture area of the antenna were to remain the same, loss does not change with frequency.

Of course, ionospheric propagation is not free space, and losses tend to be higher at lower frequencies for HF. More important, the ambient noise levels tend to be higher on the lower frequencies than the higher.

I see no reason that the 1500-watt limit needs to be changed. I can quite comfortably live with the present power rules, including the mandate to use the minimum necessary power.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2177. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:59:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119135912.09750.00001814@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31550

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Use the pickup truck. You do have vehicle redundancy, don't you?
> Or what the hey, just call the neighbors. The phone still works.

Well, there ya' go. If new hams need Morse code in an emergency, they can call you. That settles that one!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2178. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 18:59:54 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.19.13.59.53.923990.23545@arrl.org>
Source record: 31601

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002 12:05:13 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C41DDDA.36A18370@earthlink.net...
[snip]
>(I wonder how many ARRL members are SK without the ARRL knowing it? I
>suspect the number would be much
> larger both in absolute terms and as a percentage.)

No, because if nothing else does, the monthly arrival of QST alerts the
family members to notify ARRL of the member's passing. Same with emailed
bulletins and newsletters.

>> Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a
> direct
>> result of that one particular shift in position?
>
> Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position, the ARRL will
> see an increase in membership from those who perviously felt quite
> "disenfranchised" by the ARRL's former policy on Morse???

I'd be glad to take both bets.

Jon

2179. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:02:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119140228.09750.00001816@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31603

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>(I wonder how many ARRL members are SK without the
>ARRL knowing it? I suspect the number would be much
>larger both in absolute terms and as a percentage.)

Probably not many, Carl. Most ARRL members have to re-up, which very few silent keys are apt to do. Could be a few life members whose family still receives QST.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2180. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:05:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119140515.09750.00001817@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31604

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
>the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
>those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
>the ARRL's former policy on Morse???

Hard to say, Carl. The ARRL position basically was not to expend ARRL resources opposing the dropping of an international requirement for code testing. That is a far cry from the all-or-nothing approach many on both sides believe should be taken.

And, to my knowledge, the ARRL policy on Morse code testing has not changed on the national level.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2181. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:07:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <juj28.278395$WW.14106892@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31605

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020119131747.05494.00004706@mb-bh.news.cs.com...

> P.S. Vote Republican! ;-)

If you have the sense God gave a billy goat, you vote the way the South
doesn't.

2182. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:08:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49c5c9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31929

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119140931.09750.00001818@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > That's like saying you can be required to own a car because you are
issued a
> >drivers license after being tested to prove you can drive a car. Silly
boy,
> >Ed.
>
> Yes, it is rather silly to think that the licensing requirements are
directly
> related to emergency communications.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

;) ROFLMAO!!!! One *can* lead a horse to water *AND* make it drink, once
in a while...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2183. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:09:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119140931.09750.00001818@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 31606

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> That's like saying you can be required to own a car because you are issued a
>drivers license after being tested to prove you can drive a car. Silly boy,
>Ed.

Yes, it is rather silly to think that the licensing requirements are directly
related to emergency communications.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2184. Re: ARRL - Right and Wrong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:11:27 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <zxj28.109666$fe1.1846778@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31607

Ken, you can always come back. I let my call (N2JH) expire back in the early 80s. I decided to get back in 93. Quite easy, of course. If you actually know something, you don't have to look at the Q&A manuals. Of course, operating privileges have changed and I missed some of those - but you don't need to score 100%. In fact, I didn't bother answering the resonant frequency questions (oh, I just marked some boxes) as I had neither a calculator nor the inclination to extract square roots by hand. As far as a Smith chart, you can just plug numbers into your compooter. And get answers accurate to 18 decimal places (yeah)!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"shadow person" <vanishingact1003@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:8r828.7404$X4.547455@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "N4IXT" <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote in message news:a29s62$vr088$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de...
>
> > So, out of curiosity, name one thing you think the ARRL does right, AND one
> > thing they do wrong. I'll kick one off...
> > 73's,
> >
> > Robert / N4IXT
>
> Robert, Amateur Radio started going into the toilet in a flying leap
> as soon as the ARRL petetitioned the FCC to publish the Exam
> Question Pools. The reason for this was ARRL was losing revenue
> from their testing study guides to the infamous "Bash Books".
> In short, the ARRL screwed Amateur radio in the USA just so they
> could put Dick Bash Publishing out of business. Their mentality at
> the time of this was: "How dare he! We are the ARRL and WE are
> the Gatekeepers of Ham Radio". In their rush to save face and act
> like a child having a temper-tantrum, they SCREWED ham radio for
> good. As a result today's "hams" can't even comprehend Ohm's Laws
> let alone calculate Power Factors or (glub forbid) interpret a Smith Chart.
>
> It's now 'plug and play' ham radio - although the kids are LONG GONE
> to the internet. After all who want's to spend a kilobuck and put up
> unsightly antennas when for about $400 you can get a Pentium-III and
> interact with the world over the telephone line or thru the cable tv..??
>
> Stick a fork into it Rob. It's cooked and ready for dinner.

>
> Ken (callsign lapsed in disgust in 91)
>
>

2185. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:16:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C49C603.7391B162@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31608

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> technical support.

No, it's a matter of being prepared for operation with the *maximum*
feasible level of technical support. It doesn't do much good to
prepare for an emergency after it happens.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2186. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:17:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C49C649.7BC21466@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31609

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Look, simpleton cum genius, what *I* want is the system that works when I need it to work. If I
> have a transmitter with X watts capable of working a PSK mode and CW, and the PSK won't fill the
> communications requirement when the CW will, it doesn't take a lot of comparing or
> rationalizing to decide which to use. The decision is already made for you.

What do you do when CW fails?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2187. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:37:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49cc73_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31610

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201162142110.4546-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 16 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >Good points all, Jim. I agree with all of them. The biggest
reasons that
> >things are not moving forward are social, and, IMHO, groups like
ARRL and TAPR
> >need to do more to get the word out. Right now, hams think that
"digital"
> >means "computer-to-computer" or "keyboard-to-computer" and that is
only one
> >facet of the potential for digital operation.

[snip]

> For trunking, 900 is more likely than the others, since there is
> equipment on the 800/900 business/public-safety bands for this.
> However, cost is another issue.

Used gear can usually be had at affordable prices, but there's a
catch.

The 800 SMR frequencies were set up with a 45 MHz "split" and
many, if not most, commercial mobile radio units use a 45 MHz
IF to simplify the synthesizer arrangements ... thus, it would be less
than trivial to convert much such gear to work in the 902-928 MHz
band (where such a split would not be possible), even if the front
end resonators and other parts of the radio would easily tune up
there.

> For 2400, kill all the non-spread-spectrum part 15 devices off, and
maybe SS
> could work there. As I have noted earlier (last year), some
cordless phones
> operate up there as NON-SS, FM Wideband where wide means >1.5MHz.
SS cannot
> overcome such a signal unless it can hop outside of it.

Gee ... I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that ... since the
company I work for has a leading market share in the world
in IEEE 802.11b products which run 11 mbps in the 2.4 GHz
ISM band ...

In fact, the notebook at the operating position
that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
ham shack, and electronics lab.

I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
(ROTFLMAO!)

I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnKoJe+N6+q84HiEQJ1DgCfY4tJAgT5G9TWUfVyW4DfGpbPedwAnifo
2nKXODXaH0U9v3GQOpl+CBHL
=hZA+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2188. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:49:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49cf84_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31611

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.19.13.59.53.923990.23545@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002 12:05:13 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C41DDDA.36A18370@earthlink.net...
> [snip]
> >(I wonder how many ARRL members are SK without the ARRL knowing it? I
> >suspect the number would be much
> > larger both in absolute terms and as a percentage.)
>
> No, because if nothing else does, the monthly arrival of QST alerts the
> family members to notify ARRL of the member's passing. Same with emailed
> bulletins and newsletters.

Jon ... I was not infering that the ARRL wasn't diligent in
noting SKs in its' membership ... just that, since the ARRL
has a much larger membership, the absolute number of
SKs in the ARRL membership would be larger. Additionally,
though I didn't express it, my intent was to point out that
I suspect that the demographics of ARRL membership
vs. NCI membership (more older hams in ARRL than
NCI, I strongly suspect) would tend to make the percentage
of members going SK larger as well.

I certainly didn't mean the comment as being negative
towards ARRL in any way ... if you took it that way, please
accept my sincere apology.

> >> Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a
> > direct
> >> result of that one particular shift in position?
> >
> > Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position, the ARRL will
> > see an increase in membership from those who perviously felt quite
> > "disenfranchised" by the ARRL's former policy on Morse???
>
> I'd be glad to take both bets.
>
> Jon

Jon ... don't you think that more hams will join ARRL now
that it's taken a more "mainstream" position on Morse
testing? (I do ... and that doesn't bother me at all.)
I'd suggest you consult with Ed on the dangers of wagering
with me :-)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

2189. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:52:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49d018$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31612

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4605C0.F1A8EF4B@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying
Morse code
> > operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)
>
> :-) Probably only at the sub-atomic level. ;-)
>
> ac6xg

Not EVEN at the sub-atomic level :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnOcJe+N6+q84HiEQIrtQCbBUgzGq29qImp0E8fM495LoAECaEAoLsw
wgrLhq/rv5jz/1gROjyOeVNo
=qHvO
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2190. Re: What Makes Roger?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:59:16 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2cpb4$ee3$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lllllllardasssssssss LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@MyHeroIsKV4FZ14313.com> stopped
slurping drunken Ray Davies in message news:a2c9kc$q9a$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Hey JR, good job. Keep 2test Wiseman guessing, that way
> old 2test Wiseman won't find out about the Navy job and
> the deal with joanie. HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...you are a fuckwit.

From: kf4toh (kf4toh@aol.com)
Subject: THE LLOYD FILES
Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave
View complete thread (103 articles)
Date: 2000/12/08

Subj: Check out Looking for Alabama Gal
Date: 12/7/00 6:52:53 PM Central Standard Time
From: Sohole

Click here: Looking for Alabama Gal
a added bonus for aol users click above
after you read the lloyd files

here for your pleasure
THE LLOYD FILES
lloyd trys to talk him up sum !
more to come

chapter one:

Height: 5' 6"
Body Style: Average

Race/Ethnicity: White (White American)
Religion: Christian (Baptist)

Education: Some College
Occupation: Customer Support
Income: Prefer not to say

Marital Status: Single
Has Children: No
Wants Children: Yes

Drinking: Drink Occasionally
Smoking: Don't Smoke

Dating Distance Range: 150 Miles

ubj: Re: ????
Date: 11/29/00 11:54:32 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

no i did not block you. Your name does not show up. I've been tired and
not
feeling well the last few days. Hello and I'm glad you had a good time.
As
far Christmas goes, I'm afraid I am not going to be able to come down. I
have
other plans.

Lloyd
Subj: Re: did you get my picture?
Date: 11/18/00 11:11:18 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Thanks for your picture. you look very pretty and professional. I have
had a
long day of work today. I have to work tomorrow and then get packed up to
head
to iowa. I'll be there for about a week over Thanksgiving. Means I'll be
here
by myself for Christmas. I'm tired tonite. I've had alot on my mind. More
than usaual.

Take care and have a good weekend,

Lloyd
ubj: did you get my picture?
Date: 11/16/00 1:30:29 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Did it come through all right? I just wanted to know. Are you going to
send
me yours?

Lloyd
Subj: Here they are
Date: 11/15/00 4:13:20 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

File: lloyd1.jpg (113037 bytes)
DL Time (24000 bps): < 1 minute

Here are some pictures of me like I promised. I dont know how well they
came
out, but thgey seem ok. I used my Kodak digital camera. It's a simple

camera.

Lloyd

Please send me your picture please.

Subj: Re: ????
Date: 11/29/00 11:54:32 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

no i did not block you. Your name does not show up. I've been tired and
not
feeling well the last few days.

Subj: Missed you tonite
Date: 11/14/00 12:12:53 AM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I was thinking about you tonite. I see you got my mail today. you didnt
write
me back.

Lloyd

ubj: How are you?
Date: 11/13/00 12:14:19 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Did you have a good weekend? Had to work all weekend. I'm getting ready
to
visit my Mom next week in Iowa. I'll be gone all next week for
Thanksgiving.
You got Thanksgiving plans? You'll probably goto warm Florida! Iowa
gets
very cold this time of year.

I'm gonna get my picture taken this week to send to you. I have a digital
camera. I'll send it as soon as I get it taken.

Are you still in School? I did'nt know If you were or not.

Love,

Lloyd

Subj: Re: Hello
Date: 11/11/00 12:21:44 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I dont have one done of me yet, But i will get one for you this next week.
Are

you trying to keep me in suspense? Are you that pretty that my computer would
break?

I'm not real shy, I just like to keep one thing at a time. My SN is my Ham Radio call sign.

I hope you are feeling better and that you were thinking of me this week. I did not vote, I did not get register in time. I would have voted for Bush.

Lloyd Davies

Subj: Hello
Date: 11/7/00 11:40:47 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Have'nt heard from you. Been busy? I have been working alot. So, how are things going? Did you get a picture to send me yet? I was just wondering.

Lloyd

ubj: Missed you today
Date: 11/5/00 3:58:58 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I've been on most of the Afternoon. Hope you are doing OK. Well, I have to work tonight at my job. But, I should be off at 10pm or after.

Lloyd

Subj: where are you tonite?
Date: 11/4/00 10:36:02 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I've been on online all nite where have you been? I've been watching TV tonite. Hope you have a good weekend.

Ps, I think I may have missed you telling me what you look like.

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 6:02:14 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

File: truck1.ZIP (199585 bytes)
DL Time (24000 bps): < 2 minutes

Here are a couple of pictures of my truck. Sorry I don't have a picture of myself.

They may take a while to download. Will you be online tonight? I'm gonna be
on off and on. Let's chat sweetheart.

Lloyd
Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 4:59:03 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Thanks for your response. What's going on in Jan? I have a picture of my pickup truck, 1997 S-10. Would you like to see it? I really like it a lot.

Take care,

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 2:47:44 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

How are you?

I'm sorry I have not had time to write you back. I've been working a lot right
now. I am currently trying to get some more computer courses. For starters, I
have brown hair, brown eyes. I have a few extra pounds, but been trying get to
them off. I see you are college educated. I like that in a girl. I once dated a gal once, who all she wanted to do was sit at home and watch TV. Not
my kind of gal! I have a computer education, and trying to get my A+ certification. I would make a good amount of money if I could get it passed.
I'll be taking an online course.

Well, I write you later

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 10/22/00 1:45:22 PM Central Daylight Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

hello,

I'm sorry i dont even know who you are.

Do you have a picture for starters?

Lloyd
--

Lllllllllllaaaaaaardasssssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd
"Friends of Hal Turner" <we.will@get.by.com> confessed his fatassed status
in message news:3c388ad7$1_3@news.teranews.com...
"SO WHAT IF I'M A LARDASS??<...> DOESNT IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?
SO WHAT IF I WEAR A SIZE 38-40 PANTS AND SIZE 18 DRESS SHIRTS?
IS THAT A CRIME? I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE ALOT BIGGER THAN ME....."

2191. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 19:59:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49d1d2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31614

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4701E3.AD542DC2@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >> Now, if no one has observed a Carl Stevenson on earth enjoying
Morse code
> > >> operation, does the same physics remain true? :-)
> >
> > >:-) Probably only at the sub-atomic level. ;-)
> >
> > When Schroedinger sorta' knocked off his cat, that was at the
macroscopic
> > level. But I cede the point because I really can't bear the
thought that there
> > could be another Dick Carroll in the Universe. Dick feels the
same about the
> > equally (im)probable likelihood that there is another Ed Hare. :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Rest easy. Schroedinger wasn't really predicting two cats. He
would
> have said that since no one has observed Carl enjoying CW, there is
a
> probability that he both enjoys and doesn't enjoy CW - at the same
> time. Hence, one ea. Carl, Dick, and Ed.

Jim ... since Ed likes CW and I don't, it seems only fair that we
should be able to eliminate Dick (who also likes CW) from the
equation in order to keep balance in the universe :-)
(What do you think, Ed?)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

```
iQA/AwUBPEnQJpe+N6+q84HiEQI+DgCff9ww2bKbqOFbNr1GTdwQJH4P5bQAoNiI
BB+wxwiJvI5XkeW+0RFl7iHl
=39h+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2192. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:02:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119150225.16311.00000321@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 31613

In article <3c49a1d2_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>First, I don't consider thousands of members in over
>60 countries, with active National Chapters in a number,
>to be "small."

How many thousands? How many national chapters?

If you have 2000 US hams as members, that's something
like 0.3% of the US amateur radio population. That's
"small" for a national/international organization, no matter how you cut it.

>(Admittedly, we're not as large as, for
>example, the ARRL, but we haven't had 70+ years to
>achieve that level of growth either ... and we don't try
>to be "everything to everybody," which is also a factor)

ARRL is 85+ years old.

NCI is a one-issue organization - but there are no dues.

>Also, the e-mail addresses of the NCI Directors are published
>on the website and it has always been made clear to the
>membership that they are encouraged to write with questions,
>comments, suggestions and (yes) any criticisms.
>
>This is consistent with the way ARRL "does business" ...

Not really.

ARRL doesn't have a "loyalty oath" where all prospective members
must agree on specific issues in order to join. NCI does.

Since NCI is composed entirely of members who agree
with its single stated purpose, it's no wonder there is little dissent.

>And NCI's membership continues to grow steadily ... the
>establishment of National Chapters in other countries has
>had a particularly postive effect ... for example, membership
>in the Netherlands (which was already pretty good) doubled
>rapidly after the establishment of a National Chapter there
>(and continues to grow).

If there was one member, and another joined, membership doubled ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2193. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:14:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49d541_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31616

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119135710.09750.00001813@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> > path loss increases with frequency, so I don't see
> >why you're advocating higher power for 40m and below ...
>
> Free space path loss increases with frequency because the aperture
of the
> reference, typically either isotropic or dipole, decreases with
frequency.
> Typically, however, the gain of antennas used in practice goes up
with
> frequency. If the capture area of the antenna were to remain the
same, loss
> does not change with frequency.
>
> Of course, ionospheric propagation is not free space, and losses
tend to be
> higher at lower frequencies for HF. More important, the ambient
noise levels
> tend to be higher on the lower frequencies than the higher.

Point taken ... that *could* be used to justify a higher power at
the lower frequencies ... though I'd still *personally* be content
if the FCC decided that 250W was a better limit than 1500W.
I think that more people would start thinking more about using
more effective modulation/coding if they were faced with a drop
in the allowable output power.

> I see no reason that the 1500-watt limit needs to be changed. I can
quite
> comfortably live with the present power rules, including the mandate
to use the
> minimum necessary power.

I'm not *pushing* for a drop from the present limit, more
just stating that I don't think it would be a bad idea and
could have beneficial consequences in the long run ....

73,
Carl - wa6vse

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnTjJe+N6+q84HiEQI8lQCg8Twy1P72EdaFeItdqaeXtJ3wsrcAoJUO
l1M2I3LSdiFN7J5r01l4s6Rd
=dSjE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2194. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:18:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2ckgojce1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31615

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C499B9B.8BB6BC5A@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > If the issue really is emergency communications, it would be better for
the FCC
> > to mandate that hams have stations than for the FCC to mandate that hams
learn
> > Morse code.
>
> That's like saying you can be required to own a car because you are
issued a
> drivers license after being tested to prove you can drive a car. Silly
boy, Ed.

In an emergency, what good are a bunch of drivers without vehicles?
Well, then too, maybe they could cobble together a working
vehicle with bits and piees found around the house :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2195. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:21:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49d71f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31617

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020115082716.05427.00004006@mb-bh.aol.com...
> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
>
> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for
> US amateurs as a > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will
> you guys do?

Keep lobbying until it is ... although I don't anticipate that
the FCC will find any reason to keep Morse testing once
S25.5 is gone, since in the R&O in WT Docket No. 98-143
the ONLY reason that they cited for keeping any Morse
testing at that time was the existence of the treaty obligation
under S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.

> In other words, what will be the purpose of NCI?

In your (unlikely) scenario, the same purpose as now.

> I thought that "putting it to a vote" idea was
> pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it
wouldn't be a
> difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database is
finite and
> a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could
then become
> the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or
the other.)

I guess you haven't seen the posts outlining why the FCC
has a public interest mandate to make such decisions on
the basis of what's best for the ARS, represents the minimum
necessary regulation, etc. Such decisions about how public
resources (in this case the spectrum allocated to the ARS)
should not be a "popularity contest limited to the incumbent
users." (That's sort of like allowing the fox to guard the hen
house ...)

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>

<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ---
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ---
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnVT5e+N6+q84HiEQLC4QCgl3dj0sbUU31o6hM7q3SlXJFpnc8AoOC4
fAShQxznZxVC6rq+9GXvJKfp
=Yh3J
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2196. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:31:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49d944_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31620

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C442A98.3537F8E3@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Mark Pearsal wrote:
>
> > Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
group.)
> >
> > If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
amateurs as a
> > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In
other words, what
> > will be the purpose of NCI? I thought that "putting it to a vote"
idea was
> > pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it
wouldn't be a
> > difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database
is finite and
> > a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could
then become
> > the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or
the other.)
> > Take care and 73.
>
> No sweat, Mark, the geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC has
decided that CW
> must go. The one think that you can't have if you're a digigeek or a
government
> employee is to be viewed by the leading edge guys as "retro",
holding beliefs in
> anything but leading edge, ya know, stuff that can generate big
bucks. Not good for
> your career path. Plus Government guys gotta spend money, geeks
gotta constantly
> come up with "stuff" to sell us all, whether or not we "need" it.
Makes the world
> go round
> . So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting
that CW is a good
> real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has
```

served as such for
> over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into
stone. No
> matter what the facts really are.
>

Dick,

The "geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC" (your words, not
mine, of course) happens to be a 20 wpm extra whose main
interest in ham radio operating is CW DX ... I honestly don't
know what his country count is, but I'd be strongly inclined to
believe
that it probably exceeds yours. I've NO doubt that his level of both
technical knowledge AND operating skill FAR exceeds yours.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnXYZe+N6+q84HiEQL77ACZAUMYAhSWlHRUQIo0N2Yn3Yg6fvQAoNMY
tDxahbgoN3JtNpF6aeqxOK0k
=2qwp
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2197. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:31:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2cl4u$i9u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31618

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119115612.01585.00002371@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other
mode,
> >there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the
Morse
> >exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur
radio
> >is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.
>
> One can get all of the safety questions wrong and still be given a
license.
> One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license.
>
> There have been proposals put forth to treat Morse code the same as other
modes
> in the exam process, but those proposals do not have the support of either
> side. The NCTA folks believe that their view will prevail and the NCTA
folks
> believe they have compromised enough, by my read.

Did you mean to say PCTA beilieve they have compromised enough?

Assuming that makes a more logical statement, I'd suggest
that the history of the events indicates there was NO compromise
ever offered by the PCTA. The final R&O from the FCC
was exactly that...an FCC dictate...not the result of NCTA and PCTA
folks working a compromise. Indeed, had a true effort
to compromise been on the table, then I'm sure an element of such
negotiations would have included an agreement NOT to challenge
the compromised position by either side for N period of time.

No, there was no compromise ever offered, and there is, therefore,
no reason for NCI to consider that the current status quo need be
viewed in any such light. NCI will keep working towards our end
goal.

> The end result is that it will be one way or the other is my guess. Too
bad,
> because those compromise positions that keep some code testing have merit,
> IMHO.

We respectfully disagree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2198. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:34:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31619

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C499F91.32DE2B81@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other
mode,
>
> > there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the
Morse
> > exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur
radio
> > is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.
>
> Which is really NOT a problem when one considers that radiotelegraphy is
the most
> basic radiocommunications mode which should be a required skill at SOME
minimal level
> for ham radio ops, at least at HF.Personally I believe it should be
required of all
> hams.

But the FCC doesn't. Do you believe ALL drivers should know
how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle? You never know when
that could be a life/death situation.

> Of course in this jimmy-gimme, plug-and-play society anything that
requires effort
> is taboo.

I see, it is back to the "effort" measurement again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2199. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:37:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2clfpldi1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31621

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020119131747.05494.00004706@mb-bh.news.cs.com...
> >Mark Pearsal wrote:
> >> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF
access
> >> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
> >college to
> >> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they"
(That'd be
> >> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
> >
> >A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
> >vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
> >if the car won't start during an emergency?"
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Actually Cecil, that IS a better analogy. But you forgot to mention that
it
> applies to the equestrian hobby, or perhaps a rescue worker trying to
"earn"
> (Key word alert!) additional endorsements who happens to work in rough
> forboding terrain. Not society at large.

When did they start requiring "endorsements" to ride horses?

> This happens to be about the radio hobby. So given your analogy, I'd say
> "earning" some additional "privileges" via a not-so-challenging 5-wpm is
quite
> reasonable.

Others don't.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2200. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:48:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2cmbg$8oa$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31622

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b3c8c09dfb57fe9896a2@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2at31jgk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16b23b7e11900d1998969d@news.earthlink.net...
> > > In article <a298ju$j0a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > >
> > > > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:MPG.16b2341231c8474698969b@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Hey Bill, what makes you ASSume that your nifty W8 contact had
not
> > > > > started out at 100 watts and increased the power because at 10am
on a
> > > > > business day in the US because the HF bands are not that busy, he
> > hadn't
> > > > > anyone of DX consequence come back to him?
> > > > >
> > > > > Are we to ASSume that you were there when he first started his cq
cq??
> > > >
> > > > Even according you that possiblity, he NEVER lowered his power
> > > > at all during the QSO...even after getting my comments as to him
> > > > being recieved as he was. Poor operating practice in my book...you
are
> > > > free to consider otherwise.
> > >
> > > What an arrogant SOB you are. He didn't even consider turning down
the
> > > power?? Have you a clue as to how most amps work? I think not. So he
> > > turns down the power, now most likely he has to retune his plate
> > > current, so instead of satisfying you MR BILL SOHL, keeper of all that
> > > is proper, he has to throw a carrier on the air, assuming since he is
a
> > > rotten operator that he does not have a dummy load and instead of
> > > hearing you critique him he is sending tones through the uncrowdedd HF
> > > on normal business days at 10am everywhere on earth?
> >
> > See comment below.
> >
> > > > > Just curious as I fail to see how you are in a position to pass
> > > > > judgement on anyone other than yourself (he who is without

> > sin..casting
> > > > > of stones..glass houses and all that other religious zeal stuff)
> > > >
> > > > If we all subscribed to that theory here, we'd have no discussion,
> > dialog,
> > > > debate. I have every right to pass judgement as I see fit.
> > >
> > > Glad you aren't in a position of power, lawyer etc. You'd be sending
> > > people to the chair for failure to say bless you after sneezing.
> >
> > You have no clue as to what positions I hold or have held...But,
> > once again your exagerration shows you up.
>
> You're an open book councilman, or is that ex-councilman. My
> exaggerations are nothing like yours MR DX, Mr Politician. Next thing
> we'll hear is how you saved your town from a fate worse than death.

You keep making these wild statements based on what experience
as to who I am and how I conduct myself in business, life, government.
Frankly...you don't have a clue about me.

> > > >You
> > > > are free to do so too...as you have making your own judgements
> > > > of me every time you reply. You are free to do so, as I am.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > > comments.
> > >
> > > yes, you are so far out of it, you are in orbit
> > >
> > > Thanks Bill. Keep on proving to the world that it best some people
> > > actually not try to prove they are clueless in some areas
> > >
> > > BTW are you aware that the ARRL fires up all its amps when they are
> > > broadcasting they're daily bulletins? I suggest you complain to Ed as
> > > this is a prime example of your guilt by Bill's rules of poor
operating
>
> Still ducking this issue huh Mr Bill? I have yet to see you accuse the
> ARRL of poor operating conditions. Their bulletins meet the very letter
> of the Mr Bill poor station operating laws as set down by the DX KING
> BILL SOHL!!!!!

Well, as Reagan would have said...there he goes again. It is
only YOU that makes the dumb DX KING reference.
Separatetly, the ARRL has a long, well established history,
and full knowledge/consent of the FCC to do what they do...and
the BIG difference is the ARRL transmissions are intended for
distribution globally. That's a far cry from a ham in Ohio

ragchewing with a ham in NJ.

> > I suggest that if the ability to go from 1500 watts to 100 watts is all
that
> > difficult for the ham, then that is a poor station setup. Most folks
seem
> > to
> > be able to just shut down the amp and run fine. The ham in
> > question was (IMHO) a poor op. You can come up with all
> > your ifs and maybes...it doesn't change what went down that day.
>
> CLUELESS AND CLUELESS and your humble opinion don't mean doodle if you
> haven't any idea as to what is involved. no ifs ands or big butts (sorry
> kim)

I'll state it again...IF a ham can't decouple the AMP operation without
a major bit of effort, then that is poor setup.

> Better yet Councilman, send a complaint to Riley. I am sure he'll act
> on it immediately seeing as you are such great friends with the FCC.
> Take along your pal from Pa, the two of you should be able to get the
> job done.

No complaint needed. Again, you exagerate the commentary beyond
the point of rational discussion.

> NAI (No amps international) An organization whereby people who have no
> amps are able to have those with amps involuntarily surrender them to
> the have nots so that can play big gun crunch em at any costs.

Well, there he goes agin....

> Sort of the like the Star belly Screeches and those that have no stars
> on thars
>
> I doubt it went anything like that Bill or perhaps we can call you Baron
> Munchuaesen (sic)
>
> Keep hanging on to that banana Bill and the monkeys keep screeching
> louder still. Keep dreaming those dreams Bill. Someday you might wake
> up to reality.
>
> Better yet, get on some of the DX reflectors and let those bad boys know
> just how you feel. I am sure they'll all flock to you POV. The DX-LIST
> run by KH2D is a perfect starting place. Go to it boy...pontificate
> away

Clearly your ability to discuss anything rationally is a test of
your faculties... you appear to be running off at the mouth so bad,
you may be headed for a breakdown... rather than see you come to any
ill health, perhaps it is time to just leave you to your own keyboard
games.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2201. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 20:52:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49de41_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31623

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:FG218.103678$fe1.1473403@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0201151159.335f7768@posting.google.com...

[snip]

> > The interesting question is - what then for NCI once their avowed
job
> > is done?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Then the rest of the agenda becomes clear and Squiggy and Cheers
have
> large swords protruding from their backs.

Since I've been refered to by the term "Squiggy" enough times
to infer that it's a derrogatory reference to me, would you care to
elaborate on just what the heck you think "the rest of the agenda"
is??? (Since there really ISN'T one, this should make interesting
reading ...)

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

```
iQA/AwUBPEncXZe+N6+q84HiEQJKwACghEUulhASOa9AHHpOp1Em+zl35uQAoMwZ
48SfNTffnvEl2/9qlYREOBmg
=eAW5
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2202. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 21:19:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49e4ac_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31624

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years
that only
> >the
> >abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in
the 21st
> >century. ;-)
>
> Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline
into modest
> growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

And I predict that the total elimination of Morse testing
will result in an even stronger upturn, without a decrease
in the quality of licensees. In fact, I wouldn't be at all
surprised to see a noticable INCREASE in the quality of
licensees as more technical professionals, not interested
in Morse, but interested in the "new things" begin to join in
increasing numbers.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEniw5e+N6+q84HiEQJDtgCeIKn6wIll02nfAnXGnRK9UQwJmPEAmwa9
tANkU3zqDdXAQmjUSq2xVRrw
=xg6+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2203. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 21:29:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49e72e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31625

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020117153220.17074.00000003@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 1/16/2002 11:15 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0201160915.3dd90952@posting.google.com>
>
> >Here are some numbers to think about
>
> SNIP
>
> >As of January 14, 2002:
>
> >Tech Plus - 84,957 (decrease of 43,903)
> >General - 138,687 (increase of 26,010)
> >Extra - 98,119 (increase of 19,369)
>
> I find it most interesting that the increase in Generals and
Extras almost
> (and I caveat the "almost") equals the degrease in Tech Plus'
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yes, Steve ... one could actually hypothesize from that
with reasonable basis that there were PLENTY of folks
who were technically ready, willing, and able to pass
the general and/or extra written tests, but were unwilling
and uninterested in jumping through the high speed
Morse "hoop."

I think "I told you so" pretty well covers it ... :-)

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International

Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ---
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnlJ5e+N6+q84HiEQIXPgCgovR/0Z0z7xWT4gZjC9POpBtjKJAAn34E
zwOqqNVyZX/mYmMljh1vBBbq
=o8Ri
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2204. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 21:46:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49eb36_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31627

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201182143290.2028-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Fri, 18 Jan 2002, Bill, KD0HG wrote:
> >On Thu, 17 Jan 2002 17:49:32 GMT, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >> Rather it shows a definite lack of a broader view of what amateur
> >>spectrum managment should be.
> >
> >
> >It's past time that ham repeaters get rid of carrier squelch in
congested
> >areas, they need to use mandatory tone or digital squelch and share
pairs
> >within the same metropolitan areas. For emergency situations, all
repeaters
> >could respond to a secondary PL tone common to all.
> >That largely changes the matter from one of under use of any given
frequency
> >pair to the under use of a given repeater, something no one would
care about.
>
> Where is this coming from? I live in what is probably the MOST
congested area
> (Los Angeles) and 98% of all repeaters in this area use PL/CTCSS as
part of
> their normal operations. This is across ALL bands where a repeater
pair is
> shared - and often where a pair isn't shared, a repeater still uses
PL (or
> some other access method such as DCS).

In the LA area (where I lived for 20+ years and was trustee of
an amateur repeater, builder and maintainer of several other
repeaters, builder and maintainer of a couple of packet nodes,
and spent some time in the commercial 2-way business,
including operating conventional repeaters and an 800 MHz
SMR), I can tell you from experience that on the most desirable
sites (covreag-wise) there are several hundreds of transmitters,
and it's virtually necessary to use CTCSS to keep intermod
products from sporadically keying your repeater, if for no other
```

reason. (and this takes into account that most of the commercial systems are using antenna combining systems with ferrite isolators and the works to keep the IM products down ... but a rusty beer can laying against the chain link fence around one of the buildings can, in such intense field strengths, create some "interesting" products ... I've seen 9th order and higher IM products keying repeaters in that sort of environment ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnpB5e+N6+q84HiEQK1rQCfY7P8qPexy5tk4WWEYo3+uW1gXHgAn2AN
mmk4xuQW5KhgZeASTf3Q3LAr
=RxjT
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2205. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:10:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49f0e8_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31628

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020117161036.02067.00000466@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <20020117070241.11131.00001877@mb-cr.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
[snip]
>
> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
users is
> allegedly very small.

But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
channel right away at any time of day or night ...

> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ... this causes
repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
be producively using them ... the "rub" is when someone else
who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
there first ...

The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
"tied" to a dedicated channel ...

In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
while maintianing a level of service that would keep
folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be

MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
could ever handle. The distinction between "voice channels"
and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
would disappear, because to the users, the system would
be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
"turf wars")

I'm sure that if Dick sees this, he will chime in dismissing
queuing theory and the Erlang Equation as just so
much hogwash, irrelevant to hams, just as he has persisted
in doing with Shannon's work ...

I guess his motto is "Never accept the possible benefits
of technology you're incapable of understanding."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnurpe+N6+q84HiEQLIzQCgkp09PGnUaBxABVS8Axjxr3V8o50AoOsf
HejP0i/ssaQ8Fem/lQY9pLy6
=g4Mo
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2206. He Dick (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:15:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49f239$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31629

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C499D4E.89220034@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities.

Dick,

I would state categorically that, where YOU are concerned,
there is DEFINITELY a SEVERE limit to the possibilities.

> It's a matter of being prepared for operation with the
> minimum level of technical support.

I'm sure that anyone depending on you had best be
prepared for a minimum level of technical support :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnv95e+N6+q84HiEQLUmgCfcfdlauxld3iJFyOOooFq4DGlZ+kAn2ub
DdMV1UT7c5dfjR4MiujX7cVJ
=VRQe
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2207. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:23:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49f40f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31630

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119140228.09750.00001816@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >(I wonder how many ARRL members are SK without the
> >ARRL knowing it? I suspect the number would be much
> >larger both in absolute terms and as a percentage.)
>
> Probably not many, Carl. Most ARRL members have to re-up, which
very few
> silent keys are apt to do. Could be a few life members whose family
still
> receives QST.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed,

I was talking "at any given moment" ... not long term ...
since folks seem to keep wanting me to tell them how
many SKs are in NCI's membership.

Let's see ... does anyone know if one of our members
passed away recently without telling me? (I certainly
hope none have, whether they told me or not ...)

The entire thing was, as I pointed out, not a "dig" at
ARRL in any way ... just using ARRL as an example
of another organization who will, from time to time,
unfortunately lose members to the actuarial facts
and may not, instantaneously, be aware of the loss.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEnxtZe+N6+q84HiEQIDDgCg8/RV7Zq4kmRrrBMYnQm/hv8HqQ0Anje9
/8c4T003SAKyhtiHPicmJiLu
=Qo78
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2208. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:34:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49f6b5_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31632

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119140515.09750.00001817@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
> >the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
> >those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
> >the ARRL's former policy on Morse???
>
> Hard to say, Carl. The ARRL position basically was not to expend
ARRL
> resources opposing the dropping of an international requirement for
code
> testing. That is a far cry from the all-or-nothing approach many on
both sides
> believe should be taken.
>
> And, to my knowledge, the ARRL policy on Morse code testing has not
changed on
> the national level.

However, if I am right and the fact that ARRL has (at least)
taken the position of not opposing the removal of Morse
requirements from the ITU Radio Regulations (which I think
the "smart money" would bet will result in the widespread
elimination of the related requirements in national rules,
since many administrations have already more or less
said as much) leads to an increase in ARRL membership
by those previously "disenfranchised" by the ARRL's
position on Morse, the entire demographic of the ARRL
will change ... and the ARRL will have to take notice of
that ...

I have occasionally thought that one of the smartest things
we as NCI might do would be to actively encourage every
no code/slow code ham in the US to join the ARRL right
away and elect a slate of directors who would PROMISE
in no uncertain terms to vigorously support the elimination
of Morse testing in US rules as soon as the ITU Radio
Regulations permit.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEn0epe+N6+q84HiEQLDVgCeO+FuUwscGiXLeKMzXv/AY1ow4nEAoJYW
44in3z+NmPZ7b1lAVh22IeH9
=5WbJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2209. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:36:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201192233280.5304-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31631

```
On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201162142110.4546-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On 16 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>> >Good points all, Jim. I agree with all of them. The biggest
>reasons that
>> >things are not moving forward are social, and, IMHO, groups like
>ARRL and TAPR
>> >need to do more to get the word out. Right now, hams think that
>"digital"
>> >means "computer-to-computer" or "keyboard-to-computer" and that is
>only one
>> >facet of the potential for digital operation.
>
>[snip]
>
>> For trunking, 900 is more likely than the others, since there is
>> equipment on the 800/900 business/public-safety bands for this.
>> However, cost is another issue.
>
>Used gear can usually be had at affordable prices, but there's a
>catch.
>
>The 800 SMR frequencies were set up with a 45 MHz "split" and
>many, if not most, commercial mobile radio units use a 45 MHz
>IF to simplify the synthesizer arrangements ... thus, it would be less
>than trivial to convert much such gear to work in the 902-928 MHz
>band (where such a split would not be possible), even if the front
>end resonators and other parts of the radio would easily tune up
>there.
>
>> For 2400, kill all the non-spread-spectrum part 15 devices off, and
>maybe SS
>> could work there. As I have noted earlier (last year), some
>cordless phones
>> operate up there as NON-SS, FM Wideband where wide means >1.5MHz.
>SS cannot
>> overcome such a signal unless it can hop outside of it.
>
>Gee ... I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that ... since the
```

>company I work for has a leading market share in the world
>in IEEE 802.11b products which run 11 mbps in the 2.4 GHz
>ISM band ...
>
>In fact, the notebook at the operating position
>that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
>switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
>802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
>802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
>connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
>devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
>and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
>other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
>ham shack, and electronics lab.
>
>I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
>(ROTFLMAO!)
>
>I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
>802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
>that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
>I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
>none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)

You have an understanding problem: I'm talking about AMATEUR SS on 2.4, not commercial. Commercial (i.e. part 15) SS is allowed to hop above 2450 (up to 2483.5 MHz) and thus get away from the places where these NON-SS [jamming] part 15 devices work. However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's measured in feet, not miles.

2210. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:45:19 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201192239170.5304-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31633

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020117161036.02067.00000466@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <20020117070241.11131.00001877@mb-cr.aol.com>,
>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>> writes:
>>
>[snip]
>>
>> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
>users is
>> allegedly very small.
>
>But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
>high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
>channel right away at any time of day or night ...
>
>> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
>own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
>with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ... this causes
>repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
>be producively using them ... the "rub" is when someone else
>who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
>there first ...
>
>The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
>telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
>COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
>to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
>"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
>that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
>served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
>is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
>of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
>"tied" to a dedicated channel ...
>
>In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be

>integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
>while maintianing a level of service that would keep
>folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
>MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
>could ever handle. The distinction between "voice channels"
>and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
>would disappear, because to the users, the system would
>be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
>"turf wars")
>
>I'm sure that if Dick sees this, he will chime in dismissing
>queuing theory and the Erlang Equation as just so
>much hogwash, irrelevant to hams, just as he has persisted
>in doing with Shannon's work ...
>
>I guess his motto is "Never accept the possible benefits
>of technology you're incapable of understanding."

Trunking works in some cases - where the receivership is a particular group. However, as we know, many amateurs belong to more than one group. Furthermore, even with that, we sometimes get "random QSO's" from those who were merely listening, etc... The problem here would be how to coordinate everyone's radio to follow the system in a way where multiple conversations can be tuned in. We never really got cooperation on the digital packet network - it's more like constant anarchy - so what makes you think such would happen here?

Comparision to the telephone system may not work. That is a specific case of one-to-one. Radio can be many-to-many, but with only one person being able to transmit at a time, it's more like one-to-many, and in that aspect, there might be something applicable, but it's clearly a more general case than the one-to-one (or point-to-point) that exists for telco's.

2211. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:45:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119174526.08903.00001074@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31634

>NCI will keep working towards our end
>goal.

We all know that NCIs goal is complete CBing of Ham Radio

2212. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 22:46:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119174653.08903.00001076@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31635

>I see, it is back to the "effort" measurement again.
>
>Cheers,

2213. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:03:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119180306.08903.00001083@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31636

>I disagree. I bet ARO's would gladly contribute to a "save the code"
>campaign,
>don't you? ;-)
>

Well I dont normally contribute, but I sure would on this. Ham Radio has
provided more than enough Free Hand Outs.

2214. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:05:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119180530.08903.00001086@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31637

>FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
>techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?
>

Who knows, maybe they might just surprise you.

2215. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:07:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c49fbc8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31930

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C499F91.32DE2B81@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> But the FCC doesn't. Do you believe ALL drivers should know
> how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle? You never know when
> that could be a life/death situation.
>
> > Of course in this jimmy-gimme, plug-and-play society anything that
> requires effort
> > is taboo.
>
> I see, it is back to the "effort" measurement again.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

I believe it's always been a measurement game. CW can be dressed up any way anyone wants to dress it up, but the core issue is always one of measuring how *much* someone worked to be a ham; and was a means to keep the "riff-raff" out of amateur radio, or so they thought--because it didn't work.

Kim W5TIT

2216. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:08:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119180838.08903.00001088@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31638

>First, I don't consider thousands of members in over
>60 countries, with active National Chapters in a number,
>to be "small."

Great numbers, NOW Prove it!!!!!!

2217. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:09:13 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119180913.26110.00000197@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31639

>NCI will keep working towards our end
>goal.

"End result" might be a more appropriate choice of words. The phrase "working toward a goal" kinda rings hollow re. NCI and this issue.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2218. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:10:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c49ff1b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 31644

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201192233280.5304-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> >In fact, the notebook at the operating position
> >that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
> >switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
> >802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
> >802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
> >connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
> >devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
> >and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
> >other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
> >ham shack, and electronics lab.
> >
> >I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
> >(ROTFLMAO!)
> >
> >I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
> >802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
> >that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
> >I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
> >none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)
>
> You have an understanding problem:

I would assert that perhaps YOU do instead ... as Ed
pointed out, it's a shame that amateurs are not availing
themselves of some of the techniques (and perhaps even
inexpensive equipment) that's been developed in commercial
circles ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...

> I'm talking about AMATEUR SS on 2.4, not commercial.

See the paragraph above ...

> Commercial (i.e. part 15) SS is allowed to hop above 2450
> (up to 2483.5 MHz) and thus get away from the places where
> these NON-SS [jamming] part 15 devices work.
```

In many cases (in larger networks with lots of access points
... that's base stations to many hams) the channels in the
lower part of the band are used equally with the upper part.
Probably the worst potential for interference in the average
amateur (residential) environment is the leakage from your
average household microwave oven ... which can be about
the equivalent to a 1W transmitter at 3 meters in the extreme.
Fortunately, that interference is generally concentrated in about
the middle 10 MHz of the 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM band so there
IS room for activity below it if it presents a problem.

> However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
> measured in feet, not miles.

Depends ... the range is up to about 1 km, depending on the
propagation environment (that's devices like notebooks with
PCMCIA client cards talking to an AP with, perhaps, something
like a "rubber duckie" ...) Now, at extreme range, or with
blockage, etc. the data rate might back off to as low as 1 mbps
in the extreme from the 11 mbps that's available when a decent
propagation path is available ... I cover my entire 5k sq foot+
house and then some with one AP (actually a "residential gateway,"
but the distinction is not significant to this discussion) at 11 mbps
everywhere ... it's been too cold to survey the coverage outside
very much ...

We also do building to building bridges with ranges into the
miles ... I recently did the link budget for a link from my house
to my employer's nearest facility ... about a 6 m path ... no
problem ... with standard output power of +15 dBm (about
32 milliwatts) and a 20" dish at each end, I had "link margin
to burn" for excellent reliability at 11 mbps ...

So, your assertion that ranges are "only in feet, not miles"
is incorrect.

This technology is inexpensive, reliable, and within the reach
of amateurs ... like Ed said, it seems a shame that more hams
aren't using it (or developing something like it ...)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPEn8z5e+N6+q84HiEQIFqwCeL2VcC5TS6MZw9cIrfzilQ5E9rwUAoOpW
Vi16BUjRAResPRCTA42/xgzC
=BGfT
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2219. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:12:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119181226.08903.00001091@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31640

>And something on the order of 5-10 individuals have
>done so over the past several years, out of thousands
>of members worldwide.

Prove there are thousands, or is this just another one of your lies?

2220. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:14:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119181446.08903.00001092@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31641

>And NCI's membership continues to grow steadily ... the
>establishment of National Chapters in other countries has
>had a particularly postive effect ... for example, membership
>in the Netherlands (which was already pretty good) doubled
>rapidly after the establishment of a National Chapter there
>(and continues to grow).
>

Prove it, ARRL can prove it, can you????

2221. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:18:45 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119181845.26110.00000199@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31642

>When did they start requiring "endorsements" to ride horses?

In order to pull "equestrian" duty and get a park detail in the NYPD, you'd better believe that you're required to become certified to ride horses. Call it an end"horse"ment. :-D BTW, I did say "perhaps a rescue worker." Did I not?

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2222. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-19 23:19:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119181918.08903.00001093@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31643

>The FCC and other national regulatory agencies know
> we're not as big as the ARRL and we've never tried to
>"BS" them that we are ...
>

Then prove your so called numbers

2223. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 00:08:49 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119190849.26110.00000217@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31645

>>FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
>>techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?
>>
>
> Who knows, maybe they might just surprise you.

Heck, even if they didn't...I'd take a 2:1 victory any day of the week. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2224. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 00:24:25 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.19.19.24.25.77003.32668@arrl.org>
Source record: 31646

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002 14:49:59 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> I certainly didn't mean the comment as being negative towards ARRL in
> any way ... if you took it that way, please accept my sincere apology.

I didn't take it that way, just disagrreed with it. :-)

>> >> Want to bet that we'll see some changes in ARRL directors as a
>> > direct
>> >> result of that one particular shift in position?
>> >
>> > Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position, the ARRL
>> > will see an increase in membership from those who perviously felt
>> > quite "disenfranchised" by the ARRL's former policy on Morse???
>>
>> I'd be glad to take both bets.
>>
>> Jon
>
> Jon ... don't you think that more hams will join ARRL now that it's
> taken a more "mainstream" position on Morse testing?

I'm not sure its position is particularly "mainstream," but in any case
you're assuming that there is some significant number of hams who are
witholding membership in ARRL because of code testing. I don't belive
that. The few who may join becuse of that change of policy will probably
be offset -- maybe more than offset -- by those who drop membership
because of it, but I believe the numbers to be small in both cases.

> (I do ... and that
> doesn't bother me at all.) I'd suggest you consult with Ed on the
> dangers of wagering with me :-)

Why, has he been harmed because of it? AFAIK, he ended up having a nice
dinner out of the deal, even if he did have to pay for it. Talk about your
win-win proposition! Besides, Carl, despite what you think, you're not
ALWAYS right. :-)

Jon

2225. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 01:05:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201200047250.5484-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31647

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
>> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >In fact, the notebook at the operating position
>> >that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
>> >switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
>> >802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
>> >802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
>> >connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
>> >devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
>> >and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
>> >other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
>> >ham shack, and electronics lab.
>> >
>> >I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
>> >(ROTFLMAO!)
>> >
>> >I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
>> >802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
>> >that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
>> >I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
>> >none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)
>>
>> You have an understanding problem:
>
>I would assert that perhaps YOU do instead ... as Ed
>pointed out, it's a shame that amateurs are not availing
>themselves of some of the techniques (and perhaps even
>inexpensive equipment) that's been developed in commercial
>circles ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
>lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...

Until recently, there was an impediment to such - the amateur rules themselves.
SS transmissions had to follow a specific sequence defined by the FCC, but
commercial equipment had no such restriction. The removal of the restriction
was so quietly done that hardly anyone noticed until some of us were made aware
of it here....

>> I'm talking about AMATEUR SS on 2.4, not commercial.
>
>See the paragraph above ...

But we are NOT permitted to avail ourselves to the equipment itself because it
GOES OUT OF BAND (see the paragraph you quoted below). Therefore, we can't

recognize the advantage of using this stuff with higher power, etc..., without substantial modification - which generally requires (besides skill) information (e.g. schematics) that the commercial manufacturers routinely DON'T PROVIDE.

>> Commercial (i.e. part 15) SS is allowed to hop above 2450
>> (up to 2483.5 MHz) and thus get away from the places where
>> these NON-SS [jamming] part 15 devices work.
>
>In many cases (in larger networks with lots of access points
> ... that's base stations to many hams) the channels in the
>lower part of the band are used equally with the upper part.
>Probably the worst potential for interference in the average
>amateur (residential) environment is the leakage from your
>average household microwave oven ... which can be about
>the equivalent to a 1W transmitter at 3 meters in the extreme.

Wrong. My kenwood TM-2400 (the 2.4GHz version of a TM-742) has never picked up any noise or even an increase in the noise floor from my microwave oven 30' (and two rooms) away from it when both are operating.

You also failed to address the part 15 device problem on 2.4 that is caused by devices that don't employ SS but instead hog >1.5 MHz for their FM modulation. I have seen a cordless phone where the FM signal is CONTINUOUSLY spread (not SS) as wide as about 7MHz (in that case, it operated FM from 2421-2428 MHZ) and read almost full scale on my radio over the ENTIRE range, except for the last 100Khz on the ends. Any wide FM receiver could demodulate the signal.

>Fortunately, that interference is generally concentrated in about
>the middle 10 MHz of the 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM band so there
>IS room for activity below it if it presents a problem.
>
>> However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
>> measured in feet, not miles.
>
>Depends ... the range is up to about 1 km, depending on the
>propagation environment (that's devices like notebooks with
>PCMCIA client cards talking to an AP with, perhaps, something
>like a "rubber duckie" ...) Now, at extreme range, or with
>blockage, etc. the data rate might back off to as low as 1 mbps
>in the extreme from the 11 mbps that's available when a decent
>propagation path is available ... I cover my entire 5k sq foot+
>house and then some with one AP (actually a "residential gateway,"
>but the distinction is not significant to this discussion) at 11 mbps
>everywhere ... it's been too cold to survey the coverage outside
>very much ...

That's still sufficient noise to jam an amateur signal where the transmitter is 30 or so miles away (or more), when the "noise" source is within a few miles of the receiver.

>We also do building to building bridges with ranges into the
>miles ... I recently did the link budget for a link from my house

>to my employer's nearest facility ... about a 6 m path ... no
>problem ... with standard output power of +15 dBm (about
>32 milliwatts) and a 20" dish at each end, I had "link margin
>to burn" for excellent reliability at 11 mbps ...
>
>So, your assertion that ranges are "only in feet, not miles"
>is incorrect.

Then why do manufacturers publish their ranges in feet. Also, your example is not consistent in that you are adding antennas (the dishes) at each end, which is NOT part of the part 15 spec because the devices, as approved, don't come with dishes, but instead, these flimsy antennas that are more like an HT's "rubber duck" than anything else.

>This technology is inexpensive, reliable, and within the reach
>of amateurs ... like Ed said, it seems a shame that more hams
>aren't using it (or developing something like it ...)

And as I have said, there are problems with that idea, as noted above. It is not "as inexpensive ... [or] within the reach of amateurs ..." as you say.

2226. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 01:10:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119201017.16072.00000344@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 31649

In article <20020119125516.05494.00004700@mb-bh.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>>One can get all of the safety questions wrong and still be given a license.

It shouldn't be that way.

>>One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license.

NOT TRUE!!!

One can pass the Morse test two ways:

1) Answer at least 7 of 10 of the questions correctly
2) Copy (as in "legibly decode") at least 25 consecutive characters correctly.
>
>Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute
>period of the 5-wpm exam?

Approximately 125.

5 wpm is 25 characters per minute. Times 5 minutes is 125 characters.

Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.

In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass in
the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2227. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 01:10:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119201017.16072.00000343@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 31650

In article <20020119131747.05494.00004706@mb-bh.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>>Mark Pearsal wrote:
>>> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
>>> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
>>college to
>>> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd
>be
>>> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
>>
>>A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
>>vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
>>if the car won't start during an emergency?"
>>--
>>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Actually Cecil, that IS a better analogy. But you forgot to mention that it
>applies to the equestrian hobby, or perhaps a rescue worker trying to "earn"
>(Key word alert!) additional endorsements who happens to work in rough
>forboding terrain. Not society at large.
>
>This happens to be about the radio hobby. So given your analogy, I'd say
>"earning" some additional "privileges" via a not-so-challenging 5-wpm is
>quite
>reasonable. Thanks Cecil.

Right on, Bert!

Add the following consideration:

The horse-riding test seems strange because we see so few horses on the roads nowadays. But imagine a society where the number of horses on the road is only slightly less than the number of cars on the road.

On the amateur HF/MF bands, Morse/CW is second only to SSB in popularity.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2228. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 01:10:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020119201018.16072.00000345@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 31648

In article <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Do you believe ALL drivers should know
>how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

Yes.

>You never know when
>that could be a life/death situation.
>
Exactly.

Of course I don't know any states that require it. But that doesn't mean the
states are infallible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2229. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 01:27:52 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020119202752.26110.00000244@mb-ck.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31701

>>Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute
>>period of the 5-wpm exam?
>
>Approximately 125.
>
>5 wpm is 25 characters per minute. Times 5 minutes is 125 characters.
>
>Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
>
>In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass in
>the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.

Truly a noble endeavor, eh Jim? Gotta eliminate the dreaded barrier of a test
for which 20% is a passing grade.

You know, I came into this fray fairly "unspoiled," but I can now understand
how "curmudgeons" are made.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2230. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 02:50:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A241E.58E2858C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31702

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020113121724.11155.00001252@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >The same as happens in most any organization...
> > >1. A nomination period is opened,
> > >2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
> > >3. nominations are closed,
> > >4. The mebership is asked to vote.
> > >
> > >NCI has been there/done that.
> >
> > Almost. As I recall, when the nominations wer e closed, there were
> no nominees
> > other than the existing Directors, so there was no need to vote. I
> see nothing
> > wrong with declaring unopposed candidates elected, mind you; it
> happens often
> > enough in elections. But, for at least the one election I know
> about, that is
> > what the outcome was. When did that happen? Has NCI held an election
> since that
> > time?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> Ed,
>
> You are exactly right ... there were no contested seats on
> the NCI board, despite the membership being duly noticed
> that nominations were open for any member who wished
> to serve on the board.
>
> Since there were no contested seats, the unopposed
> incumbents were declared elected

Lessee now, they declared themselve elected in the first place, then
declared themselves re-elected. What an "election" (sounds like Japanese

to me).

2231. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 02:52:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A24BB.F6701385@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31703

Bert Craig wrote:

> >>If Morse testing were simply treated equal to the testing of any other mode,
> >>there probably would never have been any opposition. The fact that the Morse
> >>exam is a stand-alone pass/fail exam while everything else in amateur radio
> >>is another stand-alone pass/fail exam is the basic problem.
>
> But it does not preclude getting an amateur radio license.
>
> >One can get all of the safety questions wrong and still be given a license.
> >One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license.
>
> Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute
> period of the 5-wpm exam? I'm guessing approx. 150. (...and that's being really
> conservative.) Let's divide 100 by 150 and multiply the result by 25, which is
> the amount one must get in a row within said 150 to pass. Kind of puts it in
> perspective, doesn't it. Gosh, I don't think I'd be too proud of fighting for
> the removal of an exam for which the passing grade was a 16.7. (Yuck!)

Very good point, Bert! All this garbage about "the only pass fail element" which requires only a 16.7 % pass rate to succeed, and still they whine like banshees!

Whatta bunch!

2232. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:03:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A2750.91DF8B91@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31704

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> > path loss increases with frequency, so I don't see
> >why you're advocating higher power for 40m and below ...
>
> Free space path loss increases with frequency because the aperture of the
> reference, typically either isotropic or dipole, decreases with frequency.
> Typically, however, the gain of antennas used in practice goes up with
> frequency. If the capture area of the antenna were to remain the same, loss
> does not change with frequency.
>
> Of course, ionospheric propagation is not free space, and losses tend to be
> higher at lower frequencies for HF. More important, the ambient noise levels
> tend to be higher on the lower frequencies than the higher.
>
> I see no reason that the 1500-watt limit needs to be changed. I can quite
> comfortably live with the present power rules, including the mandate to use the
> minimum necessary power.
>

Neither does the FCC, after their "power survey" of 12-15 years ago. They concluded that ther was very little difference in the problem created with 1500 watts and 100 watts, not enough to warrant any change in authorized power levels. Nothing changed about the rule that requires hams to use the minimum power sufficient to complete the needed communications, either. Of course they have never defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed, so it might cause some problems should they arbritarily cite an indivivual for that. For instance, they have no way of knowing in advance what recieving equipment is being uses. If hams used crystal sets in esperimental communications, there would be good reason for high power for local communications. Also testing of high power amplifiers might be good reason.

2233. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:05:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Etq28.381964$W8.14151611@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31705

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119201018.16072.00000345@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Do you believe ALL drivers should know
> >how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>
> Yes.
>
> >You never know when
> >that could be a life/death situation.
> >
> Exactly.
>
> Of course I don't know any states that require it. But that doesn't mean
the
> states are infallible.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

On the other hand, Jim, how many idiot carjackers that steal stick shifts and can't drive them would now succeed? How many Americans in Europe would be cluttering their hiways? When coming down the hill into Bath in England I remember well trying to find second left-handed in a really awful gearbox in an Escort; I am told I did a Goofy 'Ya-hoo-ee' while standing on the brake pedal.

But anyone who is clanking along in second behind a bozo in a Ford Exhibitionist sure as hell agrees.

Dick NBK

2234. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:07:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Jvq28.381967$W8.14151774@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31706

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020119202752.26110.00000244@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
> >>Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five
minute
> >>period of the 5-wpm exam?
> >
> >Approximately 125.
> >
> >5 wpm is 25 characters per minute. Times 5 minutes is 125 characters.
> >
> >Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
> >
> >In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to
pass in
> >the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
>
> Truly a noble endeavor, eh Jim? Gotta eliminate the dreaded barrier of a
test
> for which 20% is a passing grade.
>
> You know, I came into this fray fairly "unspoiled," but I can now
understand
> how "curmudgeons" are made.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Wait until you are accused of everything short of child molestation for
having passed the test.

2235. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:30:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A2D83.4E802CDA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31707

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> I guess his motto is "Never accept the possible benefits
> of technology you're incapable of understanding."

So you're another friggin idoit who insists on a super-complex
solution to a
all simple problems "just because we can". But we already knew that.

2236. Re: He Dick (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:33:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A2E41.25E02772@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31708

Hey dipschit, what could you possibly know about anything
non-dipschit?
The answer to that question has been clear from the beginning.

2237. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:36:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A2EF1.7346D501@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31709

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >Hash: SHA1
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020117161036.02067.00000466@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> In article <20020117070241.11131.00001877@mb-cr.aol.com>,
> >w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >[snip]
> >>
> >> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
> >users is
> >> allegedly very small.
> >
> >But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
> >high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
> >channel right away at any time of day or night ...
> >
> >> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
> >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
> >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ... this causes
> >repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
> >be producively using them ... the "rub" is when someone else
> >who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
> >there first ...
> >
> >The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
> >telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
> >COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
> >to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
> >"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
> >that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
> >served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
> >is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
> >of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
> >"tied" to a dedicated channel ...

> >
> >In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
> >integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
> >while maintianing a level of service that would keep
> >folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
> >MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
> >could ever handle. The distinction between "voice channels"
> >and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
> >would disappear, because to the users, the system would
> >be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
> >"turf wars")
> >
> >I'm sure that if Dick sees this, he will chime in dismissing
> >queuing theory and the Erlang Equation as just so
> >much hogwash, irrelevant to hams, just as he has persisted
> >in doing with Shannon's work ...
> >
> >I guess his motto is "Never accept the possible benefits
> >of technology you're incapable of understanding."
>
> Trunking works in some cases - where the receivership is a particular group.
> However, as we know, many amateurs belong to more than one group. Furthermore,
> even with that, we sometimes get "random QSO's" from those who were merely
> listening, etc... The problem here would be how to coordinate everyone's radio
> to follow the system in a way where multiple conversations can be tuned in. We
> never really got cooperation on the digital packet network - it's more like
> constant anarchy - so what makes you think such would happen here?
>
> Comparision to the telephone system may not work. That is a specific case of
> one-to-one. Radio can be many-to-many, but with only one person being able to
> transmit at a time, it's more like one-to-many, and in that aspect, there might
> be something applicable, but it's clearly a more general case than the
> one-to-one (or point-to-point) that exists for telco's.

Oh, don't confuse Squiggy the Dip with anything approaching reality, his
(twisted) mind is already made up.

2238. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 03:39:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A2F90.BC97C0F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31710

Bert Craig wrote:

> >When did they start requiring "endorsements" to ride horses?
>
> In order to pull "equestrian" duty and get a park detail in the NYPD, you'd
> better believe that you're required to become certified to ride horses. Call it
> an end"horse"ment. :-D BTW, I did say "perhaps a rescue worker." Did I not?

It'ss very revealing that such an anology should be used these days when
21st century Special Forces are acting as horse calvary in Afghanistan.

2239. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 04:09:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A4315.5616959C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31711

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:enPu00EnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > > > I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this
> inducement
> > would
> > > > > foster more experimentation in antenna design.
> > >
> > > Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
> > > would be just about impossible.
> > >
> >
> > Uh, yup, right, fer shure good buddy. How is it that you're
> > going to enforce power output, but you can't enforce ERP?
>
> Output power *could* be "enforced" by making it
> a prima facia violation to possess a transmitter
> capable of producing more than the allowable
> output power ... antenna gain is measurable,
> of course, but with more difficulty.

And just who would go around enforcing this fanstasy scenario of yours?
It is as if we'd all have to install governors on our cars so they
couldn't exceed the speed limit.

> > And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes
> > from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP
> > on the air, so all your high sounding bias against "big guns"
> > is just so much envy, it would seem.
>
> I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
> more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
> mentality ... I know *I'm* not jealous of that sort of behavior
> (and I don't believe Bill is either, though I don't want to
> put words in his mouth as he's perfectly capable of speaking
> his peace).

You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?

Dave K8MN

2240. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 04:11:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C4A438B.411DEDE6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 31712

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> > path loss increases with frequency, so I don't see
> >why you're advocating higher power for 40m and below ...
>
> Free space path loss increases with frequency because the aperture of the
> reference, typically either isotropic or dipole, decreases with frequency.
> Typically, however, the gain of antennas used in practice goes up with
> frequency. If the capture area of the antenna were to remain the same, loss
> does not change with frequency.
>
> Of course, ionospheric propagation is not free space, and losses tend to be
> higher at lower frequencies for HF. More important, the ambient noise levels
> tend to be higher on the lower frequencies than the higher.
>
> I see no reason that the 1500-watt limit needs to be changed. I can quite
> comfortably live with the present power rules, including the mandate to use the
> minimum necessary power.

Thanks for educating the engineer on the reality of the HF bands.

Dave K8MN

2241. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 04:21:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gq7pju4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 31713

On Sat, 19 Jan 2002 07:25:41 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>>>And whatever happened to ACSSB on VHF?
>>
>> It never worked properly. It was a toy on 20 meters where it was
>> developed by Tommy Lott, and neither Aerotron nor MACOM, the latter
>> under under the "leadership" of Tio Carlos, the ex-FCC Bureau Chief,
>> could never get it to work in a commercial setting on the "liberated"
>> 220 MHz channels taken from amateur use and set aside for it.
>>
>> It died a natural death.
>
>And if it's dead, then why can't we get 220-222 back?

Because it is being used by land mobile licensees for regional and
national networks with systems other than ACSB.

Contrary to popular legend, it was never "reserved" for UPS, and
in fact UPS rejected the ACSB vaporware system proposed to it in
favor of an 800 MHz FM system using tried-and-true technology from
The Big Em.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2242. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:10:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120001028.17580.00000458@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31714

In article <3c49e4ac_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020117070801.11131.00001880@mb-cr.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >Tell it to yer buddy in Allentown who's been preaching for years
>that only
>> >the
>> >abolition of code testing will permit the survival of ham radio in
>the 21st
>> >century. ;-)
>>
>> Well, the reduction in code-speed testing did turn a modest decline
>into modest
>> growth, looking at the numbers +- 2 years from the Big Date...
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>And I predict that the total elimination of Morse testing
>will result in an even stronger upturn, without a decrease
>in the quality of licensees.

What upturn?

Surf over to:

http://www.ah0a.org

and see what the trend in the US ham population has done since 1997.

From September 1998 to March 2001, the numbers have grown. Since March 2001 the
numbers have actually declined.

Details were explained in my reply to Ed.

>In fact, I wouldn't be at all
>surprised to see a noticable INCREASE in the quality of
>licensees as more technical professionals, not interested
>in Morse, but interested in the "new things" begin to join in
>increasing numbers.

That was predicted 11 years ago, and it didn't happen. Why should it
happen today?

Dropping the code test from the Tech did not give us a revolution in amateur VHF/UHF. Where are all the "technical professionals"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2243. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:10:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120001029.17580.00000459@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31715

In article <3c49f0e8_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
>users is
>> allegedly very small.
>
>But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
>high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
>channel right away at any time of day or night ...

Ya missed the point, Carl. Snipped it right out.

On the one hand, I read that there are areas where no repeater pairs are
available. On 2 meters, anyway. On the other hand, I read that the
assigned pairs sit idle 95% of the time.

My question is, if there are so many repeaters on the air already that
are so quiet, why do we need more?
>
>> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
>own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
>with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...

Maybe.

Let's say it's true. What of it? Repeaters don't build themselves. A group
puts up money, time, and effort to get a repeater on the air and keep it
operating. Often a repeater is the work of a few dedicated individuals,
supported by a larger group who simply pay the dues. It's natural
for them to want control over their machine and its frequency pair.

> this causes
>repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
>be producively using them ...

How does having a dedicated pair cause it to be idle?

The REAL problem, it seems to me, is that there are more repeaters
than hams who want to use them. I count 53 or so pairs from 146 to 148,
plus simplex. If they were all busy, I could see a problem - but they're not.

> the "rub" is when someone else
>who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
>there first ...
>
How often does this happen?

>The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
>telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
>COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
>to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
>"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
>that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
>served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
>is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
>of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
>"tied" to a dedicated channel ...

I know all that. The trouble is that amateur radio is not the
phone company.
>
>In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
>integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
>while maintianing a level of service that would keep
>folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
>MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
>could ever handle.

All depends on the demand distribution.

> The distinction between "voice channels"
>and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
>would disappear, because to the users, the system would
>be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
>"turf wars")
>
You're missing the point. Again.

It's clear that hams could build repeater systems that are much
more advanced than the current stand-alone, one-freq-in-
one-freq-out systems we have today - IF we wanted to. But
most hams don't want to because they don't see the need, nor the
possibilities.

And there are a few knotty problems to solve:

- Universal standard system (digital voice? trunking? multiple repeaters
linked?)
- How do things like APRS fit in?
- Who decides what repeaters go silent to make room for the new systems?
- Who pays for all the new rigs hams will need to use the new system?
- How are multiple groups coordinated on the same machines?

And lots more. Unlike commercial and military applications, ham radio is all
volunteers and there is little central comtrol or chain of command.

In other words, you gotta sell 'em, not tell 'em.

>I'm sure that if Dick sees this, he will chime in dismissing
>queuing theory and the Erlang Equation as just so
>much hogwash, irrelevant to hams, just as he has persisted
>in doing with Shannon's work ...

>I guess his motto is "Never accept the possible benefits
>of technology you're incapable of understanding."
>
Gratuitous insults noted. Do you think that approach will convince
folks to do it your way?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2244. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:12:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4A51C1.611E1B32@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31716

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >>FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
> >>techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?
> >
> > Who knows, maybe they might just surprise you.
>
> Heck, even if they didn't...I'd take a 2:1 victory any day of the week. :-)

Many coded hams are against the code testing requirement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2245. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:26:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2dkg0$sc4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31717

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119201018.16072.00000345@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Do you believe ALL drivers should know
> >how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>
> Yes.
>
> >You never know when
> >that could be a life/death situation.
> >
> Exactly.
>
> Of course I don't know any states that require it. But that doesn't mean
the
> states are infallible.

Jim,

NONE require it...not one at all. As long ago as 1957, NY state
didn't reuire any "manual gearbox" endorsements to be able to
or otherwise allowed to drive a manual car. For that reason alone I
took the driver's test using an automatic and then, having passed
the test, learned to shift manually on a different car.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2246. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:30:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2dko9$e05$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31718

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020119190849.26110.00000217@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
> >>FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
> >>techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?
> >>
> >
> > Who knows, maybe they might just surprise you.
>
> Heck, even if they didn't...I'd take a 2:1 victory any day of the week.
:-)

In the last ARRL poll, the margin of support by those that
"voted" was only about 60/40...and that included very few
nocode techs. The ratio has been tilting away from your
"victory" for years. When first proposed, the amateur ommunity was
almost totally opposed to nocode. Time do and time are changin'

AND...in the ennd, it isn't about voting anyway.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2247. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:34:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2dkvf$a3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31719

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020119181845.26110.00000199@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
> >When did they start requiring "endorsements" to ride horses?
>
> In order to pull "equestrian" duty and get a park detail in the NYPD,
you'd
> better believe that you're required to become certified to ride horses.
Call it
> an end"horse"ment. :-D BTW, I did say "perhaps a rescue worker." Did I
not?

Fair enough given the additional detail...but "rescue worker"
wouldn't routinely imply anything having to do with the NYPD.
Question...after 911, do you think anyone would have been challenged
for NOT having such an endorsement IF horses and riders may
have been needed in the initial response? Would someone in the
west be told...no, you can't go "off rode" to try and rescue someone
because we have to wait for a "qualified/licensed" horseman?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2248. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:37:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2dl55$ko5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31720

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020119201017.16072.00000343@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <20020119131747.05494.00004706@mb-bh.news.cs.com>,
> kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >>Mark Pearsal wrote:
> >>> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF
access
> >>> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
> >>college to
> >>> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they"
(That'd
> >be
> >>> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
> >>
> >>A better analogy would be requiring a horse riding test before a
> >>vehicle driving test. "Horses get through when cars can't". "What
> >>if the car won't start during an emergency?"
> >>--
> >>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Actually Cecil, that IS a better analogy. But you forgot to mention that
it
> >applies to the equestrian hobby, or perhaps a rescue worker trying to
"earn"
> >(Key word alert!) additional endorsements who happens to work in rough
> >forboding terrain. Not society at large.
> >
> >This happens to be about the radio hobby. So given your analogy, I'd say
> >"earning" some additional "privileges" via a not-so-challenging 5-wpm is
> >quite
> >reasonable. Thanks Cecil.
>
> Right on, Bert!
>
> Add the following consideration:
>
> The horse-riding test seems strange because we see so few horses on the
roads
> nowadays. But imagine a society where the number of horses on the road is
only
> slightly less than the number of cars on the road.

Yet even when horses outnumbered cars, there never was a
"horse license" needed. If you wanted to ride a horse, you
didn't need anyone's certification to just go do it.

> On the amateur HF/MF bands, Morse/CW is second only to SSB in popularity.

So? If someone is "fumbling along" at 2/3 wpm, what's the problem?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2249. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 05:42:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2dle0tp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31721

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4A241E.58E2858C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020113121724.11155.00001252@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> > >
> > > >The same as happens in most any organization...
> > > >1. A nomination period is opened,
> > > >2. nominations are accepted for a designated period of time,
> > > >3. nominations are closed,
> > > >4. The mebership is asked to vote.
> > > >
> > > >NCI has been there/done that.
> > >
> > > Almost. As I recall, when the nominations wer e closed, there were
> > no nominees
> > > other than the existing Directors, so there was no need to vote. I
> > see nothing
> > > wrong with declaring unopposed candidates elected, mind you; it
> > happens often
> > > enough in elections. But, for at least the one election I know
> > about, that is
> > > what the outcome was. When did that happen? Has NCI held an election
> > since that
> > > time?
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
> >
> > Ed,
> >
> > You are exactly right ... there were no contested seats on
> > the NCI board, despite the membership being duly noticed
> > that nominations were open for any member who wished
> > to serve on the board.
> >

> > Since there were no contested seats, the unopposed
> > incumbents were declared elected
>
> Lessee now, they declared themselve elected in the first place, then
> declared themselves re-elected. What an "election" (sounds like Japanese
> to me).

Dick,

Every organization I have been in simply declares people "elected" when
there
is no one in opposition. Are you in ARRL? They do the same thing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2250. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 11:39:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120063957.13095.00002576@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31722

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Lessee now, they declared themselve elected in the first place, then
>declared themselves re-elected. What an "election" (sounds like Japanese
>to me).

Sound more like American. In Burlington, CT, there have been a few elected positions for which only the Republicans offered a candidate. They were elected on that basis.

Sounds like you are fishing to try to find ways to make NCI look bad, Dick. If all you can find is that NCI membership saw no reason to contest any of the seats for the NCI Board of Directors, that speaks pretty highly of the organization, IMHO. In your zeal to be an NCI basher, you are unintentionally ending up being one of their strongest advocates. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2251. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 11:41:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120064116.13095.00002577@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31723

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Every organization I have been in simply declares people "elected" when
>there
>is no one in opposition. Are you in ARRL? They do the same thing.

Judging by some of the things Dick has said here, he thinks ARRL is "bad," too.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

2252. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 11:52:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120065238.13095.00002579@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31724

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
>own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
>with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...

Given the useage of amateur frequencies on most bands, such waiting is not at all likely. One would only have to wait if all available frequencies were in use.

>In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
>integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
>while maintianing a level of service that would keep
>folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
>MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
>could ever handle.

And, there is nothing that says that an entire Amateur band has to be so allocated. I believe that most of the "random access" parts of the band, ie weak-signal and satellite can and should be preserved as is. Things like spread spectrum could probably be overlayed on this scheme relatively easily, possibly by including FHSS systems in the dynamic allocation.

The real rub is that there IS a need for such a system, even in the relatively little used system of Amateur repeaters. Yes, there are ways that the coordination process should be improved so that little used pairs could be more easily deallocated to those who would really like to use them, but a system that dynamically allocated frequencies in the Amateur bands would allow everyone equal access to the bands in such a way that 99% of the time, everyone who wanted to use the band could be accomodated.

Yes, there ARE existing architectures that need to be considered and there would be pain in the changeover, but real-world radio goes through this, at much greater pain, when it has to. What is really ironic is that when such a need arises, industry competitors are able to create committees and find solutions, because they fully understand that having common standards is better than not having them, and that it often goes past merely benefitting everyone -- in many cases, having those common standards is a matter of survival.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2253. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:03:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120070343.13095.00002580@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31725

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Keep lobbying until it is ... although I don't anticipate that
>the FCC will find any reason to keep Morse testing once
>S25.5 is gone, since in the R&O in WT Docket No. 98-143
>the ONLY reason that they cited for keeping any Morse
>testing at that time was the existence of the treaty obligation
>under S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.

And do keep in mind that when a requirement to demonstrate knowledge of Morse code is removed from S25, that alone will not change the rules in each nation. A rulemaking process will have to occur in each country. To my knowledge, no nation has a "sunset" clause in its present rules.

It will be interesting to see what is put on the plate and by whom, and what the ARRL's position will be when the time comes. If I had my druthers, ARRL would make an NPRM that removed most code testing, but preseved a 5 wpm test for access to the lower 25 kHz of some HF bands and included some questions in the written on the content of sent Morse code. Given the "all or nothing" outlook of some members (in both directions!), however, I think it unlikely that the League will do that. My guess is that they will not file anything, but will offer comments on the NPRM proposed by the FCC or other organizations.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2254. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:15:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120071508.13095.00002581@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31726

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
>measured in feet, not miles.

Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W peak power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over that, the power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi gain would be about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of about 400 watts. Feet?

Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving tens of miles easily.

Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as is, by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power control, we can run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could relatively easily achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.

Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from harmful interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would not.

Carl, as I am sure you are still hanging on, in what way does the IEEE 802.11b protocol handle the encoding of the network name? If I name my local network W1RFI, I am wondering whether that is transmitted in such a way that it meets the FCC identification requirements? You are our resident IEEE 802.11 expert, so please fill us in.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2255. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:21:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120072118.13095.00002585@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31727

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>The removal of the restriction
>was so quietly done that hardly anyone noticed until some of us were made
>aware
>of it here....

It was discussed in QST, on the ARRL web page, in the ARRL Letter, in various ways through TAPR, made public through an FCC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking...

What else should have been done?

>But we are NOT permitted to avail ourselves to the equipment itself because
>it
>GOES OUT OF BAND (see the paragraph you quoted below).

>Therefore, we can't recognize the advantage of using this stuff with
>higher power, etc..., without substantial modification ...

Although the Part 15 allocation extends above the ham band, the Part 15 IEEE 802.11b devices I have used as W1RFI can be easily operated entirely within the ham bands simply by selecting the appropriate operating channel.

Why are you saying that these devices require extensive modification to use?

>And as I have said, there are problems with that idea, as noted above. It is
>not "as inexpensive ... [or] within the reach of amateurs ..." as you say.

I paid $200.00 for a pair of IEEE 802.11b cards. I found that selecting channel 1 made it very much within my reach to use as a ham.

Ed Hare, W1RFI

>

2256. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:23:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120072322.13095.00002586@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31728

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Well, then too, maybe they could cobble together a working
>vehicle with bits and piees found around the house :-)

I'm pretty sure I could, Bill. I have several "retired" vehicles around and a good set of oxyacetelyne torches. Not exactly pretty welding, but enough to meet the "cobbled together" criterion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2257. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:28:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120072837.13095.00002587@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31729

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>I have occasionally thought that one of the smartest things
>we as NCI might do would be to actively encourage every
>no code/slow code ham in the US to join the ARRL right
>away and elect a slate of directors who would PROMISE
>*in no uncertain* terms to vigorously support the elimination
>of Morse testing in US rules as soon as the ITU Radio
>Regulations permit.

I am not sure that there are enough non-ARRL NCI members to hold sway on that one.

It would be interesting to see NCI support a slate of Directors in some of the upcoming elections, though. :-)

I don't know the positions of most of the ARRL Board on code testing. Has NCI ever had some of its members contact their ARRL Division Director and ask him what his policy position actually is? That position could be made public, although it would be the ethical thing to tell the Director what use would be made of his position statement. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2258. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:33:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120073310.13095.00002588@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31730

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>antenna gain is measurable,
>of course, but with more difficulty.

On HF, I believe the "more difficulty" is enough to make it virtually impossible. Unlike AM BC antennas, where the fields at ground level are also the maximum fields, most HF antennas used by amateurs put more energy skyward that one would measure on the ground.

Considering that what one measures at low height (meaning any level below the antenna) is very much influenced by the characteristics of the ground and nearby scatterers, I don't think you can easily get correlation between a field measurement and the far-field at a particular angle skyward.

I see no compelling reason to change the existing rules on absolute maximum power levels. What reasons could be given to the FCC?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2259. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:35:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31731

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Of course they have never
>defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed, so it
>might

I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One never knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact might require.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2260. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:37:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120073701.13095.00002591@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31732

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Thanks for educating the engineer on the reality of the HF bands.

I believe that Carl doesn't have much HF experience. It is not surprising that he still has a few things to learn. He has helped me with some digital learning, so I was more than pleased to help him back. From his reaction, he didn't seem to mind having someone tell him something he didn't know.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2261. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:41:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120074125.13095.00002593@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31733

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> The NCTA folks believe that their view will prevail and the NCTA
>> folks believe they have compromised enough, by my read.

>Did you mean to say PCTA beilieve they have compromised enough?

A better choice of words would have been that the PCTA folks feel that the
FCC's decision has compromised their position enough.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2262. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:51:07 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020120075107.19385.00000702@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31734

>"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020119181845.26110.00000199@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
>> >When did they start requiring "endorsements" to ride horses?
>>
>> In order to pull "equestrian" duty and get a park detail in the NYPD,
>you'd
>> better believe that you're required to become certified to ride horses.
>Call it
>> an end"horse"ment. :-D BTW, I did say "perhaps a rescue worker." Did I
>not?
>
>Fair enough given the additional detail...but "rescue worker"
>wouldn't routinely imply anything having to do with the NYPD.
>Question...after 911, do you think anyone would have been challenged
>for NOT having such an endorsement IF horses and riders may
>have been needed in the initial response? Would someone in the
>west be told...no, you can't go "off rode" to try and rescue someone
>because we have to wait for a "qualified/licensed" horseman?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

I'll certainly say "fair enough" to you as well. Too bad this issue can't have a "halfway point" as well. I don't think the "all or nothing" treatment really serves anybody's purpose particularly well. Take it easy, Bill.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2263. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 12:58:57 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020120075857.19385.00000704@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 31735

>> Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute
>> period of the 5-wpm exam? I'm guessing approx. 150. (...and that's being
>really
>> conservative.) Let's divide 100 by 150 and multiply the result by 25, which
>is
>> the amount one must get in a row within said 150 to pass. Kind of puts it
>in
>> perspective, doesn't it. Gosh, I don't think I'd be too proud of fighting
>for
>> the removal of an exam for which the passing grade was a 16.7. (Yuck!)
>
> Very good point, Bert! All this garbage about "the only pass fail element"
>which
>requires only a 16.7 % pass rate to succeed, and still they whine like
>banshees!

I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.

>Whatta bunch!

Indeed.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2264. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 13:11:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2emp3$5bt$7@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31738
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"ANONYMOUS degenerate COWARD"
<Doggiedicksucker@RumprangingStheveieTunderFagBoy.net> wrote in message
news:a2dld0$80a$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a29a65$7sk$a@dosa.alt.net...
> > King of Lame Joanie the shiteater
> > > >
>
> Roger Wiseman,

Your owner, knows the only time you can get a hard-on is when you read one
of my posts. Is that why you beat your wife? That IS why, isn't it? No
wonder you have those domestic abuse criminal charges, isn't it, Arf Arf?
BTW, I'm not a "junior," since my dad's name wasn't Roger, you fucking
drug-addict.

--
Lllllllllllaaaaaaardasssssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd
"Friends of Hal Turner" <we.will@get.by.com> confessed his fatassed status
in message news:3c388ad7$1_3@news.teranews.com...
"SO WHAT IF I'M A LARDASS??<...> DOESNT IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?
SO WHAT IF I WEAR A SIZE 38-40 PANTS AND SIZE 18 DRESS SHIRTS?
IS THAT A CRIME? I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE ALOT BIGGER THAN ME....."

2265. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 14:14:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120091452.04424.00001895@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 31736

>Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 1/19/2002 12:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c49b8ac_2@news7.fast.net>

>
>"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020113100744.17515.00001165@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal
>> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>> >Date: 1/12/2002 8:37 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <3c404cb0_1@news7.fast.net>

>However, if you propose this seriously to the FCC, I'd
>recommend that you have a consierable amount of
>suitable solvent on hand to remove the liberal amount
>of tar and feathers I expect would be applied to you
>by those whose "God-given right" to run (the current)
>legal limit to talk a few miles on 80m (despite the
>"minimum necessary power" rule) you propose to take
>away :-)

Uhhhh...yup. You'd be right...too many people have too much money
invested in thier R.F. phallic proxies.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2266. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 14:22:35 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a2ek17htu1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 31737

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Of course they have never
> >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed, so it
> >might
>
> I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One never
> knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact might
> require.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

OK now let me ask you this. If you call CQ with 1500 watts and everyone that
hears your call has only 100 watts to answer you with, when they try to answer
you don't hear them. Did the 1500 watts do YOU any good, since you could
not establish contact "both ways"? BTW this isn't a flame just an honest question.

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Progress does not consist of replacing a theory that is wrong
with one that is right. It consists of replacing a theory that is
wrong with one that is more subtly wrong. Never attribute
to malice that which is adequately explained by stupidity.
-Hawkin's Theory

2267. A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 15:43:14 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C4AE592.6A0CDA7E@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 31740
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Y'know Wiseman, I normally don't give you serious material, because I know damned well that you don't really read what other people write, anyway. You are too busy "thinking" about what you are going to spew next.

But our one year anniversary on Usenet is fast approaching, and I want to let other people know how "Stagger Lee" got involved in the first place. So skip the rest of this post, Wiseman; it isn't addressed to you.

What got to me was the way that Wiseman treated women. He wasn't in a "flame" group, and one poor woman had no reason to expect the following vomit to issue from Wiseman's keyboard in message <985226467.3ab95ce327403@webmail.cotse.com> (I have only reposted the first couple of paragraphs):

====
> Subject: Re: An ARRL letter that League members can use
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.antenna, rec.radio.amateur.equipment,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2001-03-21

> SKANKY LESBIAN "Brenda Ann" <brendaannd@uswest.net> whined in message
> news:99b1v8tn1@news1.kornet.net...
> >
> > The first amendmant has never covered libel.
>
> OOOoooohhhhhhhh, we have ourselves a "jailhouse lawyer" in the yeast infected
> BrenDUH here....
> I'm sorry that you are a lonely, fat girl living in the mid west and only have
> corn husks to play with, if you know what I mean. Try and pick yourself up a
> life or some clue or something.
> Understand what you speak of before you open your hotdog laden puss up and
> start yapping. Really. You seemed like a nice little twat, at first, but all
> this talk of libel makes you sound pretty damn obsessed. I guess you were
> stalked or libeled or something earlier in life, and it sounds like YOUR
> problem. ...
====

At that time, COTSE was free and was one of his Usenet providers. COTSE also automatically inserted the X-No-Archive header so that its subscribers could hide from a Deja News search. This post is only available because Brenda Ann quoted it in her reply.

In another archived post, we find the following example of Wiseman's vileness:

====
> From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@MailAndNews.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
> Subject: RE: IS Ham Radio Dying?
> Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 16:02:47 -0500
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> Message-ID: <3AB22B6D@MailAndNews.com>
> X-InterChange-Posted-By: kc8jbo@MailAndNews.com
> Sender: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@MailAndNews.com> ...
>
> Go FUCK yourself, LESBIAN! You don't like what I post, DON'T READ IT,
> learn to use a fucking killfile, you IDIOT. You can't even remove your
> lbulldyke lover's dildo from your skanky cunt.
>
> 73 de Roger / KC8JBO
> EM99 |
> Yaesu FT-920 | Inverted vee @ 40 Feet
> Yaesu FT-90R | Copper J-pole
====

These were far from the only two instances of Wiseman engaging in vile and harassing posts in newsgroups where such posts are not expected or welcome. He had been driven from the so-called "flame" newsgroups -- places where such posts *are* expected -- and so he came looking for victims in the radio news groups. Such posts violate the terms of service of the vast majority of Usenet providers, although the owner of COTSE seemed to have the laughable notion that what Wiseman was doing was exercising freedom of speech. Slander is of course not protected speech in the US, but the concept that even free speech has its limits seemed to be impossible for Steve Gielda -- COTSE's owner -- to grasp.

I indeed complained publicly in one of the newsgroups that the owner of COTSE regularly read, and saw to it that Wiseman's vile posts showed up in that news group too. When Gielda and his supporters complained, I suggested that they take their own advice and use filters.

When the shoe is on the other foot, it often pinches.

Eventually, Gielda started charging for COTSE access and Wiseman of course quit using COTSE. At that point, his posts began to moderate just a little, because he knew that he could lose his Usenet accounts with the other providers if he continued. When his confidence returned and he resumed his harassment, I saw to it that the alt.flame regulars knew about his posts.

The rest is history.

Wiseman now has his own news group (alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman), two "special" web pages, and a whole series of awards for 2001, all provided by the people of the flame news groups. He has been revealed as a fool,

and is now a laughing stock of Usenet.

Soy Yer Nora, Woger Dimwit. You are getting almost everything you deserve.

[Any followups by Wiseman will be ignored.]

2268. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 15:43:19 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uRw$nkcoBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31739

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Uhhhh...yup. You'd be right...too many people have too much money
> invested in thier R.F. phallic proxies.
>

No, I don't have nearly enough money invested yet.

2269. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 16:12:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4aede3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31931

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:a2ek17htu1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Of course they have never
> > >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed,
so it
> > >might
> >
> > I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One
never
> > knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact
might
> > require.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> OK now let me ask you this. If you call CQ with 1500 watts and everyone
that
> hears your call has only 100 watts to answer you with, when they try to
answer
> you don't hear them. Did the 1500 watts do YOU any good, since you could
> not establish contact "both ways"? BTW this isn't a flame just an honest
question.
>
> --
>
> '73' From KB9TMP
> NCI-2385
>

Well, you'd know that they heard you. But, that it did any good is
obviously questionable.

Kim W5TIT

2270. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 16:20:59 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b4feb248f434a09896a3@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31741

```
In article <3C4A4315.5616959C@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:enPu00EnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > > I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this
> > inducement
> > > would
> > > > > foster more experimentation in antenna design.
> > > >
> > > > Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
> > > > would be just about impossible.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Uh, yup, right, fer shure good buddy. How is it that you're
> > > going to enforce power output, but you can't enforce ERP?
> >
> > Output power *could* be "enforced" by making it
> > a prima facia violation to possess a transmitter
> > capable of producing more than the allowable
> > output power ... antenna gain is measurable,
> > of course, but with more difficulty.
>
> And just who would go around enforcing this fanstasy scenario of yours?
> It is as if we'd all have to install governors on our cars so they
> couldn't exceed the speed limit.
>
> > > And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes
> > > from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP
> > > on the air, so all your high sounding bias against "big guns"
> > > is just so much envy, it would seem.
> >
> > I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
> > more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
> > mentality ... I know *I'm* not jealous of that sort of behavior
> > (and I don't believe Bill is either, though I don't want to
> > put words in his mouth as he's perfectly capable of speaking
> > his peace).
```

>
> You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?
>
> Dave K8MN

perhaps someone who can't break through on or who had been chastised for continually using his last 2. You'd think with all the engineered skills and equipment he should have he's have the most efficient antenna system this side of the WVa Big Dish

Perhaps he needs an amp (what do you think Bill?)

CS reminds me of the people who complain that a particular operation was one of the worst ever only to discover he never worked them.

2271. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 17:01:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4af947_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31934

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120072322.13095.00002586@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Well, then too, maybe they could cobble together a working
> >vehicle with bits and piees found around the house :-)
>
> I'm pretty sure I could, Bill. I have several "retired" vehicles around
and a
> good set of oxyacetelyne torches. Not exactly pretty welding, but enough
to
> meet the "cobbled together" criterion.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ever heard of a CW rig from the Altoids(TM) tins? There's a fella,
K4IWL/Len, who makes them. I haven't seen him lately to ask him, but they
now have these even tinier Altoids tins that I wonder if anyone will try to
build a rig into...

Kim W5TIT

2272. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 17:16:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4afcc6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31932

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Of course they have never
> >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed,
so it
> >might
>
> I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One
never
> knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact might
> require.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R, let's say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a contact--that would be 50W. If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no more than 25W. This would be on a vertical, as that's all we've got right now. If I don't make contact, I keep going up, say 1/4 more of my rig's capability, until I am at full power output, which is 100W (I think--it's a Yaesu 890FT/AT). If I don't make contact then, I just drop it.

Now, mobile, with my 25W rig, I'd just start with all it's capable of, assuming that a mobile rig can't be relied upon to make contact with less than 25W. To me, that is "wrong" to do, but I would do it. The reason I think it's wrong is I think to truly follow the spirit of the R&R, I should attempt with only 1/2 of the rig's output level.

In both cases, I would drop power levels back--checking RST with my contact--until we could not maintain our desired contact duration.

On 2M/70cm I am really, really bad. Unless I am operating simplex (my preferred communication mode), I never play with my power setting for just everyday communicating. Most of the repeaters I am going through are quite some distance from where I am usually driving (however, I don't even change power level when I am right underneath the repeater antenna), so I don't minimize power, I leave it at the rig's "High" power setting. Now, for some reason, I do like to cut power back to Medium when I am on simplex, and Low if I am right near who I am talking to. I think I got in the habit of doing that because I figure that simplex changes the parameters of operation to

where a whole bunch more could be on frequency, not interfering with each other, if power levels are regarded and experimented with. Of course, squelch settings also come into play on simplex. I don't know how many times I've advised cantankerous operators to turn back their squelch setting if they can hear me on simplex in Arlington (more than 25 miles away)! :)

Kim W5TIT

2273. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 17:20:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4afde5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31933

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b4feb248f434a09896a3@news.earthlink.net...
> > Dave Heil said:
> >
> > You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> perhaps someone who can't break through on or who had been chastised for
> continually using his last 2. You'd think with all the engineered
> skills and equipment he should have he's have the most efficient antenna
> system this side of the WVa Big Dish
>
> Perhaps he needs an amp (what do you think Bill?)
>
> CS reminds me of the people who complain that a particular operation was
> one of the worst ever only to discover he never worked them.

Jay, it really sounds to me like you've got then problem. What is it?

Kim W5TIT

2274. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 17:41:22 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <37749ebea6dad1a7e7643b48fe1719a7.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31742

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote

> I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
> more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
> mentality ...

I have never encountered any such "mentatlity" among
serious amateurs, but it is beside the point anyhow,
since your receiver can't distinguish from interference
("ERP") caused by antenna design, amplifier design, or
mother natures design of the existing propagation.

> Output power *could* be "enforced" by making it
> a prima facia violation to possess a transmitter
> capable of producing more than the allowable
> output power.

Then possession of an automobile capable of moving
faster than the speed limit would also be illegal,
or possession of more than the amount of alchohol
needed to raise your blood level above .08% would
be a violation, or having more bait than needed to
catch your legal limit of walleyes would be a crime?

Go join Robeson in the "control freak" newgroup.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2275. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:13:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2f4uqsvq1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31743

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120063957.13095.00002576@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Lessee now, they declared themselve elected in the first place, then
> >declared themselves re-elected. What an "election" (sounds like Japanese
> >to me).
>
> Sound more like American. In Burlington, CT, there have been a few
elected
> positions for which only the Republicans offered a candidate. They were
> elected on that basis.

In many (all?) locales, there is still a November
election because people can "write-in" at the
last minute. It rarely works. Organizations, however,
usually (at least all I have ever
seen) simply declare nominations closed and
the lone nominees are declared elected.
For organizations, that saves much $$$,
time, etc.

> Sounds like you are fishing to try to find ways to make NCI look bad,
Dick. If
> all you can find is that NCI membership saw no reason to contest any of
the
> seats for the NCI Board of Directors, that speaks pretty highly of the
> organization, IMHO. In your zeal to be an NCI basher, you are
unintentionally
> ending up being one of their strongest advocates. :-)

Good point Ed... Thanks Dick :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2276. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:35:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4B1BF1.E364B390@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31744

Bill Sohl wrote:
> So? If someone is "fumbling along" at 2/3 wpm, what's the problem?

Staying awake through a zero?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2277. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:39:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120143904.14236.00002089@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 31745

From: "K0HB" k0hb@qwest.net

>> I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
>> more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
>> mentality ...

>I have never encountered any such "mentatlity" among
>serious amateurs,

Have you not spent much time in contests or DX pileups? :-)

>Go join Robeson in the "control freak" newgroup.

I don't know as I would go that far. Carl was not pushing to see the power limits changed, just made an off-the-cuff comment that he see his way clear to support such a change. I see no such need, nor do I believe a compelling case could be made to the Commission.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2278. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:41:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120144159.14236.00002091@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 31746

From: "KB9TMP" NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com

>OK now let me ask you this. If you call CQ with 1500 watts and everyone that
>hears your call has only 100 watts to answer you with, when they try to
>answer
>you don't hear them. Did the 1500 watts do YOU any good, since you could
>not establish contact "both ways"?

Under the circumstances, no, it didn't do me any good. Those circumstances are only somewhat likely. IMHO. If you are running 1500 watts, in most cases you will hear the 100 watt station. He/she will be lousy copy, but you will hear them. I have found an interesting phenomenon in most contests -- many of the participants only answer CQs if they are loud.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2279. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:44:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120144404.14236.00002092@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 31747

From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)

>> Very good point, Bert! All this garbage about "the only pass fail element"
>>which
>>requires only a 16.7 % pass rate to succeed, and still they whine like
>>banshees!

>I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
>characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.

>>Whatta bunch!

>Indeed.

Not a very good analysis, guys. That "20%" cannot be "any" 20%, you must get
100% of 25 characters in a row.

Must be that new math, but I didn't think Dick would fall for it. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2280. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:46:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120144600.14236.00002093@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 31748

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>My question is, if there are so many repeaters on the air already that
>are so quiet, why do we need more?

What reasons do you think those that want to put up repeaters, but cannot because there are "no pairs available" might have for wanting to do so. Although it is not certain that activity would go up if more repeaters were allowed, but I feel that it would.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2281. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:48:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120144813.14236.00002095@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 31749

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Jim ... since Ed likes CW and I don't, it seems only fair that we
>should be able to eliminate Dick (who also likes CW) from the
>equation in order to keep balance in the universe :-)
>(What do you think, Ed?)

Now, that comes dangerously close to making it appear that you want to limit CW use in some way, Carl. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2282. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:49:14 UTC
From: JR <radiobufj@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net>
Source record: 31750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

2test KC8JBO wrote:

> BTW, I'm not a "junior," since my dad's name wasn't Roger, you fucking
> drug-addict.

That is true, woger doesn't know who is father was.

2283. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 19:52:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <keF28.111135$fe1.1958028@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31751
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Why is this crap crossposted to rram???

"JR" <radiobufj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net...
>
>
> 2test KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > BTW, I'm not a "junior," since my dad's name wasn't Roger, you fucking
> > drug-addict.
>
> That is true, woger doesn't know who is father was.

2284. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 20:46:17 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2fc92cra2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well-documented Repeater Jammer"JizzswallowingRecepticle"
<radiobufj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net...
>
>
> 2test KC8JBO wrote:
^^^^^^^

Too stupid to spell anything right, repeater jammer?

> > BTW, I'm not a "junior," since my dad's name wasn't Roger, you fucking
> > drug-addict.

So you admit you are a drug addict?

> That is true, woger

Nice of you to admit it, repeater jammer.

>doesn't know who is father was.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

"Who is father was?" Learn to spell, repeater jammer. We all know you don't
know who your father is.

--
Illiterate repeater jammer "JR" slobbered the following EBONICS just like he
does in his crack-house neighborhood in 3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net:

"<...>doesn't know who is father was."

2285. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 20:51:00 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2fcfg$d5q$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:keF28.111135$fe1.1958028@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Why is this crap crossposted to rram???

It can all be attributed to "JR" <radiobufj@mailcity.net> .

--
Illiterate repeater jammer "JR" slobbered the following EBONICS
just like he does in his crack-house neighborhood
in 3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net:

"<...>doesn't know who is father was."

2286. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 21:19:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201202116570.7029-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31752

On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>And, there is nothing that says that an entire Amateur band has to be so
>allocated. I believe that most of the "random access" parts of the band, ie
>weak-signal and satellite can and should be preserved as is. Things like
>spread spectrum could probably be overlayed on this scheme relatively easily,
>possibly by including FHSS systems in the dynamic allocation.

I don't believe that spread-spectrum and weak-signal are compatible. Weak signal cannot toleratea rise in the noise floor (such as caused by SS) very well, so I understand from those who do weak signal. Satellite, due to its nature, approaches weak signal's intolerance for a noise floor increase.

Or is that all propaganda by the weak signal people?

>The real rub is that there IS a need for such a system, even in the relatively
>little used system of Amateur repeaters....

2287. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 21:29:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201202120340.7029-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31755

On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
>>measured in feet, not miles.
>
>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W peak
>power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over that, the
>power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi gain would be
>about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of about 400
>watts. Feet?

Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external equipment
as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't regularly done.....

>Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving tens of miles
>easily.
>
>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as is,
>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products
>fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power control, we can
>run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could relatively easily
>achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.

Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS device? You
must be making some sort of assumption I am not.

>Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from harmful
>interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would not.

Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL SWD
convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a JOKE on
2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already exist....

>Carl, as I am sure you are still hanging on, in what way does the IEEE 802.11b
>protocol handle the encoding of the network name? If I name my local network
>W1RFI, I am wondering whether that is transmitted in such a way that it meets
>the FCC identification requirements? You are our resident IEEE 802.11 expert,
>so please fill us in.

That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
- To stay below 2450MHz, and
- To identify (in mode)(*)

(*) - Due to its frequency hopping, I don't believe that ID'ing in morse code
would be practical (or valid) unless the code is slow enough that every "dot"

happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the hop pattern. Id'ing in mode would have to occur. However, as an unrelated problem, how would another amateur be able to tell the difference (from remote - just by the signal) between a modified system as amateur vs. part 15 (its original origins)? Not everyone has a spectrum analyzer, etc....

2288. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 21:31:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020120163125.12423.00002623@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31756

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>I don't believe that spread-spectrum and weak-signal are compatible. Weak
>signal cannot toleratea rise in the noise floor (such as caused by SS) very
>well, so I understand from those who do weak signal.

I agree, for the most part, although there are times when an SS signal can exist in a block of spectrum and not be audible at all to those that are using that spectrum for narrowband modes. A system to dynamically allocate narrowband users in a block of spectrum would be easier to manage, IMHO.

>Or is that all propaganda by the weak signal people?

Why would they want to make something up? I agree with the general idea that SS and weak-signal modes are not compatible, and, depending on how the SS is set up, either can be the loser.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2289. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-20 23:29:38 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#RnpLpgoBHA.1332@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 31757

"W1RFI" wrote

> I have found an interesting phenomenon in most contests -- many of the
> participants only answer CQs if they are loud.

Ignoring for the moment the obvious "You have no way to know what is loud at another station", the 'many' stations you mention obviously aren't too serious about contesting if they are that choosy. A good contester answers everything he can copy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2290. Re: ββββββββββββββββββ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 00:03:22 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OUiaB8goBHA.428@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31758

"□□□□" <hxbx@21cn.com> wrote in message
news:a2f09o$1c5n$665@news.cz.js.cn...
>
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ
> ββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββββ

That's easy for you to say!

2291. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 00:03:34 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2fmjjurd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600

TexASS turd and degfenerate child raper
"Stagger 'kiddie porn maker with his own grandkids' Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3C4B5770.D09E6886@houston-hunks.com...
> Rev Turd Fredericks wrote:
>
> > That is irrelevant. What Stagger Lee doesn't understand is that you
> > can't slander or libel an annonymous entity. Since he is annonymous,
>
> I Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger 'choad swallower' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

And SPANKTARD Lee: SPANK!

--
Faggot Stagger Lee confesses he and his family get this way when the
prospect of
licking testicles (something he doesn't have) is made available in
< 12417$Y17.5988@houston-hunks.com>:

"We are overjoyed."

Faggot Stagger Lee, who fails to "grasp" the concept that "slander" is
spoken and "libel" is written, would be better served if he just stuck
to grasping nutsacks, incoherently babbled
in <3C4AE592.6A0CDA7E@houston-hunks.com>:

"COTSE seemed to have the laughable notion that what Wiseman was doing
was exercising freedom of speech. Slander is of course not protected
speech in the US, but the concept that even free speech has its limits
seemed to be impossible for Steve Gielda -- COTSE's owner -- to grasp."

2292. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 01:25:45 UTC
From: JR <radiobufj@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C08E6.32518042@mailcity.net>
Source record: 31760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> Why is this crap crossposted to rram???
>
> "JR" <radiobufj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3C4BBA09.752A75D6@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > 2test KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > > BTW, I'm not a "junior," since my dad's name wasn't Roger, you fucking
> > > drug-addict.
> >
> > That is true, woger doesn't know who is father was.

Because 2test woger cross posted it there to begin with.

2293. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 02:02:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020120210215.28043.00000075@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31761

In article <3C465630.C6D1C370@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>She could have enjoyed a slinkier image as Ayn Olivetti.
>
>Dave K8MN

Reminds me of a joke (one I just made up). What do you lubricate
a typewriter with?

Olivetti Oil.

Groan!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2294. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 02:02:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020120210216.28043.00000076@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31762

In article <20020119084253.12409.00002149@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> I would suggest that it is almost NEVER the circumstances
>> whereby 1500 watts is reasonable when first getting on the
>> air.
>
>I think that someone calling CQ is well warranted to use 1500 watts. It is
>what happens once contact is made that determines whether the law to use the
>mininumum necessary power is followed.

Ed:

Interesting. In my own personal experience, I would tend to think that using 1500 watts when first calling CQ, or at any other time, is virtually NEVER warranted. Unless, of course, one was using an inherently inefficient mode such as SSB…then you may need it! I have used nothing but CW and a handful of digital modes in the last 9 years of HF operation -- made a couple of thousand QSO's covering the globe, using a maximum of 25 watts of power and indoor dipoles for 20 thru 10 meters. If the maximum power output levels for amateur HF were ever reduced to the levels being discussed, my question wouldn't be how could I go down to those levels, but when would I ever come UP to those levels? I may never get there at all!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Brains -- not brawn!

2295. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 02:28:54 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2g03n$hj9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ANONYMOUS COWARD and repeater jammer
"Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobufj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C4C08E6.32518042@mailcity.net...
> Because 2test woger cross posted it there to begin with.

Liar. You crossposted it to begin with, IDIOT.

2296. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 02:41:37 UTC
From: hello_nasty@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <7578ddcf.0201201841.13e7562c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31763

> That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
> the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
> modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
> - To stay below 2450MHz, and
> - To identify (in mode)(*)
>
> (*) - Due to its frequency hopping, I don't believe that ID'ing in morse code
> would be practical (or valid) unless the code is slow enough that every "dot"
> happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the hop pattern.
> Id'ing in mode would have to occur. However, as an unrelated problem, how
> would another amateur be able to tell the difference (from remote - just by the
> signal) between a modified system as amateur vs. part 15 (its original
> origins)? Not everyone has a spectrum analyzer, etc....

Here is an example of ID'ing via ICMP packets on a wireless network:
http://www.gbppr.org/pingid.html

2297. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 03:55:18 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a2g3f6$1sh1$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 31765

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
>>>measured in feet, not miles.
>>
>>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W peak
>>power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over that, the
>>power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi gain would be
>>about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of about 400
>>watts. Feet?
>
>Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external equipment
>as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't regularly done.....

No. Optional equipment can be approved separately for use with the
transceiver and this is done quite often. This allows third parties to
produce the optional equipment, which I guess is good for competition.
For example, see http://www.hyperlinktech.com

I used 24 dBi antennas and pole-top external amplifiers (to compensate
for the coax losses) to support an 802.11 link over 4 miles at my old
house. This worked fine, in fact it was overkill since it continued to
work even after the power supply for one of the amplifiers fried itself.

>>Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving tens of miles
>>easily.
>>
>>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as is,
>>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products
>>fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power control, we can
>>run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could relatively easily
>>achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.
>
>Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS device? You
>must be making some sort of assumption I am not.

He's talking about IEEE 802.11b devices. For the U.S. the standard divides
the band into 11 overlapping channels at 5 MHz spacing, each about 20 MHz
wide, and you pretty much always get to pick which channel to use. Channels
1 (center at 2412) through 6 (center at 2437) will keep it within the amateur
band. Note also that 802.11b is DSSS, and at 11 Mbps in a 22 MHz channel
isn't getting much coding gain either. Since it copes with noise by
falling back in speed to increase the coding gain, using this stuff to
best advantage in the presence of other 2.4 GHz devices requires picking

frequencies carefully. For my house I ended up on channel 6, at the middle
of the band, since going much higher or lower caused grief to my Siemens
cordless phones. This, of course, maximizes my exposure to interference
from the microwave oven, but this only causes trouble within about 10'
of the oven.

Unfortunately 802.11 FHSS equipment, which is lower speed but more
robust, will by default hop across the entire band. It may be possible
to reduce this at the programming interface to the chip (the hardware
must support reduced bandwidth hopping sequences if it is to be sold
in countries where the 2.4 GHz band isn't as wide as in the U.S., the
only question is whether it can be told to do this at lower frequencies),
so to use these you'd need to know something about the hardware.

>>Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from harmful
>>interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would not.
>
>Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL SWD
>convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a JOKE on
>2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already exist....

I don't get it. 2.4 GHz is a shared band and will never be quiet,
but the Part 15 devices themselves seem to cope within their constraints
and that includes links that extend for miles. It may be you need to
use modulation and coding as robust as the Part 15 devices do, and it
may be that it is way too noisy to support a 60 mile link at 1/4 Watt,
but as an amateur you aren't limited to 1/4 Watt either. It reduces
to an engineering problem.

>>Carl, as I am sure you are still hanging on, in what way does the IEEE 802.11b
>>protocol handle the encoding of the network name? If I name my local network
>>W1RFI, I am wondering whether that is transmitted in such a way that it meets
>>the FCC identification requirements? You are our resident IEEE 802.11 expert,
>>so please fill us in.
>
>That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
>the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
>modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
> - To stay below 2450MHz, and
> - To identify (in mode)(*)

I agree that modifying the hardware itself is a problem (in high volume
hardware it is usually a couple of ASICs anyway, so even with full
documentation you won't be doing much with them they weren't designed
to to in the first place), but that doesn't mean they aren't useful as
a system component. What comes out of the RF connector on these devices
is well and fully defined by the standard, for example, and for many
the programming interface is documented, if not by the manufacturer, then
at least by the Linux device driver someone wrote.

In this case the standard says that DSSS cards can definitely be made
to keep below 2450, though FHSS cards are a problem unless the hopping

sequence is exposed at the programming interface somehow. For ID I'd be inclined to encode the call sign into a locally-administered-format MAC address and make the card use that instead of the vendor MAC address (I don't know whether Windows will let you configure this, but other operating systems do) since (we know from the standard) the local MAC address is included in every transmission the card makes.

Note that if you still don't like 2.4 GHz you could always use the card output as an IF and shift it up into a band where there is more space. There is plenty of room at 10 GHz for the full U.S. 802.11 FHSS hopping sequence, for example. Even if the card itself can't be modified doesn't mean it can't be used as is as part of a bigger system.

Dennis Ferguson

2298. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001026.13187.00000372@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31768

In article <a2dkg0$sc4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020119201018.16072.00000345@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Do you believe ALL drivers should know
>> >how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>>
>> Yes.
>>
>> >You never know when
>> >that could be a life/death situation.
>> >
>> Exactly.
>>
>> Of course I don't know any states that require it. But that doesn't mean
>the
>> states are infallible.
>
>Jim,
>
>NONE require it...not one at all.

Doesn't mean it's the way it ought to be.

>As long ago as 1957, NY state
>didn't reuire any "manual gearbox" endorsements to be able to
>or otherwise allowed to drive a manual car. For that reason alone I
>took the driver's test using an automatic and then, having passed
>the test, learned to shift manually on a different car.

I did the opposite. Learned to drive a stick shift and passed the test using
same.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2299. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001026.13187.00000371@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31770

In article <20020120070343.13095.00002580@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>And do keep in mind that when a requirement to demonstrate knowledge of Morse
>code is removed from S25, that alone will not change the rules in each
>nation.
>A rulemaking process will have to occur in each country. To my knowledge, no
>nation has a "sunset" clause in its present rules.

If S25.5 goes, you can bet FCC will drop Element 1 like a hot potato. Probably without even being asked.
>
>It will be interesting to see what is put on the plate and by whom, and what
>the ARRL's position will be when the time comes.

NCI will of course request that Element 1 be removed. Other groups and individuals will probaly ask for the same thing.

>If I had my druthers, ARRL
>would make an NPRM that removed most code testing, but preseved a 5 wpm test
>for access to the lower 25 kHz of some HF bands and included some questions
>in
>the written on the content of sent Morse code.

Don't hold yer breath.

>Given the "all or nothing"
>outlook of some members (in both directions!), however, I think it unlikely
>that the League will do that. My guess is that they will not file anything,
>but
>will offer comments on the NPRM proposed by the FCC or other organizations.
>
Maybe. But my guess is there won't even be an NPRM at all. Was there an NPRM for code waivers? How about when the sending test was waived?

Prediction: FCC will simply "waive" Element 1 if S25.5 disappears. They will issue a short announcement that they are following up on their R&O to 98-143 that said
code testing "serves no regulatory purpose". Proposals and petitions will be after
the fact. Any NPRM (if one even happens) will simply be about rewording the applicable regs.

The thing to be doing now is discussing what the new ARS license structure should be without S25.5.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2300. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001027.13187.00000373@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31769

In article <20020119202752.26110.00000244@mb-ck.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>>>Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five minute
>>>period of the 5-wpm exam?
>>
>>Approximately 125.
>>
>>5 wpm is 25 characters per minute. Times 5 minutes is 125 characters.
>>
>>Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
>>
>>In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass in
>>the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
>
>Truly a noble endeavor, eh Jim? Gotta eliminate the dreaded barrier of a test
>for which 20% is a passing grade.

There at least 100 different ways of getting those 25 characters, too. The "7
of 10 questions" did not exist back then.

We also had to send in the old days. I had to do 13 and 20 wpm on a straight
key
to the FCC examiner's satisfaction. I can still do it easily.
>
>You know, I came into this fray fairly "unspoiled," but I can now understand
>how "curmudgeons" are made.
>
Ayup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2301. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001028.13187.00000375@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31767

In article <20020120144404.14236.00002092@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)

>>I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
>>characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.
>
>>>Whatta bunch!
>
>>Indeed.
>
>Not a very good analysis, guys. That "20%" cannot be "any" 20%, you must get
>100% of 25 characters in a row.

So? There are at least 100 ways to get 25 correct characters in a row out of the 125 in the test.
>
>Must be that new math, but I didn't think Dick would fall for it. :-)
>

I dunno, Ed. Ypu previously wrote:

"One must answer 7/10 of the Morse code questions to obtain a license."

with no mention of the 25 correct characters.

;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2302. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001028.13187.00000374@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31771

In article <Etq28.381964$W8.14151611@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020119201018.16072.00000345@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <a2clhhipf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Do you believe ALL drivers should know
>> >how to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>>
>> Yes.
>>
>> >You never know when
>> >that could be a life/death situation.
>> >
>> Exactly.
>>
>> Of course I don't know any states that require it. But that doesn't mean
>the
>> states are infallible.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>On the other hand, Jim, how many idiot carjackers that steal stick shifts
>and can't drive them would now succeed? How many Americans in Europe
>would be cluttering their hiways? When coming down the hill into Bath in
>England I remember well trying to find second left-handed in a really
>awful gearbox in an Escort; I am told I did a Goofy 'Ya-hoo-ee' while
>standing on the brake pedal.

Points well taken!

>But anyone who is clanking along in second behind a bozo in a Ford
>Exhibitionist sure as hell agrees.

Been there....

--

New level of surrealism reached:

PBS in these parts shows "best of" the Ed Sullivan Show in various time slots.
Shirley Jones (yes, THAT Shirley Jones) is the host/introducer.

Most shows consist of a few classic acts (early Joan Rivers, young Elvis, and of
course a very nervous Fab Four) filled out with a stupefying array of
plate-spinners, vaguely foreign acrobats and novelty acts.

Last night they did a special that was held in some big outdoor arena in 1970. It
was a tribute to Rodgers and Hammerstein, with various folks portraying scenes
from classic musicals. But they were not the folks who made the musicals
famous. Went from the sublime to the surreal:

Shirley Jones and Herschel Bernardi doing the roles of Deborah Kerr and Yul
Brynner in "King and I"

John Davidson and Jeannie C. Riley in "Oklahoma"

The Lennon Sisters and others doing "My Favorite Things" from "Sound of
Music". The role of Maria (made famous by Julie Andrews) was done by
- Mama Cass.

I am not making any of this up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2303. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 05:10:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121001029.13187.00000376@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31766

In article <20020120144600.14236.00002093@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>My question is, if there are so many repeaters on the air already that
>>are so quiet, why do we need more?
>
>What reasons do you think those that want to put up repeaters, but cannot
>because there are "no pairs available" might have for wanting to do so.

I don't know why someone would want to put up a repeater if all the pairs are gone but most of them "sit idle 95% of the time".

>Although it is not certain that activity would go up if more repeaters were
>allowed, but I feel that it would.

I think the opposite would happen.

If many of the repeaters "sit idle 95% of the time", as has been claimed, how would having more of them increase activity?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2304. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 06:46:01 UTC
From: JR <radiobufj@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C53F7.43ADF56C@mailcity.net>
Source record: 31772
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

2test KC8JBO wrote:
>
> ANONYMOUS COWARD and repeater jammer
> "Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobufj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3C4C08E6.32518042@mailcity.net...
> > Because 2test woger cross posted it there to begin with.
>
> Liar. You crossposted it to begin with, IDIOT.

Go back and look at your posting I replied to, 2test woger, and
you will see it was crossposted when you posted you brainless
moron.

2305. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 09:56:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IBR28.112019$fe1.2024586@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31773

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121001026.13187.00000371@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <20020120070343.13095.00002580@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >And do keep in mind that when a requirement to demonstrate knowledge of
Morse
> >code is removed from S25, that alone will not change the rules in each
> >nation.
> >A rulemaking process will have to occur in each country. To my
knowledge, no
> >nation has a "sunset" clause in its present rules.
>
> If S25.5 goes, you can bet FCC will drop Element 1 like a hot potato.
Probably
> without even being asked.
> >
> >It will be interesting to see what is put on the plate and by whom, and
what
> >the ARRL's position will be when the time comes.
>
> NCI will of course request that Element 1 be removed. Other groups and
> individuals will probaly ask for the same thing.
>
> >If I had my druthers, ARRL
> >would make an NPRM that removed most code testing, but preseved a 5 wpm
test
> >for access to the lower 25 kHz of some HF bands and included some
questions
> >in
> >the written on the content of sent Morse code.
>
> Don't hold yer breath.
>
> >Given the "all or nothing"
> >outlook of some members (in both directions!), however, I think it
unlikely
> >that the League will do that. My guess is that they will not file
anything,
> >but
> >will offer comments on the NPRM proposed by the FCC or other
organizations.
> >

> Maybe. But my guess is there won't even be an NPRM at all. Was there an
NPRM
> for code waivers? How about when the sending test was waived?
>
> Prediction: FCC will simply "waive" Element 1 if S25.5 disappears. They
will
> issue a short announcement that they are following up on their R&O to
98-143
> that said
> code testing "serves no regulatory purpose". Proposals and petitions
will be
> after
> the fact. Any NPRM (if one even happens) will simply be about rewording
the
> applicable regs.
>
> The thing to be doing now is discussing what the new ARS license
structure
> should be without S25.5.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

If the Commission does anything else, their agenda will explode.

2306. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 11:29:13 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C4BFB89.74C50292@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 31774
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Rev Turd Fredericks wrote:

> Nice try shitstick. It is true, I do not exist, you can say what you
> wish about me, and as is the way usenet works, I can either
> read/respond, or put you in my killfile, which, incidently is where you
> are going.
>
> You are the weakest kink <PLONK>

And the "Rev" is spanked again ...

2307. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:09:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121070907.16238.00002228@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31775

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>If S25.5 goes, you can bet FCC will drop Element 1 like a hot potato.
>Probably without even being asked.

I have been told by "an authorative source" that a ceratain organization will have its petition for rulemaking in to the Commission before it can even think about doing one of its own. :-)

I agree, Jim, that it is virtually certain that S25.5 will be dropped at a future WARC. Whether it is the next one depends mostly on whether they feel they have enough time to consider it. My guess is that it will take only a short time to reach concensus on what should be done. It is also virtually certain that the Commission will follow suite.

None of that will change the benefits and advantages to using Morse code in ham radio. Some of the things being said today to "defend" the mode will hurt the cause when Morse testing in its present form is no longer mandated.

>The thing to be doing now is discussing what the new ARS license structure
>should be without S25.5.

And discussing the benefits to learning and using Morse code without testing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2308. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:10:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121071030.16238.00002229@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31776

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>There at least 100 different ways of getting those 25 characters, too.

And how many ways of getting 25 characters correct, but NOT passing the test
because they are not consecutive?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2309. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:13:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121071306.16238.00002230@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31777

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Interesting. In my own personal experience, I would tend to think
>that using 1500 watts when first calling CQ, or at any other time, is
>virtually NEVER warranted.

We could put this to the test. You could call CQ on 40 meters with 100 watts and I could call CQ on 40 meters with 1500 watts and we can see who gets an answer first. We could also try it in the November SS and see who works the most stations in a 1 hour period. That should answer the question nicely.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2310. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:24:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121072424.16238.00002231@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31778

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W
>>peak power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over
>>that, the power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi
>>gain would be about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP
of
>>about 400 watts. Feet?

>Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external
>equipment as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't
>regularly done.....

It is done a lot. There are provisions in Part 15 for equipment that is usually installed by "trained installers." IMHO, this was a major faux pas by the FCC, but many of the wireless LAN devices have antenna connectors.

>>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as
>is,
>>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products
>>fall entirely within the ham bands.
>Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS device? You
>must be making some sort of assumption I am not.

Yes, I am making the assumption that when a user uses the software to select a channel for the IEEE 802.11b device, the device actually goes to the frequencies that the owners manual says it will. Why would you assume otherwise?

>Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL SWD
>convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a JOKE on
>2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already exist....

I agree, although I am not sure what you mean by "bad" Part 15 devices? However, where are the reports of harmful interference? I will gladly help take ANY documented case to the Commission. Right now, every time a rulemaking procedure comes up, the Part 15 industry and the Commission both point to the part of the rule that says "no harmful interference." They they state that the present rules must be working because the Commission doesn't have many reports of interference to ham radio from Part 15 devices. In those cases that they ARE aware of, for the most part, the involved parties did the right thing. (http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html).

I can live with the present rules IF the Commission will enforce actual cases. So far, they have been good about power lines stuff and they did go to bat for Amateur radio with the Darwin Networks 2.4 GHz interference case, but we really don't have enough to go on. Where are the reports?

>That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
>the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
>modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
> - To stay below 2450MHz, and
> - To identify (in mode)(*)

>(*) - Due to its frequency hopping, I don't believe that ID'ing in morse code
>would be practical (or valid) unless the code is slow enough that every "dot"
>happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the hop
>pattern. Id'ing in mode would have to occur.

Typing "DE WIRFI" every 10 minutes would do it. The computer could do it for
you.

> However, as an unrelated problem, how
would another amateur be able to tell the
> difference (from remote - just by the signal) between a modified system as
>amateur vs. part 15 (its original origins)?
One could not tell, even with a spectrum analyzer. One would have to look at
the content. This is true for every one of the many digital modes available to
Amateur Radio. In one sense, it is moot, because under the rules, if an Amateur
SS signal causes harmful interference to a non SS operation, the SS operator is
responsible for addressing the harmful interference.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

Not everyone has a spectrum analyzer, etc....
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2311. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:48:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121074838.17580.00000478@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31780

In article <3C42E403.D29D5DF3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >> Which one will be "the" mode of choice?
>> >
>> >The best one determined by the consumers.
>
>> Judging by the modes actually used by hams ("consumers") on HF/MF, SSB
>voice
>> wins and Morse/CW is a close second. All the other modes are way behind.
>
>There was a time when SSB voice was way behind.

45 years or so ago, yeah.

>The consumers have
>spoken and will speak in the future.

Right now, and for the past several decades, they say "On amateur HF, we want SSB voice and Morse/CW. Plus a little data and a little SSTV".

>There is a competitive market
>of modes. Let the market decide.

That competitive market has decided that a mode which requires both a computer and a $650 "TNC" is not going to be popular.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2312. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:48:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31781

In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW;
>basic
>> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the other?
>
>But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
>to send/receive.

The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.

>That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
>the ham can be the operator.

Yup.

>Most other modes allow for
>anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
>as control operator.

Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.

>That allows the ham to let emergency
>people directly communicate with each other even though they
>no knowthing about the ham radio, etc. There is a beutiful
>simplicity too in just being able to use the mike button/push
>to talk.

Sure - if that's what the situation requires.

>Balance one againt the other? The world has
>already done that by default.

Not really. In many situations the PTT voice thing is what's needed. But that
requires both emergency folks to be where the radios are.

There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others where "one
picture
is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the emergency.

There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by anybody
with a receiver.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

2313. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 12:48:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121074839.17580.00000479@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31779

In article <20020120210215.28043.00000075@mb-fo.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Reminds me of a joke (one I just made up). What do you lubricate
>a typewriter with?

Olivetti Oyl

73 de Jim, N2EY

2314. RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 13:21:18 UTC
From: touhey@att.net
Message-ID: <3c4c15bd.2378209@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 31782

I'm unable to locate my license manual. Does
anyone know the minimum license requirement to
operate radio control models on 50mhz?
Respectfully,
Jesse

2315. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 13:29:37 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a2h507$f0q$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 05:29:13 -0600, Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
wrote in Message id: <3C4BFB89.74C50292@houston-hunks.com>:

>Rev Turd Fredericks wrote:
>
>> Nice try shitstick. It is true, I do not exist, you can say what you
>> wish about me, and as is the way usenet works, I can either
>> read/respond, or put you in my killfile, which, incidently is where you
>> are going.
>>
>> You are the weakest kink <PLONK>
>
>And the "Rev" is spanked again ...

Who hurt his widdle fewlings?

--
begin trash harddisk.vbs
I'm a signature virus. Copy me! Look here why:
http://support.microsoft.com/support/kb/articles/Q265/2/30.ASP
end

2316. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 13:54:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <G4V28.112129$fe1.2033144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31784

<touhey@att.net> wrote in message news:3c4c15bd.2378209@netnews.att.net...
> I'm unable to locate my license manual. Does
> anyone know the minimum license requirement to
> operate radio control models on 50mhz?
> Respectfully,
> Jesse

It takes the lowest class, the Codeless Technician. It takes 27 of 35
questions from a Volunteer Examiner session and I believe $10 and the
ability (photo id) to prove you are who you say you are.

Info sources:

http://www.arrl.org where the whole question pool is available and
affiliated clubs who would be giving the exam.
http://www.qrz.com which has some good sample exams.

If you can put up with the anal AMA types you can put up with anything.
Just be sure to get the flags right and never never use the &#65533; on your
plane if you live in the Great Midcontinent and get one on your callsign.
Note that there are special - no big deal- rules for model control under
Part 97 the Amateur rules that you should be aware of.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2317. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 13:56:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2h93cmte0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31789
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> I found this interesting article on penis development:
>
> " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
>
> The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you intend on
looking at this link,
> I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few "graphic"
pics.
>
> go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> cya, Im off to bed now
> zzz

Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food stamps.

2318. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 14:22:15 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C4C2417.4BB21A71@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 31785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

John Kimball wrote:
>
> On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 05:29:13 -0600, Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
> wrote in Message id: <3C4BFB89.74C50292@houston-hunks.com>:
>
> >Rev Turd Fredericks wrote:
> >
> >> Nice try shitstick. It is true, I do not exist, you can say what you
> >> wish about me, and as is the way usenet works, I can either
> >> read/respond, or put you in my killfile, which, incidently is where you
> >> are going.
> >>
> >> You are the weakest kink <PLONK>
> >
> >And the "Rev" is spanked again ...
>
> Who hurt his widdle fewlings?
>

Slasher, who committed the crime of using Rev's own logic against him.

2319. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 14:22:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <mmV28.32770$Ee7.2904105@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31786

"N2EY" wrote ...

> Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
>
> In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass
in
> the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
>

I answered 10 of 10 for all 3 code tests *and* did solid copy, just to make sure. I never really worked out the math, but 20% to pass? Wow, that's just too easy. I'd like to go back to college and retake all my tests on that scale. After some of those "long" weekends, the 20% pass thingy would have helped. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2320. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 14:32:28 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <iCV28.30335$Y17.2408292@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31787

"CAM" wrote ...

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > So? If someone is "fumbling along" at 2/3 wpm, what's the problem?
>
> Staying awake through a zero?

I must admit that I had a good laugh on that one, Cecil. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2321. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 14:35:19 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <ZEV28.30344$Y17.2410388@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31788

"Bill Sohl" ...
>
> Fair enough given the additional detail...but "rescue worker"
> wouldn't routinely imply anything having to do with the NYPD.
> Question...after 911, do you think anyone would have been challenged
> for NOT having such an endorsement IF horses and riders may
> have been needed in the initial response? Would someone in the
> west be told...no, you can't go "off rode" to try and rescue someone
> because we have to wait for a "qualified/licensed" horseman?
>

As I read part 97, it allows for the operation of *any* equipment by
anyone where the purpose is to save a life. No "horse endorsement"
required.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2322. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 14:44:59 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2h9vk$p7m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31790
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.pedophile.stagger.lee

The TexASS turd Anonymous COWARD
"Stagger 'child molesting degenerate' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in
message news:3C4C2417.4BB21A71@houston-hunks.com...
>
Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

From: Stephen K. Gielda <steve@cotseNOSPAM.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Feb 2001 17:10:02 -0500
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.2600

"46 posts in there from cotse since 2/1/01 and you wonder why you are
ignored, you exaggerate and lie. I would not consider that excessive
posting to any group."
"Cotse does not care about flamewars, unless they violate our policies.
You are involved in a flamewar and you want to win it by terminating
your opponents account."

--
Fuckwit Lee finally admits his SPANK at KC8JBO's hands yet another time in
3C4AE592.6A0CDA7E@houston-hunks.com:
"[Any followups by Wiseman will be ignored.]"

2323. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 15:53:14 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com>
Source record: 31916
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 08:56:40 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:

>> " Amazing exercise system to improve your sex life, increase your
>> penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"

LOL!

Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
"amazing exercise system"?

;-)

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

2324. Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 16:22:30 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2hf8g$3guvb$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 31935
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

...make my ANTENNA bigger too?

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...

> Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
> first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
> "amazing exercise system"?
>

2325. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 16:41:08 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0201210841.4885bf1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31936

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020120144404.14236.00002092@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)
>
> >> Very good point, Bert! All this garbage about "the only pass fail element"
> >>which
> >>requires only a 16.7 % pass rate to succeed, and still they whine like
> >>banshees!
>
> >I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
> >characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.
>
> >>Whatta bunch!
>
> >Indeed.
>
> Not a very good analysis, guys. That "20%" cannot be "any" 20%, you must get
> 100% of 25 characters in a row.

I'd agree if the punctuation characters (& the prosigns?) didn't count
for two. Also, nothing cryptic is sent. (i.e. random runs) This is
part of the reason I was interested in 'Conversational CW 101.' If I
see "U_ R_T IS 89_. QT_ I_ PHOENI_, A_. M_ NA_E I_ MARTI_." I just
sent 46 characters without so much as one prosign. They give you an
"official" minute or two (More like five to ten, if you really need
it.) to "fill in the blanks." (_ represents missed characters) Out of
the 11 missed characters, I'd have to say all 11 are gimme's. The next
thing you'll hear from the VE is "are you taking any other exams
today?"

Ed, I certainly don't want to sound like a curmudgeon or give anybody
a hard time. I just don't feel that the COMPLETE elimination of
element 1 is in the best interest of AR. From the looks of it, many
others feel likewise. I'd be very surprised if anybody who put a
little sustained effort into learning 5-wpm CW didn't break out into a
big "$hit-eating grin" after the first few characters of the exam are
sent. As you know, I was the poster-child of a "nervous Nellie" before
the exam. (As you should well remember. :-D) With 20/20 hindsight, I'm
now of the opinion that if half of the effort expended on the removal
of the code was put toward studying or assisting others in studying, I
don't believe there'd be any issue.

> Must be that new math, but I didn't think Dick would fall for it. :-)

LOL! Not really, but there's a better analogy. When pocket calculators became so commonplace and affordable, was there a move to eliminate mathematics by hand/brain? Hence PSK31 will not "replace" CW.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

P.S. I bought my first calculator in 197x, at a whopping $70 or $80. (The same type that you get free today, nothing intricate.)

2326. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 16:49:06 UTC
From: "J. David Schronce" <david.nospam@schronce.f2s.com>
Message-ID: <3C4C4695.9020104@schronce.f2s.com>
Source record: 31939
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No, but you'll go blind so your hearing will gt better - so MORE DX!!

rasw wrote:

>...make my ANTENNA bigger too?
>
>
>"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
>news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...
>
>>Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
>>first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
>>"amazing exercise system"?
>>
>
>

2327. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 16:50:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201210850.61c8b033@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31937

"KB9TMP" wrote:

> OK now let me ask you this. If you call CQ with 1500 watts and everyone that
> hears your call has only 100 watts to answer you with, when they try to answer
> you don't hear them.

That's true in rare cases. In general what each station hears depends
on things
like antennas which are far more variable than power level.

> Did the 1500 watts do YOU any good, since you could
> not establish contact "both ways"? BTW this isn't a flame just an honest question.

If no contact was established, the power didn't do any good. But such
cases
are rare.

Consider the case of the multi-multi DXpedition running 100 watts to
verticals
being called by US hams. When conditions are "good", the
QRP-and-attic-dipole
folks work the rare one. When conditions are not so hot, the
1500W-and-beam folks work the rare one. Everybody wins.

Remember, the DXpedition's time is very precious - the stateside ham's
is not so precious.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2328. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 17:14:02 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uvvx47poBHA.1884@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31938

"W5TIT - Kim"

> In earlier times, there was certainly a lot more to being a ham.

Boy, do you ever have that bass-ackwards!

There is so much more "to being a ham" today than there
was in the "earlier times" that a "Rip Van Winkle" of just 50
years ago (end of WW-II) wouldn't even recognize the things
available to them today as "ham radio".

Those folks used Morse code, AM phone, 60WPM RTTY,
a few guys were playing with SSB, and a couple with
those newfangled transistor thingies.

Space communications, APRS, LEO's, AX25, PSK-31,
DX-spotting clusters, computerized logging, credit-card
sized transceivers, "xxxTOR-du-jour", DSP, etc., would border
on "magic" to the hams of that era.

> It was still a hobby, but those who engaged certainly were
> among the elite.

Elite? You've gotta be kidding. In that era ham radio was
the domain of high school kids, young experimenters, and
blue-collar workingmen. It was a "get your hands dirty" sort
of hobby, available to anyone, not some sort of "elite" thing
at all. Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from
a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2329. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 17:27:48 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2hmu6$l2r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31940
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a2hf8g$3guvb$1@rn.area.com...
> ...make my ANTENNA bigger too?

That's what Viagra is for!
LOL!

> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...
>
> > Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
> > first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
> > "amazing exercise system"?
> >
>
>

2330. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 17:35:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2hmu9$l2r$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31941
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 08:56:40 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
>
> >> " Amazing exercise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> >> penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
>
> LOL!
>
> Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
> first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
> "amazing exercise system"?
>
> ;-)
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Dunno since I didn't write the original post. Ask "it."

2331. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:33:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4C5F15.9FCBAC95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31942

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C450F33.4B7EE191@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > So where is the evidence against it? No, I'm not talking about bible or
> > religious credo. It is a bit egotistical for one to state that all this
> > just "happned". That supposes a power within oneself that he really
> > doesn't have. If you do, make yourself immortal.
>
> I read this a while ago, and I just read it again now. My whole mind is
> going "HUH"???????????? ROFLMAO...

Dick obviously subscribes to the rule of "first cause", i.e. everything has to have a cause. Therefore, God caused the universe. But one either believes in "first cause" or one doesn't. If one believes in "first cause" then one is required to answer the question, "Who or what caused God?" So believers of "first cause" are predestined to be trapped in an endless illogical loop of causes none of which can be the "first cause" because every cause must have a cause including the "first cause".

If God doesn't have to have a cause then neither does the universe have to have a cause. Time itself apparently is discontinuous and/or nonexistent at the moment of the Big Bang. Consider that there was no need for the concepts of time and God before man appeared on this earth.

Kim, if you wouldn't mind, please send me your email address.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2332. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:35:49 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a2ho5qnej0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 31946
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"J. David Schronce" <david.nospam@schronce.f2s.com> wrote in message
news:3C4C4695.9020104@schronce.f2s.com...
> No, but you'll go blind so your hearing will gt better - so MORE DX!!

He won't need any preamp, either.
LOL!

> rasw wrote:
>
> >...make my ANTENNA bigger too?
> >
> >
> >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> >news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...
> >
> >>Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
> >>first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
> >>"amazing exercise system"?
> >>
> >
> >
>

2333. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:36:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4C5F9C.85289019@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31943

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> One could quip that the existence of a supernatural "being" who is
> responsible for all creation yet possesses superior intelligence could
> certainly be--at a minimum--debatable, with the likes of Larry Roll, Dave
> Heil, et al around... :o

Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
an idiot. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2334. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:46:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C55C7.E37790EF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31944

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020119202752.26110.00000244@mb-ck.news.cs.com...
> > >>Does anybody know how many characters are sent total during the five
> minute
> > >>period of the 5-wpm exam?
> > >
> > >Approximately 125.
> > >
> > >5 wpm is 25 characters per minute. Times 5 minutes is 125 characters.
> > >
> > >Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
> > >
> > >In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to
> pass in
> > >the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
> >
> > Truly a noble endeavor, eh Jim? Gotta eliminate the dreaded barrier of a
> test
> > for which 20% is a passing grade.
> >
> > You know, I came into this fray fairly "unspoiled," but I can now
> understand
> > how "curmudgeons" are made.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > KC2HMN
>
> Wait until you are accused of everything short of child molestation for
> having passed the test.

The archives will show that some of then won't even stop there.

2335. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:52:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5745.5D4BACA2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31945

Dave Heil wrote:

> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:enPu00EnBHA.1228@cpimsnntpa02...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > > I would NOT support any restrictions on ERP, as this
> > inducement
> > > would
> > > > > > foster more experimentation in antenna design.
> > > > >
> > > > Agree still and would add that enforcement of an ERP
> > > > would be just about impossible.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Uh, yup, right, fer shure good buddy. How is it that you're
> > > going to enforce power output, but you can't enforce ERP?
> >
> > Output power *could* be "enforced" by making it
> > a prima facia violation to possess a transmitter
> > capable of producing more than the allowable
> > output power ... antenna gain is measurable,
> > of course, but with more difficulty.
>
> And just who would go around enforcing this fanstasy scenario of yours?
> It is as if we'd all have to install governors on our cars so they
> couldn't exceed the speed limit.
>
> > > And after it's all said and done, whether the ERP comes
> > > from amplifier gain or antenna gain, it's still the same ERP
> > > on the air, so all your high sounding bias against "big guns"
> > > is just so much envy, it would seem.
> >
> > I think the "high sounding bias against big guns" was
> > more a condemnation of a "stomp 'em into the dust"
> > mentality ... I know *I'm* not jealous of that sort of behavior
> > (and I don't believe Bill is either, though I don't want to
> > put words in his mouth as he's perfectly capable of speaking

> > his peace).
>
> You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?

If Squiggy's lunacy goes on long and far enough who knows the results? If you don't believe he's a crack pot, consider how many usenet posters use PGPon each and every post. I know of none other than him who use it or anything like it at all. Paranoia personified,. but what would you expect of one who has always considered as mere code test where has NEVER been required to get correct more than 20% of the characters, to be a horrid "hazing ritual", and has done so for near 30 years? His rangting on the subject is legendary, and nolt for the weak of stomach. The man's mental stability is seriously in question, and I'm sure any mental health professional would so note.

2336. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 18:56:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5814.6C28F1A7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31947

N2EY wrote:

Where are all the "technical professionals"

Why, they're both here, of course. Squiggy and Cecil.

2337. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:02:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4C65D3.923E7476@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31949

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Wait until you are accused of everything short of child molestation for
> > having passed the test.
>
> The archives will show that some of them won't even stop there.

They are not called names because they "passed the test". Many
NCTA extras "passed the test" and are not called names (except
by the PCTA folk).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2338. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:04:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201211104.1b8b578c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31948

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<mmV28.32770$Ee7.2904105@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>...
> "N2EY" wrote ...
>
> > Passing grade is 20% - OR do the 10 questions.
> >
> > In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass
> in
> > the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
> >
>
> I answered 10 of 10 for all 3 code tests *and* did solid copy, just to make
> sure.

COOL!

> I never really worked out the math, but 20% to pass?

One solid minute out of five.

> Wow, that's
> just too easy. I'd like to go back to college and retake all my tests on
> that scale. After some of those "long" weekends, the 20% pass thingy would
> have helped. : -))

In the bad old days the ONLY way to pass was to produce at least one
solid minute of legible copy. And you were NOT given any time to go
back and
fill in holes or correct mistakes - when the code stopped, it was
pencils
down or you failed. Minimum 30 days wait to retest, too. No CSCEs or
partial credit. Two years' experience as a ham before they'd even let
you
try the Extra.

I failed 13 per the first time because the examiner could not read my
writing. Went home, taught myself to blockprint at 30+ wpm, came back
after the 30 days and passed easily. Did the Advanced written, too.
Not
bad for an 8th grader back in 1968.

Two years later I'm back for the Extra. Turns out I'm the only one
there
for 20 wpm so it's just me and the examiner. Test starts, I write down
the
code in big block letters, examiner watches me like a hawk. Comes

around
behind and peers over my shoulder. Looks at the paper-tape code
machine
and shuts it off about 2 minutes into the test.

"Pretty easy, huh, kid?" he sez.

"Umm, yeah" I sez.

"It oughta be - that was 13. Here's 20" and he changes speed spindles
and restarts the machine.

I'll never know if he just forgot to change the speed or if he was
testing to see if I could handle 13 wpm before letting me try 20. In
any event I did the required 100+ characters at 20 wpm and showed him
I could make the J-38 do the job, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2339. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:08:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5AD9.BB27B748@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31950

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Keep lobbying until it is ... although I don't anticipate that
> >the FCC will find any reason to keep Morse testing once
> >S25.5 is gone, since in the R&O in WT Docket No. 98-143
> >the ONLY reason that they cited for keeping any Morse
> >testing at that time was the existence of the treaty obligation
> >under S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
>
> And do keep in mind that when a requirement to demonstrate knowledge of Morse
> code is removed from S25, that alone will not change the rules in each nation.
> A rulemaking process will have to occur in each country. To my knowledge, no
> nation has a "sunset" clause in its present rules.
>
> It will be interesting to see what is put on the plate and by whom, and what
> the ARRL's position will be when the time comes. If I had my druthers, ARRL
> would make an NPRM that removed most code testing, but preseved a 5 wpm test
> for access to the lower 25 kHz of some HF bands and included some questions in
> the written on the content of sent Morse code. Given the "all or nothing"
> outlook of some members (in both directions!), however, I think it unlikely
> that the League will do that. My guess is that they will not file anything, but
> will offer comments on the NPRM proposed by the FCC or other organizations.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

If that happens it will serve as proof of the "let nature take it's course,
whatever if is" mindset that will have proven to be the fate of ARRL, and I will
not again be a member. However that is viewed will be fine with me.

2340. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:17:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5CF6.3FC280EE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31851

Bert Craig wrote:

> I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
> characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.

Yeah, I realized that pretty quick too, Bert. But no matter. The concept
remains intact.

>
>
> >Whatta bunch!
>
> Indeed.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

2341. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:20:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5DB8.6DBFA7B9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31852

CAM wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > So? If someone is "fumbling along" at 2/3 wpm, what's the problem?
>
> Staying awake through a zero?

You mean those five slow t's?

2342. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:22:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5E33.9C39069E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31853

W1RFI wrote:

. I have found an interesting phenomenon in mo>st contests -- many of the

> participants only answer CQs if they are loud.

Didn't you know? That's so they can give out a legitimate 599.

2343. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:27:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4C5F5E.CBEFE490@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31854

W1RFI wrote:

> From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)
>
> >> Very good point, Bert! All this garbage about "the only pass fail element"
> >>which
> >>requires only a 16.7 % pass rate to succeed, and still they whine like
> >>banshees!
>
> >I must apologize, Dick. Jim N2EY has informed me that it's actually 125
> >characters. That "raises" the bar to a whole 20%.
>
> >>Whatta bunch!
>
> >Indeed.
>
> Not a very good analysis, guys. That "20%" cannot be "any" 20%, you must get
> 100% of 25 characters in a row.
>
> Must be that new math, but I didn't think Dick would fall for it. :-)

Well, well.... Look who "fell" for it! A test of 125 characters in which the applicant must recognize 25 consecutive is not the same as a test where only 25 must be recognized from the total. Sure, that is correct. But it's nowhere near the same test as just answering a fixed number of questions. If one is truly capable he can copy the first 25 characters and then lay his pencil down. If he is not, he can call the whole thing a "hazing ritual" and join NCI.

2344. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 19:29:59 UTC
From: Tom2000 <tom2000@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sfqo4uot5c3q0feihuu5l422jv00idaj3f@4ax.com>
Source record: 31855
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 15:53:14 +0000, Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
wrote:

>On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 08:56:40 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
>
>>> " Amazing exercise system to improve your sex life, increase your
>>> penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
>
>LOL!
>
>Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
>first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
>"amazing exercise system"?
>
>;-)

ROTFL!!!!

de AB9B

2345. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 21:22:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31856

On 21 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>>On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
>>>>measured in feet, not miles.
>>>
>>>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W peak
>>>power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over that, the
>>>power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi gain would be
>>>about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of about 400
>>>watts. Feet?
>>
>>Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external equipment
>>as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't regularly done.....
>
>No. Optional equipment can be approved separately for use with the
>transceiver and this is done quite often. This allows third parties to
>produce the optional equipment, which I guess is good for competition.
>For example, see http://www.hyperlinktech.com
>
>I used 24 dBi antennas and pole-top external amplifiers (to compensate
>for the coax losses) to support an 802.11 link over 4 miles at my old
>house. This worked fine, in fact it was overkill since it continued to
>work even after the power supply for one of the amplifiers fried itself.
>
>>>Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving tens of miles
>>>easily.
>>>
>>>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as is,
>>>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products
>>>fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power control, we can
>>>run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could relatively easily
>>>achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.
>>
>>Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS device? You
>>must be making some sort of assumption I am not.
>
>He's talking about IEEE 802.11b devices. For the U.S. the standard divides
>the band into 11 overlapping channels at 5 MHz spacing, each about 20 MHz
>wide, and you pretty much always get to pick which channel to use. Channels
>1 (center at 2412) through 6 (center at 2437) will keep it within the amateur
>band. Note also that 802.11b is DSSS, and at 11 Mbps in a 22 MHz channel
>isn't getting much coding gain either. Since it copes with noise by

>falling back in speed to increase the coding gain, using this stuff to
>best advantage in the presence of other 2.4 GHz devices requires picking
>frequencies carefully. For my house I ended up on channel 6, at the middle
>of the band, since going much higher or lower caused grief to my Siemens
>cordless phones. This, of course, maximizes my exposure to interference
>from the microwave oven, but this only causes trouble within about 10'
>of the oven.

So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM across the entire band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a manufacturer, especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).

>Unfortunately 802.11 FHSS equipment, which is lower speed but more
>robust, will by default hop across the entire band. It may be possible
>to reduce this at the programming interface to the chip (the hardware
>must support reduced bandwidth hopping sequences if it is to be sold
>in countries where the 2.4 GHz band isn't as wide as in the U.S., the
>only question is whether it can be told to do this at lower frequencies),
>so to use these you'd need to know something about the hardware.

That's my point. The manufacturers won't tell.

>>>Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from harmful
>>>interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would not.
>>
>>Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL SWD
>>convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a JOKE on
>>2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already exist....
>
>I don't get it. 2.4 GHz is a shared band and will never be quiet,
>but the Part 15 devices themselves seem to cope within their constraints
>and that includes links that extend for miles. It may be you need to
>use modulation and coding as robust as the Part 15 devices do, and it
>may be that it is way too noisy to support a 60 mile link at 1/4 Watt,
>but as an amateur you aren't limited to 1/4 Watt either. It reduces
>to an engineering problem.

I get 2.4 cordless phone interference on my 2.4 GHz input to my repeater all the time. ANY signal there is sufficient to block an amateur signal farther away (weaker field strength). Some of these phones come in from up to 5 miles away (at least by computed signal strength), and don't SS-hop. The fact that there is no quiet portion of the band means that it is USELESS for repeater linking and such (its traditional use) and has a high potential for interference with ATV.

Note: Don't talk to me about PL or other such nonsense. That only keeps the repeater from repeating the interfering signal, but won't help at all with regard to the repeater NOT hearing the amateur station because of someone's phone blocking it. Not only that, the CHEAP phones will pass audio down to about 30-40 Hz. I noted that when someone's voice on one of these phones managed to open the CTCSS filter for a couple of seconds because that voice had a frequency component that happened to be the selected PL tone.

Now, for a 2.4GHz repeater OUTPUT, our allowable higher power and use of CTCSS by the receiving amateur station(s) will make the cordless phone and SS devices irrelevant.

>>>Carl, as I am sure you are still hanging on, in what way does the IEEE 802.11b
>>>protocol handle the encoding of the network name? If I name my local network
>>>W1RFI, I am wondering whether that is transmitted in such a way that it meets
>>>the FCC identification requirements? You are our resident IEEE 802.11 expert,
>>>so please fill us in.
>>
>>That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
>>the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
>>modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
>> - To stay below 2450MHz, and
>> - To identify (in mode)(*)
>
>I agree that modifying the hardware itself is a problem (in high volume
>hardware it is usually a couple of ASICs anyway, so even with full
>documentation you won't be doing much with them they weren't designed
>to to in the first place), but that doesn't mean they aren't useful as
>a system component. What comes out of the RF connector on these devices
>is well and fully defined by the standard, for example, and for many
>the programming interface is documented, if not by the manufacturer, then
>at least by the Linux device driver someone wrote.
>
>In this case the standard says that DSSS cards can definitely be made
>to keep below 2450, though FHSS cards are a problem unless the hopping
>sequence is exposed at the programming interface somehow. For ID I'd be
>inclined to encode the call sign into a locally-administered-format
>MAC address and make the card use that instead of the vendor MAC address (I
>don't know whether Windows will let you configure this, but other operating
>systems do) since (we know from the standard) the local MAC address is
>included in every transmission the card makes.
>
>Note that if you still don't like 2.4 GHz you could always use the card
>output as an IF and shift it up into a band where there is more space.
>There is plenty of room at 10 GHz for the full U.S. 802.11 FHSS hopping
>sequence, for example. Even if the card itself can't be modified doesn't
>mean it can't be used as is as part of a bigger system.

2346. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 21:31:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212123070.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31857

On 21 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is permitted 1 W
>>>peak power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over
>>>that, the power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi
>>>gain would be about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP
>of
>>>about 400 watts. Feet?
>
>>Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external
>>equipment as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't
>>regularly done.....
>
>It is done a lot. There are provisions in Part 15 for equipment that is usually
>installed by "trained installers." IMHO, this was a major faux pas by the FCC,
>but many of the wireless LAN devices have antenna connectors.
>
>
>>>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham bands, as
>>is,
>>>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation products
>>>fall entirely within the ham bands.
>>Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS device? You
>>must be making some sort of assumption I am not.
>
>Yes, I am making the assumption that when a user uses the software to select a
>channel for the IEEE 802.11b device, the device actually goes to the
>frequencies that the owners manual says it will. Why would you assume
>otherwise?

If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do NOT assume that the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it also says that it can be. When was the last time you saw a box that said "a user selected 20MHz wide channel in the range of 2400-2483.5"?

>>Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL SWD
>>convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a JOKE on
>>2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already exist....
>
>I agree, although I am not sure what you mean by "bad" Part 15 devices?
>However, where are the reports of harmful interference? I will gladly help
>take ANY documented case to the Commission. Right now, every time a rulemaking
>procedure comes up, the Part 15 industry and the Commission both point to the
>part of the rule that says "no harmful interference." They they state that the
>present rules must be working because the Commission doesn't have many reports

>of interference to ham radio from Part 15 devices. In those cases that they ARE
>aware of, for the most part, the involved parties did the right thing.
>(http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html).

In my case, and with talking with my local coordinator (SCRRBA), we decided
that interference complaints on this are best filed after a FINAL COORDINATION
for the 2.4 GHz operations of the repeater has gone through. In that respect,
I still have to build the transmitter half. They are aware of my
experimentation at present.

As we discussed, ANY signal on an input-only frequency may interfere. However,
to properly make a complaint, we must have ACTUAL interference, not just
potential interference. Since no one other than me has used the input (and I
have always managed to capture the input since operating from my base station),
I don't yet have anything to affirmatively report. I haven't been able to set
up a mobile transmitter yet, but that will probably be what will generate any
complaint that I'm able to muster....

>I can live with the present rules IF the Commission will enforce actual cases.
>So far, they have been good about power lines stuff and they did go to bat for
>Amateur radio with the Darwin Networks 2.4 GHz interference case, but we really
>don't have enough to go on. Where are the reports?
>
>>That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't provide
>>the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to readily
>>modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
>> - To stay below 2450MHz, and
>> - To identify (in mode)(*)
>
>>(*) - Due to its frequency hopping, I don't believe that ID'ing in morse code
>>would be practical (or valid) unless the code is slow enough that every "dot"
>>happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the hop
>>pattern. Id'ing in mode would have to occur.
>
>Typing "DE WIRFI" every 10 minutes would do it. The computer could do it for
>you.

But who can read it? Don't the wireless lan stuff encrypt so only devices on
the same virtual lan can read the packets....?

>> However, as an unrelated problem, how
>would another amateur be able to tell the
>> difference (from remote - just by the signal) between a modified system as
>>amateur vs. part 15 (its original origins)?
>One could not tell, even with a spectrum analyzer. One would have to look at
>the content. This is true for every one of the many digital modes available to
>Amateur Radio. In one sense, it is moot, because under the rules, if an Amateur
>SS signal causes harmful interference to a non SS operation, the SS operator is
>responsible for addressing the harmful interference.

2347. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-21 21:32:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212132050.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 31858

On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 touhey@att.net wrote:
>I'm unable to locate my license manual. Does
>anyone know the minimum license requirement to
>operate radio control models on 50mhz?

1W power.

Transmitter need not identify but then must be physically labeled with a
callsign (of the operator).

2348. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 00:42:15 UTC
From: Cathexis@yourhaterols.com
Message-ID: <3c4cb52b.72323508@news.erols.com>
Source record: 31859
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The group might be interested in this news item:

Pfizer Corp. (NYSE PFE) is making the announcement today that VIAGRA
will soon be available in liquid form and will be marketed by Pepsi Cola
(Pepsi Bottling Group NYSE PBG) as a power beverage suitable for use
as-is, or as a mixer, under the name "Mount And Do."
Pepsi's proposed ad campaign suggests: "It will now be possible for a
man to literally pour himself a stiff one."
>

Reticulum

Remove "your.hat" when replying via e-mail

2349. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 00:50:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121195002.16286.00002698@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31860

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>On 21 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>>He's talking about IEEE 802.11b devices. For the U.S. the standard divides
>>the band into 11 overlapping channels at 5 MHz spacing, each about 20 MHz
>>wide, and you pretty much always get to pick which channel to use.

>So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM across the entire
>band (2400-2483.5)?.

Yup, that is what he is telling you. The channels are 20 MHz wide.

>>so to use these you'd need to know something about the hardware.

>That's my point. The manufacturers won't tell.

Actually, in many cases, the hardware is a masked, programmed chip, so there is
little to tell.

>I get 2.4 cordless phone interference on my 2.4 GHz input to my repeater all
>the time.

Do me a big favor -- document this interference and get a report to me at ARL
HQ. I am very much interested in these sorts of reports. If you have any
information on the offending party(ies), please include it. If it would be
helpful, I am willing to write a letter to the operater of the phone. We are
batting about 40% so far with such letters to neighbors. A few are about to get
a letter from the Commission.

> Now, for a 2.4GHz repeater OUTPUT, our allowable higher power and use of
> CTCSS by the receiving amateur station(s) will make the cordless phone
> and SS devices irrelevant.

A very strong Amateur signal could make the Part 15 operator just as unhappy as
you are. :-) And they are offered NO protection against interference from
Amateurs. The best "defense" of our bands would be to use them heavily.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2350. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 00:54:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121195432.16286.00002700@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31861

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R, let's
>say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
>would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a contact--that
>would be 50W.

Actually, I would wager that the FCC would be quite content to let Amateurs
either use or not use their linear amplifiers, as necessary. I don't think
that anyone expects amateurs to adjust power on the fly in 3 dB increments.

>If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no
>more than 25W.

There will be many a time when the station in Japan has better copy than the
station in AZ.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2351. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 00:56:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121195625.16286.00002703@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31862

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Ever heard of a CW rig from the Altoids(TM) tins? There's a fella,
>K4IWL/Len, who makes them. I haven't seen him lately to ask him, but they
>now have these even tinier Altoids tins that I wonder if anyone will try to
>build a rig into...

Ah, the QRPers use those Altoid tins like chasses. At the last QRP gathering in Dayton, they had an exhibition of QRP construction projects. They said that we could exhibit works in progress, so I put out a half-eaten tin of Altoids.

I didn't win. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2352. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 00:59:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121195948.16286.00002705@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 31863

>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
>anyway) start with minimal and go up.

Well, if I am 599 with my 10 milliwatt HF signal, I don't reduce power. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2353. Hey TR Where is my money?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 01:14:24 UTC
From: herbiebabykv4fz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121201424.22244.00002963@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 31864

You Drunken lout, where is my legal defense money you stole?

Herb EX-KV4FZ

2354. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 01:29:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2ifc5vsb1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31865

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW;
> >basic
> >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
other?
> >
> >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
> >to send/receive.
>
> The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.

What skills in particular. Assuming the connectivity
has been established, anyone can then use a
keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.

> >That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
> >the ham can be the operator.
>
> Yup.

Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?

> >Most other modes allow for
> >anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
> >as control operator.
>
> Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.

But the amateur can be just "there"...as opposed to
having to be actively engaged in the actual message
content being sent/received.

> >That allows the ham to let emergency
> >people directly communicate with each other even though they
> >no knowthing about the ham radio, etc. There is a beutiful
> >simplicity too in just being able to use the mike button/push
> >to talk.
>
> Sure - if that's what the situation requires.

Why have the ham be a "middle man" when the other
"non-hams" can be handed the mike.

> >Balance one againt the other? The world has
> >already done that by default.
>
> Not really. In many situations the PTT voice thing is what's needed. But
that
> requires both emergency folks to be where the radios are.

So? That is not an unusual set of circumstances. It isn't
all the time, but it is probably more frequent than not.

> There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others where
"one
> picture
> is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the
emergency.

How do you send pictures by CW?

> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
anybody
> with a receiver.

And that worries you? Why? We're talking
emergency, not a war effort.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2355. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 01:33:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121203323.03300.00000057@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31866

In article <20020119201017.16072.00000344@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass in
>the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.

Jim:

What was so bad about that? The second time I took my 20 WPM code test (my CSCE had expired by a few days -- I passed 20 when going for my General the previous year) I had almost 5 minutes of solid copy, and passed all the questions on the fill-in-the-blank test. Not a problem -- and a mere two years earlier, I was dragging my knuckles with the best of them, whining about having to learn the old fashioned Morris Kode in order to get a ham radio license! How dumb was that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2356. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 02:32:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020121213220.13187.00000397@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31867

In article <3c499d35_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020119084223.21442.00000345@mb-fk.aol.com...
>> >> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
>group.)
>> >>
>> >> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
>amateurs
>> >as a
>> >> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?
>> >
>> >We will keep working to eliminate the code test.
>>
>> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF access
>> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
>college to
>> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they" (That'd
>be
>> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
>>
>
>IMNSHO, I believe it's a bad analogy in these debates to begin comparing
>educational requirements to those of getting an amateur radio license.
>While the ARS is in the *avocation* [read: sideline] of providing community
>services, there is absoulutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham radio
>operator do so. While the ARS is in the *avocation* of experimenting with
>electronic theory, there is absolutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham
>radio operator do so.

True on both counts - but both activities support the basis and purpose of the
ARS.
>
>An MD is not in *any* avocation, as related to his education. An MD is in
>the *business* of diagnosing, preventetive medicine, and treatment--on
>*HUMAN BEINGS* for the sake of this discussion (not counting those who are
>veterinarians, etc.)

But except in the case of freely made contractual obligations there is
absolutely
no requirement that an MD, DO or other medical professional provide medial
services.

And there are plenty of MDs and other medical professionals who volunteer their services for little or no pay. Lawyers do pro-bono work. I know engineers who have provided services for free to support a good cause.

>Most people who take formal education are taking that education to then
>apply what they have learned to some area of professional life.

So? Plenty of people take formal education and then don't use it in professional life.
>
>The ARS should *not* be in the business of being so discretionary when
>judging how important one is by how they got their license or what they do
>with it once they get it.

I'm not sure what you mean by this.

Are you saying that nobody should have any opinion about what other hams do?

>Just as we, as people, should not be in the
>business of saying that someone who joined the Boy Scouts but never became
>an Eagle Scout is some kind of moron for not having done so.

I don't see the connection. btw, the requirements for Eagle Scout make amateur radio exams look like a piece of cake.

>Or, that a
>gardener who has never introduced a new rose because they've never
>experimented with grafting isn't a *real* gardener. Or, that someone who
>simply drinks herbal teas and has never studied any further is simply just
>not worthy of the flavor or experience of those teas. All these things are,
>basically, hobbies--and we decide when entering these hobbies just how
>"devoted" we will be to them.

Sure. But none of the hobbies you mention uses a limited, shared resource that others want. A backyard gardener does not have to compete with the flower shop for supplies or ground to plant things in. Amateur radio operators have to compete for a slice of the radio spectrum.
>
>The ARS is not a measure of intelligence, success, or even influence.

Not to you, maybe.

>It is
>a hobby, gentlemen, first and foremost.

The same could be said for volunteer firemen. After all, they don't get paid and
they can quit any time.

> Be it good or bad, I believe the
>FCC is recognizing this more and more.

If so, that's bad.

>In earlier times, there was
>certainly a lot more to being a ham. It was still a hobby, but those who

>engaged certainly were among the elite. The knowledge it took to create a
>signal that was received in distance just wasn't commonplace. Nor is it
>today.

Sorry, Kim, you're way off base on this. See K0HB's excellent post. He is right
on
the money.

>But, and I say this with great dread to the anger this inspires, it
>is not needed today.

You mean the knowledge, I presume. That is true to a certain extent - the
Ancient Ones had to know how their rigs worked in order to get them to function
at all. But those days were many decades ago.

> Before you begin to defame someone the next time you
>get angry because they worked differently than you did to get your license,
>just think about all the new things that have come out since you got your
>license.

When have I defamed any individual for how they got their license? My comments
are about the requirements themselves.

>Then, ask yourself if you understand so well how those "new" modes
>work, and how to experiment with them.
>
I do understand them, and how to experiment with them.

>> Poll the AR community. I
>> think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it away."
>Oh,
>> you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go
>poll
>> high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college
>> diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the
>"up"coming
>> graduating class. Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing the
>> "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.

>Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools
>need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed curriculums to
>get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start turning
>out pure genius in their field.

Who is qualified to say they don't do all those things now?

> BUT, the hobby arena is not the place to
>demand such stringent things of people.
> The hobby arena is the place people
>come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The more
>you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more you'll
>find the youth staying away. They've got enough, without hearing and
>listening to how incompetent they are because they only want a hobby and

>nothing more.
>
I don't think so. If that were the case, young people would not want to be Eagle Scouts, or rise to other challenges.

Next month the Winter Olympics will come to Salt Lake City. Most of the athletes will not win, nor receive any money or lasting fame for their efforts. It's just a
"hobby" for them.

Many major cities have marathons. Running 26.22 miles requires lots of training

and dedication. Yet most of those who run marathons will never win any prize or sponsorship. It's just a "hobby" for them.

Perhaps we should shorten the marathon distance to 5 miles because "it's just a hobby". Lots more people would run marathons if we did.

>Why is it that great philosophers, inventers, speakers, scientists,
>musicians, etc., why are they almost always *not* from the United States?

Well, for one thing, the US population is only a few percent of the world population.

But if you look carefully, the US produces far more than its share of great philosophers, inventors, speakers, scientists, engineers, musicians, etc.

Just look at the history of radio/electronics. The amplifying vacuum tube, transistor, integrated circuit and microprocessor were all invented here. SSB, FM, color TV, and the all-electronic digital computer are American firsts.

>Everything here in the United States is so very judged--we demand perfection
>in everything we do; when sometimes all we need and want is to just "pick up
>a microphone and argue, or chat, or frolic" [in the case of amateur radio].
>I know many Europeans who come over here and are at first amazed, then
>feared by, our work ethic; our harried lifestyles; and the way we choose to
>"enjoy" ourselves.

Maybe that's what YOU want. The success of the USA is based on the fact that we are always a little unsatisfied and looking for something better. That requires judgement.

Look at the computer in front of you. It's the result of a "very judged" attitude that
is not satisfied with the way things were. Lots of judgement.

Or consider political philosophy. The idea and practice of separation of church and state began here. The concept of meritocracy rather than inherited nobility is another example.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2357. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 03:07:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#9FfPHvoBHA.1404@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 31868

W5TIT - Kim wrote

> Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools
> need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed curriculums
to
> get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start
turning
> out pure genius in their field. BUT, the hobby arena is not the place to
> demand such stringent things of people. The hobby arena is the place
people
> come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The
more
> you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more
you'll
> find the youth staying away.

The FCC heartily disagrees with that view. In the very first article of our rules and regulations they outline the "Basis and Purpose" of our Amateur Radio service. Two of the five clauses in that "Basis and Purpose" involve training/education.

"rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communications and technical phases of the art."

"Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."

Doncha just hate it when someone spoils your rant?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2358. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 03:29:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4cde14_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31869

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uvvx47poBHA.1884@cpimsnntpa04...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim"
>
> > In earlier times, there was certainly a lot more to being a ham.
>
> Boy, do you ever have that bass-ackwards!
>

No, I don't.

>
> There is so much more "to being a ham" today than there
> was in the "earlier times" that a "Rip Van Winkle" of just 50
> years ago (end of WW-II) wouldn't even recognize the things
> available to them today as "ham radio".
>

There is more "stuff" to being a ham today. There is not much more to being a ham. It is my understanding that spark gap dictated that rigs be homebrewed, right? It is my understanding that one used to have to build to get a ticket, right? It is my understanding that one had to draw, er, something to get a ticket, right? That is my definition of "more to being a ham in earlier times."

>
> Those folks used Morse code, AM phone, 60WPM RTTY,
> a few guys were playing with SSB, and a couple with
> those newfangled transistor thingies.
>

I understand. But, I wasn't thinking of once one got the ticket...well, except for having to homebrew a rig, or at least fiddle with it in some manner to get it to work (in the case of store-bought [did they have such things?]).

>
> Space communications, APRS, LEO's, AX25, PSK-31,
> DX-spotting clusters, computerized logging, credit-card
> sized transceivers, "xxxTOR-du-jour", DSP, etc., would border
> on "magic" to the hams of that era.
>

Well, that's true--and it's also an entirely different can of worms. I say that because the "hams of yesterday" who always want to jump on the bones of

the new hams probably couldn't answer to most of the technical aspects of those modes you mention above. But, on the other hand, we newer hams can just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and, ourselves, don't even have to *really know* how they work.

> >
> > It was still a hobby, but those who engaged certainly were
> > among the elite.
>
> Elite? You've gotta be kidding. In that era ham radio was
> the domain of high school kids, young experimenters, and
> blue-collar workingmen. It was a "get your hands dirty" sort
> of hobby, available to anyone, not some sort of "elite" thing
> at all.
>

I think your interpretation of what I said is different from what I'd intended.

>
> Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
> dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from
> a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
> junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Well, I would quite consider someone who was willing to do all that as being far more elite than I. I really would. If ham radio took *that* much effort, I certainly wouldn't be interested.

Kim W5TIT

2359. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 03:34:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4cdf49_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31870

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C4C5F9C.85289019@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > One could quip that the existence of a supernatural "being" who is
> > responsible for all creation yet possesses superior intelligence could
> > certainly be--at a minimum--debatable, with the likes of Larry Roll,
Dave
> > Heil, et al around... :o
>
> Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
> an idiot. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Ah so...I see Grasshopper! For every action, there is an equal and opposite
reactor...er, ction. ;P

Kim W5TIT

2360. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 03:41:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4ce0e6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31871

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:#9FfPHvoBHA.1404@cpimsnntpa03...
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote
>
> > Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools
> > need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed
curriculums
> to
> > get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start
> turning
> > out pure genius in their field. BUT, the hobby arena is not the place
to
> > demand such stringent things of people. The hobby arena is the place
> people
> > come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The
> more
> > you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more
> you'll
> > find the youth staying away.
>
> The FCC heartily disagrees with that view. In the very first article of
our
> rules and regulations they outline the "Basis and Purpose" of our
> Amateur Radio service. Two of the five clauses in that "Basis and
> Purpose" involve training/education.
>
>
> "rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communications
> and technical phases of the art."
>
> "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service
> of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."
>
> Doncha just hate it when someone spoils your rant?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

No, Hans, I don't "hate" it at all. Good points of view are the meat of
great discussion. It's the namecalling, slurs, and intelligible rants that
spoil. Anyway, you're absolutely right, the FCC Basis and Purpose, etc.,

does say all that and all those good things. However, it is my opinion that those documents will stand long after the original intention has changed dramatically. Other government documents say lots of stuff that we'd be hard pressed to bring to task today.

Kim W5TIT

2361. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:07:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2iojd$a1q$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31872

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c4ce0e6_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:#9FfPHvoBHA.1404@cpimsnntpa03...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote
> >
> > > Educational requirements belong in the educational environment.
Schools
> > > need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed
> curriculums
> > to
> > > > get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start
> > turning
> > > > out pure genius in their field. BUT, the hobby arena is not the place
> to
> > > > demand such stringent things of people. The hobby arena is the place
> > people
> > > > come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession.
The
> > more
> > > > you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more
> > you'll
> > > > find the youth staying away.
> >
> > The FCC heartily disagrees with that view. In the very first article of
> our
> > rules and regulations they outline the "Basis and Purpose" of our
> > Amateur Radio service. Two of the five clauses in that "Basis and
> > Purpose" involve training/education.
> >
> >
> > "rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communications
> > and technical phases of the art."
> >
> > "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service
> > of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."
> >
> > Doncha just hate it when someone spoils your rant?
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >

>
> No, Hans, I don't "hate" it at all. Good points of view are the meat of
> great discussion. It's the namecalling, slurs, and intelligible rants
that
> spoil. Anyway, you're absolutely right, the FCC Basis and Purpose, etc.,
> does say all that and all those good things. However, it is my opinion
that
> those documents will stand long after the original intention has changed
> dramatically. Other government documents say lots of stuff that we'd be
> hard pressed to bring to task today.

Additionally, the basis and purpose applies to ham radio service.
The FCC has never subscribed to the concept that any one ham
had to meet all the reasons for the service as stated.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2362. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231605.03300.00000083@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31873

In article <a2hf8g$3guvb$1@rn.area.com>, "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> writes:

>
>...make my ANTENNA bigger too?

Yeah, but you'll have to "do it" at a lower frequency!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2363. Re: Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231605.03300.00000082@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31874

In article <keF28.111135$fe1.1958028@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>Why is this crap crossposted to rram???
>

Dunno. Why did you crosspost it to rrap?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2364. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231606.03300.00000084@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31879

In article <G4V28.112129$fe1.2033144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>If you can put up with the anal AMA types you can put up with anything.
>Just be sure to get the flags right and never never use the ï¿½ on your
>plane if you live in the Great Midcontinent and get one on your callsign.
>Note that there are special - no big deal- rules for model control under
>Part 97 the Amateur rules that you should be aware of.
>
>Dick Nï¿½BK

Dick:

What's the deal about not using a slashed zero {ï¿½} on an R/C plane?
Anyway, most R/C'ers would use their AMA number on their planes,
not their ham call (if any).

QSL the anal AMA types. R/C got too much like work, kept me out
of flying in contests for years. I just want to go somewhere and bore
some holes in the sky, without having some self-important "Safety
Officer" micromanaging me every step of the way. My Dad and I
used to have a joke between us that R/C flying was the third leading
cause of death in the U.S.A. But we solved our problem by buying
50 acres for flying off the ground, and lakefront vacation property for
flying off the H2O. BTW -- know any source for new, single-stick
R/C transmitters? We (mainly he) is/are still using old Kraft/Futaba
single-stick TX's dating back to the 70's.

I used to spend hours flying a "Middle Stik" with a K&B .40, making
inverted passes low enough to break baloons staked to the ground,
with a large sewing needle stuck in the top of the rudder! A few times,
I'd "flame out" making the pass...no problem -- roll over, and set it down!
I also tried "carrier landings" with arresting cables made out of
parachute line and bungee cord. Never got around to perfecting that
technique -- I joined the Air Force, not the Navy!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: AMA 63931

2365. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231607.03300.00000085@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31877

In article <3c4c15bd.2378209@netnews.att.net>, touhey@att.net writes:

>
>I'm unable to locate my license manual. Does
>anyone know the minimum license requirement to
>operate radio control models on 50mhz?
>Respectfully,
>Jesse

Jesse:

All you'd need is a Technician-class ham radio license. 35 multiple-guess Q&A's, pay a nominal fee, and you've got it. However, why would you want to use 50 MHz to fly R/C? One of the most popular uses of 50 MHz transmitters is to shoot down expensive R/C planes! I'd stick with the 72 MHz R/C freqs -- there's plenty of 'em, and no license is required. Most of the 50 MHz R/C'ers are bootleggers who don't know what they're doing, anyway.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: AMA 63931

2366. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231608.03300.00000087@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31875

In article <3c48e950_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Krell:
>>
>> That's right -- identifying yourself is not required. However, those of
>> us who DO identify ourselves are morally and intellectually superior
>> to those who don't -- with one notable exception, which we would
>> prefer to remain *unidentified.*
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Yeah, and we all know how popular he wishes he were.

Kim:

You are not using the correct pronoun.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2367. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231608.03300.00000086@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31878

In article <20020121071306.16238.00002230@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Interesting. In my own personal experience, I would tend to think
>>that using 1500 watts when first calling CQ, or at any other time, is
>>virtually NEVER warranted.
>
>We could put this to the test. You could call CQ on 40 meters with 100 watts
>and I could call CQ on 40 meters with 1500 watts and we can see who gets an
>answer first. We could also try it in the November SS and see who works the
>most stations in a 1 hour period. That should answer the question nicely.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Actually, I've spent most of my ham career proving the value of skill over brute force. I can work anyone I can hear, and I can hear a lot more stations than I have time to work! I had one of my most enjoyable QSO's in a long time the other night, with a guy in CA using 10 watts to an attic dipole -- and I was using 25 watts to my indoor dipole in my apartment. We exchanged 559/579. No problem. I then worked a bunch of Russians having some sort of sprint contest. Ripping good fun. I pity anyone who doesn't use CW! They don't know what they're missing!

See you later...gotta Czech the PacketCluster.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2368. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:16:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121231609.03300.00000088@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31876

In article <3C4C5F9C.85289019@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>> One could quip that the existence of a supernatural "being" who is
>> responsible for all creation yet possesses superior intelligence could
>> certainly be--at a minimum--debatable, with the likes of Larry Roll, Dave
>> Heil, et al around... :o
>
>Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
>an idiot. :-)

Cecil:

Assuming the opposite is also true, who is the genius that proves
your existence?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2369. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:22:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4cea85_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31881

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121213220.13187.00000397@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3c499d35_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020119084223.21442.00000345@mb-fk.aol.com...
> >> >> Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
> >group.)
> >> >>
> >> >> If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
> >amateurs
> >> >as a
> >> >> result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do?
> >> >
> >> >We will keep working to eliminate the code test.
> >>
> >> But why? Isn't MF & above enough? For a lousy 5 w.p.m. you get HF
access
> >> thereafter. I just don't get it, Bill? What if we encouraged kids in
> >college to
> >> use the same analogy. I'm going to be a doctor, so why do "they"
(That'd
> >be
> >> society, Bill.) force me to take history classes too?
> >>
> >
> >IMNSHO, I believe it's a bad analogy in these debates to begin comparing
> >educational requirements to those of getting an amateur radio license.
> >While the ARS is in the *avocation* [read: sideline] of providing
community
> >services, there is absoulutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham radio
> >operator do so. While the ARS is in the *avocation* of experimenting
with
> >electronic theory, there is absolutely no requirement whatsoever that a
ham
> >radio operator do so.
>
> True on both counts - but both activities support the basis and purpose of
the
> ARS.
>

And, as I just posted in response to Hans, you're absolutely right. However, I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be more and more of a historical notation, rather than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks of the ARS. Just my opinion, mind you.

> >
> >
> >An MD is not in *any* avocation, as related to his education. An MD is in
> >the *business* of diagnosing, preventetive medicine, and treatment--on
> >*HUMAN BEINGS* for the sake of this discussion (not counting those who are
> >veterinarians, etc.)
>
> But except in the case of freely made contractual obligations there is
> absolutely
> no requirement that an MD, DO or other medical professional provide medial
> services.
>

OK, then I'll reword, Jim. A practicing MD, in the business of practicing medicine and having patients, in not in *any* avocation, as related to his education. I think it is a given that people are not required to follow up through profession what they have mastered in continuing education. I wasn't sure that point had to be made. :|

>
> And there are plenty of MDs and other medical professionals who volunteer their
> services for little or no pay. Lawyers do pro-bono work. I know engineers who
> have provided services for free to support a good cause.
>

I don't know what your reference to "volunteerism" is intended for. My point is that there is no requirement that a ham operator be a volunteer at all. My point is that ham radio is probably, first and foremost, a hobby for most people. My point is that the requirements (or lack thereof, depending upon which side of debate you come from) for a ham radio operator--and whether a person wishes to meet them or not--should not then be translated into a formula for how that person would approach other things in their life. For example, for the *hobby* of ham radio, I was willing to put forth only minimal effort. For my job, I willing to do *nearly* whatever it takes to be successful in my workplace. For my husband, I am willing to do *whatever* it takes to make our marriage a success. For my yard to look pretty, well, in Texas, I give up...LOL

> >
> >Most people who take formal education are taking that education to then
> >apply what they have learned to some area of professional life.
>
> So? Plenty of people take formal education and then don't use it in
> professional life.

>

My point in this was that the effort put forth for ham radio should not be a measure of how much effort we will put into other things.

> >
> >The ARS should *not* be in the business of being so discretionary when
> >judging how important one is by how they got their license or what they do
> >with it once they get it.
>
> I'm not sure what you mean by this.
>

Just what I've been saying. We should not be in the business of equating the effort we put into ham radio as being the effort we put into anything else in life.

>
> Are you saying that nobody should have any opinion about what other hams do?
>

No. How can someone decide that others should not have an opinion? You have me confused with Dick C., Larry R., Dave H.

>
> >Just as we, as people, should not be in the
> >business of saying that someone who joined the Boy Scouts but never became
> >an Eagle Scout is some kind of moron for not having done so.
>
> I don't see the connection. btw, the requirements for Eagle Scout make amateur
> radio exams look like a piece of cake.
>

Actually, I don't think I am the first to make the comparison. But, regardless, it is germane to the comments I was making. Haven't you ever seen someone say, "The ARS is getting so damned dumbed down because you creeps who don't want to learn CW want *everything* in life handed to you."? That's a piss poor analogy.

> >
> >Or, that a
> >gardener who has never introduced a new rose because they've never
> >experimented with grafting isn't a *real* gardener. Or, that someone who
> >simply drinks herbal teas and has never studied any further is simply just
> >not worthy of the flavor or experience of those teas. All these things are,
> >basically, hobbies--and we decide when entering these hobbies just how
> >"devoted" we will be to them.

>
> Sure. But none of the hobbies you mention uses a limited, shared resource
that
> others want. A backyard gardener does not have to compete with the flower
shop
> for supplies or ground to plant things in. Amateur radio operators have to
> compete for a slice of the radio spectrum.
> >

Excuse me, if there is a gardener next door to me that has just decided that 3X the amount of recommended malathion will work faster and better than the prescribed amount, there is a problem, a HUGE problem. And, if that gardener allows their overspray to eliminate the true organic nature of my vegetables and herbs, there is a problem. Backyard gardeners may not overtly have to compete for space, but in reality they do. And, they should maintain "their" space so that it will spread nicely to others' "spaces" and into "spaces" for the future.

> >
> >The ARS is not a measure of intelligence, success, or even influence.
>
> Not to you, maybe.
>

Oh, 'scuse me. I forgot to add, "in my opinion." And, I don't see it as a measure of any of the above. I mean, *just because* someone is an amateur radio operator doesn't necessarily mean squat.

> >
> >It is
> >a hobby, gentlemen, first and foremost.
>
> The same could be said for volunteer firemen. After all, they don't get
paid
> and
> they can quit any time.
>

It could be said. You are right. Pay has nothing to do with my measure of hobby.

> >
> > Be it good or bad, I believe the
> >FCC is recognizing this more and more.
>
> If so, that's bad.
>
> >In earlier times, there was
> >certainly a lot more to being a ham. It was still a hobby, but those who
> >engaged certainly were among the elite. The knowledge it took to create
a
> >signal that was received in distance just wasn't commonplace. Nor is it

> >today.
>
> Sorry, Kim, you're way off base on this. See K0HB's excellent post. He is
right
> on
> the money.
>

I don't think so, for reasons in my response back to him.

> >
> >But, and I say this with great dread to the anger this inspires, it
> >is not needed today.
>
> You mean the knowledge, I presume. That is true to a certain extent - the
> Ancient Ones had to know how their rigs worked in order to get them to
function
> at all. But those days were many decades ago.
>

I'm not measuring distance or time. I made the general observation--and I think I am correct--that hams of yesteryear *had* to know more than we do today to get a rig up and running on the air. I am under that impression because I don't think one just trotted out to the local radio shop, picked up a radio, brought it home, plugged it in and talked to lands across the world. To me, those are the more admirable people, the people that--(sigh) *in my opinion* did have to know more and were among the elite.

> >
> > Before you begin to defame someone the next time you
> >get angry because they worked differently than you did to get your
license,
> >just think about all the new things that have come out since you got your
> >license.
>
> When have I defamed any individual for how they got their license? My
comments
> are about the requirements themselves.
>

Jim, when I post I am posting to the group. Shall I make a list of all the qualifiers I must now use in posts:

A. I will remember to use the phrase "in my opinion" so that it is clear I am posting my opinion and not the opinion of someone else
B. I will head each and every post with the salutation "Group" for the benefit of having everyone understand that I am posting to a discussion, not to a person

What else would you like, Jim? See? *THAT* is a direct comment to *YOU*. How can we get that into some kind of recognizable format?

> >
> >Then, ask yourself if you understand so well how those "new" modes
> >work, and how to experiment with them.
> >
> I do understand them, and how to experiment with them.
>

Well, I don't, and I am not even one of the old ones...LOL And, that was a general comment to the discussion.

> >>
> >> Poll the AR community. I
> >> think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it
away."
> >Oh,
> >> you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go
> >poll
> >> high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college
> >> diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the
> >"up"coming
> >> graduating class. Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing
the
> >> "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.
>
> >Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools
> >need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed curriculums
to
> >get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start
turning
> >out pure genius in their field.
>
> Who is qualified to say they don't do all those things now?
>

Many of the teachers my children had in Ft. Worth public schools developed curriculum of their own that was quickly quashed by the District because it was outside their standards. When you post your opinions (they *are* opinions, are they not) from now on, would you like me to ask you, "Jim, who is qualified to say that?"

> >
> > BUT, the hobby arena is not the place to
> >demand such stringent things of people.
> > The hobby arena is the place people
> >come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The
more
> >you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more
you'll
> >find the youth staying away. They've got enough, without hearing and
> >listening to how incompetent they are because they only want a hobby and
> >nothing more.
> >

> I don't think so. If that were the case, young people would not want to be
> Eagle Scouts, or rise to other challenges.
>

I don't know how or why, but amateur radio and things like it are different. Scouts is mainstream, maybe. I don't know. But I think you'll find far more young people involved in Scouting than you will find involved in ham radio. Of course, that's obvious--in my opinion.

>
> Next month the Winter Olympics will come to Salt Lake City. Most of the
> athletes will not win, nor receive any money or lasting fame for their efforts.
> It's just a
> "hobby" for them.
>

It probably is a hobby for them. So, where is the sacrifice in ham radio? You mean we are supposed to revere someone who chases paper? We are supposed to revere the contester in ham radio who goes to the store, buys equipment, even pretty logs, as much as someone who gets to the Olympics? And, I better clarify that statement for you, Jim. It is my belief that most (not all, but most) people in ham radio *do not* build their rigs today. Most, in my opinion, don't even build their antennas.

>
> Many major cities have marathons. Running 26.22 miles requires lots of training
>
> and dedication. Yet most of those who run marathons will never win any prize
> or sponsorship. It's just a "hobby" for them.
>

Probably. See above comments. What, in ham radio, is the high success that we should revere, Jim?

>
> Perhaps we should shorten the marathon distance to 5 miles because "it's just a
> hobby". Lots more people would run marathons if we did.
>

Now, you are getting way off topic and ridiculous to boot. Here is my comment, short and simple: the measure of education in the educational arena, should not be measured against ham radio in terms of effort put forth. Ham radio is a hobby. Getting a ham license easier, cheaper, and with less effort has nothing to do with the effort someone would put forth in other things in life.

> >
> >Why is it that great philosophers, inventers, speakers, scientists,
> >musicians, etc., why are they almost always *not* from the United States?

> Well, for one thing, the US population is only a few percent of the world
> population.
>
> But if you look carefully, the US produces far more than its share of great
> philosophers, inventors, speakers, scientists, engineers, musicians, etc.
>
> Just look at the history of radio/electronics. The amplifying vacuum tube,
> transistor, integrated circuit and microprocessor were all invented here. SSB,
> FM, color TV, and the all-electronic digital computer are American firsts.
>
> >Everything here in the United States is so very judged--we demand perfection
> >in everything we do; when sometimes all we need and want is to just "pick up
> >a microphone and argue, or chat, or frolic" [in the case of amateur radio].
> >I know many Europeans who come over here and are at first amazed, then
> >feared by, our work ethic; our harried lifestyles; and the way we choose to
> >"enjoy" ourselves.
>
> Maybe that's what YOU want. The success of the USA is based on the fact that we
> are always a little unsatisfied and looking for something better. That requires
> judgement.
>
> Look at the computer in front of you. It's the result of a "very judged"
> attitude that
> is not satisfied with the way things were. Lots of judgement.
>
> Or consider political philosophy. The idea and practice of separation of church
> and state began here. The concept of meritocracy rather than inherited nobility
> is another example.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

The ease of getting a ham radio ticket, or the difficulty of getting a ham radio ticket--is not an accurate measure of the effort one will put forth for other more important things in life.

Kim W5TIT

2370. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:25:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4ceb08_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31882

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121195948.16286.00002705@mb-df.aol.com...
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
> >anyway) start with minimal and go up.
>
> Well, if I am 599 with my 10 milliwatt HF signal, I don't reduce power.
:-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

heh heh heh...yeah, there is a minimal, eh?

Kim W5TIT

2371. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:27:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4ceb9d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31883

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121195625.16286.00002703@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >Ever heard of a CW rig from the Altoids(TM) tins? There's a fella,
> >K4IWL/Len, who makes them. I haven't seen him lately to ask him, but
they
> >now have these even tinier Altoids tins that I wonder if anyone will try
to
> >build a rig into...
>
> Ah, the QRPers use those Altoid tins like chasses. At the last QRP
gathering in
> Dayton, they had an exhibition of QRP construction projects. They said
that we
> could exhibit works in progress, so I put out a half-eaten tin of Altoids.
>
> I didn't win. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed, I wish I could remember this with the clarity I'd like to have, but here goes. At the Texoma Hamfest a couple of years ago, there was a guy (can't remember his call) who makes the "tiniest CW rig in the world." This thing is, I think, solid brass, and is probably no more than 1.5" square. WOW, and the darned thing works, looks pretty, and provides conversation as well!

Kim W5TIT

2372. Re: DR. KING DAY: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NEEDED IN HAM RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:28:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020121232811.03300.00000089@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31880

In article <20020121224131.22658.00002911@mb-mi.aol.com>, crt4239@aol.com (Crt4239) writes:

>*******
>"Anyone who attends a ham club meeting would have to agree that certain
>minorities, especially, African Americans, are grossly underrepresented in
>our
>hobby. I believe, and I think many of you will agree, that perhaps we should
>remedy the effects of past discrimination by some sort of affirmative action
>allowing underrepresented minorities a FAIR OPPORTUNITY to get their tickets.
>Much has recently been reported in the last decade of growing "electronic
>divide" in the percentage of white versus black households having computers
>and
>Internet access. You would all have to agree that this "electronic divide"
>has
>ALWAYS been in the amateur radio hobby. This would be a perfect time in our
>country's history, especially in light of the dwindling numbers of potential
>hams lost to the computer hobbyists, to begin thinking about policies that
>might create real interest in our great hobby. My ideas of remedies for past
>discrimination include DROPPING THE CODE REQUIREMENT FOR MINORITY APPLICANTS
>and possibly WAIVING SOME SECTIONS OF THE EXAMS. Such remedies are a way to
>ensure an integrated society of amateurs and allow equal opportunity.
>Numerical
>goals for admission to our great hobby is necessary to integrate a hobby
>traditionally closed to minorities because of discrimination. At a time when
>our hobby needs a shot in the arm, these kind of policies might help in
>increasing our numbers and preserving our power to demand that no more of our
>frequencies be taken away. Any THOUGHTFUL replies are welcomed."

I see. The original Affirmative Action programs got Dr. King spinning
in his grave; now he's just hit about 1,000 RPM. We should at least
hook some kind of generator up to the poor guy! Got any more
brilliant ideas?

I think you're a racist, trolling wanker. Is that thoughtful enough for
you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2373. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 04:28:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4cebe0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31884

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121195432.16286.00002700@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R,
let's
> >say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
> >would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a
contact--that
> >would be 50W.
>
> Actually, I would wager that the FCC would be quite content to let
Amateurs
> either use or not use their linear amplifiers, as necessary. I don't
think
> that anyone expects amateurs to adjust power on the fly in 3 dB
increments.
>
> >If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no
> >more than 25W.
>
> There will be many a time when the station in Japan has better copy than
the
> station in AZ.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Well, so true. But you got my point. Just flip flop the scenario.

Kim W5TIT

2374. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 05:07:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122000744.02067.00000548@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 31885

In article <20020121203323.03300.00000057@mb-fo.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>>In the bad old days, the "one minute solid copy" was the only way to pass in
>>the USA. 25 for 5 wpm, 65 for 13 wpm, 100 for 20 wpm.
>
>Jim:
>
>What was so bad about that?

Nothing. "Bad old days" is not meant to be taken literally.

(Curmudgeon mode ON)

>The second time I took my 20 WPM
>code test (my CSCE had expired by a few days -- I passed 20 when
>going for my General the previous year) I had almost 5 minutes of
>solid copy, and passed all the questions on the fill-in-the-blank
>test.

CSCE? Fill in the blank? Didn't have those either. Had to pass the code and written in the same session or do the whole mess all over again. No second tries for a second fee, either - they said "go home and come back after at least 30 days - when you're ready".

>Not a problem -- and a mere two years earlier, I was dragging
>my knuckles with the best of them, whining about having to learn
>the old fashioned Morris Kode in order to get a ham radio license!
>How dumb was that?
>
I dunno. Nike has the right slogan.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2375. Re: DR. KING DAY: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NEEDED IN HAM RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 05:14:05 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ubIMLOwoBHA.1636@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 31886

"Crt4239" <crt4239@aol.com> wrote

> Any THOUGHTFUL replies are welcomed.

I thought, and I thought, and I thought some more. The longer I thought, the more thoughtful I was, until my thoughts overwhelmingly were "this guy is nothing but a dump huck troll".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2376. MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 06:30:38 UTC
From: CW - never CB <realhams@njnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C4D070E.4C30E492@njnet.com>
Source record: 31887

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

2377. More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 06:43:26 UTC
From: CW - never CB <realhams@njnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C4D0A0E.191FF43C@njnet.com>
Source record: 31888

Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
A. An iTard.

Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
A. Only one. But none will try.

Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?

A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.

Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!

Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval track race?
One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.

An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio and which end went to the antenna.

Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.

2378. Twistedhed The CRaZy Freebander

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 07:10:22 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0201212310.7e53e2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

2379. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 09:55:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0Ga38.113322$fe1.2127447@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31890

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020121231606.03300.00000084@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article
<G4V28.112129$fe1.2033144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> >If you can put up with the anal AMA types you can put up with anything.
> >Just be sure to get the flags right and never never use the ø on your
> >plane if you live in the Great Midcontinent and get one on your
callsign.
> >Note that there are special - no big deal- rules for model control
under
> >Part 97 the Amateur rules that you should be aware of.
> >
> >Dick NØBK
>
> Dick:
>
> What's the deal about not using a slashed zero {ø} on an R/C plane?
> Anyway, most R/C'ers would use their AMA number on their planes,
> not their ham call (if any).
>
> QSL the anal AMA types. R/C got too much like work, kept me out
> of flying in contests for years. I just want to go somewhere and bore
> some holes in the sky, without having some self-important "Safety
> Officer" micromanaging me every step of the way. My Dad and I
> used to have a joke between us that R/C flying was the third leading
> cause of death in the U.S.A. But we solved our problem by buying
> 50 acres for flying off the ground, and lakefront vacation property for
> flying off the H2O. BTW -- know any source for new, single-stick
> R/C transmitters? We (mainly he) is/are still using old Kraft/Futaba
> single-stick TX's dating back to the 70's.
>
> I used to spend hours flying a "Middle Stik" with a K&B .40, making
> inverted passes low enough to break baloons staked to the ground,
> with a large sewing needle stuck in the top of the rudder! A few times,
> I'd "flame out" making the pass...no problem -- roll over, and set it
down!
> I also tried "carrier landings" with arresting cables made out of
> parachute line and bungee cord. Never got around to perfecting that
> technique -- I joined the Air Force, not the Navy!
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Ex: AMA 63931
>
>

I got into, and out of, RC in the 80s at the urging of another ham, a dentist whose undergrad degree was in aeronautical engineering. I gathered the 72 MHz freqs were new at the time or some major change had been made because the emphasis was on being 'narrowbanded' and picked up some 53.3 gear (cheap) to avoid the bullshit.

Built a simple-minded trainer for no better reason than I needed the training and for lack of anything better to do put my call sign -- hey it started with an 'N' didn't it -- on the wing and roared off to bore holes. So I am having fun doing touch-and-gos on a dead day at the RC park when the goon squad approaches. The opening line was 'I don't recognize your flags' to which I said 53.3 and got a dumb look. I was also informed that the FAA does not put the on airplanes and this was highly irregular to which I said the whole plane was not a model of much of anything except a highly forgiving airframe suitable for a rookie who was likely to reduce it to balsa scrap pretty soon anyway. It turned into a pissing contest.

So at the next meeting -- finding that two of the goon squad were club officers -- burned my membership card publicly. Sold the radio gear, cheap, in a package to another ham so he and his kid could bore holes. Ha, ha, ha.

The only group more hostile to newbies are handball players down at the Y.

Dick N BK

2380. Re: Twistedhed The CRaZy Freebander

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 10:57:04 UTC
From: Steve Hanis <wxfreak@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Wyb38.29181$3K2.4857490@twister.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 31891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

google

2381. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 12:15:14 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120020715137514%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31892

I find your attempt at humor patently unfunny. There are many good reasons to not pursue the CW endorsement. None of them should condemn the choose. On the other hand, plenty of Extra's I've heard on the air display frustratingly poor manners.

I find your form of bigotry as distasteful as racism, sexism, and all the other forms.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2382. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 12:16:15 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120020716131140%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31893

In article <3C4D070E.4C30E492@njnet.com>, CW - never CB
<realhams@njnet.com> wrote:

] NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

Not true. Go back to your hole troll.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2383. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 12:16:47 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120020716463091%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31894

In article <3C4D070E.4C30E492@njnet.com>, CW - never CB
<realhams@njnet.com> wrote:

] NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

PS - welcome to my kill file.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2384. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 12:54:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122075406.05200.00000384@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31895

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>We could put this to the test. You could call CQ on 40 meters with 100
>>watts and I could call CQ on 40 meters with 1500 watts and we can see
>>who gets an answer first. We could also try it in the November SS
>>and see who works the most stations in a 1 hour period. That should
>>answer the question nicely.

>Actually, I've spent most of my ham career proving the value of skill
>over brute force. I can work anyone I can hear, and I can hear a lot
>more stations than I have time to work! I had one of my most
>enjoyable QSO's in a long time the other night, with a guy in CA
>using 10 watts to an attic dipole -- and I was using 25 watts to my
>indoor dipole in my apartment. We exchanged 559/579. No
>problem. I then worked a bunch of Russians having some sort of
>sprint contest. Ripping good fun. I pity anyone who doesn't use
>CW! They don't know what they're missing!

Sure, I have done the same.

Do I take it from your response that you don't want to try the experiment?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2385. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 12:55:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122075539.05200.00000385@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31896

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>...make my ANTENNA bigger too?

>Yeah, but you'll have to "do it" at a lower frequency!

Not at all, Larry; there is nothing magical about resonance in antenna systems.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2386. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 13:02:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122080222.05200.00000386@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31897

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
>just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and, ourselves,
>don't even have to *really know* how they work.

That was true in 1950, too, Kim. If this is a "problem," it is one that is a
half century old, and during that time, Amateur Radio has thrived.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2387. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 13:03:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122080336.05200.00000387@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 31898

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>The FCC has never subscribed to the concept that any one ham
>had to meet all the reasons for the service as stated.

Good thing, because I don't meet them all.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2388. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 13:07:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122080718.17580.00000514@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31899

In article <3c49927c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

> If tuning is required with a carrier
>because one does not have a dummy load (and I know few hams who do), then
>just be sure to ID (and I know many hams who don't) when you've completed
>each step of tuning.

Tuning up with the antenna is usually done because the setup requires it, not
due to lack of a dummy load. Unless the antenna presents the same complex
impedance as the dummy load, tuning up with the antenna to be used is
usually necessary.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2389. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 13:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122080719.17580.00000515@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 31900

In article <a2ifc5vsb1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
>> >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW;
>> >basic
>> >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
>other?
>> >
>> >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
>> >to send/receive.
>>
>> The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.
>
>What skills in particular.

The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station to work
and establish/maintain a QSO.

>Assuming the connectivity
>has been established, anyone can then use a
>keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
>
But the "connection" must be established and maintained. And the speed
of communication is directly related to typing skill.

>> >That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
>> >the ham can be the operator.
>>
>> Yup.
>
>Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
>a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?

Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for example,
requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software, interconnections and
skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.
>
>> >Most other modes allow for
>> >anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
>> >as control operator.

>>
>> Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.
>
>But the amateur can be just "there"...as opposed to
>having to be actively engaged in the actual message
>content being sent/received.

So? You still need a qualified amateur at eac end of the QSO.
>
>> >That allows the ham to let emergency
>> >people directly communicate with each other even though they
>> >no knowthing about the ham radio, etc. There is a beutiful
>> >simplicity too in just being able to use the mike button/push
>> >to talk.
>>
>> Sure - if that's what the situation requires.
>
>Why have the ham be a "middle man" when the other
>"non-hams" can be handed the mike.

All depends on the situation.
>
>> >Balance one againt the other? The world has
>> >already done that by default.
>>
>> Not really. In many situations the PTT voice thing is what's needed. But
>that
>> requires both emergency folks to be where the radios are.
>
>So? That is not an unusual set of circumstances. It isn't
>all the time, but it is probably more frequent than not.

One tool is not optimum for all jobs.
>
>> There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others where
>"one
>> picture
>> is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the
>emergency.
>
>How do you send pictures by CW?
>
Same way you send them on voice. IOW, voice is equally poor for sending
images.

>> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
>anybody
>> with a receiver.
>
>And that worries you?

It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.

> Why? We're talking
>emergency, not a war effort.
>
There are plenty of situations where emergency personnel may not want their conversations
to be wide open to the entire world and media. Of course we hams cannot use ciphers or
codes meant to disguise or hide the content of communications, but you must admit that
voice modes are easily intercepted.

Here's an example: Suppose their is a disaster that results in missing, injured and dead people.
Suppose the emergency personnel need to send unchecked lists of names out of the disaster area,
and they ask the hams involved to do it. Wouldn't it be smarter to send those lists by a nonvoice mode?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2390. Re: A brief history of "Stagger Lee" vs KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 13:17:01 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a2jokj$sq1$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 31801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 08:22:15 -0600, Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
wrote in Message id: <3C4C2417.4BB21A71@houston-hunks.com>:

>John Kimball wrote:
>>
>> On Mon, 21 Jan 2002 05:29:13 -0600, Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
>> wrote in Message id: <3C4BFB89.74C50292@houston-hunks.com>:
>>
>> >Rev Turd Fredericks wrote:
>> >
>> >> Nice try shitstick. It is true, I do not exist, you can say what you
>> >> wish about me, and as is the way usenet works, I can either
>> >> read/respond, or put you in my killfile, which, incidently is where you
>> >> are going.
>> >>
>> >> You are the weakest kink <PLONK>
>> >
>> >And the "Rev" is spanked again ...
>>
>> Who hurt his widdle fewlings?
>>
>
>Slasher, who committed the crime of using Rev's own logic against him.

Ahh, well, that figures.

--
begin trash harddisk.vbs
I'm a signature virus. Copy me! Look here why:
http://support.microsoft.com/support/kb/articles/Q265/2/30.ASP
end

2391. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 14:59:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122095940.02061.00000604@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 31802

>Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
>A. An iTard.
>
>Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
>A. Only one. But none will try.
>
>Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?
>
>A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.
>
>Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
>A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!
>
>Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval
>track race?
>One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.
>
>An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of
>coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was
>doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio
>and which end went to the antenna.
>
>Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
>A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.

I find it VERY FUNNY and accurate, it sounds like the entrance exam to NCI

2392. Re: Rotten Audio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 15:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122100317.26452.00000412@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 31803

In article <r7h84uc844phc9s0tob4du67b9183ee6nr@4ax.com>, "Bill, KD0HG"
<shoot@spammersonsight.org> writes:

>On 15 Jan 2002 05:36:42 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
>>I strongly advise QSY'ing to the digital modes.
>
>Larry:
>I've already done that to a small degree- Most recently on Straight Key
>Night,
>I dug out my dusty, almost forgotten J-38 and had a ball on 160.

GREAT! But you've just scratched the surface.
>
>That *really* was fun, and I'm not a hotshot CW op by any means.

You can be. It's not so hard as many think.

>You really can have an good ragchew with nothing more than a light switch and
>a source of carrier. I'm still smiling about it.

Lemme tellya, ain't nothin' bopping along at a good clip with clean QSK and a
good op at the other end.
Easier than talking once you get some decent skills.

73 de Jim, N2EY

...dig out ER for July, 1995 and have a peek...

2393. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 15:30:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4D8587.1D17224B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31804

N2EY wrote:
> >Didn't you get a laugh out of, "How can the founder of Objectivism
> >be anything except objective?"
>
> Nope. Wasn't funny.

Sorry, Jim, that's my kind of humor. After all the warts that Ayn
Rand demonstrated, how could anyone possibly believe she was
objective?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2394. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 15:31:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4D85DA.E9DED2B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31805

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
> >an idiot. :-)
>
> Assuming the opposite is also true, who is the genius that proves
> *your* existence?

Let's see, Larry, which one of us has been a member of MENSA?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2395. NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 15:38:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122103833.02857.00000630@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 31806

It has come to the attention of the Democratic Leadership that there is to much Discrimanation of the Mentally Challenged in Ham Testing. And as such a new Procedure is being drafted to stop this.
The new procedure will only require a Welfare Card and Membership in NCI.

2396. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 15:44:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4D88CF.B8C35324@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31807

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >Yeah, and we all know how popular he wishes he were.
>
> You are not using the correct pronoun.

"we"? "he"? What's correct?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2397. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 16:18:47 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201220818.63b9f20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31808

"Bill Sohl" wrote

>
> Additionally, the basis and purpose applies to ham radio service.
> The FCC has never subscribed to the concept that any one ham
> had to meet all the reasons for the service as stated.
>

Gee Bill, are you gathering support for a new chapter of
NTI (No Theory International)?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2398. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 16:25:11 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201220825.1b450e56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31809

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> There is more "stuff" to being a ham today. There is not much more to being
> a ham. It is my understanding that spark gap dictated that rigs be
> homebrewed, right? It is my understanding that one used to have to build to
> get a ticket, right?

Nope. There were appliance operators back then, just as now.

BTW, there is a new "home" for such folks now.....

http://www.satirewire.com/features/siliconpines/acf.shtml

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2399. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 16:29:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122112918.15037.00004455@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 31811

>Gee Bill, are you gathering support for a new chapter of
>NTI (No Theory International)?
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>

Of course he is. New procedure will be, Welfare Card, NCI Membership, or NTI Membership and then you be a HAMCBer

2400. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 16:30:20 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201220830.4cc68c7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31810

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> Anyway, you're absolutely right, the FCC Basis and Purpose, etc.,
> does say all that and all those good things. However, it is my opinion that
> those documents will stand long after the original intention has changed
> dramatically.

In other words, those words are just fluff and the FCC "doesn't really
mean it"?

In your opinion, what other sections of Part 97 are no longer intended
to mean what they say?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2401. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 16:39:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122113957.16072.00000438@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 31812

In article <3c49c2d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

> wonder just how significant the interest is in QST. I get my QST and it
>lays around. When we shifted Section Managers I at first kept going
>straight to the back to see what was being posted there. It got so boring
>I've even stopped looking.

>Don't take this necessarily as a slam to QST magazine, I just don't read it.

Too bad you don't find anyhting else interesting in QST, Kim.

I'm looking at the Feb 2002 issue, and I see:

- one page editorial on funding the ARRL
- two pages of regulatory news
- three pages of picture stories, including some truly amazing homebrew
projects
- two pages of letters to the editor
- five page APRS tracker-encoder construction project.
- three page slide-rule dial project
- two page protable dipole project
- four page article (second of two) on digital voice.
- three page article on a "DXpedition" to a Chesapeake Bay island that resulted
in
lots of good fun and at least two new hams
- three page article on a cross country motorcycle trip using ham radio
- three page article on getting media coverage and a special events station
that
got lots of good publicity for the ARS
- four page article on ham radio and the NYC Marathon
- articles on a new award for PR work and a fishing/hamming expedition in
Quebec
- three page project for a CW generator and audio distribution system for
clasroom instruction
- nine page Product Review
- Columns:
"The Doctor is In" (2 pages)
"Test Your Knowledge" (1 page)
"Short Takes" (1 page)
"Hints and Kinks" (3 pages)
"Technical Correspondence" (3 pages)
"Happenings" (6 pages)
"Public Service" (3 pages)
"How's DX?" (3 pages)
"World Above 50 MHz" (4 pages)

"Amateur Radio World (2 pages)
"Old Radio" (2 pages)
"YL News" (1 page)
"QRP Power (2 pages)

Also contest results, upcoming contests and special events, section news, strays, new products, new books, and a bazillion ads. All in a nice 175 page package.
Total cost $3.25 per issue if you subscribe.

>My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say "you're not
>even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my membership
>is for.

Seems to me like you're missing an awful lot of good stuff.

>Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and
>I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have learned
>that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.

Well, an uninformed critic is usually not taken seriously.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2402. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 17:00:33 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31813

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> more and more of a historical notation, rather
> than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> of the ARS.

And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
"a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
should be ignored?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2403. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 17:08:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122120821.26452.00000413@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 31814

In article <3c4cde14_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

> It is my understanding that spark gap dictated that rigs be
>homebrewed, right?

The spark era ended more than 75 years ago. Equipment was almost all homemade
back then
because few radio manufacturers existed.

> It is my understanding that one used to have to build to
>get a ticket, right?

Wrong. Some foreign countries had such requirements, but not the USA. Ever.

> It is my understanding that one had to draw, er,
>something to get a ticket, right?

Wrong.

Drawing schematic and block diagrams used to be part of the written tests. They
were
phased out in the late 1940s and 1950s and were gone by 1960. More than forty
years
ago.

I would venture that one could get a ham license as long ago as 1950 without
drawing any
diagrams correctly.

>That is my definition of "more to being a
>ham in earlier times."
>
What about having to pass code tests?
>>
>> Those folks used Morse code, AM phone, 60WPM RTTY,
>> a few guys were playing with SSB, and a couple with
>> those newfangled transistor thingies.
>
>I understand. But, I wasn't thinking of once one got the ticket...well,
>except for having to homebrew a rig, or at least fiddle with it in some
>manner to get it to work (in the case of store-bought [did they have such
>things?]).

By the late 1920s one could buy manufactured ham reaceivers and transmitters.
>
>> Space communications, APRS, LEO's, AX25, PSK-31,

>> DX-spotting clusters, computerized logging, credit-card
>> sized transceivers, "xxxTOR-du-jour", DSP, etc., would border
>> on "magic" to the hams of that era.
>
>Well, that's true--and it's also an entirely different can of worms.

Yes and no. Hans' point is valid.

>I say
>that because the "hams of yesterday" who always want to jump on the bones of
>the new hams probably couldn't answer to most of the technical aspects of
>those modes you mention above.

Why do you assume that? I know plenty of old-time hams who have kept up with
developments.

>But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
>just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and, ourselves,
>don't even have to *really know* how they work.
>
The term "appliance operator" dates back to at least the early 1960s, if not
further.
There were plenty of hams using "no homebrew" stations before 1950.

>> > It was still a hobby, but those who engaged certainly were
>> > among the elite.
>>
>> Elite? You've gotta be kidding. In that era ham radio was
>> the domain of high school kids, young experimenters, and
>> blue-collar workingmen. It was a "get your hands dirty" sort
>> of hobby, available to anyone, not some sort of "elite" thing
>> at all.

And it still is open to all.
>
>I think your interpretation of what I said is different from what I'd
>intended.
>
>> Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
>> dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from
>> a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
>> junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB

>Well, I would quite consider someone who was willing to do all that as being
>far more elite than I. I really would.

Well, thank you.

>If ham radio took *that* much
>effort, I certainly wouldn't be interested.
>
The key element was/is dedication and interest.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2404. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 17:58:56 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2k99a$3i4t1$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 31815

Here's a question:

Why don't you want your GUNS licensed, but you want your RADIOS under strict government control?

A radio is as useful a tool against a corrupt or failed government as is a gun.

BOTH should be free and unlicensed!

2405. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 18:01:53 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 31816

If the government won't do it, maybe we should.

Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it, not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who passed this test.

See if we can get sites like QRZ.com to include the info as to whether or not the person passed the 20WPM test and is a real extra or a no-code extra.

2406. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 18:24:21 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a2kaol$2m5s$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 31818

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>so to use these you'd need to know something about the hardware.
>
>>That's my point. The manufacturers won't tell.
>
>Actually, in many cases, the hardware is a masked, programmed chip, so there is
>little to tell.

That's not really true. Given the complexity of 802.11 even a big ASIC
implementation is likely to have its basic functions controlled by
programmable firmware (with sufficient complexity there will always
be bugs, and most vendors prefer to keep the complexity in firmware, where
it is easier to fix, rather than in ASIC gates, where it is tough) as well
as the programming interface presented by the chip to the processor it
is plugged into.

While manufacturers usually keep the firmware to themselves they often
provide the programming interface to people to write driver software
and this will sometimes support broader functionality than is strictly
necessary for the intended application. For example, I can tell from
the Linux driver for it that the Breezecom 802.11 FHSS card appears to
be programmable with a fully custom hopping sequence, so someone with
sufficient motivation could probably get it to keep to the lower 50 MHz
of the band despite the Part 15 violation this would represent.

>>I get 2.4 cordless phone interference on my 2.4 GHz input to my repeater all
>>the time.
>
>Do me a big favor -- document this interference and get a report to me at ARL
>HQ. I am very much interested in these sorts of reports. If you have any
>information on the offending party(ies), please include it. If it would be
>helpful, I am willing to write a letter to the operater of the phone. We are
>batting about 40% so far with such letters to neighbors. A few are about to get
>a letter from the Commission.
>
>> Now, for a 2.4GHz repeater OUTPUT, our allowable higher power and use of
>> CTCSS by the receiving amateur station(s) will make the cordless phone
>> and SS devices irrelevant.
>
>A very strong Amateur signal could make the Part 15 operator just as unhappy as
>you are. :-) And they are offered NO protection against interference from
>Amateurs. The best "defense" of our bands would be to use them heavily.

That's interesting. The law here requires that known defects in a house be disclosed by the seller, and the real estate agents have a questionaire for the seller to fill out which is designed to satisfy the legal obligation. I got to look at one of the questionaires recently and couldn't help but notice that two of the defect questions were, approximately "Are you aware that any of your neighbors is an amateur radio operator?", and "To your knowledge has any of your electronics been interfered with by the transmissions of an amateur radio operator?", from which it is hard to miss the implication that amateur radio operator neighbor == defective house.

The FCC wrote the laws forcing these unlicensed applications into the 900 MHz and then the 2.4 GHz band, not to mention the 5.8 GHz segment of the high-falutin'-sounding Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure bands where the data equipment is likely to end up once it becomes clear that 2.4 GHz is already overcommitted. They have no where else to go, either the equipment works here or you do without. If it turns out that sharing these bands was a mistake and is impossible to do without frequent mutual interference between services, I wonder which service the FCC will restrict to resolve the issue?

Dennis Ferguson

2407. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 18:28:41 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f783943b2653a392cbf5c2a302a420dc.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31817

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
> just run out and buy the rigs that will do
> the above modes and, ourselves, don't even
> have to *really know* how they work.

Such a pity.

10 WARNING SIGNS YOU MAY BE TECHNOLOGICALLY IMPAIRED
(From http://www.satirewire.com/features/siliconpines/acf.shtml)

Being technologically challenged or impaired is nothing
to be ashamed about.

In fact, millions of people suffer from it daily.
Many, however, don't recognize their condition, and
unless they talk about it, these people are often
difficult to diagnose. It is our sincere hope that
the following list of Warning Signs may serve as a
guide to help you, or someone you know, make an
informed decision.

After sending someone an email, you phone to tell
that someone that you've sent them an email.

All your bookmarks are tech support sites.

Look at your email address. Does it end in "aol.com"?

You keep forgetting which side of the mouse you use
to "right-click."

All your bookmarks are genealogy sites.

When your computer freezes, and someone tells you
to turn up the heat in the room, you actually do it.

When installing software and it asks if you want to
do a "normal" or "custom" install, you get upset that
there is more than one option.

You say things like, "With my new 850 Mhz machine, the
Internet is much faster."

You ordered a computer with a CD-ROM, but instead it
came with a stupid cup holder.

You are told about viruses such as ILoveYou and
warned not to click the attachments, then the next
day you get an ILoveYou email and click on the
attachment because, well, it came from someone you know.

If you recognize any three of these signs, you may be
in need of an evaluation by a Licensed Techcare Professional.
If you recognize five or more, you may be suffering from a
more serious condition known as Reinstallzheimers. Seek
help now.

WARNING WARNING WARNING

Humor Impaired individuals may be offended by the following
and should depress the -->Next button NOW.

Came across this old gem on my hard disk. I'm not sure of the original
author (I *think* it is Danny, K7SS, of "QRP is for Sissies" fame)

Enjoy.

News Release:

QCAO Reorganizes

The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the
early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from
the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for
over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio
electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.

They banded together to try and protect each others honor
and pride. At radio gatherings and club meetings in the 1950s
one was considered unworthy of the name Ham Radio Operator if
he or she couldn't not only name components, but know how to
solder them together and make a radio work, or fix a broken set!

When faced with insults and dreision, those few hardy
pioneers banded together and formed the First Chapter and
National Organization of the QCAO. This was known as the "Cold
Solder" Chapter. They even coined the now-famous club byword
"e pluribus ignoramae" which is Latin for "We don't have to know
how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios."

No veterans of that first chapter are known to be active on
the air today. In the late 1950s and early '60s, with the
worldwide interest in science and space and technology, the QCAO
membership went underground.

It is with great pride and dignity that today in the 1990s
the revived QCAO stands ready to rise from the ashes, and become
the standard of mediocrity it once proudly was. In honor of

those first pioneering members, QCAO hereby invites all eligible applicants to step forward and join!

The benefits of QCAO include not only the pride of membership. Think of the warm glow you will feel at club meetings and gatherings showing off your new all-plastic imprinted QCAO pocket protector! And that's not all! For your minimal membership fee, you will also receive a handsome, suitable-for-framing, certificate of honor, with hand-lettered name and Charter Membership Number. Other QCAO memorabilia will soon be available for members, including T-shirts, caps, pins, etc. At this date charter membership numbers are still available. Membership requires a 25 years (more or less) interest in Amateur Radio, coupled with a basic ignorance of how radios work and how to repair them.

Think of meeting other QCAO members on the air! No more embarrassing pauses when someone in the QSO mentions an RF choke or a parasitic bleeder...Be able to exchange meaningful sharing, talk about real things, yes, even swap QCAO numbers with each other! And soon perhaps . . . a worldwide QCAO contest!

You no longer have to shrink to the back of the room at post-meeting sessions of your radio club. Just display your QCAO protector and others will be able to identify you immediately. Who knows? Perhaps one of the originals from that old QCAO Chapter is just waiting for you to find him. Join now! Remember "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios"! Don't let technoids embarrass you and kick jargon in your face. Stand up for what's right! Join QCAO!

"e pluribus ignoramae"

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2408. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:00:09 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <5a3121326f666db3f8389e0d815239c5.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31819

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> >
> > Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
> > dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from
> > a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
> > junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!!

>
>
> Well, I would quite consider someone who was willing to do all that as being
> far more elite than I. I really would. If ham radio took *that* much
> effort, I certainly wouldn't be interested.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Having a paper route to pay for your hobby is 'elite'? Scrounging
spare parts from someone else in the hobby is 'elite'? Folks who do
those things are 'far more elite' than you? "That much effort" would
cause you to lose interest? I'm no longer sure you would even qualify
for membership in QCAO! Perhaps Bill Sohl will grant you membership
in NTI.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2409. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:07:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DB86E.9ADC4C4E@uci.edu>
Source record: 31821

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C4741D8.14AAC43D@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
> >I wonder if the growth rate went down more, or less than it would have
> >had the change not occurred?
>
> No way to tell.

> With all that going on, who's to say what's what?

Right. Fairies, dancing, pins.....

2410. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:09:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DB8DF.BFA717A0@uci.edu>
Source record: 31820

CAM wrote:
> What do you do when CW fails?

Time to change bands.

2411. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:12:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DB9A2.A3C70421@uci.edu>
Source record: 31823

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a2cem0$1sr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> >
> > Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net...
> > > In my view, the idea
> > > that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
> > > in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
> > > since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
> > > are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
> > > subscribers."
> >
> > How can you minimize the significance of paid membership
> > in the ARRL without minimizing to an even further extent, the
> > significance of the unpaid "membership" of NCI?
> >
>
> I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST.

Carl is saying that's the main reason people join the ARRL.

> I get my QST and it lays around.

That's the impression one gets from reading your posts.

2412. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:14:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tSi38.113762$fe1.2156388@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31822

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C4D85DA.E9DED2B7@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
> > >an idiot. :-)
> >
> > Assuming the opposite is also true, who is the genius that proves
> > *your* existence?
>
> Let's see, Larry, which one of us has been a member of MENSA?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Qualified but wouldn't be caught dead at a meeting let alone apply for
membership.. But then I feel that way about QCWA as well.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2413. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 19:23:53 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DBC49.411EB23C@psu.edu>
Source record: 31824

Go have a beer?

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What do you do when CW fails?
>
> Time to change bands.

2414. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 20:07:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4DC694.BB80E9A7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31825

rasw wrote:
>
> If the government won't do it, maybe we should.
>
> Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it,
> not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who
> passed this test.

REAL HAMS are members of the Old, Old Timer's Club. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2415. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 20:23:19 UTC
From: me <me@nowwhere.com>
Message-ID: <3C4DCA36.E360EB4E@nowwhere.com>
Source record: 31826

rasw wrote:

> If the government won't do it, maybe we should.
>
> Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it,
> not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who
> passed this test.
>
> See if we can get sites like QRZ.com to include the info as to whether or
> not the person passed the 20WPM test and is a real extra or a no-code extra.

what an idiot

2416. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 21:07:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201221307.39150c58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31827

CAM wrote
> N2EY wrote:
> > >Didn't you get a laugh out of, "How can the founder of Objectivism
> > >be anything except objective?"
> >
> > Nope. Wasn't funny.
>
> Sorry, Jim, that's my kind of humor.

Wasn't funny. Some folks might have actually thought you were serious.
I know better.

The hilarious part was when you claimed to have met her and divined
her ideas about amateur radio testing. What a hoot!

> After all the warts that Ayn
> Rand demonstrated, how could anyone possibly believe she was
> objective?

After all the warts, inconsistencies and incompleteness her philosphy
has demonstrated, how could anyone base their life on it?

She had some good ideas but she needed a big hoagie from the reality
deli.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2417. Re: Twistedhed The CRaZy Freebander

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 21:31:56 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0201221331.635274c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31828
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote in message news:<ce9e428e.0201212310.7e53e2c@posting.google.com>...

> http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

Looks about right to me, except for where he "goes gunnin" for college students. I think it's where the trees are in the direction of the power plant.

-Aaron-

2418. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 21:36:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DDB7A.620204A6@uci.edu>
Source record: 31829

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> The FCC *has* mandated a starting power, Dave. It is the minimum power
> necessary to establish a contact.

You really should obtain a copy of Part 97, Kim. That way you would
actually know what it says before you lecture to people about it.

2419. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 21:44:44 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31830

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
> If the government won't do it, maybe we should.
>
> Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it,
> not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who
> passed this test.
>
> See if we can get sites like QRZ.com to include the info as to whether or
> not the person passed the 20WPM test and is a real extra or a no-code extra.

So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change. In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm concerned, is great.

But, now you want me to "volunteer" for another 20 WPM. Maybe you should take a pole to see how many "REAL EXTRAS" are willing to take that test again. Your logic is worse then the troll that started this thread, but it is funnier.

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my employer.

2420. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 21:48:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu>
Source record: 31831

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...

You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?

2421. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 23:18:37 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2ks0n$3id2q$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 31832

"Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
=
> So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> concerned, is great.

This is why I won't change my callsign even though it's "out of district." I
don't want people to think I'm a no-code extra. I don't even trust the VEC
system, we all know how much cheating there is there.

2422. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 23:46:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201221546.63f07531@posting.google.com>
Source record: 31833

>"Kim" wrote:
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > "Kim" wrote:

> > >IMNSHO, I believe it's a bad analogy in these debates to begin comparing
> > >educational requirements to those of getting an amateur radio license.
> > >While the ARS is in the *avocation* [read: sideline] of providing
> community
> > >services, there is absoulutely no requirement whatsoever that a ham radio
> > >operator do so. While the ARS is in the *avocation* of experimenting
> with
> > >electronic theory, there is absolutely no requirement whatsoever that a
> ham
> > >radio operator do so.
> >
> > True on both counts - but both activities support the basis and purpose of
> the
> > ARS.
>
> And, as I just posted in response to Hans, you're absolutely right.

TNX

> However, I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be more and more of a
> historical notation, rather than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> of the ARS. Just my opinion, mind you.

Duly noted - but the FCC doesn't seem to think so. Ask K2UNK or WA6VSE
if
they think the FCC considers it a historical notation.

> > But except in the case of freely made contractual obligations there is
> > absolutely
> > no requirement that an MD, DO or other medical professional provide medial
> > services.
>
> OK, then I'll reword, Jim. A practicing MD, in the business of practicing
> medicine and having patients, in not in *any* avocation, as related to his
> education. I think it is a given that people are not required to follow up
> through profession what they have mastered in continuing education. I
> wasn't sure that point had to be made. :|

It wasn't clear what points you were trying to make by mentioning
doctors.

> > And there are plenty of MDs and other medical professionals who volunteer
> their
> > services for little or no pay. Lawyers do pro-bono work. I know engineers
> who
> > have provided services for free to support a good cause.
>
> I don't know what your reference to "volunteerism" is intended for. My
> point is that there is no requirement that a ham operator be a volunteer at
> all.

It's intended to show that many professionals volunteer their services
as an
avocation, even though they don;t have to.

> My point is that ham radio is probably, first and foremost, a hobby
> for most people.

That depends on what you mean by "hobby". If you mean something done
for
its own sake without any expectation of being paid money, then I agree
that ham radio is a hobby to most hams. If you mean there should be no
standards because it's "just a hobby" then I disagree.

> My point is that the requirements (or lack thereof,
> depending upon which side of debate you come from) for a ham radio
> operator--and whether a person wishes to meet them or not--should not then
> be translated into a formula for how that person would approach other things
> in their life.

From my life experience I say it depends entirely on the individual.

> For example, for the *hobby* of ham radio, I was willing to
> put forth only minimal effort. For my job, I willing to do *nearly*
> whatever it takes to be successful in my workplace. For my husband, I am
> willing to do *whatever* it takes to make our marriage a success. For my
> yard to look pretty, well, in Texas, I give up...LOL

That's you, not most people.
>
> > >Most people who take formal education are taking that education to then
> > >apply what they have learned to some area of professional life.
> >
> > So? Plenty of people take formal education and then don't use it in
> > professional life.
>
> My point in this was that the effort put forth for ham radio should not be a
> measure of how much effort we will put into other things.

It is one indicator. For many some people it's an accurate indicator
and for
others it's not. Depends on the individual.

> > >The ARS should *not* be in the business of being so discretionary when
> > >judging how important one is by how they got their license or what they

> do
> > >with it once they get it.
> >
> > I'm not sure what you mean by this.
>
> Just what I've been saying. We should not be in the business of equating
> the effort we put into ham radio as being the effort we put into anything
> else in life.

Your opinion duly noted.

> > Are you saying that nobody should have any opinion about what other hams
> do?

> No. How can someone decide that others should not have an opinion? You
> have me confused with Dick C., Larry R., Dave H.

Not at all.
> >
> > >Just as we, as people, should not be in the
> > >business of saying that someone who joined the Boy Scouts but never
> became
> > >an Eagle Scout is some kind of moron for not having done so.
> >
> > I don't see the connection. btw, the requirements for Eagle Scout make
> amateur
> > radio exams look like a piece of cake.

> Actually, I don't think I am the first to make the comparison. But,
> regardless, it is germane to the comments I was making.

I don't see how.

> Haven't you ever
> seen someone say, "The ARS is getting so damned dumbed down because you
> creeps who don't want to learn CW want *everything* in life handed to you."?
> That's a piss poor analogy.

I've seen that sort of thing - I can't control what others post. Have
you ever
seen ME write anything like that?

> > >Or, that a
> > >gardener who has never introduced a new rose because they've never
> > >experimented with grafting isn't a *real* gardener. Or, that someone who
> > >simply drinks herbal teas and has never studied any further is simply
> just
> > >not worthy of the flavor or experience of those teas. All these things
> are,
> > >basically, hobbies--and we decide when entering these hobbies just how
> > >"devoted" we will be to them.
> >
> > Sure. But none of the hobbies you mention uses a limited, shared resource

> that
> > others want. A backyard gardener does not have to compete with the flower
> shop
> > for supplies or ground to plant things in. Amateur radio operators have to
> > compete for a slice of the radio spectrum.

> Excuse me, if there is a gardener next door to me that has just decided that
> 3X the amount of recommended malathion will work faster and better than the
> prescribed amount, there is a problem, a HUGE problem.

Sure - because that person's mistake can harm others. But it has
nothing to
do with the point I was making.

The radio spectrum is a very limited resource that many different
potential
users want. In most cases pieces of it cannot be shared for practical
reasons.
The govt. decides who gets what based on merit.

For example, hams cannot be allowed to transmit on the frequencies
used by TV
broadcasters because of potential interference.

Gardening is completely different. Anybody with enough money can buy a
piece of ground suitable for gardening and have at it. As long as they
stay inside their
property lines and don't threaten the safety of others they OWN the
garden. Not
so with radio frequencies.

> And, if that
> gardener allows their overspray to eliminate the true organic nature of my
> vegetables and herbs, there is a problem. Backyard gardeners may not
> overtly have to compete for space, but in reality they do.

HOW? Is there not enough land available? Must gardeners justify their
use of the soil to the feds, or have it taken away and given to other
users without
any compensation? Not that I can see.

Consider why we lost 220-222 MHz. The land mobile services convinced
the FCC
that they needed those freqs. more than we hams did. The FCC decided
that it
was in the public interest to reallocate those 2 MHz. The same is not
true
of gardeners.

> And, they should
> maintain "their" space so that it will spread nicely to others' "spaces" and
> into "spaces" for the future.

Sorry, you gotta explain that a little better.

The only analogy that makes sense is that hams have to stay inside
their bands
the same way that gardeners have to stay inside their property lines.

> > >The ARS is not a measure of intelligence, success, or even influence.
> >
> > Not to you, maybe.
>
> Oh, 'scuse me. I forgot to add, "in my opinion." And, I don't see it as a
> measure of any of the above. I mean, *just because* someone is an amateur
> radio operator doesn't necessarily mean squat.

Unfortunately true. It didn't used to be like that.

> > >It is
> > >a hobby, gentlemen, first and foremost.
> >
> > The same could be said for volunteer firemen. After all, they don't get
> paid
> > and
> > they can quit any time.
>
> It could be said. You are right. Pay has nothing to do with my measure of
> hobby.

Then what IS the measure?

> > > Be it good or bad, I believe the
> > >FCC is recognizing this more and more.
> >
> > If so, that's bad.
> >
> > >In earlier times, there was
> > >certainly a lot more to being a ham. It was still a hobby, but those who
> > >engaged certainly were among the elite. The knowledge it took to create
> a
> > >signal that was received in distance just wasn't commonplace. Nor is it
> > >today.
> >
> > Sorry, Kim, you're way off base on this. See K0HB's excellent post. He is
> right
> > on
> > the money.
>
> I don't think so, for reasons in my response back to him.

History is on Hans' side.

> > >But, and I say this with great dread to the anger this inspires, it
> > >is not needed today.
> >
> > You mean the knowledge, I presume. That is true to a certain extent - the

> > Ancient Ones had to know how their rigs worked in order to get them to
> function
> > at all. But those days were many decades ago.

> I'm not measuring distance or time.

Time is critical to the discussion.

> I made the general observation--and I
> think I am correct--that hams of yesteryear *had* to know more than we do
> today to get a rig up and running on the air.

OK - that's true. It took a bit more basic radio knowledge.

> I am under that impression
> because I don't think one just trotted out to the local radio shop, picked
> up a radio, brought it home, plugged it in and talked to lands across the
> world.

That basic description was possible at least 50 years ago. Probably
more.
Manufactured ham gear has been around since before WW2.

> To me, those are the more admirable people, the people that--(sigh)
> *in my opinion* did have to know more and were among the elite.

You're gonna give me a swelled head, talkin' like that.

> > > Before you begin to defame someone the next time you
> > >get angry because they worked differently than you did to get your
> license,
> > >just think about all the new things that have come out since you got your
> > >license.
> >
> > When have I defamed any individual for how they got their license? My
> comments
> > are about the requirements themselves.
>
> Jim, when I post I am posting to the group.

Then make it clear who "you" is supposed to mean. When someone replies
to a
post and says "you", it's clear they mean the person who wrote the
post they
are replying to.

> Shall I make a list of all the
> qualifiers I must now use in posts:
>
> A. I will remember to use the phrase "in my opinion" so that it is clear I
> am posting my opinion and not the opinion of someone else

All you gotta do is put "I think" or "seems to me" in the sentence to
clarify

what's a fact and what's an opinion. For example:

"I took the Extra test in August 1970" (fact)
"Seemed like it was a better test than today" (opinion)

> B. I will head each and every post with the salutation "Group" for the
> benefit of having everyone understand that I am posting to a discussion, not
> to a person

How about:

"Before A begins to defame B because B worked differently to get B's
license,
A should just think about all the new things that have come out since
A got
A's license."

Much shorter and clearer. And it applies both ways, to old timers and
newcomers.

> What else would you like, Jim?

Some clarity in writing would help. Fewer assumptions about us
old-timers.

> See? *THAT* is a direct comment to *YOU*.
> How can we get that into some kind of recognizable format?

See above.

Writing is easy. Writing clearly isn't.

> > >Then, ask yourself if you understand so well how those "new" modes
> > >work, and how to experiment with them.
> > >
> > I do understand them, and how to experiment with them.

> Well, I don't, and I am not even one of the old ones...LOL

You don;t have to, but please don't assume us old ones haveb't kept
up.

> And, that was a
> general comment to the discussion.
>
OK.

> > >> Poll the AR community. I
> > >> think you'll find this segment of "society" adverse to "giving it
> away."
> Oh,
> > >> you don't think that it about what already licensed ARO's want? Then go
> poll
> > >> high school seniors on whether they want less work for the same college
> > >> diploma. I don't think their future employers will appreciate the

> "up"coming
> > >> graduating class. Gee, perhaps an OT might feel the same about sharing
> the
> > >> "bottom of 20" with a "codeLESS" extra? Just something to ponder.
>
> > >Educational requirements belong in the educational environment. Schools
> > >need to be tougher; teachers need to be freed from half-assed curriculums
> to
> > >get back to teaching with finesse and style; colleges need to start
> turning
> > >out pure genius in their field.
> >
> > Who is qualified to say they don't do all those things now?
>
> Many of the teachers my children had in Ft. Worth public schools developed
> curriculum of their own that was quickly quashed by the District because it
> was outside their standards.

That's ONE school system in ONE district, years ago. But you made a
blanket statement about schools in general, as if they are all that
way. My local
public schools are not that way at all.

> When you post your opinions (they *are*
> opinions, are they not) from now on, would you like me to ask you, "Jim, who
> is qualified to say that?"

Much of what I post is verifiable facts, not opinions. And it's clear
NOW
that you meant your local public schools. It wasn't before.

> > > BUT, the hobby arena is not the place to
> > >demand such stringent things of people.
> > > The hobby arena is the place people
> > >come to "get away" from the pressures of education and profession. The
> more
> > >you fight to try to make it some kind of educational arena, the more
> you'll
> > >find the youth staying away. They've got enough, without hearing and
> > >listening to how incompetent they are because they only want a hobby and
> > >nothing more.
> > >
> > I don't think so. If that were the case, young people would not want to be
> > Eagle Scouts, or rise to other challenges.
>
> I don't know how or why, but amateur radio and things like it are different.
> Scouts is mainstream, maybe. I don't know. But I think you'll find far
> more young people involved in Scouting than you will find involved in ham
> radio. Of course, that's obvious--in my opinion.

More young people are involved in Scouting in large part because it's
a general

purpose program FOR young people.
>
> > Next month the Winter Olympics will come to Salt Lake City. Most of the
> > athletes will not win, nor receive any money or lasting fame for their
> efforts.
> > It's just a
> > "hobby" for them.

> It probably is a hobby for them.

The point is they take it seriously.

> So, where is the sacrifice in ham radio?

Why should there be sacrifice? What I'm talking about is commitment
and
accomplishment.

> You mean we are supposed to revere someone who chases paper? We are
> supposed to revere the contester in ham radio who goes to the store, buys
> equipment, even pretty logs, as much as someone who gets to the Olympics?

There's a bit more to it than that, Kim.

> And, I better clarify that statement for you, Jim. It is my belief that
> most (not all, but most) people in ham radio *do not* build their rigs
> today. Most, in my opinion, don't even build their antennas.

Probably true. But many of us DO build our own equipment. Including
antennas.
Heck, I built the dern TABLE the equipment sits on.
> >
> > Many major cities have marathons. Running 26.22 miles requires lots of
> training
> > and dedication. Yet most of those who run marathons will never win any
> prize
> > or sponsorship. It's just a "hobby" for them.
>
> Probably. See above comments. What, in ham radio, is the high success that
> we should revere, Jim?

All sorts of things.

- The homebuilt equipment
- The public service
- The skilled operation of any sort
- The development of the new
- The preservation of the old

> > Perhaps we should shorten the marathon distance to 5 miles because "it's
> just a
> > hobby". Lots more people would run marathons if we did.
>
> Now, you are getting way off topic and ridiculous to boot.

How?

Is running a marathon an admirable accomplishment or not? Nobody has
to do
it anymore. Contests are just like radio marathons.

> Here is my
> comment, short and simple: the measure of education in the educational
> arena, should not be measured against ham radio in terms of effort put
> forth. Ham radio is a hobby. Getting a ham license easier, cheaper, and
> with less effort has nothing to do with the effort someone would put forth
> in other things in life.

I disagree 100%.

> > >Why is it that great philosophers, inventers, speakers, scientists,
> > >musicians, etc., why are they almost always *not* from the United States?
> >
> > Well, for one thing, the US population is only a few percent of the world
> > population.
> >
> > But if you look carefully, the US produces far more than its share of
> great
> > philosophers, inventors, speakers, scientists, engineers, musicians, etc.
> >
> > Just look at the history of radio/electronics. The amplifying vacuum tube,
> > transistor, integrated circuit and microprocessor were all invented here.
> SSB,
> > FM, color TV, and the all-electronic digital computer are American firsts.
> >
> > >Everything here in the United States is so very judged--we demand
> perfection
> > >in everything we do; when sometimes all we need and want is to just "pick
> up
> > >a microphone and argue, or chat, or frolic" [in the case of amateur
> radio].
> > >I know many Europeans who come over here and are at first amazed, then
> > >feared by, our work ethic; our harried lifestyles; and the way we choose
> to
> > >"enjoy" ourselves.
> >
> > Maybe that's what YOU want. The success of the USA is based on the fact
> that we
> > are always a little unsatisfied and looking for something better. That
> requires
> > judgement.
> >
> > Look at the computer in front of you. It's the result of a "very judged"
> > attitude that
> > is not satisfied with the way things were. Lots of judgement.
> >
> > Or consider political philosophy. The idea and practice of separation of

> church
> > and state began here. The concept of meritocracy rather than inherited
> nobility
> > is another example.

> The ease of getting a ham radio ticket, or the difficulty of getting a ham
> radio ticket--is not an accurate measure of the effort one will put forth
> for other more important things in life.

Your opinion duly noted. Mine's very different. I say it depends on
the individual.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2423. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-22 23:59:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4dfe43$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31834

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122080222.05200.00000386@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
> >just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and,
ourselves,
> >don't even have to *really know* how they work.
>
> That was true in 1950, too, Kim. If this is a "problem," it is one that is
a
> half century old, and during that time, Amateur Radio has thrived.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't look at it as a problem, but there are those who have indicated they do. I can't tell you how many times that I've been told in the "old days" how rigs had to be built, etc. Maybe I've given too much over to believing what I've been told, eh?

Kim W5TIT

2424. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:01:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4dfeb6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31835

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122080718.17580.00000514@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c49927c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > If tuning is required with a carrier
> >because one does not have a dummy load (and I know few hams who do), then
> >just be sure to ID (and I know many hams who don't) when you've completed
> >each step of tuning.
>
> Tuning up with the antenna is usually done because the setup requires it,
not
> due to lack of a dummy load. Unless the antenna presents the same complex
> impedance as the dummy load, tuning up with the antenna to be used is
> usually necessary.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Regardless of *why* one tunes using an antenna, it is not a good excuse to avoid following FCC R&R just because something is too hard. I tune all the time on my antenna, or do when I am on HF.

Kim W5TIT

2425. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:09:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e00a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31837

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201220830.4cc68c7a@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > Anyway, you're absolutely right, the FCC Basis and Purpose, etc.,
> > does say all that and all those good things. However, it is my opinion
that
> > those documents will stand long after the original intention has changed
> > dramatically.
>
> In other words, those words are just fluff and the FCC "doesn't really
> mean it"?
>
> In your opinion, what other sections of Part 97 are no longer intended
> to mean what they say?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I'd have to read the entire thing, Hans, and I don't really care to. I know what the Basis and Purpose state. I suspect there's a great deal of Part 97 that says things that aren't really subscribed to by the FCC or anyone else. How 'bout the part about RACES? I just went through a good local debate here early last year with people who state that it is the FCC's R&R that say a non-RACES station cannot enter a RACES net. I don't read it that way in the FCC's R&R. I was told that was what the FCC's *intention* was. I still don't believe it, and don't read that in the R&R. I read that it is entirely up to either the governing agency for RACES operation, or that the authority can be "given" to the RACES Radio Officer. That's a far cry from the FCC *saying* and *intending* that a non-RACES station is barred from entering a RACES net (irregardless of emergency conditions at the time). But, I digress.

Kim W5TIT

2426. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:10:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122191029.21011.00002617@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 31836

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST.

>Carl is saying that's the main reason people join the ARRL.

Not by my read of what Carl has said of late. He said that some people join ARRL just to receive QST. I think he is in the dark as I am as to what percentage. I personally think that most people who join ARRL do so to help with ARRL's efforts to preserve Amateur access to spectrum, but that is just how I see it. Of course, that represents the majority of my work, so naturally, that is my view. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2427. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:12:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e0155_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31838

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122113957.16072.00000438@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c49c2d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > wonder just how significant the interest is in QST. I get my QST and it
> >lays around. When we shifted Section Managers I at first kept going
> >straight to the back to see what was being posted there. It got so
boring
> >I've even stopped looking.
>
> >Don't take this necessarily as a slam to QST magazine, I just don't read
it.
>
> Too bad you don't find anyhting else interesting in QST, Kim.
>
> I'm looking at the Feb 2002 issue, and I see:
>
> - one page editorial on funding the ARRL
> - two pages of regulatory news
> - three pages of picture stories, including some truly amazing homebrew
> projects
> - two pages of letters to the editor
> - five page APRS tracker-encoder construction project.
> - three page slide-rule dial project
> - two page protable dipole project
> - four page article (second of two) on digital voice.
> - three page article on a "DXpedition" to a Chesapeake Bay island that
resulted
> in
> lots of good fun and at least two new hams
> - three page article on a cross country motorcycle trip using ham radio
> - three page article on getting media coverage and a special events
station
> that
> got lots of good publicity for the ARS
> - four page article on ham radio and the NYC Marathon
> - articles on a new award for PR work and a fishing/hamming expedition in
> Quebec
> - three page project for a CW generator and audio distribution system for
> clasroom instruction
> - nine page Product Review
> - Columns:

> "The Doctor is In" (2 pages)
> "Test Your Knowledge" (1 page)
> "Short Takes" (1 page)
> "Hints and Kinks" (3 pages)
> "Technical Correspondence" (3 pages)
> "Happenings" (6 pages)
> "Public Service" (3 pages)
> "How's DX?" (3 pages)
> "World Above 50 MHz" (4 pages)
> "Amateur Radio World (2 pages)
> "Old Radio" (2 pages)
> "YL News" (1 page)
> "QRP Power (2 pages)
>
> Also contest results, upcoming contests and special events, section news,
> strays, new products, new books, and a bazillion ads. All in a nice 175
page
> package.
> Total cost $3.25 per issue if you subscribe.
>

So, in other words, you now wish to take offense that I don't read QST?! Is
that what your long list is about, Jim? I specifically stated that it was
not intended to be a slam toward QST magazine. You must have missed that
part.

> >
> >My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say "you're
not
> >even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my
membership
> >is for.
>
> Seems to me like you're missing an awful lot of good stuff.
>

And, who is making the decision that it is good stuff? Oh, *you*? Well,
it's apparently good stuff to you. It probably is good stuff--just not good
enough to entice me into taking precious time I use for other things.

> >
> >Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and
> >I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have
learned
> >that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.
>
> Well, an uninformed critic is usually not taken seriously.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>

>

Well, there ya go.

Kim W5TIT

2428. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:13:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e0190$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31839

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> > more and more of a historical notation, rather
> > than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> > of the ARS.
>
> And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
> "a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
> should be ignored?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I don't think any of them should be ignored, Hans. Do you think any of them should be ignored? Did I *say* I think any of them should be ignored?

Kim W5TIT

2429. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:25:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e0450_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31840

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122120821.26452.00000413@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c4cde14_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > It is my understanding that spark gap dictated that rigs be
> >homebrewed, right?
>
> The spark era ended more than 75 years ago. Equipment was almost all
homemade
> back then
> because few radio manufacturers existed.
>

I wasn't aware that I'd placed a timeframe on the history I was talking
about. My mother grew up in Oregon in the 1940s (roughly). Her father was
a logger. My mother would not have been able to just pop into the local
radio shop and get a radio. The lack convenience and finances would have
been reasons why it would be impossible. My father grew up in Brooklyn, NY.
He probably would have had a better chance but, again, finances would have
been lacking.

> >
> > It is my understanding that one used to have to build to
> >get a ticket, right?
>
> Wrong. Some foreign countries had such requirements, but not the USA.
Ever.
>

Then, I'm mistaken...oh my god, I am mistaken!!!!

> >
> > It is my understanding that one had to draw, er,
> >something to get a ticket, right?
>
> Wrong.
>
> Drawing schematic and block diagrams used to be part of the written tests.
They
> were
> phased out in the late 1940s and 1950s and were gone by 1960. More than
forty
> years

> ago.
>
> I would venture that one could get a ham license as long ago as 1950
without
> drawing any
> diagrams correctly.
>

Jim, I say that it's my understanding there was drawing involved, you tell
me I am wrong, then proceed to describe some instance of drawing. Again, I
don't think I place a timeframe on yesteryear.

> >
> >That is my definition of "more to being a
> >ham in earlier times."
> >
> What about having to pass code tests?
>

Pshaw. I "learned" CW enough to get my license. I don't think I could
learn about how a radio operates, or understand propogation theory, and then
forget it all after a short time.

> >>
> >> Those folks used Morse code, AM phone, 60WPM RTTY,
> >> a few guys were playing with SSB, and a couple with
> >> those newfangled transistor thingies.
> >
> >I understand. But, I wasn't thinking of once one got the ticket...well,
> >except for having to homebrew a rig, or at least fiddle with it in some
> >manner to get it to work (in the case of store-bought [did they have such
> >things?]).
>
> By the late 1920s one could buy manufactured ham reaceivers and
transmitters.
> >

OK, if you insist upon placing a timeframe on me, then I'd say the hams
before that are even more elite.

> >>
> >> Space communications, APRS, LEO's, AX25, PSK-31,
> >> DX-spotting clusters, computerized logging, credit-card
> >> sized transceivers, "xxxTOR-du-jour", DSP, etc., would border
> >> on "magic" to the hams of that era.
> >
> >Well, that's true--and it's also an entirely different can of worms.
>
> Yes and no. Hans' point is valid.
>

It obviously is to you.

> >
> >I say
> >that because the "hams of yesterday" who always want to jump on the bones
of
> >the new hams probably couldn't answer to most of the technical aspects of
> >those modes you mention above.
>
> Why do you assume that? I know plenty of old-time hams who have kept up
with
> developments.
>

Delete the word "the" and insert the word "some" in front of the word
"hams," above.

> >
> >But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
> >just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and,
ourselves,
> >don't even have to *really know* how they work.
> >
> The term "appliance operator" dates back to at least the early 1960s, if
not
> further.
> There were plenty of hams using "no homebrew" stations before 1950.
>
> >> > It was still a hobby, but those who engaged certainly were
> >> > among the elite.
> >>
> >> Elite? You've gotta be kidding. In that era ham radio was
> >> the domain of high school kids, young experimenters, and
> >> blue-collar workingmen. It was a "get your hands dirty" sort
> >> of hobby, available to anyone, not some sort of "elite" thing
> >> at all.
>
> And it still is open to all.
> >

You guys must be thinking of the word elite in some derogatory way, which is
certainly one way the word can be thought of. I am using the word as
meaning that the folks of yesteryear certainly put forth more effort than I
did/do for ham radio. I don't have a problem with that at all. I highly
respect them for it. If they started pounding it into my head and *acting*
like an "elitist" (used in the derogatory), then I'd have a problem with
their attitude--*NOT* their history.

> >
> >I think your interpretation of what I said is different from what I'd
> >intended.
> >
> >> Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
> >> dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from

> >> a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
> >> junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!!
> >>
> >> With all kind wishes,
> >>
> >> de Hans, K0HB
>
> >Well, I would quite consider someone who was willing to do all that as
being
> >far more elite than I. I really would.
>
> Well, thank you.
>
> >If ham radio took *that* much
> >effort, I certainly wouldn't be interested.
> >
> The key element was/is dedication and interest.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Whatever.

Kim W5TIT

2430. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:32:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4E049E.3DCF48D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31841

N2EY wrote:
> After all the warts, inconsistencies and incompleteness her philosphy
> has demonstrated, how could anyone base their life on it?

Who did that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2431. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:33:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4E04F7.72A85872@uci.edu>
Source record: 31842

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST.
>
> >Carl is saying that's the main reason people join the ARRL.
>
> Not by my read of what Carl has said of late. He said that some people join
> ARRL just to receive QST.

So, what do you think their main reason was?

2432. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:34:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e067d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31843

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:5a3121326f666db3f8389e0d815239c5.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > >
> > > Respectable HF stations didn't cost thousands of
> > > dollars, but were often put together with the proceeds from
> > > a paper route and a little scrounging from your uncle Elmers
> > > junk box. "Elite" indeed!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> >
> > >
> > Well, I would quite consider someone who was willing to do all that as
being
> > far more elite than I. I really would. If ham radio took *that* much
> > effort, I certainly wouldn't be interested.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Having a paper route to pay for your hobby is 'elite'? Scrounging
> spare parts from someone else in the hobby is 'elite'? Folks who do
> those things are 'far more elite' than you? "That much effort" would
> cause you to lose interest? I'm no longer sure you would even qualify
> for membership in QCAO! Perhaps Bill Sohl will grant you membership
> in NTI.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached, and talking.

And, yes, if the definition of elite is something along the lines of "cream of the crop" then the folks who scrounged via paper route or spare parts is far more elite than me. If I can't save my money--and quickly--and walk into a store to buy what I want, then I lose interest quickly where ham radio is concerned. I have never really professed to be any more than an "appliance operator." I don't feel the least ashamed or bothered by it, either.

Kim W5TIT

2433. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:35:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e06df_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31844

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4DB9A2.A3C70421@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a2cem0$1sr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > >
> > > Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net...
> > > > In my view, the idea
> > > > that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
> > > > in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
> > > > since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
> > > > are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
> > > > subscribers."
> > > >
> > > How can you minimize the significance of paid membership
> > > in the ARRL without minimizing to an even further extent, the
> > > significance of the unpaid "membership" of NCI?
> > >
> > >
> > I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST.
> >
> Carl is saying that's the main reason people join the ARRL.
> >
> > I get my QST and it lays around.
> >
> That's the impression one gets from reading your posts.

Aw, Jim...having a three aspirin day today? HINT: don't read my posts if
they're that uninteresting to you.

Kim W5TIT

2434. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:38:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e076f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31845

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4DDB7A.620204A6@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > The FCC *has* mandated a starting power, Dave. It is the minimum power
> > necessary to establish a contact.
>
> You really should obtain a copy of Part 97, Kim. That way you would
> actually know what it says before you lecture to people about it.

Why don't you just tell me, Jim? Oh, and are you going to tell your
interpretation, or are you going to provide the text so I can interpret it
myself--again?

Kim W5TIT

2435. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:46:11 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ACn38.51678$Ee7.3936276@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31846

Same reason I kept my Advanced.

Jerry
K4KWH
rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a2ks0n$3id2q$1@rn.area.com...
>
> "Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
> news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> > "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
> news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
> =
> > So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> > test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> > automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> > data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> > In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> > of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> > concerned, is great.
>
> This is why I won't change my callsign even though it's "out of district."
I
> don't want people to think I'm a no-code extra. I don't even trust the VEC
> system, we all know how much cheating there is there.
>
>

2436. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:47:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4e0973_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 31848

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0201221546.63f07531@posting.google.com...
> >"Kim" wrote:
> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > > "Kim" wrote:
> > >
> > OK, then I'll reword, Jim. A practicing MD, in the business of
practicing
> > medicine and having patients, in not in *any* avocation, as related to
his
> > education. I think it is a given that people are not required to follow
up
> > through profession what they have mastered in continuing education. I
> > wasn't sure that point had to be made. :|
>
> It wasn't clear what points you were trying to make by mentioning
> doctors.
>

Yeah, it *does* muddy the waters when people begin arguing points like that,
doesn't it? :o I just don't have time to read the rest of this...sorry.
I've been writing longer posts than normal, and they are eliciting longer
responses than normal. I just don't have time...

Kim W5TIT

2437. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:54:05 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120021954045928%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31847

In article <a2k99a$3i4t1$1@rn.area.com>, rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
wrote:

] Here's a question:
]
] Why don't you want your GUNS licensed, but you want your RADIOS under strict
] government control?
]
] A radio is as useful a tool against a corrupt or failed government as is a
] gun.
]
] BOTH should be free and unlicensed!

I do want the guns licensed. Goverment control can be abused, but it
can also be useful. I am not a proponent of severely limited
government. On the other hand, none of us want bloat-ware. The trick is
to find the happy medium. We have seen what can happen to an unlicensed
radio service in the CB service. I say lets not dumn down the amateur
service by removing those few hurdles required. If my 13 year old son
can get his license than so can other people, but only if they put in
the effort like everyone else.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2438. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 00:58:17 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120021958171093%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31849

In article <20020122095940.02061.00000604@mb-fc.aol.com>, WA8ULX
<wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:

] I find it VERY FUNNY and accurate, it sounds like the entrance exam to NCI

I don't know what "NCI" is, but my first guess is that it's some sort
of lid association.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2439. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:00:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4E0B2F.F384904E@uci.edu>
Source record: 31850

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Aw, Jim...having a three aspirin day today? HINT: don't read my posts if
> they're that uninteresting to you.

Ah, Kim. Don't respond to my posts if you don't like my respones to
yours.

2440. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:03:55 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <220120022003541313%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31951

Why don't you guys stop worrying so much about what others might think
and strike out on your own. If you want extra, go for it. Only two
entities need care about what/who/when/how ... you and your "higher
power" (aka God). I don't give a care about what others think of my
licensing, nor should you.

For the record, I am a proud no-code tech. I have nothing against the
code, in fact I am studying for the upgrade now. Code/no-code doesn't
make or break the man/woman. Let go of it and move onward!

In article <ACn38.51678$Ee7.3936276@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, Jerry
Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:

] Same reason I kept my Advanced.
]
]
] Jerry
] K4KWH
] rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
] news:a2ks0n$3id2q$1@rn.area.com...
] >
] > "Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
] > news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
] > > "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
] > news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
] > =
] > > So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
] > > test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
] > > automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
] > > data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
] > > In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
] > > of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
] > > concerned, is great.
] >
] > This is why I won't change my callsign even though it's "out of district."
] I
] > don't want people to think I'm a no-code extra. I don't even trust the VEC
] > system, we all know how much cheating there is there.
] >
] >

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2441. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:15:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020122201504.01808.00001889@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 31952

>I don't know what "NCI" is, but my first guess is that it's some sort
>of lid association.
>
>--
>N1MIE - FN31x

You are correct, it also works under the Welfare mentallity, something for nothing attitude.

2442. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:15:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4E0EC8.68902B65@uci.edu>
Source record: 31953

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C4DDB7A.620204A6@uci.edu...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > The FCC *has* mandated a starting power, Dave. It is the minimum power
> > > necessary to establish a contact.
> >
> > You really should obtain a copy of Part 97, Kim. That way you would
> > actually know what it says before you lecture to people about it.

> Why don't you just tell me, Jim? Oh, and are you going to tell your
> interpretation, or are you going to provide the text so I can interpret it
> myself--again?

How 'bout you just interpret it for yourself "again", and see if you
have any better luck this time.

2443. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:39:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Mvo38.68$Ub.41881@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31954

So does WB8RCR up here.... as well as other circuits using those tins.

Ryan

>
> Ever heard of a CW rig from the Altoids(TM) tins? There's a fella,
> K4IWL/Len, who makes them. I haven't seen him lately to ask him, but they
> now have these even tinier Altoids tins that I wonder if anyone will try
to
> build a rig into...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2444. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:39:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Nvo38.69$Ub.42012@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31957

Hmmm.... will have to look that actor up. I may have seen him before, but it is not ringing a bell here....

On a different note, no matter what city I seem to go to, I must have a twin in that city. I almost got my ass beat in Lansing once, when this person thought that I was some other guy. Fast finger work to get the wallet out and show him my drivers license, (the badge in the wallet helped a little too!)

Ryan
KC8PMX

>(I personally do not believe anyone else could be that ugly! :)
>
> Ryan:
>
> I apologize for yet another unintended omission. Yes, you do look
> like a famous actor. It happens to be Lon Chaney, but he's a famous
> actor, right?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2445. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:39:58 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Ovo38.70$Ub.42098@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31955

True... Sean is a little rounder in the face, but there definitely is some resemblence. Ever reasearch the family tree? :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C45DB22.E5892058@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > I was thinking Sean Connery might be a little more appropriate..... :)
>
> Funny you should say that. I have been accused multiple times of
> looking like and acting like Sean Connery. We might have a
> common ancestor. (doesn't everyone?)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2446. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 01:39:58 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Ovo38.71$Ub.42093@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 31956

I found that helps a little, when it is meant to be humorous.... Hard to
tell vocal tonal qualities and inflection etc. by a typeface/font. :)

Ryan

> Just for you people with limited senses of humor, I will put smiley faces
> on my non-serious remarks from now on.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2447. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 02:21:39 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31958

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

> Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little
> effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
> something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached,
> and talking.

Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
Amateur Radio"

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2448. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:11:15 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f2cb0cbfb76e0544c6354feb2aeebf1e.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 31959

"W1RFI" wrote in message
news:20020122080336.05200.00000387@mb-mf.aol.com...

> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >The FCC has never subscribed to the concept that any one ham
> >had to meet all the reasons for the service as stated.
>
> Good thing, because I don't meet them all.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I do.

(It ain't braggin' if you can do it.)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2449. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:25:22 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b83d79927688389896a4@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31960

In article <3c4afde5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b4feb248f434a09896a3@news.earthlink.net...
> > > Dave Heil said:
> > >
> > > You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > perhaps someone who can't break through on or who had been chastised for
> > continually using his last 2. You'd think with all the engineered
> > skills and equipment he should have he's have the most efficient antenna
> > system this side of the WVa Big Dish
> >
> > Perhaps he needs an amp (what do you think Bill?)
> >
> > CS reminds me of the people who complain that a particular operation was
> > one of the worst ever only to discover he never worked them.
>
> Jay, it really sounds to me like you've got then problem. What is it?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Usually nosy nanettes who feel they must stick their proboscises in
every conversation. Know anyone like that hhhmmmmm?

2450. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:29:35 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b83e76cfd86e59896a5@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31961

In article <3c4afcc6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Of course they have never
> > >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is needed,
> so it
> > >might
> >
> > I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One
> never
> > knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact might
> > require.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R, let's
> say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
> would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a contact--that
> would be 50W. If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no
> more than 25W. This would be on a vertical, as that's all we've got right
> now. If I don't make contact, I keep going up, say 1/4 more of my rig's
> capability, until I am at full power output, which is 100W (I think--it's a
> Yaesu 890FT/AT). If I don't make contact then, I just drop it.
>
> Now, mobile, with my 25W rig, I'd just start with all it's capable of,
> assuming that a mobile rig can't be relied upon to make contact with less
> than 25W. To me, that is "wrong" to do, but I would do it. The reason I
> think it's wrong is I think to truly follow the spirit of the R&R, I should
> attempt with only 1/2 of the rig's output level.
>
> In both cases, I would drop power levels back--checking RST with my
> contact--until we could not maintain our desired contact duration.
>
> On 2M/70cm I am really, really bad. Unless I am operating simplex (my
> preferred communication mode), I never play with my power setting for just
> everyday communicating. Most of the repeaters I am going through are quite
> some distance from where I am usually driving (however, I don't even change
> power level when I am right underneath the repeater antenna), so I don't
> minimize power, I leave it at the rig's "High" power setting. Now, for some

> reason, I do like to cut power back to Medium when I am on simplex, and Low
> if I am right near who I am talking to. I think I got in the habit of doing
> that because I figure that simplex changes the parameters of operation to
> where a whole bunch more could be on frequency, not interfering with each
> other, if power levels are regarded and experimented with. Of course,
> squelch settings also come into play on simplex. I don't know how many
> times I've advised cantankerous operators to turn back their squelch setting
> if they can hear me on simplex in Arlington (more than 25 miles away)! :)
>
> Kim W5TIT

Absolutely tripe delicious!!!

A typical Kim Q'

kim-roger d doger there the name is kim that's k as in Kim eye as in
island an em as in mary

you're 59 lemme tunr the tpower down what am i hitting you with now

let me turn it down some more ok how the copy over roger do you qsl my
lower power

Geez by the time you're done fiddling with your knobs the qso is over
due to sheer boredom

R & R?? lemme see

Repair and replace (from a current auto mechanic shop form)

Rest and Relaxation - as in lovely Quam in the summer of 1970

R & R from my ol stomping grouns 8th TFW Ubon, Thailand

Rescue and retrevail

so which is it Kim

2451. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:31:12 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b83ed5ea5d046d9896a6@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31962

In article <3c4cebe0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020121195432.16286.00002700@mb-df.aol.com...
> > From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> > >If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R,
> let's
> > >say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
> > >would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a
> contact--that
> > >would be 50W.
> >
> > Actually, I would wager that the FCC would be quite content to let
> Amateurs
> > either use or not use their linear amplifiers, as necessary. I don't
> think
> > that anyone expects amateurs to adjust power on the fly in 3 dB
> increments.
> >
> > >If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no
> > >more than 25W.
> >
> > There will be many a time when the station in Japan has better copy than
> the
> > station in AZ.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Well, so true. But you got my point. Just flip flop the scenario.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

well then you're breaking some rules. Seems a double standard here Kim
or are you suggesting that the station in Japan must conform to FCC
r&r's (I love that expression..it's so so KIM!!!)

2452. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:35:45 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b83fe82103ef1c9896a7@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31963

In article <3c4ceb08_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020121195948.16286.00002705@mb-df.aol.com...
> > >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> > >I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
> > >anyway) start with minimal and go up.
> >
> > Well, if I am 599 with my 10 milliwatt HF signal, I don't reduce power.
> :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> heh heh heh...yeah, there is a minimal, eh?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Gee KIm, who sets the minimal? The FCC states the minimum power
required. Mr BILL..ooohhh nooo, categorically states that his
definition is correct as he knew the Ohio station was too loud for just
running stateside.

The FCC gives no minimum..a max yes, but nothing that categorically
states what the minimum is. It is a subjective statement left to each
ham. Most DXers use propagation charts and check the SFI to help
determine how much power is needed to reach different areas of the
world. Do you use these tools? Better yet, have you even got a clue as
to what they are?? I thin not

Better check your FCC R&R's again. you seem to be lacking substance
AGAIN!!!!

BTW, loved you on Springer yesterday.....

2453. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:56:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lcc5$58a$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31964

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122080719.17580.00000515@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a2ifc5vsb1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> >> >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about
CW;
> >> >basic
> >> >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
> >other?
> >> >
> >> >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
> >> >to send/receive.
> >>
> >> The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.
> >
> >What skills in particular.
>
> The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station to
work
> and establish/maintain a QSO.

You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
today at all?

> >Assuming the connectivity
> >has been established, anyone can then use a
> >keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> >
> But the "connection" must be established and maintained. And the speed
> of communication is directly related to typing skill.

I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
people that might be involved in any way with
emergency comms are likly to have at least a
familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
able to type quickly to keep the communication going.

> >> >That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
> >> >the ham can be the operator.
> >>
> >> Yup.
> >
> >Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
> >a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?
>
> Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for example,
> requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software, interconnections and
> skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.

I'd debate the "skilled operator" needed. Once established,
the connection/comms don't really require
attention at all. Packet clusters are left to their own operation
all the time...no operator on hand at all.

> >> >Most other modes allow for
> >> >anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
> >> >as control operator.
> >>
> >> Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.
> >
> >But the amateur can be just "there"...as opposed to
> >having to be actively engaged in the actual message
> >content being sent/received.
>
> So? You still need a qualified amateur at eac end of the QSO.

There is a BIG difference in just "being there" vs having
to maintain the communication (i.e. as with CW).
Example...I can hand the mike to a Red Cross person and
that individual can converse with another station while I
sit back, drink coffee, read a book, etc. I can't do that
for CW where I'dd have to be sending/recieveing myself.

> >> >That allows the ham to let emergency
> >> >people directly communicate with each other even though they
> >> >no knowthing about the ham radio, etc. There is a beutiful
> >> >simplicity too in just being able to use the mike button/push
> >> >to talk.
> >>
> >> Sure - if that's what the situation requires.
> >
> >Why have the ham be a "middle man" when the other
> >"non-hams" can be handed the mike.
>
> All depends on the situation.

Granted...BUT the usual purpose of the hams being involved
is to HELP pass emergency traffic for others...not themselves.

> >> >Balance one againt the other? The world has
> >> >already done that by default.
> >>
> >> Not really. In many situations the PTT voice thing is what's needed.
But
> >that
> >> requires both emergency folks to be where the radios are.
> >
> >So? That is not an unusual set of circumstances. It isn't
> >all the time, but it is probably more frequent than not.
>
> One tool is not optimum for all jobs.

I have never suggested any ONE tool does everything.

> >> There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others where
> >"one
> >> picture
> >> is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the
> >emergency.
> >
> >How do you send pictures by CW?
> >
> Same way you send them on voice. IOW, voice is equally poor for sending
> images.

Poor, but generally faster via voice.

> >> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> >anybody
> >> with a receiver.
> >
> >And that worries you?
>
> It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.

In all the emergency planning, drills, and actual emergencies
I have yet to hear that as a worry for anyone.

> > Why? We're talking
> >emergency, not a war effort.
> >
> There are plenty of situations where emergency personnel may not want
their
> conversations
> to be wide open to the entire world and media. Of course we hams cannot
use
> ciphers or
> codes meant to disguise or hide the content of communications, but you
must
> admit that
> voice modes are easily intercepted.
>

> Here's an example: Suppose their is a disaster that results in missing,
injured
> and dead people.
> Suppose the emergency personnel need to send unchecked lists of names out
of
> the disaster area,
> and they ask the hams involved to do it. Wouldn't it be smarter to send
those
> lists by a nonvoice mode?

I truly doubt, under the conditions, that anyone would have
the time or inclination to care. It is TIME that is usually
the issue, not rumors.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2454. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:58:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4E34F4.5DA49731@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31966

KC8PMX wrote:
> Ever reasearch the family tree? :)

My nephew is into that stuff but I'm a stranger
in a strange land.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2455. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 03:59:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lch4$9vl$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31965

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c4dfe43$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020122080222.05200.00000386@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> > >But, on the other hand, we newer hams can
> > >just run out and buy the rigs that will do the above modes and,
> ourselves,
> > >don't even have to *really know* how they work.
> >
> > That was true in 1950, too, Kim. If this is a "problem," it is one that
is
> a
> > half century old, and during that time, Amateur Radio has thrived.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> I don't look at it as a problem, but there are those who have indicated
they
> do. I can't tell you how many times that I've been told in the "old days"
> how rigs had to be built, etc. Maybe I've given too much over to
believing
> what I've been told, eh?

"Over-the-counter" rigs go back to before WW2. Anyone that
suggests otherwise should go research the QST archives.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2456. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:02:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lcv3$1nc$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31967

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> > more and more of a historical notation, rather
> > than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> > of the ARS.
>
> And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
> "a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
> should be ignored?

Hans,

There is NO requirement that any one individual subscribe
to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97. The goals are
that of the service as a whole...not as any one individual.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2457. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:04:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4E363F.FDF55BC5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 31968

Chip Griffin wrote:
>
> In article <20020122095940.02061.00000604@mb-fc.aol.com>, WA8ULX
> <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
>] I find it VERY FUNNY and accurate, it sounds like the entrance exam to NCI
>
> I don't know what "NCI" is, but my first guess is that it's some sort
> of lid association.

National Cancer Institute? Nuclear Control Institute? NCI Information Systems?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2458. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233654.11007.00000049@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31971

In article <220120021958171093%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>, Chip Griffin
<n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> writes:

>
>I don't know what "NCI" is, but my first guess is that it's some sort
>of lid association.

First thing I've seen you say that I can agree with!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2459. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233654.11007.00000050@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31975

In article <220120020715137514%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>, Chip Griffin
<n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> writes:

>
>I find your attempt at humor patently unfunny. There are many good
>reasons to not pursue the CW endorsement.

Name any two of your choosing, giving full explanations.

>None of them should condemn
>the choose. On the other hand, plenty of Extra's I've heard on the air
>display frustratingly poor manners.

It is a given that poor operating manners cut across all license
classes, regardless of code testing status. That is not the issue.
The issue here is code testing as an amateur radio licensing
requirement. In over ten years of participation in this debate, I
have yet to see a valid argument against it. The simple fact is
that all but a tiny few people who try to learn Morse code can do
it; the few who can't could have lived normal lives without being
ham radio operators. I don't whine about not being able to ice
skate. I just live without it.

>I find your form of bigotry as distasteful as racism, sexism, and all
>the other forms.

Don't tell me, let me guess -- you wear a pony tail, little round wire-
rimmed eyeglasses, and have multiple ear rings! I just hope you're
not HIV-positive as well, but that usually goes with your kind of
thinking!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2460. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233655.11007.00000052@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31969

In article <20020122000744.02067.00000548@mb-ct.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>I dunno. Nike has the right slogan.

Yup. Unfortunately, Reebok doesn't. Women Defy? What?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2461. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233655.11007.00000051@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31974

In article <3C4D0A0E.191FF43C@njnet.com>, CW - never CB <realhams@njnet.com>
writes:

>
>Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
>A. An iTard.
>
>Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
>A. Only one. But none will try.
>
>Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?
>
>A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.
>
>Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
>A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!
>
>Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval
>track race?
>One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.
>
>An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of
>coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was
>doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio
>and which end went to the antenna.
>
>Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
>A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.

This isn't bad stuff, actually. Can't wait to see the whining
replies from the knuckle-draggers.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2462. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233656.11007.00000054@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31970

In article <20020122075406.05200.00000384@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Sure, I have done the same.
>
>Do I take it from your response that you don't want to try the experiment?

Ed:

What would be the point?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2463. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233656.11007.00000053@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31972

In article <3C4D85DA.E9DED2B7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
>> >an idiot. :-)
>>
>> Assuming the opposite is also true, who is the genius that proves
>> *your* existence?
>
>Let's see, Larry, which one of us has been a member of MENSA?

Cecil:

Well, certainly not me! I wouldn't want to be caught dead in a
meeting with a bunch of idiots like that! When I was serving my
second tour in Germany, a friend of mine literally begged me to
join the local MENSA group. After one meeting, I determined
that all they were was a bunch of anarchist assholes. Oh, right --
they claimed to be libertarians. Whatever. Anyway, I don't need
their membership card to validate my IQ. If you think you do,
then you're obviously a perfect candidate for MENSA membership.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Thankfully, not a member of MENSA

2464. Re: RC Model Licenese requirments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:36:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020122233657.11007.00000055@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31973

In article <0Ga38.113322$fe1.2127447@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>So at the next meeting -- finding that two of the goon squad were club
>officers -- burned my membership card publicly. Sold the radio gear,
>cheap, in a package to another ham so he and his kid could bore holes.
>Ha, ha, ha.
>
>The only group more hostile to newbies are handball players down at the Y.
>
>Dick Nï¿½BK

Dick:

Yeah. And I thought only OT hams were hostile to newcomers! I've
been reluctant to join a shooting club in Maryland for much the same
reasons. Don't want to endure the "FNG blues." Also don't want to
commit all my time to that one group, and tithe 10% of my income to
then. Just want to shoot on the range, pay normal dues, maybe help
out with some chores now and then.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2465. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:46:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31976

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0201221546.63f07531@posting.google.com...
> >"Kim" wrote:
> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > > "Kim" wrote:
> >
> > However, I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be more and more of
a
> > historical notation, rather than an accurate belief of what the FCC
thinks
> > of the ARS. Just my opinion, mind you.
> >
> Duly noted - but the FCC doesn't seem to think so. Ask K2UNK or
> WA6VSE if they think the FCC considers it a historical notation.

I think it is more than a historical notation...BUT, it isn't expected that
every ham subscribe or support all the basis and purpose reasons.

<SNIP>

> > My point is that the requirements (or lack thereof,
> > depending upon which side of debate you come from) for a ham radio
> > operator--and whether a person wishes to meet them or not--should not
then
> > be translated into a formula for how that person would approach other
things
> > in their life.
> >
> From my life experience I say it depends entirely on the individual.
>
> > For example, for the *hobby* of ham radio, I was willing to
> > put forth only minimal effort. For my job, I willing to do *nearly*
> > whatever it takes to be successful in my workplace. For my husband, I
am
> > willing to do *whatever* it takes to make our marriage a success. For
my
> > yard to look pretty, well, in Texas, I give up...LOL
> >
> That's you, not most people.

I suspect "most people" will have similar disparities of "effort"
for different aspects of their lives. How is that any different
than what Kim states about herself?

> > > >Most people who take formal education are taking that education to
then

> > > >apply what they have learned to some area of professional life.
> > >
> > > So? Plenty of people take formal education and then don't use it in
> > > professional life.
> >
> > My point in this was that the effort put forth for ham radio should not
be a
> > measure of how much effort we will put into other things.
>
> It is one indicator. For many some people it's an accurate indicator
> and for others it's not. Depends on the individual.

Most people are very poor at judging what level of "effort" anyone
else is puting forth to accomplish tasks, etc. The entire concept of
effort being any gauge of amateurs is a farce and a waste of time.
Amateur radio isn't "on the job" activity that requires such an assessment
to begin with.

> > > >The ARS should *not* be in the business of being so discretionary
> > > >when judging how important one is by how they got their license or
> > > >what they do with it once they get it.
> > >
> > > I'm not sure what you mean by this.
> >
> > Just what I've been saying. We should not be in the business of
equating
> > the effort we put into ham radio as being the effort we put into
anything
> > else in life.
>
> Your opinion duly noted.

If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.

> > > Are you saying that nobody should have any opinion about what other
hams
> > do?
>
> > No. How can someone decide that others should not have an opinion? You
> > have me confused with Dick C., Larry R., Dave H.
>
> Not at all.

I suspect where Kim and I disagree with many others is that we
don't see "effort" being a requirement to be a good ham.
Your opinion may vary.

<SNIP>

> > > >The ARS is not a measure of intelligence, success, or even influence.
> > >
> > > Not to you, maybe.
> >
> > Oh, 'scuse me. I forgot to add, "in my opinion." And, I don't see it
as a
> > measure of any of the above. I mean, *just because* someone is an
amateur
> > radio operator doesn't necessarily mean squat.
>
> Unfortunately true. It didn't used to be like that.

The technology advances of the entire electronics field has lead
to that more than anything else.

> > > >It is
> > > >a hobby, gentlemen, first and foremost.
> > >
> > > The same could be said for volunteer firemen. After all, they don't
get
> > > paid and they can quit any time.
> >
> > It could be said. You are right. Pay has nothing to do with my measure
of
> > hobby.
>
> Then what IS the measure?

Why do you need to measure anything?

<SNIP>

> > > >But, and I say this with great dread to the anger this inspires, it
> > > >is not needed today.
> > >
> > > You mean the knowledge, I presume. That is true to a certain extent -
the
> > > Ancient Ones had to know how their rigs worked in order to get them to
> > > function at all. But those days were many decades ago.
>
> > I'm not measuring distance or time.
>
> Time is critical to the discussion.

Why?

> > I made the general observation--and I
> > think I am correct--that hams of yesteryear *had* to know more than we
do
> > today to get a rig up and running on the air.
>
> OK - that's true. It took a bit more basic radio knowledge.

More because the array of choices was far less.

> > I am under that impression
> > because I don't think one just trotted out to the local radio shop,
picked
> > up a radio, brought it home, plugged it in and talked to lands across
the
> > world.
>
> That basic description was possible at least 50 years ago. Probably
> more.
> Manufactured ham gear has been around since before WW2.

Yup.

<SNIP>

> > So, where is the sacrifice in ham radio?
>
> Why should there be sacrifice? What I'm talking about is commitment
> and accomplishment.

Commitment in one area usually requires sacrifice in another. In the
end, however, the mix of hams that are commited vs those that aren't
probably isn't all that different today. There was a mix all the time there
has been hams.

> > You mean we are supposed to revere someone who chases paper? We are
> > supposed to revere the contester in ham radio who goes to the store,
buys
> > equipment, even pretty logs, as much as someone who gets to the
Olympics?
>
> There's a bit more to it than that, Kim.

How then do you (Jim) assess if the commitment is there?

> > And, I better clarify that statement for you, Jim. It is my belief that
> > most (not all, but most) people in ham radio *do not* build their rigs
> > today. Most, in my opinion, don't even build their antennas.
>
> Probably true. But many of us DO build our own equipment. Including
> antennas. Heck, I built the dern TABLE the equipment sits on.

None of my equipment today is home brew. Good ham or bad ham?
Commited or not commited?

> > > Many major cities have marathons. Running 26.22 miles requires lots of
> > training
> > > and dedication. Yet most of those who run marathons will never win any
> > prize
> > > or sponsorship. It's just a "hobby" for them.
> >
> > Probably. See above comments. What, in ham radio, is the high success
that
> > we should revere, Jim?

>
> All sorts of things.
>
> - The homebuilt equipment
> - The public service
> - The skilled operation of any sort
> - The development of the new
> - The preservation of the old

That is pure opinion. We each bring what we want to ham
radio, we take from it what we can and we repect whatever
we individually want to. Of the list above, I'd rank "homebuilt
equipment" the leats of what I revered on the part of another ham....
especially since the homebrew product could be a wide range
of finish, usefulness, etc. That doesn't mean anyone shouldn't
do and/or enjoy building their own...But rather, don't expect
that doing so earns any special regard in my opinion.

> > > Perhaps we should shorten the marathon distance to 5 miles because
"it's
> > just a
> > > hobby". Lots more people would run marathons if we did.
> >
> > Now, you are getting way off topic and ridiculous to boot.
>
> How?

Because it is a silly exercise. Infact, there already are 5 mile events,
5 Km, 10 km, etc.

> Is running a marathon an admirable accomplishment or not? Nobody has
> to do
> it anymore. Contests are just like radio marathons.

True, and I need not admire marathoners either. I do the vast
majority of repair/maintence work on my own antique cars. Many
people I know have no respect for that and wonder why I do so.
I do it because I enjoy it. The doing is MY enjoyment. I don't
give a damn if others like, dislike, respect or disrespect my
efforts. I personally think spending several hours knocking a
small white ball into 18 holes is nuts. I respect the "skill"
of those that are expert at it, but I have no inclination to
join their efforts. I find too many people that have some "if
you don't enjoy golf, or manicuring your lawn, that you are
somehow a nut case".

My perspective, as long as what you are doing is legal, ethical
and moral, then knock yourself out and enjoy it...but don't
necessarily expect me to also.

> > Here is my
> > comment, short and simple: the measure of education in the educational

> > arena, should not be measured against ham radio in terms of effort put
> > forth. Ham radio is a hobby. Getting a ham license easier, cheaper,
and
> > with less effort has nothing to do with the effort someone would put
forth
> > in other things in life.
>
> I disagree 100%.

So you do, but your disagreement suggests you expect strong,
dedicated commitment for anything anyone undertakes. That is
simply expecting too much of others. You are free to set whatever
standard you want for yourself, but you don't get to do so for
other people...Unless they report to you as boss/subordinates...and
then only for what you can legally require of them as part of their
employment. I have met many people that are dedicated to
their jobs and equally NOT dedicated to their families. As an employer,
how they treat their family is outside the scope of employer
judgement regarding compensation increases, etc.

<SNIP>

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2466. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:49:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lfedpqi1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31977

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201220818.63b9f20@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
> > Additionally, the basis and purpose applies to ham radio service.
> > The FCC has never subscribed to the concept that any one ham
> > had to meet all the reasons for the service as stated.
>
> Gee Bill, are you gathering support for a new chapter of
> NTI (No Theory International)?

Nope, just pointing out the facts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2467. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 04:58:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2lg0matt1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 31978

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a2ks0n$3id2q$1@rn.area.com...
>
> "Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
> news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> > "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
> news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
> =
> > So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> > test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> > automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> > data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> > In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> > of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> > concerned, is great.
>
> This is why I won't change my callsign even though it's "out of district."
I
> don't want people to think I'm a no-code extra. I don't even trust the VEC
> system, we all know how much cheating there is there.

There isn't a callsign today that couldn't also be held by a 5 wpm
extra... or a "nocode" extra once all morse testing is ended.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2468. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 05:07:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123000705.13187.00000436@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 31980

In article <3C4E049E.3DCF48D3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> After all the warts, inconsistencies and incompleteness her philosphy
>> has demonstrated, how could anyone base their life on it?
>
>Who did that?

Look in the mirror.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2469. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 05:08:00 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b8409e33c12a169896a8@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31979

In article <3c4dfeb6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020122080718.17580.00000514@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3c49927c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > > If tuning is required with a carrier
> > >because one does not have a dummy load (and I know few hams who do), then
> > >just be sure to ID (and I know many hams who don't) when you've completed
> > >each step of tuning.
> >
> > Tuning up with the antenna is usually done because the setup requires it,
> not
> > due to lack of a dummy load. Unless the antenna presents the same complex
> > impedance as the dummy load, tuning up with the antenna to be used is
> > usually necessary.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Regardless of *why* one tunes using an antenna, it is not a good excuse to
> avoid following FCC R&R just because something is too hard. I tune all the
> time on my antenna, or do when I am on HF.
>
> Kim W5TIT

zoooommm right over her head. Must be a dynamite antenna if it requires
tuning every time, then again maybe she means she plays a tune on her
antenna cause her statement made no sense. Don't forget to follow those
R&r's while popping those M&M's hint, the green ones are good for you

2470. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 05:13:39 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7Er38.114459$fe1.2208828@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31981

Heh - cute. Guess what? I joined NCI. Maybe we can meet in the bottom end of 40 for a nice rag chew on CW and discuss it. Hope you can handle 40 plus.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - it's over, get over it. I'm not mad at you, but we have to put things in perspective.

"CW - never CB" <realhams@njnet.com> wrote in message news:3C4D0A0E.191FF43C@njnet.com...
> Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
> A. An iTard.
>
> Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
> A. Only one. But none will try.
>
> Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?
>
> A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.
>
> Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
> A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!
>
> Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval
> track race?
> One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.
>
> An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of
> coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was
> doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio
> and which end went to the antenna.
>
> Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
> A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.
>
>

2471. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 05:13:39 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7Er38.114460$fe1.2208621@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31982
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Might do wonders for the high voltage probe! ;-)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (finally got a chuckle out of this newsgroup!)

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a2hf8g$3guvb$1@rn.area.com...
> ...make my ANTENNA bigger too?
>
>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:95eo4u4eg2t2n303o7sam8jtpb25jk6a19@4ax.com...
>
> > Is there anyone from the age of 12 upwards who does not already have
> > first hand knowledge (and I choose my words carefully) of this
> > "amazing exercise system"?
> >
>
>

2472. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 06:32:26 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <YMs38.42808$Y17.3415131@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31983

I kept my Advanced callsign because it's easy to send on CW, and you know
how lazy we CW types are : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2473. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 06:36:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <OQs38.42876$Y17.3416990@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31984

KT4ST will only be held by a 20 wpm code tested Extra for as long as I'm active. What happens after that is not my concern .. unless of course, I'm Ayn Rand : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2474. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 06:42:00 UTC
From: "Michael W. McGinley" <mmcginley@kscable.com>
Message-ID: <YWs38.291010$8w3.68282468@typhoon.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 31985

"Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...

Snipped to save bandwith----------

> So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> concerned, is great.

Forget this Code Vs. Nocode crap already...This hobby or Service depending
on your point of view is basically bleeding at the seams over this tiring
debate/flamewar....it don't matter if your a 13 WPM General or 5 WPM General
and weither or not anyone else knows that you rattle code off at 13+ - you
know personally that you are capiable of doing cw at those speeds so instead
of arguing like little children grow up a little and learn to get along.

and as for the socalled "freebanders " debate of them invading the amatuer
radio serivce
like a swarm of locust's we will see a few but not in the numbers the
naysayers are stating
the Typical freebander does not want to be shackled by rules or
regulations - they enjoy the anarchy that reins in between 27.405 - 27.995
Mhz so as far as i am concerned that argument is invaled.

Just my 1/50 of a dollars worth

Michael W. McGinley - N0JVT

2475. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 06:50:40 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <32t38.43111$Y17.3420124@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31986

"Chip Griffin" wrote ...
>
> I do want the guns licensed. Goverment control can be abused, but it
> can also be useful. I am not a proponent of severely limited
> government. On the other hand, none of us want bloat-ware. The trick is
> to find the happy medium. We have seen what can happen to an unlicensed
> radio service in the CB service. I say lets not dumn down the amateur
> service by removing those few hurdles required. If my 13 year old son
> can get his license than so can other people, but only if they put in
> the effort like everyone else.
>

You do realize that you are going to get pummeled for spelling "dumb"
incorrectly, right? Hurdles, requirements, effort. All this just to obtain
a government "controlled" license. These are not words that NCI will like.
I highly recommend that you join KCI. Oops, you want guns licensed. KCI is
not for you either. I guess you'll just have to stay an Independent.
: -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2476. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 06:58:54 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 31987

"Bill Sohl" responded ...

> > There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> anybody
> > with a receiver.
>
> And that worries you? Why? We're talking emergency, not a war effort.
>

Sometimes during an emergency, a little security might be a good thing. I might not want the whole world to know that "Aunt Sally" has just been crushed by a building until her next of kin has been notified. It also might be wise to limit the people who know that "Upton's Jewelry Store" has lost power. Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2477. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 11:11:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rTw38.418150$W8.14509117@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 31988

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Bill Sohl" responded ...
>
> > > There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> > anybody
> > > with a receiver.
> >
> > And that worries you? Why? We're talking emergency, not a war
effort.
> >
>
> Sometimes during an emergency, a little security might be a good thing.
I
> might not want the whole world to know that "Aunt Sally" has just been
> crushed by a building until her next of kin has been notified. It also
> might be wise to limit the people who know that "Upton's Jewelry Store"
has
> lost power. Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web

Probably the only good reason for 222-225

2478. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 11:43:36 UTC
From: jo <captjoejoe@uswest.net>
Message-ID: <Ilx38.117101$va.55274484@news2.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 31989
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS TELECOPING
PNUMATIC DEVICE CAN I ELEVATE MY ANTENNA!!! with
it!!!??

2479. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:01:53 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020701525049%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31990

In article <20020122233654.11007.00000050@mb-md.aol.com>, Larry Roll
K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

] >I find your attempt at humor patently unfunny. There are many good
] >reasons to not pursue the CW endorsement.
]
] Name any two of your choosing, giving full explanations.

1. Desire. The motivation for the CW endorsement is increased license
priveleges. If one is not motivated for the additional priveleges then
there is no reason to pursue the CW endorsement. There are plenty of
the aspect of the hobby which can be enjoyed without knowledge of or
capability to use CW.

2. Time. Learning CW, more than the theory, requires a commitment of
time to practice, practice, practice. This is a personal decision and
should not be condemned because of your differing opinion. It's a
matter of mutual respect.

3. Choice. I have some ham friends who do not like to rag chew. They
don't like to contest. They like to fiddle with the electronics. For
them CW has no lure. There are other reasons to make this choice, all
personal.

] It is a given that poor operating manners cut across all license
] classes, regardless of code testing status. That is not the issue.

I would disagree. I never asked for the complete removal of the CW
requirements. I never asked for a lowering of the requirements. What I
did do was object to someone blatantly bashing "no-code" hams because
they are somehow less than those with code. The only way in which I am
less is in my license priveleges. This I can accept and I know how I
can (and will) change that. Those who bash often site the fact that us
"dumb" techs are ruining the world, the bands, the hobby, and anything
else worthwhile. My ability, or inability, to copy CW has absolutely no
relation to my operating behavior or ability (except for the
aforementioned priveleges). Please don't bash me, or others like me,
because of a label (especially one as dynamic as license class).

] The issue here is code testing as an amateur radio licensing
] requirement. In over ten years of participation in this debate, I
] have yet to see a valid argument against it. The simple fact is
] that all but a tiny few people who try to learn Morse code can do
] it; the few who can't could have lived normal lives without being
] ham radio operators. I don't whine about not being able to ice
] skate. I just live without it.

Then lets take the other tack. Give me two good reasons to test to the CW requirements. Does passing a CW test make me a better phone operator? Is CW a dead mode? Why is Amateur Radio the only radio service not to abandon CW? Is there something fundamentally wrong with not testing on every aspect of the hobby (i.e., CW)?

I certainly agree that testing is appropriate and necessary. I too share many hams frustration that some percentage of licensed hams are lids. I would argue, however, that the percentage of new hams that are lids are not very different than the percentage of old hams that are lids. If my theory is true, then it's not the new hams or the different requirements which make it seem like there are more lids, it's just a convenient excuse.

] >I find your form of bigotry as distasteful as racism, sexism, and all
] >the other forms.
]
] Don't tell me, let me guess -- you wear a pony tail, little round wire-
] rimmed eyeglasses, and have multiple ear rings! I just hope you're
] not HIV-positive as well, but that usually goes with your kind of
] thinking!

That was personal and low. I have short hair, might almost pass a military inspection. I am ex-Navy, with more than 8 years of proud service. I do not wear glasses (yet, although I suspect I will shortly). I have no earrings. I do not choose any of the alternative life styles which are at high risk for AIDS. I am, in fact, married with two children. I am a 30-something guy who works hard like the rest of you to keep a roof over my head and food on the plates. But for choosing to have a different viewpoint than you I am accused of being what you apparently feel is sub-par.

The whole point of my initial message was that it would be great if we could keep it above the belt.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2480. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:03:51 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020703512217%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31991

In article <20020122233655.11007.00000051@mb-md.aol.com>, Larry Roll
K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

] This isn't bad stuff, actually. Can't wait to see the whining
] replies from the knuckle-draggers.

In my line of work, a "knuckle-dragger" is a mechanic. This is as
opposed to a "twiget", which is an electronics or instrument
specialist, or "wire-biter", which is an electrician.

To what are you referring?

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2481. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:04:43 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020704425300%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31992

In article
<7Er38.114459$fe1.2208828@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, JAMES
HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

] Heh - cute. Guess what? I joined NCI. Maybe we can meet in the bottom end
] of 40 for a nice rag chew on CW and discuss it. Hope you can handle 40
] plus.

So Jim, tell us what NCI is. Please.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2482. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:06:26 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020706251466%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31993

In article <YMs38.42808$Y17.3415131@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:

] I kept my Advanced callsign because it's easy to send on CW, and you know
] how lazy we CW types are : -))

Actually I like my "no-code" license on CW as well. When I do upgrade I will be keeping it.

-. .---- -- .. .

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2483. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:10:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123071026.17686.00000010@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31994

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Do I take it from your response that you don't want to try the experiment?

>What would be the point?

You are correct. It is clear that you have ceded it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2484. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:13:18 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020713176185%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31995

In article
<d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, K0HB
<k0hb@qwest.net> wrote:

] > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little
] > effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
] > something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached,
] > and talking.
]
] Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
] to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
] Amateur Radio"

I would argue that there is nothing wrong with Kim's approach. How many
of us built all of our radios, amplifiers, and antennas from scratch? I
bet the answer is very close to zero. Why didn't you? There are many
aspects of the hobby which require no ability or desire to repair a
radio or perform other feats of technical expertise. One of the
wonderful things about our hobby is the diversity it offers. Nothing
says we have to be interested in all aspects.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2485. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:15:29 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020715294074%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31996

In article <a2lcc5$58a$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, Bill Sohl
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

] > The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station to
] > work and establish/maintain a QSO.
]
] You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
] today at all?

Nor were they ever tested!

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2486. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:17:26 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020717251075%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 31997

In article <N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:

] Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.

If CW is so easy to learn, as is often argued by the pro-CW crowd, then how can it be secure? I don't think this is a valid arguement. CW is not secure, even the boy scouts used to learn it for a badge.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2487. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:21:31 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 31998

In article <230120020713176185%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>,
n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net says...
> In article
> <d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, K0HB
> <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote:
>
>] > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little
>] > effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
>] > something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached,
>] > and talking.
>]
>] Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
>] to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
>] Amateur Radio"
>
> I would argue that there is nothing wrong with Kim's approach. How many
> of us built all of our radios, amplifiers, and antennas from scratch? I
> bet the answer is very close to zero. Why didn't you? There are many
> aspects of the hobby which require no ability or desire to repair a
> radio or perform other feats of technical expertise. One of the
> wonderful things about our hobby is the diversity it offers. Nothing
> says we have to be interested in all aspects.
>
>
According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
radio service like the FRS or CB.
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2488. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:22:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123072207.17686.00000011@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 31999

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I can't tell you how many times that I've been told in the "old days"
>how rigs had to be built, etc. Maybe I've given too much over to believing
>what I've been told, eh?

Maybe, Kim. I don't think that most hams even in the 50s built their main rig. And if you don't count the Heathkits, the number of hams that literally homebrewed their stations was relatively small.

In 1963, I borrowed a homebrew rig from W1BNB (he had built it in the 1940s), and then bought used Heathkit rigs.

It was not 5 miles to school, uphill both ways, in the snow, with bare feet, with barbed wire on my feet for traction. I took a bus to school, bought used rigs and studied a 16-page study guide to get my General and access to ALL amateur frequencies as a result.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2489. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:22:50 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020722490524%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32000

In article <32t38.43111$Y17.3420124@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, Arnie
Macy <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:

] You do realize that you are going to get pummeled for spelling "dumb"
] incorrectly, right?

A typo. I'm sure it never happens to you.

] Hurdles, requirements, effort. All this just to obtain
] a government "controlled" license. These are not words that NCI will like.
] I highly recommend that you join KCI. Oops, you want guns licensed. KCI is
] not for you either. I guess you'll just have to stay an Independent.

I have no idea the meaning of the acronyms you are using, so your point
is lost. But my position is clear to me. The government is not out to
get us. There can be too much or too little goverment. I like the
current balance both with amateur radio and with gun control. Both are
freedoms we can choose to excercise. Both have been abused in the past.
Both are presently regulated to (hopefully) limit further abuse. It's
not a perfect system, but it's the best we have.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2490. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:24:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123072417.17686.00000012@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32001

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do NOT assume
>that
>the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it also says that
>it
>can be. When was the last time you saw a box that said "a user selected
>20MHz
>wide channel in the range of 2400-2483.5"?

The last time I saw a box that said IEEE 802.11(b) and 2400-2483.5 MHz.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2491. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:27:01 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32002

In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:

] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
] radio service like the FRS or CB.

She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
application of Part 97?

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2492. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:28:58 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120020728582642%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32003

In article <20020123072207.17686.00000011@mb-dd.aol.com>, W1RFI
<w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:

] Maybe, Kim. I don't think that most hams even in the 50s built their main
] rig.
] And if you don't count the Heathkits, the number of hams that literally
] homebrewed their stations was relatively small.
]
] In 1963, I borrowed a homebrew rig from W1BNB (he had built it in the 1940s),
] and then bought used Heathkit rigs.
]
] It was not 5 miles to school, uphill both ways, in the snow, with bare feet,
] with barbed wire on my feet for traction. I took a bus to school, bought used
] rigs and studied a 16-page study guide to get my General and access to ALL
] amateur frequencies as a result.

Careful. Based on these admissions, and applying the rules of NCI (at
least as explained so far on this NG), you would have to be condemned
as a non-contributing member of the service.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2493. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 12:55:04 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b8c303102567929896aa@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32004

In article <230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>,
n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net says...
> In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
>
>] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
>] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
>] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
>] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
>] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
>] radio service like the FRS or CB.
>
> She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> advance the hobby?

I build stuff. I take technology and make it better. I am working on
allowing free Internet access on amateur frequencies via the use of SS
technologies, thereby ridding everyone the expense of ISP's. So far, in
wWestchester County, there are over 150 amateurs in a 20 mile radius
enjoying this service and it will keep growing

Who is Mr. Stevenson?

the EXECUTIVE Director of NCI and the keeper of the holy of holies PART
97. Mr S provides definitive interpretation of PART 97 and decides who
is and who is not worthy. Technoids are worthy, DX'ers are not.
Inventors like him are worthy, appliance operators like Kim are not

What is NCI?
The official registered trademark of the National Cancer Institute

If Mr. Stevenson
> does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
> application of Part 97?

Read the archives. MR S is more powerful than the FCC. Mr S with a
small tad of help from little Mr S personally took responsibility for
the great upheaval in 2000. It's all there. Mr S stated that through
his efforts, hams everywhere were free to get on HF a scream their lass
2's whereby he then condemned then for(1) no joining his NCI cult and
(2) not following the path of righteousness PART 97

For you failure to realize this 5 lashes with RG8
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2494. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 13:07:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123080721.17580.00000527@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32007

In article <3c49f6b5_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020119140515.09750.00001817@mb-cq.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
>> >the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
>> >those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
>> >the ARRL's former policy on Morse???

How could such a change ever be measured?

If every single US member of NCI who is not now an ARRL member joined,
how many would that add to the ARRL membership? Probably less than 1%.

>> Hard to say, Carl. The ARRL position basically was not to expend
>ARRL
>> resources opposing the dropping of an international requirement for
>code
>> testing. That is a far cry from the all-or-nothing approach many on
>both sides
>> believe should be taken.

Not opposing in this case means accepting the obvious.
>>
>> And, to my knowledge, the ARRL policy on Morse code testing has not
>changed on
>> the national level.

Not yet. But given the FCC's stance, that policy is just a bone tossed to
the procodetest membership. FCC will ignore it, you watch.
>
>However, if I am right and the fact that ARRL has (at least)
>taken the position of not opposing the removal of Morse
>requirements from the ITU Radio Regulations (which I think
>the "smart money" would bet will result in the widespread
>elimination of the related requirements in national rules,
>since many administrations have already more or less
>said as much) leads to an increase in ARRL membership
>by those previously "disenfranchised" by the ARRL's
>position on Morse, the entire demographic of the ARRL
>will change ... and the ARRL will have to take notice of
>that ...
>

How you gonna measure it?

>I have occasionally thought that one of the smartest things
>we as NCI might do would be to actively encourage every
>no code/slow code ham in the US to join the ARRL right
>away and elect a slate of directors who would PROMISE
>*in no uncertain* terms to vigorously support the elimination
>of Morse testing in US rules as soon as the ITU Radio
>Regulations permit.

That would work IF the number of nocodetest hams in the USA were
significant enough to make a difference in director elections.

But I think it could backfire because you might find that such a move
made no big difference in the membership or ARRL BoD. NCI has
how many US members?

Consider this: Back in 1990, the ARRL BoD voted FOR a nocodetest
ham license, based on a number of factors. The Atlantic Division
director at the time voted FOR the move. FCC had made it clear that
they wanted a nocodetest license, and if the ARRL opposed it they
would lose all input into the process.

Same deal will happen in a post S25.5 world.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2495. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 13:07:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123080722.17580.00000528@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32005

In article <3c4e0155_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Also contest results, upcoming contests and special events, section news,
>> strays, new products, new books, and a bazillion ads. All in a nice 175
>page
>> package.
>> Total cost $3.25 per issue if you subscribe.
>>
>
>So, in other words, you now wish to take offense that I don't read QST?! Is
>that what your long list is about, Jim?

Nope.

I'm simply pointing out what you are missing by not reading a typical issue.

> I specifically stated that it was
>not intended to be a slam toward QST magazine. You must have missed that
>part.

No, I saw that part. I'm just pointing out what is in a typical QST issue.
>
>> >My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say "you're
>not
>> >even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my
>membership
>> >is for.
>>
>> Seems to me like you're missing an awful lot of good stuff.

>And, who is making the decision that it is good stuff? Oh, *you*?

Yeah. Got a problem with that?

>Well,
>it's apparently good stuff to you. It probably is good stuff--just not good
>enough to entice me into taking precious time I use for other things.

Like posting here.
>
>> >Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and
>> >I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have
>learned
>> >that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.
>>
>> Well, an uninformed critic is usually not taken seriously.

>Well, there ya go.
>
If the shoe fits...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2496. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 13:07:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123080723.17580.00000529@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32006

In article <3c4dfeb6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020122080718.17580.00000514@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3c49927c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> > If tuning is required with a carrier
>> >because one does not have a dummy load (and I know few hams who do), then
>> >just be sure to ID (and I know many hams who don't) when you've completed
>> >each step of tuning.
>>
>> Tuning up with the antenna is usually done because the setup requires it,
>not
>> due to lack of a dummy load. Unless the antenna presents the same complex
>> impedance as the dummy load, tuning up with the antenna to be used is
>> usually necessary.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Regardless of *why* one tunes using an antenna, it is not a good excuse to
>avoid following FCC R&R just because something is too hard. I tune all the
>time on my antenna, or do when I am on HF.
>
Kim, your verbiage above makes no sense at all. Sorry, but I've read it a
doizen times and it just doesn't compute.

"Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the antenna/transmission
line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most transmatches
require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the antenna
just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being "too
hard".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2497. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 13:42:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32008

>"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>> "N2EY" wrote:
> > The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station to
> work
> > and establish/maintain a QSO.
>
> You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
> today at all?

Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
The
fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure of
its
importance - or is it?

> > >Assuming the connectivity
> > >has been established, anyone can then use a
> > >keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> > >
> > But the "connection" must be established and maintained. And the speed
> > of communication is directly related to typing skill.
>
> I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
> people that might be involved in any way with
> emergency comms are likly to have at least a
> familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
> able to type quickly to keep the communication going.

All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
>
> > >> >That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
> > >> >the ham can be the operator.
> > >>
> > >> Yup.
> > >
> > >Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
> > >a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?
> >
> > Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for example,
> > requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software, interconnections and
> > skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.
>
> I'd debate the "skilled operator" needed. Once established,
> the connection/comms don't really require
> attention at all. Packet clusters are left to their own operation

> all the time...no operator on hand at all.

Once the communication is established, and if the equipment and
propagation
are reliable. Such is often not the case - it all depends on the
situation.
Will the repeater/packet cluster be working? Will it cover the needed
area?
>
> > >> >Most other modes allow for
> > >> >anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
> > >> >as control operator.
> > >>
> > >> Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.
> > >
> > >But the amateur can be just "there"...as opposed to
> > >having to be actively engaged in the actual message
> > >content being sent/received.
> >
> > So? You still need a qualified amateur at eac end of the QSO.
>
> There is a BIG difference in just "being there" vs having
> to maintain the communication (i.e. as with CW).
> Example...I can hand the mike to a Red Cross person and
> that individual can converse with another station while I
> sit back, drink coffee, read a book, etc.

Sure. That's the one big advantage of voice modes.

> I can't do that
> for CW where I'dd have to be sending/recieveing myself.

Maybe you can't, but I can sit back, drink coffee, and even read a
book
while operating CW. (I used to do my homework during CW traffic nets -
and I was an A student). I can't eat/drink and transmit on voice at
the same time, but I can do so on CW. About the only thing I can't do
while using CW is
sleep.

And it's not just me - lots of CW ops have those skills.
>
> > >> There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others where
> "one
> > >> picture
> > >> is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the
> > >emergency.
> > >
> > >How do you send pictures by CW?
> > >
> > Same way you send them on voice. IOW, voice is equally poor for sending
> > images.

>
> Poor, but generally faster via voice.

Not if you have to write it down.
>
> > >> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> anybody
> > >> with a receiver.
> > >
> > >And that worries you?
> >
> > It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.
>
> In all the emergency planning, drills, and actual emergencies
> I have yet to hear that as a worry for anyone.

Ask KT4ST.
>
> > > Why? We're talking
> > >emergency, not a war effort.
> > >
> > There are plenty of situations where emergency personnel may not want
> their
> > conversations
> > to be wide open to the entire world and media. Of course we hams cannot
> use
> > ciphers or
> > codes meant to disguise or hide the content of communications, but you
> must
> > admit that
> > voice modes are easily intercepted.
> >
> > Here's an example: Suppose their is a disaster that results in missing,
> injured
> > and dead people.
> > Suppose the emergency personnel need to send unchecked lists of names out
> of
> > the disaster area,
> > and they ask the hams involved to do it. Wouldn't it be smarter to send
> those
> > lists by a nonvoice mode?
>
> I truly doubt, under the conditions, that anyone would have
> the time or inclination to care.

It's still a concern - and with the heightened awareness of the need
for
better domestic security you may want to rethink that doubt, Bill.

> It is TIME that is usually
> the issue, not rumors.

If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text messages.
Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape recorders.

Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names and some
other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW circuit, decent
ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the message
with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message faster?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2498. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 15:34:25 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0201230734.3cacf9cd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32009

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message news:<a2ks0n$3id2q$1@rn.area.com>...
> "Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
> news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> > "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
> news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
> =
> > So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> > test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> > automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> > data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> > In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> > of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> > concerned, is great.
>
> This is why I won't change my callsign even though it's "out of district." I
> don't want people to think I'm a no-code extra. I don't even trust the VEC
> system, we all know how much cheating there is there.

Well, sooner or later you are going to have to renew your license.
When that happens, the effective date on you license is going to
be after the regulation change date. So in the end, you will be
"assimilated". You will become one with the collective.

The only ones who will continue to be distinguished from the Borg Extras,
like Jerry pointed out, are the ones with license classes that no
longer exist, like Advanced. And, it is likely that they will be
grandfathered, or is that "assimilated", in eventually.

I think I need to throw in a few happy faces. :) Everyone is starting
to take this thing way to seriously. :)

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
employer.

2499. RETEST every 10 years

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 16:14:45 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2mnhm$3j1ti$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 32011

Even though I'm getting on in years myself, I think they should RETEST hames every 10 years or so for two reasons:

1. The UNAUDITED "VEC" system is not as reliable as when the government did the testing

2. Many older hams are suffering from senile dementia an/or effects of RF on the brain. (That's why some of the most "experienced" hams have the worst operating manners.

Thoughts?

2500. "Know Code" international's web site isn't working!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 16:17:43 UTC
From: rasw <atdot.dotat@at.sorry>
Message-ID: <a2mnn7$3i519$1@rn.area.com>
Source record: 32010

Maybe the folks at NCI are right! Replace the code test with more questions about modern operating modes and digital electronics. If they did, the folks at KCI could keep their website up!

2501. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 17:00:35 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <T_B38.317798$WW.14504045@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32012

No Code International. A group trying to eliminate CW as a requirement for
HF priveleges.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:230120020704425300%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> In article
> <7Er38.114459$fe1.2208828@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, JAMES
> HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>] Heh - cute. Guess what? I joined NCI. Maybe we can meet in the bottom
end
>] of 40 for a nice rag chew on CW and discuss it. Hope you can handle 40
>] plus.
>
> So Jim, tell us what NCI is. Please.
>
> --
> N1MIE - FN31xm

2502. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 17:04:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201230904.197fa1bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32013

>"Kim" wrote:
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:

> > The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
> > them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
> > raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And, it's obvious the League has grown up a little more and gotten a lot
> more business sense about it.

Not obvious at all. Ed sez the position is running at a deficit.

If the fundraiser does not raise at least as much money after expenses as
has been done in the past, it's not good business sense.

If the fundraiser's attitude angers and alienates the very people who have been
most forthcoming with funds in the past, it's not good business sense.

"Growing up" has nothing to do with it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2503. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:01:54 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201231001.63d2417c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32014

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote:

> How 'bout the part about RACES? I just went through a good local debate
> here early last year with people who state that it is the FCC's R&R that say
> a non-RACES station cannot enter a RACES net.

97.407 is pretty clear on which stations can participate in RACES
communications, and leave no wiggle-room regarding "intention".

1) A station certified by a civil defense organization.
2) An FCC-licensed RACES station.

If your station is not in one of those categories you can't check in,
and the RACES stations are specifically prohibited from communicating
with you.

Them's the rules.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2504. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:09:43 UTC
From: dj <drfsun@wessnett.com>
Message-ID: <80D38.29$ro6.57242@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 32015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

LEARN HOW TO SNIP?!?!?!?!

LOLOLOLOLOLHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
LOLHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAH

Sheesh...'learn how to snip" !

learn!!!
how
to
snip

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:poi52u4609q2ksgj7irkvpe0e7jr72mqes@4ax.com...
> SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->veep.....my ,my....i am impressed........really......also on the
> ->letters by your name thing......may i suggest the letters 'DH' be
> ->added....i feel it would be most appropriate.......
>
> I'm presuming that the above circumlocution means "no". I'd suggest some
> remedial education is in order.
>
> Learn how to snip, asshole.
>
> Jim
>
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup
>

2505. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:15:11 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0201231015.3e2a1550@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32016

Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:<230120020704425300%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>...
> In article
> <7Er38.114459$fe1.2208828@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, JAMES
> HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>] Heh - cute. Guess what? I joined NCI. Maybe we can meet in the bottom end
>] of 40 for a nice rag chew on CW and discuss it. Hope you can handle 40
>] plus.
>
> So Jim, tell us what NCI is. Please.

I thought you were kidding at first but then after seeing you ask this
in other places, I guess you weren't.

NCI = No-Code International - http://www.nocode.org/

Check it out. It's good entertainment. :)

There use to be KCI - Know-Code International, but I can't seem to
find them any more. They may be defunct.

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
employer.

2506. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:17:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF1FA.E58D8D7C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32017

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C442A98.3537F8E3@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Mark Pearsal wrote:
> >
> > > Hello Carl & Bill, (Since you guys seem to be the NCI reps of the
> group.)
> > >
> > > If, by some miracle, the code requirement is NOT dropped for US
> amateurs as a
> > > result of the elimination of S25.5, what will you guys do? In
> other words, what
> > > will be the purpose of NCI? I thought that "putting it to a vote"
> idea was
> > > pretty good. With approximately 700k licensed US amateurs it
> wouldn't be a
> > > difficult thing for the ARRL to arrange. (After all, the database
> is finite and
> > > a time limit to respond could be set.) The results of which could
> then become
> > > the single largest petition the FCC has ever received. (One way or
> the other.)
> > > Take care and 73.
> >
> > No sweat, Mark, the geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC has
> decided that CW
> > must go. The one think that you can't have if you're a digigeek or a
> government
> > employee is to be viewed by the leading edge guys as "retro",
> holding beliefs in
> > anything but leading edge, ya know, stuff that can generate big
> bucks. Not good for
> > your career path. Plus Government guys gotta spend money, geeks
> gotta constantly
> > come up with "stuff" to sell us all, whether or not we "need" it.
> Makes the world
> > go round
> > . So when the FCC employee, who wouldn't be caught dead admitting

> that CW is a good
> > real life communications mode, in spite of the fact that it has
> served as such for
> > over a hundred years, made the decision it was pretty well cut into
> stone. No
> > matter what the facts really are.
> >
>
> Dick,
>
> The "geek dealing with ham radio at the FCC" (your words, not
> mine, of course) happens to be a 20 wpm extra whose main
> interest in ham radio operating is CW DX ... I honestly don't
> know what his country count is, but I'd be strongly inclined to
> believe
> that it probably exceeds yours. I've NO doubt that his level of both
> technical knowledge AND operating skill FAR exceeds yours.

Now, that could well be. There are some folks out there who are, indeed.
But
you have been quite successfull in making it clear that you sure aren't
one of them.
You're really a pitiful case, as noted here often before. You'll NEVER get
over the code,
try as you might. It will always be there to jab you in the butt, to goose
you
along over all life's little humps (and some pretty big ones, too). Have
fun.

Cheers.

2507. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:19:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF294.24821ECD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32018

> I predict that the total elimination of Morse testing
> will result in an even stronger upturn, without a decrease
> in the quality of licensees. In fact, I wouldn't be at all
> surprised to see a noticable INCREASE in the quality of
> licensees as more technical professionals, not interested
> in Morse, but interested in the "new things" begin to join in
> increasing numbers.

Where have we heard this tired BS before? Yeah, same guy.
Still in denial. Wont ever get out.

2508. Re: He Dick (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:21:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF316.FDAB68A9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32019

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C499D4E.89220034@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities.
>
> Dick,
>
> I would state categorically that, where YOU are concerned,
> there is DEFINITELY a SEVERE limit to the possibilities.
>
> > It's a matter of being prepared for operation with the
> > minimum level of technical support.
>
> I'm sure that anyone depending on you had best be
> prepared for a minimum level of technical support :-)

Unlike you, I earned a LONG time ago how to get the job done, not
to sit in the corner bitching and sulking til someone took pity and
changed
things do I could qualify.

2509. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:23:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF36D.F28AFB9B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32020

CAM wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >>FYI too...over 1/3 of all current hame are nocode
> > >>techs (234,000). How would you expect them to vote?
> > >
> > > Who knows, maybe they might just surprise you.
> >
> > Heck, even if they didn't...I'd take a 2:1 victory any day of the week. :-)
>
> Many coded hams are against the code testing requirement.

So name both of them. Old Techs don't count.

2510. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:27:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F007B.285F7900@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32021

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C4E049E.3DCF48D3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> After all the warts, inconsistencies and incompleteness her philosphy
> >> has demonstrated, how could anyone base their life on it?
> > >
> > >Who did that?
>
> Look in the mirror.

You mean, "Look in the mirror thirty years ago." I gave up on objectivism
when I moved to California in 1971.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2511. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:29:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F0116.E8DA281@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32022

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I wouldn't want to be caught dead in a
> meeting with a bunch of idiots like that!

I see, in your upside down world, a person with a high IQ is an idiot.
And you're not an idiot, therefore you don't have a high IQ. I think
I understand now. (Somebody get the net!)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2512. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:33:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF5D4.D71A43C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32023

CAM wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > One could quip that the existence of a supernatural "being" who is
> > responsible for all creation yet possesses superior intelligence could
> > certainly be--at a minimum--debatable, with the likes of Larry Roll, Dave
> > Heil, et al around... :o
>
> Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
> an idiot. :-)
> --

The real trick is what you pull - both in a single package.

2513. Re: He Dick (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:37:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F02E0.9A3D4BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32026

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Unlike you, I earned a LONG time ago how to get the job done, not
> to sit in the corner bitching and sulking ...

Dick, The great majority of your postings are your bitchings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2514. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:39:17 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120021339174014%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32024

In article <270a577d.0201231015.3e2a1550@posting.google.com>, Martin
Meserve <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote:

] I thought you were kidding at first but then after seeing you ask this
] in other places, I guess you weren't.

Nope, honestly ignorant on that issue.

] NCI = No-Code International - http://www.nocode.org/

I don't see anything patently wrong on their site. They have some good
points. They are entitled to their opinion and appear to be working
within the system to advocate change. Seems to me that if you are
opposed to those changes then you should work within the system to
oppose them. I'd say that low-ball humor and vulgar attacks on other
licensed hams won't help promote either cause.

] There use to be KCI - Know-Code International, but I can't seem to
] find them any more. They may be defunct.

I found a lot of hits for those key words, but it appears that
http://www.knowcode.org is now defunct.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2515. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:40:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EF76B.4294AA0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32025

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> > >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about CW;
> > >basic
> > >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
> other?
> > >
> > >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
> > >to send/receive.
> >
> > The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.
>
> What skills in particular. Assuming the connectivity
> has been established, anyone can then use a
> keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> And that worries you? Why? We're talking
> emergency, not a war effort.

Really, Bill, you should invest in some gear and put it on the air sometime.
Drop the shack on the belt for awhile and get into ham radio realtime.
You might learn something about the hobby. There are definitely things that
must be learned to work PSK31, and without which you cannot do it.

2516. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:43:54 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120021343540646%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32027

In article <MPG.16b8c303102567929896aa@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:

] I build stuff. I take technology and make it better. I am working on
] allowing free Internet access on amateur frequencies via the use of SS
] technologies, thereby ridding everyone the expense of ISP's. So far, in
] wWestchester County, there are over 150 amateurs in a 20 mile radius
] enjoying this service and it will keep growing

Sounds cool. But I'd be will to make (and win) a large bet that you are
a significant minority. Most are varying degrees of appliance
operators. Some perform a little more tinkering than others.

I'd love to hear more about what you are doing over there in
Westchester Co. (I have a cousin who lives there part time. As far as I
know he is not a ham.) Sounds intruiging.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2517. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:48:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu>
Source record: 32028

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com...
> > "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
> >
> > > I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> > > more and more of a historical notation, rather
> > > than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> > > of the ARS.
> >
> > And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
> > "a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
> > should be ignored?
>
> Hans,
>
> There is NO requirement that any one individual subscribe
> to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97. The goals are
> that of the service as a whole...not as any one individual.

Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
follow
the goals set forth in Part 97?
```

2518. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:52:46 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120021352452500%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32029

In article <MPG.16b8c303102567929896aa@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:

] the EXECUTIVE Director of NCI and the keeper of the holy of holies PART
] 97. Mr S provides definitive interpretation of PART 97 and decides who
] is and who is not worthy. Technoids are worthy, DX'ers are not.
] Inventors like him are worthy, appliance operators like Kim are not

I stand by my comment. He is not in my food chain. With respect to my
licensing activities I report solely to the FCC as the governing body.
I do not report to the ARRL nor to NCI. I choose to be a member of the
ARRL because I see benefit in it. But, like any club, they have limit
sway upon my opinion.

] Read the archives. MR S is more powerful than the FCC.

So you are saying that he is an officially sanctioned agent of the US
Government, the IARU, or the ITU? If his best claim to fame is his
responsibilities with NCI, then he is nothing to me.

] Mr S with a
] small tad of help from little Mr S personally took responsibility for
] the great upheaval in 2000. It's all there. Mr S stated that through
] his efforts, hams everywhere were free to get on HF a scream their lass
] 2's whereby he then condemned then for(1) no joining his NCI cult and
] (2) not following the path of righteousness PART 97

Again I am missing something here. What was the "great upheaval in
2000?" Why would we care if he is upset because we aren't in his cult?
Why would this be any different than the ramblings of any of the other
weirdos on this newsgroup?

] For you failure to realize this 5 lashes with RG8

Whatever ...

] 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

Been there, done that. Collected my first OZ contact today. Almost
snagged my first TF (almost had him yesterday too). The band has been a
little flat the past few days, but a contact or two have been possible.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2519. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 18:56:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F0777.55AF6A70@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32030

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> follow the goals set forth in Part 97?

I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2520. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:01:07 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <230120021401062556%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32031

In article <9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com>, N2EY
<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

] Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
] The fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure of
] its importance - or is it?

Exactly. And the converse is true. We're still tested on CW and it
isn't very important to proper operation on phone or data. :)

] All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.

Perhaps we should make typing a mandatory tested skill for ham radio. I
can do 60 wpm pretty reliably, how about you? :)

] > It is TIME that is usually the issue, not rumors.
]
] If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
] messages.
] Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
] recorders.

That may be. Although since I can type at 60 WPM, I can almost keep up
with normal voice speed. There is very little slowing if I'm typing the
traffic as I receive it. As for CW as faster, that is only if the CW
stations can receive fast enough. I doubt if everyone was at 5 wpm if
it would be faster.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2521. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:14:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4F0B8B.AF3211C5@uci.edu>
Source record: 32033

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
>
> I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.

Is that your final answer?

2522. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:14:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4EFF83.394F8C87@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32032

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C4D85DA.E9DED2B7@IEEE.org...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >Consider the normal bell curve. For every genius, there must exist
> > > >an idiot. :-)
> > >
> > > Assuming the opposite is also true, who is the genius that proves
> > > *your* existence?
> >
> > Let's see, Larry, which one of us has been a member of MENSA?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Qualified but wouldn't be caught dead at a meeting let alone apply for
> membership.. But then I feel that way about QCWA as well.

Ditto on both counts and organizations.

2523. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:30:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9bE38.115101$fe1.2256694@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32034

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:230120021339174014%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> I don't see anything patently wrong on their site. They have some good
> points. They are entitled to their opinion and appear to be working
> within the system to advocate change. Seems to me that if you are
> opposed to those changes then you should work within the system to
> oppose them. I'd say that low-ball humor and vulgar attacks on other
> licensed hams won't help promote either cause.
>
> N1MIE - FN31xm

Chip, you seem to have wandered in at Chapter 48.

I, for one, did not see a lot of sense in code testing beyond 12wpm in the 70s but I took and passed my 20 for the FCC -- in a blizzard walking 17 miles uphill in both directions barefoot and all that crapola. And that was when where I lived you could take it only every 90 days.

Since wandering onto this newsgroup I have been accused of being an old-fart in my mid-50s, running a hazing ritual, participating in Wouff Houng ceremonies, child molestation, bestiality, and a few other things for the simple fact of having passed a code test. I know it sounds silly and it is but it has happened.

What happens, and you see it here, is that because of an initial reluctance to simply learn what is a mechanical skill right up there with Advanced Nintendo which one learns essentially the same way -- by doing it, gonads and self-justification coupled with large doses of self-deception start to happen. I call it Lifer Tech Syndrome.

The classic Lifer Tech is a member of both NCI and the ARRL and is probably petitioning QCWA for a medical exemption. They show up at Dayton like the face of doom and make semi-annual pilgimages to HP Maxim's grave. And they are resident geniuses in rules and regs, 160 meter gray line propagation, emergency comms, and pronounce learnedly upon 'modern digital techniques' without having a clue how duplex TTY works on a phone line. Anything to achieve some sense of equality without the code test.

So as you might expect, OTs get a little tired of it. And I have an ethical problem debating simply because there is little to debate and I am enabling self-destructive behavior. So I don't.

You are apparently trying to be rational in an irrational situation. As I have pointed out to Cecil, there is little or no payoff in being the only sane man in the asylum.

Dick, N&#65533;BK

2524. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:31:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F0359.FD37807B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32035

K0HB wrote:

> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little
> > effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
> > something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached,
> > and talking.
>
> Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
> to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
> Amateur Radio"

Seems no one but me is willing to even acknowledge it - the CB-ization of the
ARS
has been under way for a LONG time now.

Judging from the lack of interest in the late restructuring, it would seem that
is must
be relatively complete by now.

2525. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 19:44:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F0679.450A6DCE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32036

W1RFI wrote:

I don't think that most hams even in the 50s built their main rig.

> And if you don't count the Heathkits, the number of hams that literally
> homebrewed their stations was relatively small.

Lots did, When you consider that most of the military
conversions were "home brew" jobs that often involved
as much work at homebrewing. The main componant
of the station that was bought was the receiver. Many more
transmitters were homebrewed than receivers, though some
built their own receives too. The "one box" concept was
still far in the future.

2526. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 21:19:30 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b9393a2d62be429896ab@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32037

In article <230120021343540646%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>,
n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net says...
> In article <MPG.16b8c303102567929896aa@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
>
>] I build stuff. I take technology and make it better. I am working on
>] allowing free Internet access on amateur frequencies via the use of SS
>] technologies, thereby ridding everyone the expense of ISP's. So far, in
>] wWestchester County, there are over 150 amateurs in a 20 mile radius
>] enjoying this service and it will keep growing
>
> Sounds cool. But I'd be will to make (and win) a large bet that you are
> a significant minority. Most are varying degrees of appliance
> operators. Some perform a little more tinkering than others.

Certainly meets the criteria as set by Mr S. If it weren't for duct
tape, this would never work. Interesting project was making enough 1.2
gig antennae to start things off. One of my neighbors cobbled things
together using cut up coke can for the director and reflector rings.
Worked OK till birds landed on them and bent them out of shape. Use a
lot of old cordless phones for parts

>
> I'd love to hear more about what you are doing over there in
> Westchester Co.

I work for a fairly large computer company with offices in White Plains
and Armonk, NY. Currently I am supervising the installation of a 20,000
sq foot Class 10 clean room in their new chip manufacturing facility
being built in North Fishkill, NY. Normally I head up the ESD QC
division for the entire corporation. Once this project is done, I am
off to the next one. Normally I am in the Elmira plant (3 days a week)

(I have a cousin who lives there part time. As far as I
> know he is not a ham.) Sounds intruiging.
>
>

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2527. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 21:23:11 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b93a15442f0fbd9896ac@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32038

In article <230120021352452500%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>,
n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net says...
> In article <MPG.16b8c303102567929896aa@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
>
>] the EXECUTIVE Director of NCI and the keeper of the holy of holies PART
>] 97. Mr S provides definitive interpretation of PART 97 and decides who
>] is and who is not worthy. Technoids are worthy, DX'ers are not.
>] Inventors like him are worthy, appliance operators like Kim are not
>
> I stand by my comment. He is not in my food chain. With respect to my
> licensing activities I report solely to the FCC as the governing body.
> I do not report to the ARRL nor to NCI. I choose to be a member of the
> ARRL because I see benefit in it. But, like any club, they have limit
> sway upon my opinion.
>
>] Read the archives. MR S is more powerful than the FCC.
>
> So you are saying that he is an officially sanctioned agent of the US
> Government, the IARU, or the ITU? If his best claim to fame is his
> responsibilities with NCI, then he is nothing to me.

Don't say that too loud or you'll upset his apple cart. Mr S is a giant
in his own mind

>
>] Mr S with a
>] small tad of help from little Mr S personally took responsibility for
>] the great upheaval in 2000. It's all there. Mr S stated that through
>] his efforts, hams everywhere were free to get on HF a scream their lass
>] 2's whereby he then condemned then for(1) no joining his NCI cult and
>] (2) not following the path of righteousness PART 97
>
> Again I am missing something here. What was the "great upheaval in
> 2000?"

Restructuring. ;-0

> Why would we care if he is upset because we aren't in his cult?

Because if you aren't with him, you are against everything he stands
for..truth..justice and the American Way (cue Superman music)

> Why would this be any different than the ramblings of any of the other
> weirdos on this newsgroup?

ding ding ding ding and circle gets the square. Well, Chip, now you
are catching on

>
>] For you failure to realize this 5 lashes with RG8
>
> Whatever ...
>
>] 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
> Been there, done that. Collected my first OZ contact today. Almost
> snagged my first TF (almost had him yesterday too). The band has been a
> little flat the past few days, but a contact or two have been possible.

Seems the last few weeks have been something else. Heard reports that
they are actually predicting a double solar peak. Wonder if Mr S and
NCI will take credit for this too hi hi only kidding
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2528. Re: RETEST every 10 years

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 21:37:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201232135480.1302-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32039

On Wed, 23 Jan 2002, rasw wrote:
>Even though I'm getting on in years myself, I think they should RETEST hames
>every 10 years or so for two reasons:
>
>1. The UNAUDITED "VEC" system is not as reliable as when the government did
>the testing
>
>2. Many older hams are suffering from senile dementia an/or effects of RF on
>the brain. (That's why some of the most "experienced" hams have the worst
>operating manners.
>
>Thoughts?

1) Some people had enough trouble passing the test the first time.
2) Retesting will include questions (just as the initial test did) on areas that some operators NEVER use. Not everyone is interested in ATV, satellite, packet/digital, HF, VHF/UHF-repeaters, etc.... There is no one common area to all operations.
3) If someone fails the retest, what do you propose? Immediate downgrade or license cancellation?

2529. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:42:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123174241.17714.00000103@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32040

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
>follow the goals set forth in Part 97?

Wishes? Probably. Expects? Probably not. Requires?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2530. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:43:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123174316.17714.00000104@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32041

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.

Didn't WA6VSE say that? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2531. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:51:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123175140.17714.00000110@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32042

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>> "Dave Heil" wrote:

>> > The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to pay
>> > them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
>> > raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.

>> And, it's obvious the League has grown up a little more and gotten a lot
>> more business sense about it.

>Not obvious at all. Ed sez the position is running at a deficit.

I have to correct that. I read that last year ended with the fund raising effort is about $100k ahead of the year before. The position was started as a deficit, but it appears the investment is being returned. That was the hope.

> If the fundraiser's attitude angers and alienates the very people
> who have been most forthcoming with funds in the past, it's not
> good business sense.

Frankly, I am still amazed at Dave's reaction. I rather doubt that he believes that anything that was said in the donation letter is untrue. By what he told us, he has known for years the reasons that it takes $$$ to protect spectrum -- with increasing pressures, now more than ever. The fact that the letter is trying to say it a bit more forcefully to reach some of those who have not chosen to make contributions in the past (apparently iwht success) seems to really bother him. I don't understand why.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2532. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:53:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123175313.17714.00000112@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32043

From: Chip Griffin n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net

>I'd say that low-ball humor and vulgar attacks on other
>licensed hams won't help promote either cause.

And do note which "side" seems to be doing the vast majority of it...\

>I found a lot of hits for those key words, but it appears that
>http://www.knowcode.org is now defunct.

I don't believe it ever was more than a spoof.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2533. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:57:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <kdH38.168$7y2.29525@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 32045

Real Hams use Spark Gap! Real Hams at least use Straight Keys.... Bugs or Paddles are for Wussies!

REAL HAMS look to do stuff the absolute hardest way, cheapest way, and MUST resemble those guys in the informational films we had in the 70's in school or in those VD films the guys in the military had to watch in the 50-60's.

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C4DC694.BB80E9A7@IEEE.org...
> rasw wrote:
> >
> > If the government won't do it, maybe we should.
> >
> > Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it,
> > not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who
> > passed this test.
>
> REAL HAMS are members of the Old, Old Timer's Club. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2534. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:57:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <ldH38.169$7y2.29525@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 32044

And where the hell were you when all these changes that you detest so much?

Did you bother working towards a "positive goal" at least as what is percieved in your own mind? Did you do anything towards the promotion of your beliefs other that bitching and moaning here?

My guess is no. My guess is you are the type that enjoys bitching about everything with doing nothing to make it better. Not once have I ever see you post a positive message, nor a contributory one either. Even some of the other "sticks in the mud" in this newsgroup at least contribute positively to a debate, or provide some information.

Find a counselor or someone who can help you with your negativity. It is not healthy.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020122103833.02857.00000630@mb-dh.aol.com...
> It has come to the attention of the Democratic Leadership that there is to
> much Discrimanation of the Mentally Challenged in Ham Testing. And as such
a
> new Procedure is being drafted to stop this.
> The new procedure will only require a Welfare Card and Membership in NCI.

2535. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 22:58:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123175819.17714.00000115@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32046

From: Chip Griffin n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net

>Careful. Based on these admissions, and applying the rules of NCI (at
>least as explained so far on this NG), you would have to be condemned
>as a non-contributing member of the service.

For the first decades of my hamming, my contributions were to get on the air and operate. That was it. I was as green as they come and didn't have a clue about most aspects of ham radio past HF and CW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2536. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 23:09:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4F42AE.9E23DA99@uci.edu>
Source record: 32047

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> >follow the goals set forth in Part 97?

> Wishes? Probably. Expects? Probably not. Requires?

I guess you're right. They prolly just needed to kill some time when
they wrote Part 97.

2537. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 23:11:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C4F4313.DC68102C@uci.edu>
Source record: 32048

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
>
> Didn't WA6VSE say that? :-)
>

Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
pile-up?

2538. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-23 23:41:16 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.23.18.41.11.517917.24207@arrl.org>
Source record: 32049

On Wed, 23 Jan 2002 12:04:00 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>"Kim" wrote:
>>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>> > The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to
>> > pay them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional
>> > fund raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> And, it's obvious the League has grown up a little more and gotten a
>> lot more business sense about it.
>
> Not obvious at all. Ed sez the position is running at a deficit.

Most fundraising efforts do start out that way. Ya gotta spend money to raise money. The question is whether the efforts work in the end. As far as the expanded ARRL fundraising effort is concerned, the early results are encouraging.

> If the fundraiser does not raise at least as much money after expenses
> as has been done in the past, it's not good business sense.

Duh, really?

The first program the new fundraiser did (the Defense Fund drive) netted about $100k more than previous efforts. So far, so good.

> If the fundraiser's attitude angers and alienates the very people who
> have been most forthcoming with funds in the past, it's not good
> business sense.

As far as I can tell, Dave's complaints are (1) that the League has hired a professional to manage its fundraising and development efforts, and (2) that he got a fundraising form letter. As for (1), the reality is simply that the ad hoc fundraising ARRL has relied on in the past is no longer sufficient to meet the growing threats. With regard to (2), form letters do annoy some people, but they are an effective means of soliciting contributions. If someone knows of a better mechanism, I'm sure Mary Hobart, the ARRL Chief Development Officer, would like to hear about it. (So would every other nonprofit organization in the country!)

Anyone who's interested in more background can read the editorial in February QST, also available at:
http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/01/14/2/

Jon

2539. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 00:20:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020123192049.17829.00000154@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32050

>And where the hell were you when all these changes that you detest so much?
>
>Did you bother working towards a "positive goal" at least as what is
>percieved in your own mind? Did you do anything towards the promotion of
>your beliefs other that bitching and moaning here?
>
>My guess is no. My guess is you are the type that enjoys bitching about
>everything with doing nothing to make it better. Not once have I ever see
>you post a positive message, nor a contributory one either. Even some of
>the other "sticks in the mud" in this newsgroup at least contribute
>positively to a debate, or provide some information.
>
>Find a counselor or someone who can help you with your negativity. It is not
>healthy.

SCREW OFF, just as I figured, checked the Qrz DATA Base and of course you are one of them there CBplussers. Why dont you get off your Dead ASS and get a Real Ham License, havent you heard they are basically giving them away.

2540. Re: "Know Code" international's web site isn't working!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 00:56:30 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <rXI38.49019$Y17.3751510@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32051

The KCI Website has been inactive for more than a year. Eric, who had the registered rights to the URL, took it off-line and asked that it not be re-registered. I spoke with him about it, respect his decision and won't re-open it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message news:a2mnn7$3i519$1@rn.area.com...
> Maybe the folks at NCI are right! Replace the code test with more questions
> about modern operating modes and digital electronics. If they did, the folks
> at KCI could keep their website up!
>
>
>
>

2541. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 01:16:48 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <veJ38.49180$Y17.3761114@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32052

"Chip Griffin" wrote
>
> A typo. I'm sure it never happens to you.
>
A Joke, Chip. Not to be taken seriously. I just thought it was funny that
of all the words to mis-spell, "dumb" was the one that picked you. And, of
course, it has happened to all of us.

>] Hurdles, requirements, effort. All this just to obtain
>] a government "controlled" license. These are not words that NCI will
like.
>] I highly recommend that you join KCI. Oops, you want guns licensed.
KCI is
>] not for you either. I guess you'll just have to stay an Independent.
>
> I have no idea the meaning of the acronyms you are using, so your point
> is lost. But my position is clear to me. The government is not out to
> get us. There can be too much or too little goverment. I like the
> current balance both with amateur radio and with gun control. Both are
> freedoms we can choose to excercise. Both have been abused in the past.
> Both are presently regulated to (hopefully) limit further abuse. It's
> not a perfect system, but it's the best we have.
>

KCI stands for Know Code International. NCI stands for No Code
International. KCI advocates the retention of code testing. It also has
said that if the code testing *was* removed, the written tests should be
strengthened. NCI advocates the ending of All code testing with no
strengthening of the written exams. It has also hinted that CW's (and
Digital's) special status should be removed so that all modes could fend for
themselves as it believes that no single mode should have special status.

I don't want to get into a "gun rights" debate here, but the abuses have
been in large by criminals who will not abide by any regulations concerning
registration (control); past, present, or future. We have seen this
internationally time after time (England, South Africa) There is no balance
as I see it. We have the right to bear arms, not to be infringed -- period.
Additional regulation will not help one bit.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2542. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 01:49:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f67eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32053

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4E0B2F.F384904E@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Aw, Jim...having a three aspirin day today? HINT: don't read my posts
if
> > they're that uninteresting to you.
>
> Ah, Kim. Don't respond to my posts if you don't like my respones to
> yours.

I didn't mean to give you the impression that I don't like your response.
It's just that you seemed quite bored by reading mine, and I couldn't figure
out why you'd do that... Carry on!

Kim W5TIT

2543. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:02:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6ae1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32054

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4E0EC8.68902B65@uci.edu...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C4DDB7A.620204A6@uci.edu...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > The FCC *has* mandated a starting power, Dave. It is the minimum
power
> > > > necessary to establish a contact.
> > >
> > > You really should obtain a copy of Part 97, Kim. That way you would
> > > actually know what it says before you lecture to people about it.
>
> > Why don't you just tell me, Jim? Oh, and are you going to tell your
> > interpretation, or are you going to provide the text so I can interpret
it
> > myself--again?
>
> How 'bout you just interpret it for yourself "again", and see if you
> have any better luck this time.

Well, if you insist. From
http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/get-cfr.cgi?TITLE=47&PART=97&SECTION
=313&YEAR=2000&TYPE=TEXT the following:

[Code of Federal Regulations]
[Title 47, Volume 5, Parts 80 to End]
[Revised as of October 1, 2000]
From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access
[CITE: 47CFR97.313]

[Page 597-598]

TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents

Subpart D--Technical Standards

Sec. 97.313 Transmitter power standards.

(a) An amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power
necessary to carry out the desired communications.

Now, if you'd like, I imagine that more can be found on the topic but I figure the FCC *is* the governing body of the ARS. The text specifically states, "an amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power necessary to carry out the desired communications." So, Jim, if only 25W is necessary, how far above the "minimum power necessary to carry out the desired communication" do *you* recommend?

My interpretation stands.

Kim W5TIT

2544. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:04:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6b4d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32055

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth
little
> > effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
> > something that is already put together, with a working microphone
attached,
> > and talking.
>
> Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
> to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
> Amateur Radio"
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans, if all the garbage that existed *before* I ever got into ham radio hasn't seen the demise of ham radio, you won't see it from me as an amateur either. Get real.

Kim W5TIT

2545. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:05:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6b85_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32056

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b83d79927688389896a4@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4afde5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16b4feb248f434a09896a3@news.earthlink.net...
> > > > Dave Heil said:
> > > >
> > > > You mean a pileup? Who are you to condemn a pileup?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > perhaps someone who can't break through on or who had been chastised
for
> > > continually using his last 2. You'd think with all the engineered
> > > skills and equipment he should have he's have the most efficient
antenna
> > > system this side of the WVa Big Dish
> > >
> > > Perhaps he needs an amp (what do you think Bill?)
> > >
> > > CS reminds me of the people who complain that a particular operation
was
> > > one of the worst ever only to discover he never worked them.
> >
> > Jay, it really sounds to me like you've got then problem. What is it?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Usually nosy nanettes who feel they must stick their proboscises in
> every conversation. Know anyone like that hhhmmmmm?

Not sure. How big is your proboscis?

Kim W5TIT

2546. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:07:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6c15_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32057

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b83e76cfd86e59896a5@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4afcc6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > > >Of course they have never
> > > >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is
needed,
> > so it
> > > >might
> > >
> > > I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One
> > never
> > > knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact
might
> > > require.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
> >
> > If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R,
let's
> > say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
> > would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a
contact--that
> > would be 50W. If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try
no
> > more than 25W. This would be on a vertical, as that's all we've got
right
> > now. If I don't make contact, I keep going up, say 1/4 more of my rig's
> > capability, until I am at full power output, which is 100W (I
think--it's a
> > Yaesu 890FT/AT). If I don't make contact then, I just drop it.
> >
> > Now, mobile, with my 25W rig, I'd just start with all it's capable of,
> > assuming that a mobile rig can't be relied upon to make contact with
less
> > than 25W. To me, that is "wrong" to do, but I would do it. The reason
I
> > think it's wrong is I think to truly follow the spirit of the R&R, I

should
> > attempt with only 1/2 of the rig's output level.
> >
> > In both cases, I would drop power levels back--checking RST with my
> > contact--until we could not maintain our desired contact duration.
> >
> > On 2M/70cm I am really, really bad. Unless I am operating simplex (my
> > preferred communication mode), I never play with my power setting for
just
> > everyday communicating. Most of the repeaters I am going through are
quite
> > some distance from where I am usually driving (however, I don't even
change
> > power level when I am right underneath the repeater antenna), so I don't
> > minimize power, I leave it at the rig's "High" power setting. Now, for
some
> > reason, I do like to cut power back to Medium when I am on simplex, and
Low
> > if I am right near who I am talking to. I think I got in the habit of
doing
> > that because I figure that simplex changes the parameters of operation
to
> > where a whole bunch more could be on frequency, not interfering with
each
> > other, if power levels are regarded and experimented with. Of course,
> > squelch settings also come into play on simplex. I don't know how many
> > times I've advised cantankerous operators to turn back their squelch
setting
> > if they can hear me on simplex in Arlington (more than 25 miles away)!
:)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Absolutely tripe delicious!!!
>
> A typical Kim Q'
>
> kim-roger d doger there the name is kim that's k as in Kim eye as in
> island an em as in mary
>
> you're 59 lemme tunr the tpower down what am i hitting you with now
>
> let me turn it down some more ok how the copy over roger do you qsl my
> lower power
>
> Geez by the time you're done fiddling with your knobs the qso is over
> due to sheer boredom
>
> R & R?? lemme see
>

> Repair and replace (from a current auto mechanic shop form)
>
> Rest and Relaxation - as in lovely Quam in the summer of 1970
>
> R & R from my ol stomping grouns 8th TFW Ubon, Thailand
>
> Rescue and retrevail
>
> so which is it Kim

Well, you obviously don't agree with the prescribed R&R from the FCC. Which is it? I would follow the R&R, Jay. What would *you* do?

Kim W5TIT

2547. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:08:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6c5b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32058

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b83ed5ea5d046d9896a6@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4cebe0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020121195432.16286.00002700@mb-df.aol.com...
> > > From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > >
> > > >If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R,
> > let's
> > > >say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in
Japan, I
> > > >would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a
> > contact--that
> > > >would be 50W.
> > >
> > > Actually, I would wager that the FCC would be quite content to let
> > Amateurs
> > > either use or not use their linear amplifiers, as necessary. I don't
> > think
> > > that anyone expects amateurs to adjust power on the fly in 3 dB
> > increments.
> > >
> > > >If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try no
> > > >more than 25W.
> > >
> > > There will be many a time when the station in Japan has better copy
than
> > the
> > > station in AZ.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Well, so true. But you got my point. Just flip flop the scenario.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> well then you're breaking some rules. Seems a double standard here Kim
> or are you suggesting that the station in Japan must conform to FCC
> r&r's (I love that expression..it's so so KIM!!!)

Uh, Jay...Mr. HamRadio, Ed was not making that point at all. Think aboudit.

Kim W5TIT

2548. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:11:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6d10_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32059

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b83fe82103ef1c9896a7@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4ceb08_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020121195948.16286.00002705@mb-df.aol.com...
> > > >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > >
> > > >I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
> > > >anyway) start with minimal and go up.
> > > >
> > > Well, if I am 599 with my 10 milliwatt HF signal, I don't reduce
power.
> > :-)
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > heh heh heh...yeah, there is a minimal, eh?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Gee KIm, who sets the minimal? The FCC states the minimum power
> required. Mr BILL..ooohhh nooo, categorically states that his
> definition is correct as he knew the Ohio station was too loud for just
> running stateside.
>
> The FCC gives no minimum..a max yes, but nothing that categorically
> states what the minimum is.
>

The FCC certainly *does* state categorically what the minimum power standard
is, Jay:

[Code of Federal Regulations]
[Title 47, Volume 5, Parts 80 to End]
[Revised as of October 1, 2000]
From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access
[CITE: 47CFR97.313]

[Page 597-598]

TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents

Subpart D--Technical Standards

Sec. 97.313 Transmitter power standards.

(a) An amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power necessary to carry out the desired communications.

>
> It is a subjective statement left to each
> ham. Most DXers use propagation charts and check the SFI to help
> determine how much power is needed to reach different areas of the
> world. Do you use these tools? Better yet, have you even got a clue as
> to what they are?? I thin not
>
> Better check your FCC R&R's again. you seem to be lacking substance
> AGAIN!!!!
>
> BTW, loved you on Springer yesterday.....
>

You absorb your time by watching shows like that? You'd probably do better by reading a little more, but that's just my opinion. Try the FCC website. Especially the part about minimum power standards.

Kim W5TIT

2549. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:20:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32060

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
>

ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable, Bill! I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2550. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:26:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f707f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32061

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:230120020713176185%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> In article
> <d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, K0HB
> <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote:
>
>] > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth
little
>] > effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
>] > something that is already put together, with a working microphone
attached,
>] > and talking.
>]
>] Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
>] to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
>] Amateur Radio"
>
> I would argue that there is nothing wrong with Kim's approach. How many
> of us built all of our radios, amplifiers, and antennas from scratch? I
> bet the answer is very close to zero. Why didn't you? There are many
> aspects of the hobby which require no ability or desire to repair a
> radio or perform other feats of technical expertise. One of the
> wonderful things about our hobby is the diversity it offers. Nothing
> says we have to be interested in all aspects.
>
> --
> N1MIE - FN31xm

Absolutely!

Kim W5TIT

2551. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:28:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f70e1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32062

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
> does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
> user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
> absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
> radio service like the FRS or CB.
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

Oh, oh, oh. Now I get it. You're just a NCI basher. Well, here I thought
you really had a point you were trying to make.

Kim W5TIT

2552. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:34:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f726d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32063

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
>
>] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
>] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
>] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
>] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
>] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
>] radio service like the FRS or CB.
>
> She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)?
>

Actually, I am going on break from public service. I have just resigned my position as Hunt County ARES EC--handing the reigns over to the very capable KD5DXW. I am rounding up mentoring my last class of ARECC, which I have been doing for just about a year steady now. I spent $1500 of my own money for an all day planning session in Hunt County, where local fire and county EOC and NWS were guest speakers. I am tired. I am worn out...and now my job requires much more time from me--which takes away from my capabilities for emergency and public service.

Yeah, what you been up to there, Jay? Eh?

Kim W5TIT

2553. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:38:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f734f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32064

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020123080722.17580.00000528@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c4e0155_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Also contest results, upcoming contests and special events, section
news,
> >> strays, new products, new books, and a bazillion ads. All in a nice 175
> >page
> >> package.
> >> Total cost $3.25 per issue if you subscribe.
> >>
> >
> >So, in other words, you now wish to take offense that I don't read QST?!
Is
> >that what your long list is about, Jim?
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm simply pointing out what you are missing by not reading a typical
issue.
>
> > I specifically stated that it was
> >not intended to be a slam toward QST magazine. You must have missed that
> >part.
>
> No, I saw that part. I'm just pointing out what is in a typical QST issue.
> >
> >> >My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say
"you're
> >not
> >> >even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my
> >membership
> >> >is for.
> >>
> >> Seems to me like you're missing an awful lot of good stuff.
>
> >And, who is making the decision that it is good stuff? Oh, *you*?
>
> Yeah. Got a problem with that?
>

Not if you're talking for you. I may not find it as interesting as you.

> >Well,
> >it's apparently good stuff to you. It probably is good stuff--just not
good
> >enough to entice me into taking precious time I use for other things.
>
> Like posting here.
>

I happen to find posting here a quite nice distraction. You must also.

> >
> >> >Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and
> >> >I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have
> >learned
> >> >that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.
> >>
> >> Well, an uninformed critic is usually not taken seriously.
>
> >Well, there ya go.
> >
> If the shoe fits...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Is it good and snug?

Kim W5TIT

2554. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:41:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7414$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32065

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020123080723.17580.00000529@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c4dfeb6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Regardless of *why* one tunes using an antenna, it is not a good excuse
to
> >avoid following FCC R&R just because something is too hard. I tune all
the
> >time on my antenna, or do when I am on HF.
> >
> Kim, your verbiage above makes no sense at all. Sorry, but I've read it a
> doizen times and it just doesn't compute.
>
> "Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the
antenna/transmission
> line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most
transmatches
> require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the
antenna
> just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being "too
> hard".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I saw this while I checked the newsgroup from work today. I *was* going to recommend that you go back and read the posts from the fella named "Jay," to whom I began responding with the comments on tuning up and power limitations. However, I've discovered he's quite a boring read, so you may waste your time. I wasn't aware you may have come in mid-thread.

Kim W5TIT

2555. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:45:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f74ef_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32067

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201230904.197fa1bc@posting.google.com...
> >"Kim" wrote:
> >> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > > The League has *long* solicited funds from those who are willing to
pay
> > > them. It was done without the necessity of hiring a professional fund
> > > raiser. You've misunderstood my belief.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > And, it's obvious the League has grown up a little more and gotten a lot
> > more business sense about it.
>
> Not obvious at all. Ed sez the position is running at a deficit.
>
> If the fundraiser does not raise at least as much money after expenses as
> has been done in the past, it's not good business sense.
>

If the fundraiser is excellent at what she does (and I suspect that Jim
Haynie's business savvy provided some good insight), then she'll do fine.
So will the ARRL. And, hopefully, so will amateur radio.

>
> If the fundraiser's attitude angers and alienates the very people who have
been
> most forthcoming with funds in the past, it's not good business sense.
>
> "Growing up" has nothing to do with it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jim, in an organization as large as the ARRL, for every person dismayed by
something the ARRL does, there are probably an equal--if not greater--number
of people that will take their place. If the fundraiser does her job, for
at least half the people who may be dismayed enough to go, there will be
double that amount she brings in.

Yep, the ARRL has grown up.

Kim W5TIT

2556. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:50:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f761e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32072

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201231001.63d2417c@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote:
>
> > How 'bout the part about RACES? I just went through a good local debate
> > here early last year with people who state that it is the FCC's R&R that
say
> > a non-RACES station cannot enter a RACES net.
>
> 97.407 is pretty clear on which stations can participate in RACES
> communications, and leave no wiggle-room regarding "intention".
>
> 1) A station certified by a civil defense organization.
> 2) An FCC-licensed RACES station.
>
> If your station is not in one of those categories you can't check in,
> and the RACES stations are specifically prohibited from communicating
> with you.
>
> Them's the rules.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Nope. How 'bout this. I am a RACES station here in Kaufman County. I am also a RACES station in Hunt County. I cannot, by the rules set forth in Dallas County RACES, enter a RACES net in Dallas County. I am certified by a civil defense organization, by virtue of being a RACES station in two other counties. Dallas County RACES does not allow check-ins or participation by anyone not in *their* RACES program.

It is entirely their right to have such rules. However, at the beginning of each and every net (unless they've changed since the last time I listened, and they may have) the preamble states that it is by FCC Rules and Regulations that they cannot allow non-RACES or any other than a Dallas County RACES station onto their net (that is paraphrased). I can listen up for you and give it to you specifically if you'd like. So, they are right to make their own rules...I believe the FCC allows for that. However, they are wrong to blame their rules and policies on the FCC--it spreads misinformation in my opinion.

Kim W5TIT

2557. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:50:57 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b986e1f572e1389896ad@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32066

```
In article <3c4f6c15_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b83e76cfd86e59896a5@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <3c4afcc6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> > > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020120073520.13095.00002590@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > >
> > > > >Of course they have never
> > > > >defined how hams are to go about determining what poer level is
> needed,
> > > so it
> > > > >might
> > > >
> > > > I agree. In fact, calling CQ is a valid reason to use 1500 watts. One
> > > never
> > > > knows how much power that unknown station you are trying to contact
> might
> > > > require.
> > > >
> > > > 73,
> > > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > > >
> > >
> > > If I were to conduct myself within my interpretation of the FCC R&R,
> let's
> > > say on 10M, from my fixed station, with a station I've heard in Japan, I
> > > would use half the power output capability I have to attempt a
> contact--that
> > > would be 50W. If the person was in NY, AZ, etc., I would probably try
> no
> > > more than 25W. This would be on a vertical, as that's all we've got
> right
> > > now. If I don't make contact, I keep going up, say 1/4 more of my rig's
> > > capability, until I am at full power output, which is 100W (I
> think--it's a
> > > Yaesu 890FT/AT). If I don't make contact then, I just drop it.
> > >
> > > Now, mobile, with my 25W rig, I'd just start with all it's capable of,
> > > assuming that a mobile rig can't be relied upon to make contact with
> less
> > > than 25W. To me, that is "wrong" to do, but I would do it. The reason
```

> I
> > > think it's wrong is I think to truly follow the spirit of the R&R, I
> should
> > > attempt with only 1/2 of the rig's output level.
> > >
> > > In both cases, I would drop power levels back--checking RST with my
> > > contact--until we could not maintain our desired contact duration.
> > >
> > > On 2M/70cm I am really, really bad. Unless I am operating simplex (my
> > > preferred communication mode), I never play with my power setting for
> just
> > > everyday communicating. Most of the repeaters I am going through are
> quite
> > > some distance from where I am usually driving (however, I don't even
> change
> > > power level when I am right underneath the repeater antenna), so I don't
> > > minimize power, I leave it at the rig's "High" power setting. Now, for
> some
> > > reason, I do like to cut power back to Medium when I am on simplex, and
> Low
> > > if I am right near who I am talking to. I think I got in the habit of
> doing
> > > that because I figure that simplex changes the parameters of operation
> to
> > > where a whole bunch more could be on frequency, not interfering with
> each
> > > other, if power levels are regarded and experimented with. Of course,
> > > squelch settings also come into play on simplex. I don't know how many
> > > times I've advised cantankerous operators to turn back their squelch
> setting
> > > if they can hear me on simplex in Arlington (more than 25 miles away)!
> :)
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Absolutely tripe delicious!!!
> >
> > A typical Kim Q'
> >
> > kim-roger d doger there the name is kim that's k as in Kim eye as in
> > island an em as in mary
> >
> > you're 59 lemme tunr the tpower down what am i hitting you with now
> >
> > let me turn it down some more ok how the copy over roger do you qsl my
> > lower power
> >
> > Geez by the time you're done fiddling with your knobs the qso is over
> > due to sheer boredom
> >

> > R & R?? lemme see
> >
> > Repair and replace (from a current auto mechanic shop form)
> >
> > Rest and Relaxation - as in lovely Quam in the summer of 1970
> >
> > R & R from my ol stomping grouns 8th TFW Ubon, Thailand
> >
> > Rescue and retrevail
> >
> > so which is it Kim
>
> Well, you obviously don't agree with the prescribed R&R from the FCC. Which
> is it? I would follow the R&R, Jay. What would *you* do?
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'll use the minimum power *I* feel is necessary to do the job. The FCC
sez I can and I do and if that's 1500 watss...so be it. The FCC sez
it's OK so that must mean it's OK and anything you say to the contray is
dead on WRONG!!!!

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2558. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:52:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2nt7a$o66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32068

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com...
> >"Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >> "N2EY" wrote:
> > > The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station
to
> > > work and establish/maintain a QSO.
> > >
> > > You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
> > > today at all?
> >
> > Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
> > The fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure
> > of its importance - or is it?

Then I just don't understand your point. What do you want
to see happen related to any of those skills?

> > > >Assuming the connectivity
> > > >has been established, anyone can then use a
> > > >keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> > > >
> > > But the "connection" must be established and maintained. And the speed
> > > of communication is directly related to typing skill.
> > >
> > I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
> > people that might be involved in any way with
> > emergency comms are likly to have at least a
> > familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
> > able to type quickly to keep the communication going.
> >
> > All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.

But more than fast enough to type communication messages.

> > > >> >That being the case, in an emergency ONLY
> > > >> >the ham can be the operator.
> > > >>
> > > >> Yup.
> > > >
> > > >Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
> > > >a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?
> > >
> > > Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for example,
> > > requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software, interconnections

and
> > > skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.
> >
> > I'd debate the "skilled operator" needed. Once established,
> > the connection/comms don't really require
> > attention at all. Packet clusters are left to their own operation
> > all the time...no operator on hand at all.
>
> Once the communication is established, and if the equipment and
> propagation
> are reliable. Such is often not the case - it all depends on the
> situation.
> Will the repeater/packet cluster be working? Will it cover the needed
> area?

If I am helping out and the reptr/packet cluster goes down,
I can be asked for help. The important point is that the ham
can be present...but need not be awake and in direct
operation 24 hours a day.

> > > >> >Most other modes allow for
> > > >> >anyone to be the operator and the ham can "be there"
> > > >> >as control operator.
> > > >>
> > > >> Which means you still need the amateur at bot ends anyway.
> > > >
> > > >But the amateur can be just "there"...as opposed to
> > > >having to be actively engaged in the actual message
> > > >content being sent/received.
> > >
> > > So? You still need a qualified amateur at eac end of the QSO.
> >
> > There is a BIG difference in just "being there" vs having
> > to maintain the communication (i.e. as with CW).
> > Example...I can hand the mike to a Red Cross person and
> > that individual can converse with another station while I
> > sit back, drink coffee, read a book, etc.
>
> Sure. That's the one big advantage of voice modes.

Exactly.

> > I can't do that
> > for CW where I'dd have to be sending/recieveing myself.
>
> Maybe you can't, but I can sit back, drink coffee, and even read a
> book
> while operating CW.

How long can you keep it up for. In the voice mode, I could be
sitting back and grabbing a few z'x and anyone else could be
listening. Likewise, the packet cluster...anyone could be reading

incoming messages and replying while the ham was relaxing, etc.

> (I used to do my homework during CW traffic nets -
> and I was an A student). I can't eat/drink and transmit on voice at
> the same time, but I can do so on CW. About the only thing I can't do
> while using CW is
> sleep.

Exactly...One of my points!

> And it's not just me - lots of CW ops have those skills.

> > > >> There are situations where a text report is needed. Still others
where
> > "one
> > > >> picture
> > > >> is worth a thousand words". All depends on the situation and the
> > > >emergency.
> > > >
> > > >How do you send pictures by CW?
> > > >
> > > Same way you send them on voice. IOW, voice is equally poor for
sending
> > > images.
> > >
> > Poor, but generally faster via voice.
>
> Not if you have to write it down.

That's a stretch.

> > > >> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted
by
> > anybody
> > > >> with a receiver.
> > > >
> > > >And that worries you?
> > >
> > > It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.
> >
> > In all the emergency planning, drills, and actual emergencies
> > I have yet to hear that as a worry for anyone.
>
> Ask KT4ST.

Your point? Ask KT4ST what?

> > > > Why? We're talking
> > > >emergency, not a war effort.
> > > >
> > > There are plenty of situations where emergency personnel may not want
> > their
> > > conversations

> > > to be wide open to the entire world and media. Of course we hams
cannot
> > use
> > > ciphers or
> > > codes meant to disguise or hide the content of communications, but you
> > must
> > > admit that
> > > voice modes are easily intercepted.
> > >
> > > Here's an example: Suppose their is a disaster that results in
missing,
> > injured
> > > and dead people.
> > > Suppose the emergency personnel need to send unchecked lists of names
out
> > of
> > > the disaster area,
> > > and they ask the hams involved to do it. Wouldn't it be smarter to
send
> > those
> > > lists by a nonvoice mode?
> >
> > I truly doubt, under the conditions, that anyone would have
> > the time or inclination to care.
>
> It's still a concern - and with the heightened awareness of the need
> for
> better domestic security you may want to rethink that doubt, Bill.

I think it is bunk. Has there been ANY such movement to now
use CW rather than other "clear" modes?

> > It is TIME that is usually
> > the issue, not rumors.
>
> If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
> messages.

I don't see any logic in that possibility.

> Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
> recorders.

What is so special about a tape recorder?

> Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names
> and some
> other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW
> circuit, decent
> ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the
> message
> with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message faster?

Let's be serious here, it will depend on each person. The vast majority of such traffic in none ham communications would be voice. If CW was any sustained and consistent clearcut winner then the military and all other services wouldn't have abondoned its use.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2559. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:55:30 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b987f28d2273c59896ae@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32069

In article <3c4f6d10_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b83fe82103ef1c9896a7@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <3c4ceb08_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> > > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020121195948.16286.00002705@mb-df.aol.com...
> > > > >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > > >
> > > > >I still err on the side of caution and (when on HF
> > > > >anyway) start with minimal and go up.
> > > > >
> > > > Well, if I am 599 with my 10 milliwatt HF signal, I don't reduce
> power.
> > > > :-)
> > > > >
> > > > 73,
> > > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > > >
> > > heh heh heh...yeah, there is a minimal, eh?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Gee KIm, who sets the minimal? The FCC states the minimum power
> > required. Mr BILL..ooohhh nooo, categorically states that his
> > definition is correct as he knew the Ohio station was too loud for just
> > running stateside.
> >
> > The FCC gives no minimum..a max yes, but nothing that categorically
> > states what the minimum is.
> >
>
> The FCC certainly *does* state categorically what the minimum power standard
> is, Jay:
>
> [Code of Federal Regulations]
> [Title 47, Volume 5, Parts 80 to End]
> [Revised as of October 1, 2000]
> From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access
> [CITE: 47CFR97.313]
>
> [Page 597-598]
>

> TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION
>
> COMMISSION (CONTINUED)
>
> PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
>
> Subpart D--Technical Standards
>
> Sec. 97.313 Transmitter power standards.
>
> (a) An amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power
> necessary to carry out the desired communications.
>

HMMMM sez absolutely nothing about any quantitative amount of power.
Looks like the FCC leaves the decision up to the individual amateur
operator. Guess you lose again KIM!!!!

If I feel that 1500 watts is necessary then I am in complete and total
compliance and neither you nor Mr Bill DX Sole can state otherwise

> >
> > It is a subjective statement left to each
> > ham. Most DXers use propagation charts and check the SFI to help
> > determine how much power is needed to reach different areas of the
> > world. Do you use these tools? Better yet, have you even got a clue as
> > to what they are?? I thin not
> >
> > Better check your FCC R&R's again. you seem to be lacking substance
> > AGAIN!!!!
> >
> > BTW, loved you on Springer yesterday.....
> >
>
> You absorb your time by watching shows like that? You'd probably do better
> by reading a little more, but that's just my opinion. Try the FCC website.
> Especially the part about minimum power standards.

I have a copy in the shack just like you're suppose to and no where does
it say I can't use 1500 watts if that's what I think is needed.
Anything you say to the contrary is dead WRONG!!!!

You lose twice. care to a hat trick??

BTW your opinion don't mean merde when you're wrong
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2560. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:55:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2nt5viji1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32071

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Bill Sohl" responded ...
>
> > > There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> > > anybody with a receiver.
> >
> > And that worries you? Why? We're talking emergency, not a war effort.
>
> Sometimes during an emergency, a little security might be a good thing. I
> might not want the whole world to know that "Aunt Sally" has just been
> crushed by a building until her next of kin has been notified. It also
> might be wise to limit the people who know that "Upton's Jewelry Store"
has
> lost power. Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.

The police do this all the time. Odds are far more
likly someone of ill repute would be listening to police
via a scanner...than just happening on an emergency
QSO on the ham bands.

Me thinks thou doth grasp at straws.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2561. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:56:42 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32070

In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
> >
>
> ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable, Bill!
> I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2562. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:58:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2ntbqufg1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32074

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4EF76B.4294AA0@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > > In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> > > >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about
CW;
> > > >basic
> > > >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
> > other?
> > > >
> > > >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
> > > >to send/receive.
> > >
> > > The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.
> >
> > What skills in particular. Assuming the connectivity
> > has been established, anyone can then use a
> > keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> > And that worries you? Why? We're talking
> > emergency, not a war effort.
>
> Really, Bill, you should invest in some gear and put it on the air
sometime.
> Drop the shack on the belt for awhile and get into ham radio realtime.

True to form, Dick is always one for the perjoritive comments.

> You might learn something about the hobby. There are definitely things
that
> must be learned to work PSK31, and without which you cannot do it.

Once established, it seems many packet operations run
for days/weeks/months with little or no intervention.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2563. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 02:59:35 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32073

In article <3c4f726d_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> >
> >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
> >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
> >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
> >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
> >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> >
> > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)?
> >
>
> Actually, I am going on break from public service. I have just resigned my
> position as Hunt County ARES EC--handing the reigns over to the very capable
> KD5DXW. I am rounding up mentoring my last class of ARECC, which I have
> been doing for just about a year steady now. I spent $1500 of my own money
> for an all day planning session in Hunt County, where local fire and county
> EOC and NWS were guest speakers. I am tired. I am worn out...and now my
> job requires much more time from me--which takes away from my capabilities
> for emergency and public service.
>
> Yeah, what you been up to there, Jay? Eh?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I spent
3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid me
for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2564. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:08:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7a4f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32076

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com...
> > > "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
> > >
> > > > I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> > > > more and more of a historical notation, rather
> > > > than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> > > > of the ARS.
> > >
> > > And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
> > > "a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
> > > should be ignored?
> >
> > Hans,
> >
> > There is NO requirement that any one individual subscribe
> > to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97. The goals are
> > that of the service as a whole...not as any one individual.
>
> Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> follow
> the goals set forth in Part 97?
>

I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all amateurs would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97. However, it's obvious they also recognized that as a fairly unrealistic wish, since they don't *require* all amateurs to subsribe to all parts, especially the Basis and Purpose.

Kim W5TIT

2565. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:10:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32075

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
>
>] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
>] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
>] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
>] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
>] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
>] radio service like the FRS or CB.
>
> She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
> application of Part 97?

Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:

Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director

NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.

Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
NCI Director

2566. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:10:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7abd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32077

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4EFF83.394F8C87@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >
> > Qualified but wouldn't be caught dead at a meeting let alone apply for
> > membership.. But then I feel that way about QCWA as well.
>
> Ditto on both counts and organizations.
>

See Dick follow. See Dick follow more. See Dick follow again.

Kim W5TIT

2567. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:19:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2nuipsof1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32078

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7c5262e.0201220900.61f1aa16@posting.google.com...
> > > "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
> > >
> > > > I think the Basis and Purpose is getting to be
> > > > more and more of a historical notation, rather
> > > > than an accurate belief of what the FCC thinks
> > > > of the ARS.
> > >
> > > And what other sections of the FCC Rules are
> > > "a historical notation" and, in your opinion,
> > > should be ignored?
> >
> > Hans,
> >
> > There is NO requirement that any one individual subscribe
> > to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97. The goals are
> > that of the service as a whole...not as any one individual.
>
> Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> follow the goals set forth in Part 97?

In truth, no I don't. The words choosen for the Part 97.1 rules
are very clear that the FCC is setting the purpose/goals as being
for the service as a whole rather than expected of or
required of each individual ham. Might the FCC be particularly
satisfied if EVERY ham subscribed to and followed every aspect of
the goals/purpose? Sure, but IF they wanted that as a specific
approach, they would have stated it as such.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2568. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:20:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7d45_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32080

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:9bE38.115101$fe1.2256694@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> news:230120021339174014%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > I don't see anything patently wrong on their site. They have some good
> > points. They are entitled to their opinion and appear to be working
> > within the system to advocate change. Seems to me that if you are
> > opposed to those changes then you should work within the system to
> > oppose them. I'd say that low-ball humor and vulgar attacks on other
> > licensed hams won't help promote either cause.
> >
> > N1MIE - FN31xm
>
> Chip, you seem to have wandered in at Chapter 48.
>
> I, for one, did not see a lot of sense in code testing beyond 12wpm in the
> 70s but I took and passed my 20 for the FCC -- in a blizzard walking 17
> miles uphill in both directions barefoot and all that crapola. And that
> was when where I lived you could take it only every 90 days.
>
> Since wandering onto this newsgroup I have been accused of being an
> old-fart in my mid-50s, running a hazing ritual, participating in Wouff
> Houng ceremonies, child molestation, bestiality, and a few other things
> for the simple fact of having passed a code test. I know it sounds silly
> and it is but it has happened.
>

Dick, while I have never seen you act in the manner that has elicited the above responses from people--it is not the fact that people passed CW tests that caused them. First of all, it is people out of control on both sides that caused it to happen. But, the philosophical aside, the response that begets the comments about hazing, child molestation, bestiality, etc., are purely anger inspired comments at the very aggressive posturing on the part of over-zealous hams who riled against the Biennial Review (Restructuring).

As an example. I have no problem at all with someone making the immediate decision that another is a slough because they only passed 5wpm to get onto HF as a General. However, when that person--who thinks the other is a slough--begins calling names such as Extra-Lite; or making it sound like all of amateur radio is going to die because of the policies set forth by the FCC; or the debate takes on a life of its own because someone makes the stupid comment that "well, you must be as good at making it easy on yourself with welfare as you are at being lazy in ham radio" and countless other ridiculous analogies, then I have a real problem. The analogies are

unfounded and so is the namecalling and the attitude.

>
> What happens, and you see it here, is that because of an initial
> reluctance to simply learn what is a mechanical skill right up there with
> Advanced Nintendo which one learns essentially the same way -- by doing
> it, gonads and self-justification coupled with large doses of
> self-deception start to happen. I call it Lifer Tech Syndrome.
>

Just like that, Dick.

>
> The classic Lifer Tech is a member of both NCI and the ARRL and is
> probably petitioning QCWA for a medical exemption. They show up at Dayton
> like the face of doom and make semi-annual pilgimages to HP Maxim's grave.
> And they are resident geniuses in rules and regs, 160 meter gray line
> propagation, emergency comms, and pronounce learnedly upon 'modern digital
> techniques' without having a clue how duplex TTY works on a phone line.
> Anything to achieve some sense of equality without the code test.
>

You are generalizing. And it's ridiculous that you allow yourself to get
caught up in the attitude you display, above. For you, it looks like it all
boils down to a CW test. Ignore the real contributions that many will make
to amateur radio.

>
> So as you might expect, OTs get a little tired of it. And I have an
> ethical problem debating simply because there is little to debate and I am
> enabling self-destructive behavior. So I don't.
>

You mean you don't like you just started to?

>
> You are apparently trying to be rational in an irrational situation. As I
> have pointed out to Cecil, there is little or no payoff in being the only
> sane man in the asylum.
>
> Dick, NBK
>
>

Yeah, right. And I am the only beautiful person here.

Kim W5TIT

2569. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:22:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7dac_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32081

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4F0679.450A6DCE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> I don't think that most hams even in the 50s built their main rig.
>
> > And if you don't count the Heathkits, the number of hams that literally
> > homebrewed their stations was relatively small.
>
> Lots did, When you consider that most of the military
> conversions were "home brew" jobs that often involved
> as much work at homebrewing. The main componant
> of the station that was bought was the receiver. Many more
> transmitters were homebrewed than receivers, though some
> built their own receives too. The "one box" concept was
> still far in the future.
>

Uh, your witness Counse...er, Ed. ;)

Kim W5TIT
PS--I'll remember to think of the source the next time I begin hearing this
drone of homebrew, etc.

2570. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:23:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2nuqherh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32079

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4F42AE.9E23DA99@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > >follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
>
> > Wishes? Probably. Expects? Probably not. Requires?
>
> I guess you're right. They prolly just needed to kill some time when
> they wrote Part 97

While I suspect that's just being sarcastic, I'll attempt
to show why they did it the way they did.

The FCC set the basis and purpose as a defining aspect of
why the service exists. If, in the overall results of the
amateur service the basis and purpose isn't generally being met, then
the FCC might seriously question the future existence
of amateur radio (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2571. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:25:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7e37$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32082

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b93a15442f0fbd9896ac@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <230120021352452500%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>,
> n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net says...
>
> > Why would this be any different than the ramblings of any of the other
> > weirdos on this newsgroup?
>
> ding ding ding ding and circle gets the square. Well, Chip, now you
> are catching on
>
>

Woosh, it went right over his head, Chip. Tsk, tsk, tsk. It's OK.

Kim W5TIT

2572. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:28:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f7f0c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32083

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4F4313.DC68102C@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
> >
> > Didn't WA6VSE say that? :-)
> >
>
> Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
> pile-up?

I do and I don't. I enjoy the "training" I get from it, but it does get
kinda tiresome.

Kim W5TIT

2573. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:33:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f8037_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32084

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b986e1f572e1389896ad@news.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Well, you obviously don't agree with the prescribed R&R from the FCC.
Which
> > is it? I would follow the R&R, Jay. What would *you* do?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I'll use the minimum power *I* feel is necessary to do the job. The FCC
> sez I can and I do and if that's 1500 watss...so be it. The FCC sez
> it's OK so that must mean it's OK and anything you say to the contray is
> dead on WRONG!!!!
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

Well, I don't see a problem with that at all. However, I hope your emphasis on the word "I" is not meant to indicate a defiance of the FCC R&R. I could decide arbitrarily that I just absolutely need a full 1500W to contact a station. The reality of that is probably quite false.

Your technique of debate sounds rather like some of the poorer ham operators and CBers that I've heard. Do you happen to have a ham license?

Kim W5TIT

2574. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:36:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f80fa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32085

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> > > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> > > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
> > >
> >
> > ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> > committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,
Bill!
> > I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
> when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
> Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:

Q: Know why women have a hard time with math?
A: Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"

Kim W5TIT

2575. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:38:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f8155_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32087

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> >
> >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance.
She
> >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
> >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim
have
> >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
> >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> >
> > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> > advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> > does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
> > application of Part 97?
>
> Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:
>
> Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director
>
> NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
> whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.
>
> Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
> NCI Director
>

I've never seen anything like that said by Carl.

Kim W5TIT

2576. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:44:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c4f82c9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32088

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C4F774E.D8E438DE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> >
> > I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
> >
>
> Could that be because you have never been in one, and thus have a very
> incomplete understanding of what is involved?
>
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Er, Cecil, nothing left to wonder about what Dick believes is goodwill. ;o

Kim W5TIT

2577. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 03:46:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F774E.D8E438DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32086

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
>
> I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
>

Could that be because you have never been in one, and thus have a very
incomplete understanding of what is involved?

> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2578. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:07:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F7C54.5FFFC68@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32089

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" responded ...
> >
> > > > There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted by
> > > > anybody with a receiver.
> > >
> > > And that worries you? Why? We're talking emergency, not a war effort.
> >
> > Sometimes during an emergency, a little security might be a good thing. I
> > might not want the whole world to know that "Aunt Sally" has just been
> > crushed by a building until her next of kin has been notified. It also
> > might be wise to limit the people who know that "Upton's Jewelry Store"
> has
> > lost power. Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.
>
> The police do this all the time. Odds are far more
> likly someone of ill repute would be listening to police
> via a scanner...than just happening on an emergency
> QSO on the ham bands.
>
> Me thinks thou doth grasp at straws.

Me thinks you know little about police radio operations, or your local PD is a bunch of clods.
The proper way to handle sensitive police comms is by secure methods if that means finding a hardwired phone. Today, digital cellphones take care of it.

2579. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:09:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F7CEE.F28A3AF0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32090

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C4EF76B.4294AA0@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020121074838.17580.00000477@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > > > In article <a1r5mn$d34$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> From: "Arnie Macy" kt4st@csam.net
> > > > >> > That's (and you have to agree) one of the beautiful things about
> CW;
> > > > >basic
> > > > >> > equipment and ease of use. So, how do we balance one against the
> > > other?
> > > > > >
> > > > >But ease of use requires a specific skill set to be able
> > > > >to send/receive.
> > > > >
> > > > The same is true of many modes. Like PSK31.
> > > >
> > > What skills in particular. Assuming the connectivity
> > > has been established, anyone can then use a
> > > keyboard/monitor ro send/recieve.
> > > And that worries you? Why? We're talking
> > > emergency, not a war effort.
> > >
> > Really, Bill, you should invest in some gear and put it on the air
> sometime.
> > Drop the shack on the belt for awhile and get into ham radio realtime.
>
> True to form, Dick is always one for the perjoritive comments.
>
> > You might learn something about the hobby. There are definitely things
> that
> > must be learned to work PSK31, and without which you cannot do it.
>
> Once established, it seems many packet operations run
> for days/weeks/months with little or no intervention.

So you think packet and PSK31 are alike. Chuckle... No, chortle!

2580. Re: He Dick (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:16:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F7E89.F57CA1EC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32091

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Unlike you, I earned a LONG time ago how to get the job done, not
> > to sit in the corner bitching and sulking ...
>
> Dick, The great majority of your postings are your bitchings.
> -

Hey, you qualify for this one, too, Mr Extra Lite.

(paste) Unlike you, I earned a LONG time ago how to get the job done,
not
to sit in the corner bitching and sulking til someone took pity and
changed things do I could qualify.

2581. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:21:53 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b99c2aad487c3c9896b1@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32092

In article <a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> >
> >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance. She
> >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
> >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim have
> >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
> >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> >
> > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> > advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> > does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
> > application of Part 97?
>
> Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:
>
> Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director
>
> NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
> whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.
>
> Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
> NCI Director

Well Mr Director, prepare for the worst. Your day is really gonna suck
afetr reading these google goodies...

From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
Subject: Re: ARRL vs. No Code Majority
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (61 articles) | Original Format
Date: 1998/01/03 ?)

I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio, don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services like CB, FRS, etc.

Hmmm reads like he did say that stuff...I continue (oh BTW, all this took about 3 minutes to find....

From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
Subject: Re: THANKS FOR THE VAST SUPPORT NO NO CODE
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (39 articles) | Original Format
Date: 1998/01/14

I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ... technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.

Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc.

--
Carl - wa6vse
wa6vse@fast.net
NCI #1052
Join No Code International!
Support the modernization of ham radio and
help to assure its survival into the 21st century!

OR THIS ONE.....

Search Result 5
From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
Subject: Re: CW--It's all My Fault
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
View: Complete Thread (211 articles) | Original Format
Date: 1997/09/28

Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit about radio technology ... the ARRL has promoted the competitive games and DXing thing to the point where they have perverted ham radio into something VERY different than its charter purpose ... if we don't get it back on track, we'll be dead meat before 2010 ... many of us don't want to see that happen because of clinging to "tradition" and religious dogma WRT the mystical powers of Morse ...

> when all I want to do is plug in my Yaesu, connect it to a store bought
> antenna and yell CQ DX? Why not just stand at the local Ham radio outlet
> and hand licenses out?

Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it
...
you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for
"yackers" ...

Hmmm sounds a lot like 5'6 300 pound kim svelte as she may be

Gee Bill, seems like Carl actually did state the very things you deny he
states such a suck up.

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2582. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:23:15 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b99c7ee95278c79896b2@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32093

In article <3c4f8155_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> > news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance.
> She
> > >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> > >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an FRS
> > >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim
> have
> > >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in another
> > >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> > >
> > > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> > > advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> > > does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of my
> > > application of Part 97?
> >
> > Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:
> >
> > Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director
> >
> > NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
> > whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.
> >
> > Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> > has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> > towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> > NCI Director
> >
>
> I've never seen anything like that said by Carl.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>
>
see a previous post where these statements ARE documented. I humbly
suggest that you see Carl for he appears to be....the minimum power
required to maintain his base
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2583. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:25:48 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b99d1919a1b2e19896b3@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32094

In article <3c4f80fa_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> > > > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> > > > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
> > > >
> > >
> > > ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> > > committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,
> Bill!
> > > I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
> > Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
> >
> > --
> > 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
> You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
> clothing is that huge,

Huge would be a tad understated there Kim

I can only think of the joke that goes:
>
> Q: Know why women have a hard time with math?
> A: Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"

Well, sharing your husbands shortcomings with the group is very noble
and deserves a show on Oprah Large women married to small men
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2584. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:32:51 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16b99ec0e1aa6cd19896b4@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32095

In article <3c4f8037_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b986e1f572e1389896ad@news.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Well, you obviously don't agree with the prescribed R&R from the FCC.
> Which
> > > is it? I would follow the R&R, Jay. What would *you* do?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > I'll use the minimum power *I* feel is necessary to do the job. The FCC
> > sez I can and I do and if that's 1500 watss...so be it. The FCC sez
> > it's OK so that must mean it's OK and anything you say to the contray is
> > dead on WRONG!!!!
> >
> > --
> > 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
> Well, I don't see a problem with that at all. However, I hope your emphasis
> on the word "I" is not meant to indicate a defiance of the FCC R&R. I could
> decide arbitrarily that I just absolutely need a full 1500W to contact a
> station. The reality of that is probably quite false.
>
> Your technique of debate sounds rather like some of the poorer ham operators
> and CBers that I've heard. Do you happen to have a ham license?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
Actually it's a perfect debating style. Your opponent makes a
categorical statement and then in rebuttal you prove the statement to be
credibly false. There is no defiance in any R&R's because the R&R's
don't set down definitive terms. *I* feel that to work last weeks VP*
I needed 800 watts minimum, so I cranked the amp to 800 watts
(approx). I want to work Bill in NJ, being in NY *I* need 50 watts, so
I reduce my power. It's up to *I* to determine the minimum power needed
and the FCC backs my decision. The reality of the statement is
absolutely true

And yes I do. I chose to share that with friends family and other
amateur contacts I make on the air, not via some the Internet. I will
give you a clue, there are 4 letters in my call and there is the number

2...knock yourself out rolling on the floor laughing your ass off...must be some sight, all the pictures swaying, the vases rattling around yada yada yada
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2585. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 04:44:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C4F8508.908CFD70@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32096

Chip Griffin wrote:

> In article <N9t38.43248$Y17.3421333@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, Arnie
> Macy <kt4st@csam.net> wrote:
>
>] Using CW or secure voice would be a benefit here.
>
> If CW is so easy to learn, as is often argued by the pro-CW crowd, then
> how can it be secure? I don't think this is a valid arguement. CW is
> not secure, even the boy scouts used to learn it for a badge.

CW is secure as far as the general population of "scanner manners" and
"Hobby cops" is concerned. That is the target population.
Hey, if you have a no-code tech ticket that would include you and the rest
too,
niche war? Besides, with all those Crays out there, what *is* truly
secure?

How do you nocode dudes ID the local repeater?

2586. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 05:05:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F961A.15844A36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32097

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> >
> > I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
>
> Could that be because you have never been in one, and thus have a very
> incomplete understanding of what is involved?

I've been listening for 50 years, Dick. Manners have gotten a lot worse
over that 50 years. I hear twenty junkyard dogs barking over their KW
systems fighting over a DX bone and I just shake my head and keep on
tuning.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2587. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 05:08:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C4F96C1.2FBC050E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32098

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Q: Know why women have a hard time with math?
> A: Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"

A newslady recently cracked everyone up when she asked the weatherman
on the air, "Where's that eight inches you promised me last night?"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2588. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 09:08:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124040800.17971.00000639@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 32100

In article <230120021401062556%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>, Chip Griffin
<n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> writes:

>In article <9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com>, N2EY
><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>] Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
>] The fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure of
>] its importance - or is it?
>
>Exactly. And the converse is true. We're still tested on CW and it
>isn't very important to proper operation on phone or data. :)

And we're tested on phone and data even though it isn't important at all to
proper operation on CW.
>
>] All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
>
>Perhaps we should make typing a mandatory tested skill for ham radio. I
>can do 60 wpm pretty reliably, how about you? :)

I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it, no big
deal.
>
>] > It is TIME that is usually the issue, not rumors.
>]
>] If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
>] messages.
>] Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
>] recorders.
>
>That may be.

It is. What slows down voice transmission of record messages is not only the
writing/typing speed at the receiving end but the necessity to phoneticize
unusual words.

> Although since I can type at 60 WPM, I can almost keep up
>with normal voice speed.

Until you hit something that must be spelled out, like an unfamiliar proper
name.
On CW it's already spelled out.

>There is very little slowing if I'm typing the
>traffic as I receive it. As for CW as faster, that is only if the CW

>stations can receive fast enough. I doubt if everyone was at 5 wpm if
>it would be faster.

5 wpm is th starting point. With a little practice most folks can get up to
20-25 wpm fairly quickly. We're talking ablout operators with decent skills - neither
beginners nor experts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2589. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 09:08:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124040801.17971.00000640@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 32099

In article <230120020713176185%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>, Chip Griffin
<n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> writes:

>How many
>of us built all of our radios, amplifiers, and antennas from scratch?

I've built most of mine from scratch. Receivers, transmitters, transceivers,
antennas, antenna matchers, power supplies, test equipment, etc., etc.

>I
>bet the answer is very close to zero.

So?

> Why didn't you?

I did. Still do. In fact I have built far more ham gear than I have bought.
I've only
owned one factory-made ham transceiver - and I sold it in 1984.

>There are many
>aspects of the hobby which require no ability or desire to repair a
>radio or perform other feats of technical expertise. One of the
>wonderful things about our hobby is the diversity it offers. Nothing
>says we have to be interested in all aspects.

True. But technical stuff is basic to the basis and purpose of the ARS. The
attitude of "I don't care about technical stuff" reduces the justification for
the existence of the amateur radio service.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2590. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 11:34:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201240334.2eaa3a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32101

> "Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the antenna/transmission
> line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most transmatches
> require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the antenna
> just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being "too
> hard".
>
>
There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
>
>
Proper 2002 operating practice is to "tune up" antennas with one of
the inexpensive antenna analyzers which are out there now and an
antenna tuner, not by putting a dead carrier on the air and diddling
the pi net tanks in boat anchor transmitters and/or tube-type amps to
"fix" high swrs an antenna might present.
>
>
"Tuner upper" carrier = LID.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

2591. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 13:07:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124080700.13187.00000463@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32102

In article <a2nt7a$o66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com...
>> >"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>> >> "N2EY" wrote:
>> > > The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a station
>to
>> > > work and establish/maintain a QSO.
>> >
>> > You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
>> > today at all?
>>
>> Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
>> The fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure
>> of its importance - or is it?
>
>Then I just don't understand your point.

My point is that testing is not a perfect indicator of something's
importance to amateur radio. I thought you'd agree with that
statement.

For example, I think it's important for ALL hams to know the
standard phonetic alphabet (alfa, bravo, charlie...) well enough
that they don't stumble or make up nonstandard ones because they
can't remember the standard ones. Is that tested? Nope.

I also think hams should know Ohm's Law for DC and its practical
applications well enough to avoid stuff like trying to power a 50
watt rig through 30 feet of #20 wire from a 12 volt battery. That's
not well tested, either - one can get all the Ohm's Law questions
wrong and still get an Extra.
well

>What do you want
>to see happen related to any of those skills?
>
Hams should be of a mindset to learn them on their own. Just my
opinion and example. I'm not on phone very much but I can do
the phonetics.

>> > I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
>> > people that might be involved in any way with
>> > emergency comms are likly to have at least a

>> > familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
>> > able to type quickly to keep the communication going.
>>
>> All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
>
>But more than fast enough to type communication messages.

Not if TIME is a concern...
>
>> > > >Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
>> > > >a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?
>> > >
>> > > Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for example,
>> > > requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software, interconnections
>and
>> > > skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.
>> >
>> > I'd debate the "skilled operator" needed. Once established,
>> > the connection/comms don't really require
>> > attention at all. Packet clusters are left to their own operation
>> > all the time...no operator on hand at all.
>>
>> Once the communication is established, and if the equipment and
>> propagation
>> are reliable. Such is often not the case - it all depends on the
>> situation.
>> Will the repeater/packet cluster be working? Will it cover the needed
>> area?
>
>If I am helping out and the reptr/packet cluster goes down,
>I can be asked for help. The important point is that the ham
>can be present...but need not be awake and in direct
>operation 24 hours a day.

The ham need not be awake to be a control operator when nonhams are
using the equipment? I wonder...

>> > There is a BIG difference in just "being there" vs having
>> > to maintain the communication (i.e. as with CW).
>> > Example...I can hand the mike to a Red Cross person and
>> > that individual can converse with another station while I
>> > sit back, drink coffee, read a book, etc.
>>
>> Sure. That's the one big advantage of voice modes.
>
>Exactly.
>
>> > I can't do that
>> > for CW where I'dd have to be sending/recieveing myself.
>>
>> Maybe you can't, but I can sit back, drink coffee, and even read a

>> book
>> while operating CW.
>
>How long can you keep it up for.

"That's rather a personal question, sir!" - Monty Python lifeboat/cannibalism
sketch

I would say that I can operate CW and do other things listed above
simultaneously for hours at astretch with only short breaks. Contesting
helped me develop those skills.

>In the voice mode, I could be
>sitting back and grabbing a few z'x and anyone else could be
>listening. Likewise, the packet cluster...anyone could be reading
>incoming messages and replying while the ham was relaxing, etc.

But sleeping?
>
>> (I used to do my homework during CW traffic nets -
>> and I was an A student). I can't eat/drink and transmit on voice at
>> the same time, but I can do so on CW. About the only thing I can't do
>> while using CW is
>> sleep.
>
>Exactly...One of my points!

I wonder what the FCC would think of a control op sound asleep. Maybe
they wouldn't care in a genuine emergency.
>
>> And it's not just me - lots of CW ops have those skills.

>> > > >> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be intercepted
>by
>> > anybody
>> > > > >> with a receiver.
>> > > > >
>> > > > >And that worries you?
>> > > >
>> > > > It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.
>> > >
>> > > In all the emergency planning, drills, and actual emergencies
>> > > I have yet to hear that as a worry for anyone.
>> >
>> Ask KT4ST.
>
>Your point? Ask KT4ST what?

He agrees that there are situations where wide-open voice modes
may not be the best choice.
>
>> > > > > Why? We're talking

>> > > >emergency, not a war effort.
>> > > >
>> > > There are plenty of situations where emergency personnel may not want
>> > their
>> > > conversations
>> > > to be wide open to the entire world and media. Of course we hams
>cannot
>> > use
>> > > ciphers or
>> > > codes meant to disguise or hide the content of communications, but you
>> > must
>> > > admit that
>> > > voice modes are easily intercepted.
>> > > >
>> > > Here's an example: Suppose their is a disaster that results in
>missing,
>> > injured
>> > > and dead people.
>> > > Suppose the emergency personnel need to send unchecked lists of names
>out
>> > of
>> > > the disaster area,
>> > > and they ask the hams involved to do it. Wouldn't it be smarter to
>send
>> > those
>> > > lists by a nonvoice mode?
>> > >
>> > I truly doubt, under the conditions, that anyone would have
>> > the time or inclination to care.
>>
>> It's still a concern - and with the heightened awareness of the need
>> for
>> better domestic security you may want to rethink that doubt, Bill.
>
>I think it is bunk.

I don't.

> Has there been ANY such movement to now
>use CW rather than other "clear" modes?

I don't know. Note that CW is not the only option - modes like
PSK31 serve the same purpose, and are mentioned above.

The fact that something isn't done widely right now doesn't
mean it's a bad idea.

>> > It is TIME that is usually
>> > the issue, not rumors.
>>
>> If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
>> messages.

>
>I don't see any logic in that possibility.

If you have to send a written message, CW with decent operators is
usually FASTER than voice because the voice ops have to spell out
and phoneticize. Being able to talk 200 wpm doesn't help if the
receiving op can only write at 25 wpm.
>
>> Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
>> recorders.
>
>What is so special about a tape recorder?
>
Cecil cited a case where they sent simulated messages by voice at high speed
and then played them back for a professional stenographer to transcribe. Do all
the emergency stations you know have tape recorders set up like that?

>> Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names
>> and some
>> other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW
>> circuit, decent
>> ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the
>> message
>> with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message faster?
>
>Let's be serious here, it will depend on each person.

Sure. That's why I specified "decent ops - not beginners and not experts.

>The vast majority
>of such traffic in none ham communications would be voice.

It would? Why not use a data mode?

>If CW
>was any sustained and consistent clearcut winner then the military
>and all other services wouldn't have abondoned its use.

Not that old saw!

The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators. They installed TOR
type modes as a replacement, not voice, in almost all cases.

Since hams are unpaid and self-trained, we have a different paradigm.

How much SSB and FM do the military and commercial services use?

It sure sounds to me like you are very resistant to the idea that Morse/CW
has, or can have, any place in amateur emergency communications, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2592. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 13:12:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201240512.7d51f3b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32103

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0201240334.2eaa3a4@posting.google.com>...
> > "Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the antenna/transmission
> > line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most transmatches
> > require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the antenna
> > just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being "too
> > hard".
> >
> There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
> >
> Proper 2002 operating practice is to "tune up" antennas with one of
> the inexpensive antenna analyzers which are out there now and an
> antenna tuner, not by putting a dead carrier on the air and diddling
> the pi net tanks in boat anchor transmitters and/or tube-type amps to
> "fix" high swrs an antenna might present.

> "Tuner upper" carrier = LID.

I know a guy who has an older-model Kenwood rig - top of the line some
years back. Has the built in ATU and nice filters, really good deal for
just over a thousand bucks. The ATU cannot be manually adjusted by means
of an external noise bridge or analyzer - it's part of the rig.

Hooked to a G5RV, it does a decent job. The ATU deals with the moderate
SWR of the G5RV. Nice setup - find a clear spot, punch the tune button
and the servos grind away until a match is found.

Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
IDs afterwards.

Is he a lid?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2593. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 15:23:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0201240723.187e94e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32104

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3c4f734f_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020123080722.17580.00000528@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3c4e0155_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >> Also contest results, upcoming contests and special events, section
> news,
> > >> strays, new products, new books, and a bazillion ads. All in a nice 175
> page
> > >> package.
> > >> Total cost $3.25 per issue if you subscribe.
> > >>
> > >
> > >So, in other words, you now wish to take offense that I don't read QST?!
> Is
> > >that what your long list is about, Jim?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > I'm simply pointing out what you are missing by not reading a typical
> issue.
> >
> > > I specifically stated that it was
> > >not intended to be a slam toward QST magazine. You must have missed that
> > >part.
> >
> > No, I saw that part. I'm just pointing out what is in a typical QST issue.
> > >
> > >> >My membership is for the benefit of people not being able to say
> "you're
> not
> > >> >even an ARRL member, so you have no voice." And that's *all* my
> membership
> > >> >is for.
> > >>
> > >> Seems to me like you're missing an awful lot of good stuff.
>
> > >And, who is making the decision that it is good stuff? Oh, *you*?
> >
> > Yeah. Got a problem with that?
>
> Not if you're talking for you. I may not find it as interesting as you.

The way you wrote about QST it looked like you never bothered to read it.
>
> > >Well,
> > >it's apparently good stuff to you. It probably is good stuff--just not
> good
> > >enough to entice me into taking precious time I use for other things.
> > >
> > Like posting here.
>
> I happen to find posting here a quite nice distraction. You must also.

I post here for different reasons than you, Kim.

> > >> >Let someone tell me I have no right to criticize a ham club, and
> > >> >I'll join that club also. Although, in both circumstances, I have
> learned
> > >> >that "joining" doesn't really mean a damned thing.
> > >>
> > >> Well, an uninformed critic is usually not taken seriously.
>
> > >Well, there ya go.
> > >
> > If the shoe fits...

> Is it good and snug?
>
Nope. Doesn't fit me at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2594. The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 15:25:44 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eurQatOpBHA.1440@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32105

N0FP posted an idea to the CQ-CONTEST reflector a couple of days ago about a contest that could prove to provide considerable exposure to contesting, ham radio, and emergency preparedness.

The purpose? To demonstrate that US hams are capable of originating and delivering significant and meaningful traffic to central collection points. We are not rank "amateurs".

Imagine a contest where the purpose is to publicly simulate a significant national disaster--a thermo nuclear device detonated over Chicago for example. The FCCs Mr. Powell would send out a press release to the ARRL and all media (CNN, NBC, ABC, etc.) at high noon EST on a Friday or Saturday between two dates (e.g. 9/11 and 3/31) stating: "All amateur radio operators are instructed to begin the emergency communications simulation beginning today at 02:00 UTC and ending 06:00 UTC. That would be the kick-off of the mother of all US contests. All amateurs on all bands on all modes all at once. Every scrap of equipment you own would be pressed into service.

Starting at 22:00 hours the same day, W1AW would begin posting instructions for the contest using digital modes to provide the "rules of engagement" for the contest. The contest exchange, log routing, collection points, etc., would be sent from W1AW during the entire contest. Specific instructions from W1AW will direct appropriate band limits, restrictions, regional information, etc.

The goal for contesters would be to collect valid QSOs using the instructed exchange. Any station may be worked for valid QSO points, on any non-WARC band more than once, but never more than once per hour. All US amateur ops on all bands except the WARC bands would be eligible to collect valid Qs. Each US section would be a "team." Logs would be routed to section managers using ARES people to man the traffic. The traffic would be the logs of contesters.

The goal? Deliver logs to section managers as often and quickly as possible. Points would be assigned to sections based on the number of Qs in the log and the time received by the section manager. Relays of logs are encouraged. The use of VHF frequencies is encouraged. Every scrap of equipment you own will be pressed into service, except your phone line. No internet is allowed. No twisted pairs allowed. Only RF delivered traffic allowed.

Section managers will accumulate the data and summarize the results. Email the results to a central collection point -- W1AW. Mr. Powell will get a report on Monday morning outlining the success of the operation. Number of Qs, counties covered, time delivered, number of stations, etc. would all be

proudly displayed to the FCC and the media. We are not rank "amateurs" as some congressmen have proclaimed recently.

This is rough but I think you get the general idea.

*****

Imagine the press. Imagine the questions you will get at work. Imagine the pride in Mr. Haynie's heart when he delivers the 6" thick printout to Mr. Powell, in a ceremony on the following Monday morning. Congressmen will no longer be able to call us rank "amateurs" any more. I wonder if the BoD will question whether these line scores should make it into print? Contesting will be front page news on QST for sure. Page 2 on NYTimes, Wall Street Journal, CNN Headline news and on-and on-and on.

Imagine the local press in your neighborhood anxious to get the local scoop on this mysterious press release the previous Friday noon. Equipment sales will soar. Contesters will be asked to Elmer the capable hams that have shun contesting all these years. I get goose bumps.

You want to contribute. Give this idea legs and the ranks of ham radio, and contesting, will grow more than at any other time in our history. The only way this will fly is if contesters get involved. The time is ripe (9/11). Real traffic in a real emergency simulation.

2595. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 15:53:52 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0201240753.7b04c5b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32106

"W5TIT - Kim" wrote

>
> I've never seen anything like that said by Carl.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Then you haven't been paying attention. Here are just a few
quotes on the topic from Carl.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: I have some sypathy for his position.

".... he's not a "real" ham in the sense of what ham radio is
supposed to be and perhaps he is more suited to a "communicator"
service like CB or GMRS or the new FRS (family radio service) ... those
three services exist for the many people who wish to "yack" on the radio
without having any technical skills or interests ... that's NOT what ham
radio is for ..."

"Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it ...
you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for "yackers" ..."

"Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
about radio technology ... "

"I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.

Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."

"I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply

happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services like CB, FRS, etc."

2596. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 16:03:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124110318.08311.00000408@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32107

>".... he's not a "real" ham in the sense of what ham radio is
>*supposed* to be and perhaps he is more suited to a "communicator"
>service like CB or GMRS or the new FRS (family radio service) ... those
>three services exist for the many people who wish to "yack" on the radio
>without having any technical skills or interests ... that's NOT what ham
>radio is for ..."
>
>"Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it ...
>you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
>services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
>require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for "yackers" ..."
>
>"Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
>to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
>ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
>for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
>to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
>about radio technology ... "
>
>"I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
>technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.
>
>Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
>medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
>in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."
>
>"I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
>stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
>don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
>appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply
>happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living
>up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more
>appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services
>like CB, FRS, etc

Isnt he a good example of what NCI followers should look up to?

2597. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 16:11:49 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>
Source record: 32108

What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?

- Mike -

K0HB wrote:

>
> PS: I have some sypathy for his position.
>
> --

> Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."

2598. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 16:16:13 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#TJY6KPpBHA.1804@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32109

"N2EY" wrote

> The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
> to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators.

As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The military abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.

Been there, tried that, it didn't work.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

2599. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 16:21:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5034A0.3CD41C95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32110

Brian Kelly wrote:
> There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?

Where are you going to find a dummy load to exactly equal an antenna system
with an unknown load impedance? Take 300+j300, for instance.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2600. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 17:04:40 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ba4efa14581d069896b5@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32111

In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mjc5@psu.edu says...
> What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>
> - Mike -
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> >
> > PS: I have some sypathy for his position.
> >
> > ---
>
> > Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> > medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> > in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."
>

DX'ing contesting Field Day rag chewing (feel free to add to the
list) If it doesn't involve creating building or inhaling solder fumes
Carl doesn't like it

YET..note when he came back from his year long exile, he proudly
proclaimed to all

In 3 weeks I worked 76 countries and m,ost states what a hippocrite
(spelled wrong on porpoise)
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2601. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 17:11:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mfX38.300$Ab1.17491@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32112

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:#TJY6KPpBHA.1804@cpimsnntpa03...
> "N2EY" wrote
>
> > The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
> > to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators.
>
> As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The
military
> abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war
> in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.
>
> Been there, tried that, it didn't work.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

It was just as true in 1940. The signal Corps was run by two guys one
from RCA Globecom and the other from Western Union. Large amounts of TTY
was installed asappy for exactly the reason Hans mentions.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2602. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 17:15:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124121503.25262.00000485@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 32113

>In 3 weeks I worked 76 countries and m,ost states what a hippocrite
>(spelled wrong on porpoise)
>--

Thats what his whole mission was, he was either to stupid or lazy to pass a
real test, then it took him over 6 Months to upgrade, what a LOOOOSSSSER

2603. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 18:17:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201241017.33f92149@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32114

> If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
> clothing is that huge

http://www.halls.md/body-mass-index/bmi.htm

2604. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 18:23:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a2pj22$r3u$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32115

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c4f6ae1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> The text specifically
> states, "an amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power
necessary
> to carry out the desired communications."

Very good Kim. Now compare that to the text I quoted from your post, and
maybe then you'll take the point.

2605. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 19:05:46 UTC
From: Austere
Message-ID: <a2pmkqgec1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 32116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Sounds more like a golden opportunity to be a loser!

ujhijq@winwinwin.com wrote in message ...
>BE A WINNER!!!
>
>Send in US$5.00 to the address below and be a winner!

2606. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 19:54:02 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C50665A.E2CF6D23@psu.edu>
Source record: 32117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Not for Ian it doesn't!

I'd bet he makes a good bit of money on this scam.

- Mike -

Austere wrote:
>
> Sounds more like a golden opportunity to be a loser!
>
> ujhijq@winwinwin.com wrote in message ...
> >BE A WINNER!!!
> >
> >Send in US$5.00 to the address below and be a winner!

2607. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 20:25:10 UTC
From: Monty <Monty@McGinty.net>
Message-ID: <1011903941.20872.0.nnrp-12.d4e54c2a@news.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 32118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Not if everyone sends an empty envelope with no stamp on it.

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C50665A.E2CF6D23@psu.edu...
> Not for Ian it doesn't!
>
> I'd bet he makes a good bit of money on this scam.
>
> - Mike -
>
> Austere wrote:
> >
> > Sounds more like a golden opportunity to be a loser!
> >
> > ujhijq@winwinwin.com wrote in message ...
> > >BE A WINNER!!!
> > >
> > >Send in US$5.00 to the address below and be a winner!

2608. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 20:55:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5074C4.74652814@uci.edu>
Source record: 32119

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all amateurs
> would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97.

Thank you. That was my only point.

2609. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 21:59:19 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0201241359.302be8d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32120

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0201240512.7d51f3b6@posting.google.com>...
> I know a guy who has an older-model Kenwood rig - top of the line some
> years back. Has the built in ATU and nice filters, really good deal for
> just over a thousand bucks. The ATU cannot be manually adjusted by means
> of an external noise bridge or analyzer - it's part of the rig.
>
> Hooked to a G5RV, it does a decent job. The ATU deals with the moderate
> SWR of the G5RV. Nice setup - find a clear spot, punch the tune button
> and the servos grind away until a match is found.
>
> Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
> IDs afterwards.
>
> Is he a lid?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Not that my opinion matters much, but, I wouldn't consider this person
a lid. He has done everything he could to ensure that no one is being
interferred with. And, in the end, he IDs himself. Sounds like careful
considerate operating to me.

But then, I feel this way partially because that's how I operate. Just
without the ATU. I have a dummy load and use it for gross transmitter
adjustments but you always have to do some little touching up, if you
change frequency very far. For some reason my antennas don't have the
bandwidth that the dummy load does. :)

If I move a appreciable distance, I find a clear spot, listen for a
while, and then do about 10 seconds of tune-up. If I'm going to send
a CQ, I usually stay right there and work that frequency. But if I
really intend to work someone else, I move to his frequency. My TX
and RX frequencies are independent of each other. There is no need
to re-tune if I don't have to change frequency very far. (How many
out there how to use a "SPOT" function these days?)

My main rig runs full-breakin and I can hear the band while I am
sending. This is a great feature and helps save some time, should
you accidentially get on someone elses frequency (and accidents do
happen). Or, when the band goes out in the middle of your transmission
and the other station starts to send.

The ones that get me are the ones that tune up right on top of your
signal, while you are sending a CQ. I'm running full-breakin and I
can hear them. It's most distracting. Or, on someone elses CQ, while

you are trying to pick them out of the noise. I guess everyone has their pet peeves.

Well, so much for my random thoughts. Just putting in my $0.02. Thanks for reading.

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my employer.

2610. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:33:33 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C508BBD.9A794DDB@uci.edu>
Source record: 32124

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu...
> > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
>
> In truth, no I don't. The words choosen for the Part 97.1 rules
> are very clear that the FCC is setting the purpose/goals as being
> for the service as a whole rather than expected of or
> required of each individual ham.

Can you provide the list of licensed individuals who are exempt? The point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL amateur radio operators.

> Might the FCC be particularly
> satisfied if EVERY ham subscribed to and followed every aspect of
> the goals/purpose?

Minimum reasonable expectation should be that every licensee would at least be aware and supportive of the Basis and Purpose. Nobody is saying they HAVE to fulfill every aspect of Part 97. But it's quite another thing to stand in defiance of it, claiming "I don't have to, you can't make me".

2611. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:34:35 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <uS%38.76981$Ee7.5146505@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32121

"K0HB" wrote ...
>
> As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The
military
> abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war
> in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.
>
> Been there, tried that, it didn't work.
>

With one notable exception. The US Coast Guard generally doesn't operate in a multi-threat war environment. They opted out of CW for purely financial reasons as did most commercially based CW stations. And, of course, the military still uses and trains Morse operators for Special Operations. That hasn't gone away, and won't for a long time to come.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2612. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:35:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C508C1A.D743170F@uci.edu>
Source record: 32123

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C4F4313.DC68102C@uci.edu...

> > Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
> > pile-up?

> I do and I don't. I enjoy the "training" I get from it, but it does get
> kinda tiresome.

What, on the repeater?

2613. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:37:35 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <jV%38.76984$Ee7.5148119@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32122

"Kim" wrote in part ...

> Nope. How 'bout this. I am a RACES station here in Kaufman County. I am
> also a RACES station in Hunt County. I cannot, by the rules set forth in
> Dallas County RACES, enter a RACES net in Dallas County. I am certified
by
> a civil defense organization, by virtue of being a RACES station in two
> other counties. Dallas County RACES does not allow check-ins or
> participation by anyone not in *their* RACES program.
>

I never could understand that reasoning, Kim. I think that's why ARES has a
huge advantage over the RACES program.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2614. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:49:46 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <ec048.84$ys1.12796@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 32125

Hey dumb fuck..... CSCE is sitting right at home for your ever-important code test! Don't have the need to send it in nor the equipment as well. My dead ass as you call it works between 55-70 hours per week as well as pursuing university courses? So who has the dead ass here? At least I either to try to support others here or inject a little humor once in a while. I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written and the code test.

Oh yeah.... had it not been for some VE's screwing up 13 years ago, I would have been a licensee then. They chose what rules they wished to follow, and made up their own.

Get a life loser.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020123192049.17829.00000154@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >And where the hell were you when all these changes that you detest so much?
> >
> >Did you bother working towards a "positive goal" at least as what is
> >percieved in your own mind? Did you do anything towards the promotion of
> >your beliefs other that bitching and moaning here?
> >
> >My guess is no. My guess is you are the type that enjoys bitching about
> >everything with doing nothing to make it better. Not once have I ever see
> >you post a positive message, nor a contributory one either. Even some of
> >the other "sticks in the mud" in this newsgroup at least contribute
> >positively to a debate, or provide some information.
> >
> >Find a counselor or someone who can help you with your negativity. It is not
> >healthy.
>
>
> SCREW OFF, just as I figured, checked the Qrz DATA Base and of course you are
> one of them there CBplussers. Why dont you get off your Dead ASS and get a Real
> Ham License, havent you heard they are basically giving them away.

2615. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 22:49:47 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <fc048.85$ys1.12796@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 32126

Yes Cecil.... they do say that about Texas..... :)

Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C4E34F4.5DA49731@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Ever reasearch the family tree? :)
>
> My nephew is into that stuff but I'm a stranger
> in a strange land.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2616. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 23:02:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gqd9mh7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 32127

On 22 Jan 2002 00:50:02 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>A very strong Amateur signal could make the Part 15 operator just as unhappy as
>you are. :-) And they are offered NO protection against interference from
>Amateurs.

I hawked this point to the (SF Bay Area) Wireless Communications
Alliance for the four years that I was a member, and except for a few
hams such as Dewayne, no one even listened. The non-hams' feeling
was that SS is like the Colgate Invisible Shield.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2617. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 23:08:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <e#OXkvSpBHA.1420@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32128

"Arnie Macy" wrote

> With one notable exception. The US Coast Guard generally doesn't operate
in
> a multi-threat war environment. They opted out of CW for purely financial
> reasons

Get a clue! All USCG (seagoing and airborne) units are configured and
trained to operate as an integrated part of US and NATO naval forces
in time of conflict, and CW would be as obsolete as sails in that
environment.
Has zero to do with "financial reasons". Has entirely to do with mission
critical communications capabilities.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

2618. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 23:41:23 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <KX048.58000$Y17.4277966@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32129

"K0HB" wrote ...
>
> Get a clue! All USCG (seagoing and airborne) units are configured and
> trained to operate as an integrated part of US and NATO naval forces
> in time of conflict, and CW would be as obsolete as sails in that
> environment.

> Has zero to do with "financial reasons". Has entirely to do with mission
> critical communications capabilities.

When the Coast Guard removed CW monitoring stations, they cited (the cost of
training operators) as one of their reasons for discontinuing use.

Hans, you certainly are quick to tell people to "get a clue". I suppose
that being a MCPO and drinking that retched coffee for all those years can
do those things to ya. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2619. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-24 23:59:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 32130

In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?

He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2620. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 00:36:42 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16bab8e9d2efeb7f9896b6@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32131

In article <20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
says...
> In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>
> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

He sez..boy doies he sez. See previous posts with direct statements as
made to the rrap NG from the keyboard of CS
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2621. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 00:53:08 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.24.19.53.08.320310.26516@arrl.org>
Source record: 32132

On Thu, 24 Jan 2002 18:41:23 -0500, Arnie Macy wrote:

> I suppose
> that being a MCPO and drinking that retched coffee for all those years
> can do those things to ya.

I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
do! :-)

Jon

2622. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:23:29 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <xr248.58537$Y17.4339191@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32133

"Jon Bloom" wrote ...

> I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
> do! :-)
>

"retched" coffee is worse in every respect, Jon ;-)

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2623. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:27:29 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <hv248.58552$Y17.4340664@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32134

"KC8PMX" wrote in part ...

>I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written and the code
test.
>

Just curious -- CSCE for 5, 13, or 20?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2624. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:38:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020124203854.16942.00000022@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 32135

In article <d5740186d3b112afc1c1493f93d6e089.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, "K0HB"
<k0hb@qwest.net> writes:

>
>"W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
>> Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little
>> effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up
>> something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached,
>> and talking.
>
>Attention K3LT. Please muster front and center with your camera
>to take a photograph of your Poster Child of the "Demise of
>Amateur Radio"

Hansl:

OK, here I am, Canon A-1 with 85-mm Canon FD portrait lens attached;
focusing on Kim now. Click. Clunk. Whaaaa??? Damn -- my camera
is broken! It was your idea, Hans -- you'll get the repair bill!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2625. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:41:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <uI248.58606$Y17.4347688@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32136

"N2EY" wrote ...

> http://www.halls.md/body-mass-index/bmi.htm

Hey, thanks. I took the BMI thingy for men (and got 23.7) I feel so much
better now : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2626. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:41:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2qdgq$2mi$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32137

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020124080700.13187.00000463@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <a2nt7a$o66$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0201230542.310c5545@posting.google.com...
> >> >"Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >> >> "N2EY" wrote:
> >> > > The skills to set up the station, get it working, and find a
station
> >to
> >> > > work and establish/maintain a QSO.
> >> >
> >> > You do realize that NONE of those skills are tested
> >> > today at all?
> >>
> >> Sure. But we're talking about needed skills, not just tested skills.
> >> The fact that something is or is not tested isn't a reliabel measure
> >> of its importance - or is it?
> >
> >Then I just don't understand your point.
>
> My point is that testing is not a perfect indicator of something's
> importance to amateur radio. I thought you'd agree with that
> statement.

OK, that I agree with.

> For example, I think it's important for ALL hams to know the
> standard phonetic alphabet (alfa, bravo, charlie...) well enough
> that they don't stumble or make up nonstandard ones because they
> can't remember the standard ones. Is that tested? Nope.

It used to be part of the Novice pool.

> I also think hams should know Ohm's Law for DC and its practical
> applications well enough to avoid stuff like trying to power a 50
> watt rig through 30 feet of #20 wire from a 12 volt battery. That's
> not well tested, either - one can get all the Ohm's Law questions
> wrong and still get an Extra.

I have written suggestions to the "test creators" on the same point.

> >What do you want
> >to see happen related to any of those skills?

> >
> Hams should be of a mindset to learn them on their own.

I agree.

> Just my opinion and example.
> I'm not on phone very much but I can do the phonetics.

I learned them in the Navy.

> >> > I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
> >> > people that might be involved in any way with
> >> > emergency comms are likly to have at least a
> >> > familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
> >> > able to type quickly to keep the communication going.
> >>
> >> All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
> >
> >But more than fast enough to type communication messages.
>
> Not if TIME is a concern...

It rarely is of that much immediate concern.
You are far more likly to have several people who
can type at 20 wpm than CW operators at that speed.

> >> > > >Having acknowledged that...don't you see such
> >> > > >a "ham only" mode having that as a shortcoming?
> >> > >
> >> > > Sure. All modes have advantages and shortcomings. PSK31, for
example,
> >> > > requires a suitable rig/antenna, computer, software,
interconnections
> >> > > and skilled operator. Plus a power source for everything.
> >> >
> >> > I'd debate the "skilled operator" needed. Once established,
> >> > the connection/comms don't really require
> >> > attention at all. Packet clusters are left to their own operation
> >> > all the time...no operator on hand at all.
> >>
> >> Once the communication is established, and if the equipment and
> >> propagation
> >> are reliable. Such is often not the case - it all depends on the
> >> situation.
> >> Will the repeater/packet cluster be working? Will it cover the needed
> >> area?
> >
> >If I am helping out and the reptr/packet cluster goes down,
> >I can be asked for help. The important point is that the ham
> >can be present...but need not be awake and in direct
> >operation 24 hours a day.
>

> The ham need not be awake to be a control operator when nonhams are
> using the equipment? I wonder...

Hams don't have to be present at all for packet cluster
operations where traffic is being received or automatically
passed through. As to being awake...do you really think the
FCC would object if a ham was sitting near a voice
station grabbing a few ZZ's while other (non-ham) emergency
volunteers were talking on the station? I really doubt it.

> >> > There is a BIG difference in just "being there" vs having
> >> > to maintain the communication (i.e. as with CW).
> >> > Example...I can hand the mike to a Red Cross person and
> >> > that individual can converse with another station while I
> >> > sit back, drink coffee, read a book, etc.
> >>
> >> Sure. That's the one big advantage of voice modes.
> >
> >Exactly.
> >
> >> > I can't do that
> >> > for CW where I'd have to be sending/recieveing myself.
> >>
> >> Maybe you can't, but I can sit back, drink coffee, and even read a
> >> book
> >> while operating CW.
> >
> >How long can you keep it up for.
>
> "That's rather a personal question, sir!" - Monty Python
lifeboat/cannibalism
> sketch

I see the personal nature of the question now :-)

> I would say that I can operate CW and do other things listed above
> simultaneously for hours at astretch with only short breaks. Contesting
> helped me develop those skills.

But you still require those breaks...at which time,
if CW was the only mode, the station is off the air.

> >In the voice mode, I could be
> >sitting back and grabbing a few z'x and anyone else could be
> >listening. Likewise, the packet cluster...anyone could be reading
> >incoming messages and replying while the ham was relaxing, etc.
>
> But sleeping?

Ditto my comment a few paragraphs above.

> >> (I used to do my homework during CW traffic nets -
> >> and I was an A student). I can't eat/drink and transmit on voice at

> >> the same time, but I can do so on CW. About the only thing I can't do
> >> while using CW is
> >> sleep.
> >
> >Exactly...One of my points!
>
> I wonder what the FCC would think of a control op sound asleep. Maybe
> they wouldn't care in a genuine emergency.

Exactly.

> >> And it's not just me - lots of CW ops have those skills.
>
> >> > > >> There is also the fact that common voice modes can be
intercepted
> >by
> >> > anybody
> >> > > >> with a receiver.
> >> > > >
> >> > > >And that worries you?
> >> > >
> >> > > It's a disadvantage. Rumors get started that way.
> >> >
> >> > In all the emergency planning, drills, and actual emergencies
> >> > I have yet to hear that as a worry for anyone.
> >>
> >> Ask KT4ST.
> >
> >Your point? Ask KT4ST what?
>
> He agrees that there are situations where wide-open voice modes
> may not be the best choice.

Then PSK or other packet modes can also be imployed.

> >> It's still a concern - and with the heightened awareness of the need
> >> for
> >> better domestic security you may want to rethink that doubt, Bill.
> >
> >I think it is bunk.
>
> I don't.

We'll just have to agree to disagree then.

> > Has there been ANY such movement to now
> >use CW rather than other "clear" modes?
>
> I don't know. Note that CW is not the only option - modes like
> PSK31 serve the same purpose, and are mentioned above.

Glad we agree on that as I also mentioned above.

> The fact that something isn't done widely right now doesn't
> mean it's a bad idea.

But I haven't seen any discussion that suggests
any pressing need for "secure" comms on any regular basis.
Not even infrequently.

> >> > It is TIME that is usually
> >> > the issue, not rumors.
> >>
> >> If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
> >> messages.
> >
> >I don't see any logic in that possibility.
>
> If you have to send a written message, CW with decent operators is
> usually FASTER than voice because the voice ops have to spell out
> and phoneticize. Being able to talk 200 wpm doesn't help if the
> receiving op can only write at 25 wpm.

IF you have the CW op with that ability.
I still disagree in general.

> >> Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
> >> recorders.
> >
> >What is so special about a tape recorder?
> >
> Cecil cited a case where they sent simulated messages by voice at high
speed
> and then played them back for a professional stenographer to transcribe.
Do all
> the emergency stations you know have tape recorders set up like that?

I'd think a "permanent" station might be smart to consider
that today.

> >> Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names
> >> and some
> >> other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW
> >> circuit, decent
> >> ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the
> >> message
> >> with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message faster?
> >
> >Let's be serious here, it will depend on each person.
>
> Sure. That's why I specified "decent ops - not beginners and not experts.

It all still comes back to training, practice
and skills...regardless of mode.

> >The vast majority
> >of such traffic in none ham communications would be voice.

>
> It would? Why not use a data mode?

They could do that also.

> >If CW
> >was any sustained and consistent clearcut winner then the military
> >and all other services wouldn't have abondoned its use.
>
> Not that old saw!

The truth, like it or not.

> The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
> to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators. They installed
TOR
> type modes as a replacement, not voice, in almost all cases.

I'd agree to the "commercial" economics, but
if CW was truly better, the military wouldn't care about
the costs. We are not talking about megabucks here.

> Since hams are unpaid and self-trained, we have a different paradigm.

True, and if YOU wnat to do CW, then go for it. On the same
basis, I don't propose its use for emergencies.

> How much SSB and FM do the military and commercial services use?

Probably a lot of FM these days.

> It sure sounds to me like you are very resistant to the idea that Morse/CW
> has, or can have, any place in amateur emergency communications, Bill.

You are free to propose its use. I don't.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2627. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:44:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50ba06_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32138

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b99c7ee95278c79896b2@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4f8155_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> > > has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> > > towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > > NCI Director
> > >
> >
> > I've never seen anything like that said by Carl.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
> see a previous post where these statements ARE documented. I humbly
> suggest that you see Carl for he appears to be....the minimum power
> required to maintain his base
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

Quite frankly, all I saw in that post was Carl Stevenson's expression of dismay about poor operators (I don't like to say CBers, because I also like CB) on ham radio. While he may find my not-so-technical attitude toward ham radio not to his liking, that is certainly his right. I think he gets a little on the side of name-calling, but isn't that what you've been doing also? Isn't it what most of us do best here, when our ire is up?

So?

Kim W5TIT

2628. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:47:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50baa8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32139

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b99d1919a1b2e19896b3@news.earthlink.net...
> > Kim Said:
> > You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a
size 20
> > clothing is that huge,
>
> Huge would be a tad understated there Kim
>
> I can only think of the joke that goes:
> >
> > Q: Know why women have a hard time with math?
> > A: Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"
>
> Well, sharing your husbands shortcomings with the group is very noble
> and deserves a show on Oprah Large women married to small men
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

You checkin' out another man's size are ya?

Kim W5TIT

2629. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 01:50:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50bb64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32140

Seems Brian disagrees with you, Jim.

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201240334.2eaa3a4@posting.google.com...
> > "Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the
antenna/transmission
> > line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most
transmatches
> > require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the
antenna
> > just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being
"too
> > hard".
> >
> >
> There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
> >
> >
> Proper 2002 operating practice is to "tune up" antennas with one of
> the inexpensive antenna analyzers which are out there now and an
> antenna tuner, not by putting a dead carrier on the air and diddling
> the pi net tanks in boat anchor transmitters and/or tube-type amps to
> "fix" high swrs an antenna might present.
> >
> >
> "Tuner upper" carrier = LID.
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> w3rv

2630. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:00:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50be64_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32142

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0201240753.7b04c5b9@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" wrote
>
> >
> > I've never seen anything like that said by Carl.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Then you haven't been paying attention. Here are just a few
> quotes on the topic from Carl.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: I have some sypathy for his position.
>
> ---
>
>
> ".... he's not a "real" ham in the sense of what ham radio is
> *supposed* to be and perhaps he is more suited to a "communicator"
> service like CB or GMRS or the new FRS (family radio service) ... those
> three services exist for the many people who wish to "yack" on the radio
> without having any technical skills or interests ... that's NOT what ham
> radio is for ..."
>

Sounds like Carl has an idea of how he thinks ham radio should be. While I
would disagree with his sentiment that someone may be more suited to
something like CB, etc., I do find it interesting that he did so in the
above post without really insulting comments.

>
> "Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it ...
> you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
> services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
> require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for "yackers"
..."
>

If this was a comment to "new" hams, I'd be concerned that Carl hasn't
listened around, even 6-7 years ago. There's loads of "stuff" I wouldn't at
first expect to hear on ham radio. Of course, I like yacking.

>
> "Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
> to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
> ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
> for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
> to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
> about radio technology ... "
>

I wonder if Carl's attitude has changed any in the recent past. I'd challenge him on this one. Ham radio is something for everyone, technical or not, technology or not.

>
> "I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
> technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.
>

I'd agree with this. But I'd allow for the potential that there are people who won't be interested in any of the above, and that is OK, too.

>
> Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."
>

Chatter and infantile games we can definitely have less of.

>
> "I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
> stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
> don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
> appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply
> happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living
> up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more
> appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services
> like CB, FRS, etc."
>

Well, I don't operate an appliance to play infantile/machismo competitive games. I think Carl is right on the money. If there are people who are picking up ham radio to act as such, then they'd probably do better to get onto CB and do it.

Kim W5TIT

2631. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:03:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50be67_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32143

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020124110318.08311.00000408@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >".... he's not a "real" ham in the sense of what ham radio is
> >*supposed* to be and perhaps he is more suited to a "communicator"
> >service like CB or GMRS or the new FRS (family radio service) ... those
> >three services exist for the many people who wish to "yack" on the radio
> >without having any technical skills or interests ... that's NOT what ham
> >radio is for ..."
> >
> >"Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it
...
> >you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
> >services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
> >require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for "yackers"
..."
> >
> >"Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
> >to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
> >ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
> >for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
> >to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
> >about radio technology ... "
> >
> >"I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
> >technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.
> >
> >Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> >medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> >in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc."
> >
> >"I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
> >stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
> >don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
> >appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply
> >happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living
> >up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more
> >appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services
> >like CB, FRS, etc
>
> Isnt he a good example of what NCI followers should look up to?
>
>

Oh, by the way. Forgot to mention something. I am quite shocked that you guys would be so dismayed at some of the things you've put above. Sounds like Carl echoing you.

Kim W5TIT

2632. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:06:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50bf1a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32145

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a2pj22$r3u$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c4f6ae1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > The text specifically
> > states, "an amateur station must use the minimum transmitter power
> necessary
> > to carry out the desired communications."
>
> Very good Kim. Now compare that to the text I quoted from your post, and
> maybe then you'll take the point.
>
>

Jim, it'd be a lot more handy if you'd like to do that for me. I don't get
off on going back through old posts.

Kim W5TIT

2633. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:07:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50bf4e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32147

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C5074C4.74652814@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all
amateurs
> > would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97.
>
> Thank you. That was my only point.

And, my point is wish in one hand and shit in the other. See which one
fills up with reality the quickest.

Kim W5TIT

2634. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:08:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2qeodqfh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32141

Kim's not mentioned anywhere in the posts below. Nor has
Kim's coments provided any indication she fits the
descriptions below.

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b99c2aad487c3c9896b1@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> >
> > "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> > news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance.
She
> > >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> > >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an
FRS
> > >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim
have
> > >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in
another
> > >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> > >
> > > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> > > advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> > > does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of
my
> > > application of Part 97?
> >
> > Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:
> >
> > Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director
> >
> > NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
> > whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.
> >
> > Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> > has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> > towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

> > NCI Director
>
> Well Mr Director, prepare for the worst. Your day is really gonna suck
> afetr reading these google goodies...
>
> From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> Subject: Re: ARRL vs. No Code Majority
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (61 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 1998/01/03 ?)
>
> I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
> stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
> don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
> appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply
> happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living
> up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more
> appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services
> like CB, FRS, etc.
>
>
>
>
> Hmmm reads like he did say that stuff...I continue (oh BTW, all this
> took about 3 minutes to find....
>
> From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> Subject: Re: THANKS FOR THE VAST SUPPORT NO NO CODE
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (39 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 1998/01/14
>
> I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
> technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.
>
> Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc.
>
>
> --
> Carl - wa6vse
> wa6vse@fast.net
> NCI #1052
> Join No Code International!
> Support the modernization of ham radio and
> help to assure its survival into the 21st century!
>
> OR THIS ONE.....
>

> Search Result 5
> From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> Subject: Re: CW--It's all My Fault
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
> View: Complete Thread (211 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 1997/09/28
>
> Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
> to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
> ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
> for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
> to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
> about radio technology ... the ARRL has promoted the competitive games
> and DXing thing to the point where they have perverted ham radio into
> something VERY different than its charter purpose ... if we don't get it
> back on track, we'll be dead meat before 2010 ... many of us don't want
> to see that happen because of clinging to "tradition" and religious
> dogma WRT the mystical powers of Morse ...
>
> > when all I want to do is plug in my Yaesu, connect it to a store bought
> > antenna and yell CQ DX? Why not just stand at the local Ham radio outlet
> > and hand licenses out?
>
> Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it
> ...
> you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
> services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
> require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for
> "yackers" ...
>
> Hmmm sounds a lot like 5'6 300 pound kim svelte as she may be
>
> Gee Bill, seems like Carl actually did state the very things you deny he
> states such a suck up.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2635. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:11:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50c04f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32148

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C508BBD.9A794DDB@uci.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu...
> > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> >
> > In truth, no I don't. The words choosen for the Part 97.1 rules
> > are very clear that the FCC is setting the purpose/goals as being
> > for the service as a whole rather than expected of or
> > required of each individual ham.
>
> Can you provide the list of licensed individuals who are exempt? The
> point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL
> amateur radio operators.
>

How many of us really live up to the Basis and Purpose? How many of us really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?

Kim W5TIT

> >
> > Might the FCC be particularly
> > satisfied if EVERY ham subscribed to and followed every aspect of
> > the goals/purpose?
>
> Minimum reasonable expectation should be that every licensee would at
> least be aware and supportive of the Basis and Purpose. Nobody is
> saying they HAVE to fulfill every aspect of Part 97. But it's quite
> another thing to stand in defiance of it, claiming "I don't have to, you
> can't make me".

If the FCC wants to put meat into the Basis and Purpose, then it will have more meaning. It's kind of like gentlemen's agreements. I don't believe in them. I wasn't around when those agreements were made, and I don't agree with them. I will abide by them--but they'll never have my endearment. *If* it's just a mention, that's all the regard it gets...the Basis and Purpose went out with the bathwater quite some time ago. I think it's only brought up in argument, just as most FCC R&R are brought up.

Kim W5TIT

2636. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:11:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <G9348.906$Ab1.53791@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32144

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.24.19.53.08.320310.26516@arrl.org...
> On Thu, 24 Jan 2002 18:41:23 -0500, Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > I suppose
> > that being a MCPO and drinking that retched coffee for all those years
> > can do those things to ya.
>
> I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
> do! :-)
>
> Jon

Amen bro, when it comes out your nose you know you are retching wretched
coffee.

2637. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:13:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2qfae$dq2$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32146

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C508BBD.9A794DDB@uci.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C4F056F.527453F9@uci.edu...
> > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> >
> > In truth, no I don't. The words choosen for the Part 97.1 rules
> > are very clear that the FCC is setting the purpose/goals as being
> > for the service as a whole rather than expected of or
> > required of each individual ham.
>
> Can you provide the list of licensed individuals who are exempt? The
> point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL
> amateur radio operators.

Don't take up writing rules/regs or contracts because you
are having difficulty in uderstanding the difference between
mandating vs a general expectation of the service at large.

> > Might the FCC be particularly
> > satisfied if EVERY ham subscribed to and followed every aspect of
> > the goals/purpose?
>
> Minimum reasonable expectation should be that every licensee would at
> least be aware and supportive of the Basis and Purpose. Nobody is
> saying they HAVE to fulfill every aspect of Part 97. But it's quite
> another thing to stand in defiance of it, claiming "I don't have to, you
> can't make me".

Has the FCC every tried to "make anyone." With all the actual
offenses that the FCC has prosecuted, has there ever been
anyone charged for NOT following the basis and purpose?
The basis and purpose items are "goals" and they are certainly
not in any way definitive in making a claim of "non-compliance."

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2638. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:16:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50c16d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32149

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C508C1A.D743170F@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C4F4313.DC68102C@uci.edu...
>
> > > Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
> > > pile-up?
>
> > I do and I don't. I enjoy the "training" I get from it, but it does get
> > kinda tiresome.
>
> What, on the repeater?

Nope, sorry to shock ya there, Jim. Each time I've been on the air on HF with this callsign (twice), it's been a matter of just a few minutes and I've had a pileup on me. Both times I was the one getting off the air while there were still all kinds of calls out there.

Sorry. But that's the way it was. And, as soon as I do my own QSL card up (I've always done others' but never got to my own...LOL), I'll be back out there. That is when I'll probably log, so I can run the cards out to whomever they'd go to. I am sure they think they're going to get some kind of XXX-rated card, but they won't. Wolves are my favorite animal, and that's what my card will be. Part of a wolf's face, with the reflection of Texas in his eye. I just have to figure out exactly how to do it in black and white and have it look really great.

Kim W5TIT

2639. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:18:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50c1d8$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32151

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:jV%38.76984$Ee7.5148119@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "Kim" wrote in part ...
>
> > Nope. How 'bout this. I am a RACES station here in Kaufman County. I
am
> > also a RACES station in Hunt County. I cannot, by the rules set forth
in
> > Dallas County RACES, enter a RACES net in Dallas County. I am certified
> by
> > a civil defense organization, by virtue of being a RACES station in two
> > other counties. Dallas County RACES does not allow check-ins or
> > participation by anyone not in *their* RACES program.
> >
>
> I never could understand that reasoning, Kim. I think that's why ARES has
a
> huge advantage over the RACES program.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>

As an outgoing ARES EC, I must "be good" and "be diplomatic" but *YOU'RE
RIGHT--ABSOLUTELY RIGHT,* Arnie.... ;) I never was really all that good at
diplomacy....heh heh heh

Kim W5TIT

2640. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:19:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32152

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>
> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Oh really? I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the "my radio is bigger than your radio" game.

Kim W5TIT

2641. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:24:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uSZTQdUpBHA.1896@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32167

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote

> Hans, you certainly are quick to tell people to "get a clue".

Actually I'm very slow to tell people that. By my recollection
you're the first person to whom I've made that recommendation
for several years. Does that suggest anything to you?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2642. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:25:40 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16bad27a739d14a19896b7@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32150

In article <a2qeodqfh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> Kim's not mentioned anywhere in the posts below. Nor has
> Kim's coments provided any indication she fits the
> descriptions below.

What about the "other people" you mention Bill. I can't believe someone who professes intelligence ever tries this weak ploy to evade the fact you got GOT!!!

At times you amaze even me with your total lack of following your own threads.

As to Kim fitting the Carl slacker profile, there's this gem.....

Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth little effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking up something that is already put together, with a working microphone attached, and talking.....I have never really professed to be any more than an "appliance operator."

(a perfect example of Carl's rant about a person who is better off on FRS or CB but not on amateur radio.)

So that's 2 for 2 on the ooppps I did it again. You must have been a debate teams nightmare when you got up and spoke.

Of course you can spin this any way you want..after all your ARE a politician and that's what they do best..

Does Carl pay you money to be his punching bag or do you do it out of a total sense of loyalty to someone who has no use for anyone but those who see his point. Come on Bill, even you don;t fit the CS world of amateur perfection. You have yet to even work one public service event in your local calling region..admit it
Thanks again for trying. Maybe you should buy Debating for Dummies. It will help you at least formulate a better response than what you present here.

Sorry dud err dude, that's a fact jack!!!!

>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16b99c2aad487c3c9896b1@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > >

> > > "Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:230120020727015617%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> > > > In article <MPG.16b8bb27a8f867e29896a9@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > > > <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >] According to Kim precious M&M's or RR's, she is not in compliance.
> She
> > > >] does nothing to advance the state of the art. According to Mr
> > > >] Stevenson, EXECUTIVE Director of NCI, she is the embodiment of an
> FRS
> > > >] user. Mr. S has stated many times over the years, people like Kim
> have
> > > >] absolutely no place in amateur radio and are better suited in
> another
> > > >] radio service like the FRS or CB.
> > > >
> > > > She does no public service (like NTS or ARES)? What have YOU done to
> > > > advance the hobby? Who is Mr. Stevenson? What is NCI? If Mr. Stevenson
> > > > does not work for the FCC why should I give a darn what he thinks of
> my
> > > > application of Part 97?
> > >
> > > Chip....FYI to a couple of your questions:
> > >
> > > Mr. Stevenson is Carl Stevenson, NCI Exec. Director
> > >
> > > NCI is: No Code International...a member based organization
> > > whose charter is to end all morse code test requirements.
> > >
> > > Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
> > > has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
> > > towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > > NCI Director
> >
> > Well Mr Director, prepare for the worst. Your day is really gonna suck
> > afetr reading these google goodies...
> >
> > From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> > Subject: Re: ARRL vs. No Code Majority
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > View: Complete Thread (61 articles) | Original Format
> > Date: 1998/01/03 ?)
> >
> > I and others (Gary was one, I believe, but there were others, too) have
> > stated taht clueless idiots who know virtually nothing about radio,
> > don't care to learn, and don't give a damn about anything but operating
> > appliances to play infantile/machismo competitive games that simply

> > happen to use the radio medium as a playing field are NOT really living
> > up to the chartered purpose for our service and would be more
> > appropriately hosted in one of the non-technical personal radio services
> > like CB, FRS, etc.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Hmmm reads like he did say that stuff...I continue (oh BTW, all this
> > took about 3 minutes to find....
> >
> > From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> > Subject: Re: THANKS FOR THE VAST SUPPORT NO NO CODE
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > View: Complete Thread (39 articles) | Original Format
> > Date: 1998/01/14
> >
> > I agree, Steve ... ham *radio* is supposed to be about *radio* ...
> > technology, experimentation, public service communications, etc.
> >
> > Many, many existing hams who simply want to use radio as a
> > medium to yack and play infantile competitive games really belong
> > in another, non-technical personal radio service like CB, FRS, etc.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Carl - wa6vse
> > wa6vse@fast.net
> > NCI #1052
> > Join No Code International!
> > Support the modernization of ham radio and
> > help to assure its survival into the 21st century!
> >
> > OR THIS ONE.....
> >
> > Search Result 5
> > From: Carl R. Stevenson (wa6vse@fast.net)
> > Subject: Re: CW--It's all My Fault
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
> > View: Complete Thread (211 articles) | Original Format
> > Date: 1997/09/28
> >
> > Simply because 1) it's necessary to demonstrate that you know enough
> > to operate safely and in compliance with the rules ... and 2) because
> > ham radio is *supposed* to be a TECHNICAL avocation ... it is meant
> > for those who want to tinker, build, experiment, and learn ... NOT just
> > to be another personal radio service for folks who don't give a shit
> > about radio technology ... the ARRL has promoted the competitive games
> > and DXing thing to the point where they have perverted ham radio into
> > something VERY different than its charter purpose ... if we don't get it

> > back on track, we'll be dead meat before 2010 ... many of us don't want
> > to see that happen because of clinging to "tradition" and religious
> > dogma WRT the mystical powers of Morse ...
> >
> > > when all I want to do is plug in my Yaesu, connect it to a store bought
> > > antenna and yell CQ DX? Why not just stand at the local Ham radio outlet
> > > and hand licenses out?
> >
> > Because it's not CB ... despite the fact that many of you act like it
> > ...
> > you sound like you really belong more in one of the personal radio
> > services like CB, GMRS, or FRS ... they are not technical and don't
> > require any technical knowledge ... they are specifically for
> > "yackers" ...
> >
> > Hmmm sounds a lot like 5'6 300 pound kim svelte as she may be
> >
> > Gee Bill, seems like Carl actually did state the very things you deny he
> > states such a suck up.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
>
>

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2643. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:33:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2qgd3$p8c$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32153

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16bad27a739d14a19896b7@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2qeodqfh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > Kim's not mentioned anywhere in the posts below. Nor has
> > Kim's coments provided any indication she fits the
> > descriptions below.
>
> What about the "other people" you mention Bill. I can't believe someone
> who professes intelligence ever tries this weak ploy to evade the fact
> you got GOT!!!
>
> At times you amaze even me with your total lack of following your own
> threads.
>
> As to Kim fitting the Carl slacker profile, there's this gem.....
>
> Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth
> little effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking
> up something that is already put together, with a working microphone
> attached, and talking.....I have never really professed to be any more
> than an "appliance operator."
>
> (a perfect example of Carl's rant about a person who is better off on
> FRS or CB but not on amateur radio.)

You take one statement out of the context and ignor Kim's
public service, etc. That has been your problem all along,
you micro analyze and miss the big picture.

> So that's 2 for 2 on the ooppps I did it again. You must have been a
> debate teams nightmare when you got up and spoke.

Don't run to the bank with your winnings, you haven't scored
anything worth counting.

> Of course you can spin this any way you want..after all your ARE a
> politician and that's what they do best..

I guess that really bothers you.

> Does Carl pay you money to be his punching bag or do you do it out of a
> total sense of loyalty to someone who has no use for anyone but those
> who see his point. Come on Bill, even you don;t fit the CS world of
> amateur perfection. You have yet to even work one public service event
> in your local calling region..admit it

You don't have any clue at all as to what role I play in
local "public service."

> Thanks again for trying. Maybe you should buy Debating for Dummies. It
> will help you at least formulate a better response than what you present
> here.

Maybe you should have the courage to
come out from your anonomous internet login.
It's always easy to post the tripe comments of the nature
that you do when no one knows who you are.

>and Sorry dud err dude, that's a fact jack!!!!

Just another example of why you apparently hide who
you are.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2644. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 02:59:01 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16bada50d90bb0b39896b8@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32154

In article <a2qgd3$p8c$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16bad27a739d14a19896b7@news.earthlink.net...
> > In article <a2qeodqfh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > > Kim's not mentioned anywhere in the posts below. Nor has
> > > Kim's coments provided any indication she fits the
> > > descriptions below.
> >
> > What about the "other people" you mention Bill. I can't believe someone
> > who professes intelligence ever tries this weak ploy to evade the fact
> > you got GOT!!!
> >
> > At times you amaze even me with your total lack of following your own
> > threads.
> >
> > As to Kim fitting the Carl slacker profile, there's this gem.....
> >
> > Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth
> > little effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking
> > up something that is already put together, with a working microphone
> > attached, and talking.....I have never really professed to be any more
> > than an "appliance operator."
> >
> > (a perfect example of Carl's rant about a person who is better off on
> > FRS or CB but not on amateur radio.)
>
> You take one statement out of the context and ignor Kim's
> public service, etc. That has been your problem all along,
> you micro analyze and miss the big picture.

Gee, we seem to have a problem Bill. You state fact, get caught with
erroneous information then back pedal..typical Kim fits the CS profile
for a person who according to CS is not fit to have an amateur license.
Period..end of sentence. Deal with it.

>
> > So that's 2 for 2 on the ooppps I did it again. You must have been a
> > debate teams nightmare when you got up and spoke.
>
> Don't run to the bank with your winnings, you haven't scored
> anything worth counting.

Spoken like someone who just lost. Thanks for the compliment

>
> > Of course you can spin this any way you want..after all your ARE a
> > politician and that's what they do best..
>
> I guess that really bothers you.

Politicians...they rank right Down there with lawyers and fat house
wives. Not worth the time to day....

>
> > Does Carl pay you money to be his punching bag or do you do it out of a
> > total sense of loyalty to someone who has no use for anyone but those
> > who see his point. Come on Bill, even you don;t fit the CS world of
> > amateur perfection. You have yet to even work one public service event
> > in your local calling region..admit it
>
> You don't have any clue at all as to what role I play in
> local "public service."

I know you are legendary of discussing you public service exploits at
the local NNJ hamfests. As if walking around with an HT is public
service. Yet, no mention is ever made of the various walk-a-thons,
marathons, civil events, etc etc Sorry, you are well known in the
circles that you travel. Hey, come to think of it, I got a mailing
about the SARA hamfest in a month. Will you be there giving a talk on
all the great public service stuff you do. Remember, old stuff doesn't
count. It's what you are doing today that makes the grade (D-)

>
> > Thanks again for trying. Maybe you should buy Debating for Dummies. It
> > will help you at least formulate a better response than what you present
> > here.
>
> Maybe you should have the courage to
> come out from your anonomous internet login.
> It's always easy to post the tripe comments of the nature
> that you do when no one knows who you are.

The people I want to know, know. Those that are on a need to know basis
are..well...left out. Care to wager where you fit. Funny how you never
seem to give that Aaron guy a line like that....hmmmm..come to think of
it...UNK and Aaron always post within a few minutes of each other...then
Aaron disappears..hmmmmm

>
> >and Sorry dud err dude, that's a fact jack!!!!
>
> Just another example of why you apparently hide who
> you are.

I love it when you are baffled. Keep smiling Bill You are a great
humanitarian. After all, you spent all that time and effort making sure

that people can ride around with scanners in NJ. BTW, what was your role in the recent NJ decision to allow amateur radio license plates. I don't remember seeing your name anywhere on all the reports. Aren't you an ARRL Government Liaison? Isn't that what you're suppose to be doing?

>
> No cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

No Cheers, where everyone DOESN'T know your name get it Bill.. You made a funny

TTFN I am off to the land of sun and snow The lovely Mount of Stowe for 2 weeks of skiing, wine and wenching. Feel free to discuss me behind my back..that would fit the typical politician profile

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2645. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 03:21:38 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <240120022221375390%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32155

In article
<9bE38.115101$fe1.2256694@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, Richard
McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

] You are apparently trying to be rational in an irrational situation. As I
] have pointed out to Cecil, there is little or no payoff in being the only
] sane man in the asylum.

Actually that's about all you would needed to say to make your point.
Yes, I am late on the scene. I don't often read newsgroups but prefer
to have my message topics delivered to my mailbox (via lists). Besides,
I really don't too wound up in the whole debate anyway. Frankly I like
the compromise the FCC devised with respect to CW.

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2646. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 03:26:45 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <Vf448.1667$mU4.77648@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32156

> "N2EY" wrote ...

> > http://www.halls.md/body-mass-index/bmi.htm

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote

> Hey, thanks. I took the BMI thingy for men (and got 23.7) I feel so much
> better now : -))

I 'scored' a 30.1 ...

It said I wasn't tall enough... ;-)

Rich

2647. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 03:27:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Ag448.1043$Ab1.61515@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32157

"Chip Griffin" <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net> wrote in message
news:240120022221375390%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net...
> In article
> <9bE38.115101$fe1.2256694@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, Richard
> McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>] You are apparently trying to be rational in an irrational situation.
As I
>] have pointed out to Cecil, there is little or no payoff in being the
only
>] sane man in the asylum.
>
> Actually that's about all you would needed to say to make your point.
> Yes, I am late on the scene. I don't often read newsgroups but prefer
> to have my message topics delivered to my mailbox (via lists). Besides,
> I really don't too wound up in the whole debate anyway. Frankly I like
> the compromise the FCC devised with respect to CW.
>
> --

If a compromise it be. What I think will come of this is that we will
have a lot of guys who will need to unlearn a lot of bad habits to get the
the journeyman 16-20 level after they have been subjected to 5.
> N1MIE - FN31xm

2648. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 03:40:03 UTC
From: Chip Griffin <n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Message-ID: <240120022240021669%n1mie@NOSPAM.snet.net>
Source record: 32158

In article <a2nu0pkkr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, Bill Sohl
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

] Mr. Stevenson does NOT work for the FCC...however, Carl
] has also NOT said Kim or people that have similar mindsets
] towards amateur radio have no place in amateur radio.

It's amazing just how much misinformation is floating around these
newsgroups ... better go back to validating everything ... :)

--
N1MIE - FN31xm

2649. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:03:39 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <a2qlfi01odh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32163
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, I was complaining to my wife about the high cost of Viagra -- $10 per pill -- she said, "It's not a problem, we can afford $50.00 a year."

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

"Reticulum" <Cathexis@yourhaterols.com> wrote in message news:3c4cb52b.72323508@news.erols.com...
>
> The group might be interested in this news item:
>
> Pfizer Corp. (NYSE PFE) is making the announcement today that VIAGRA
> will soon be available in liquid form and will be marketed by Pepsi Cola
> (Pepsi Bottling Group NYSE PBG) as a power beverage suitable for use
> as-is, or as a mixer, under the name "Mount And Do."
> Pepsi's proposed ad campaign suggests: "It will now be possible for a
> man to literally pour himself a stiff one."
> >
>
>
> Reticulum
>
> Remove "your.hat" when replying via e-mail

2650. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:07:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C50DA19.82E75180@uci.edu>
Source record: 32160

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C5074C4.74652814@uci.edu...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all
> amateurs
> > > would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97.
> >
> > Thank you. That was my only point.
>
> And, my point is wish in one hand and shit in the other. See which one
> fills up with reality the quickest.

Yes. The 'hand' does seem to be filling up with that - and YOU'RE
helping it.

2651. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:09:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C50DA6B.D2B5D4E6@uci.edu>
Source record: 32159

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> How many of us really live up to the Basis and Purpose? How many of us
> really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?

Some of us at least try.

2652. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:15:51 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C50DBF7.5EE8B2AA@uci.edu>
Source record: 32161

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote

> > Can you provide the list of licensed individuals who are exempt? The
> > point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL
> > amateur radio operators.

> Don't take up writing rules/regs or contracts because you
> are having difficulty in uderstanding the difference between
> mandating vs a general expectation of the service at large.

You're mistaken on that point. I said Part 97 applies to all amateurs,
and you've been trying to shoot me down on that point.

> > Minimum reasonable expectation should be that every licensee would at
> > least be aware and supportive of the Basis and Purpose. Nobody is
> > saying they HAVE to fulfill every aspect of Part 97. But it's quite
> > another thing to stand in defiance of it, claiming "I don't have to, you
> > can't make me".
>
> Has the FCC every tried to "make anyone."

You misunderstand. We're seeing that kind of attitude conveyed by some
here - in particular, those arguing from your perspective.

2653. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:19:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C50DCBA.51EC454A@uci.edu>
Source record: 32162

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Each time I've been on the air on HF
> with this callsign (twice), it's been a matter of just a few minutes and
> I've had a pileup on me. Both times I was the one getting off the air while
> there were still all kinds of calls out there.

Wow. So you're pretty experienced in this. We were talking DX
pile-ups. You've been on the receiving end of a DX pile-up have you?

2654. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 04:44:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C50E2AD.57642FE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32164

N2EY wrote:
> Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
> IDs afterwards.

How can an amp with adjustable pi-net tuning be tuned up into a mismatched
load without putting a carrier on the air?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2655. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 05:07:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125000706.05154.00001444@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 32166

In article <MPG.16ba4efa14581d069896b5@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:

>YET..note when he came back from his year long exile, he proudly
>proclaimed to all
>
>In 3 weeks I worked 76 countries and m,ost states

But he still won't tell us what mode he used to work them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2656. Re: The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 05:07:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125000707.05154.00001445@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 32165

Hans,

Thanks for posting this.

There are some details I would haggle over (length of contest, for example) but they are just details. The basic concept is excellent. It's long overdue.

Does ARRL Hq know about this?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2657. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 10:48:10 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <yJa48.61106$Y17.4549902@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32168

"K0HB" wrote ...
>
> Actually I'm very slow to tell people that. By my recollection
> you're the first person to whom I've made that recommendation
> for several years. Does that suggest anything to you?
>

Not really. But you have to understand that I don't have a clue. Except, of course, when it comes to knowing what the USCG said in regards to CW monitoring stations, the current use of Morse Code in military operations, and a myriad of other things : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2658. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 11:40:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125064055.17580.00000576@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32170

In article <3C50E2AD.57642FE7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
>> IDs afterwards.
>
>How can an amp with adjustable pi-net tuning be tuned up into a mismatched
>load without putting a carrier on the air?

Simple:

You need three pieces of extra equipment:

- MFJ-259B analyzer or equivalent
- dummy load capable of handling the amplifier power output
- transmatch capable of handling the amplifier power output

1) Measure the "mismatched load impedance" with the analyzer.
2) Connect the transmatch to the dummy load and the analyzer to
the transmatch.
3) Adjust the transmatch until the analyzer says it's the same impedance
as the "mismatched load".
4) Disconnect the analyzer from the transmatch and connect the amplifier
output
5) Adjust the amplifer for desired output into the transmatch/dummy load combo
6) Disconnect the amplifier from the transmatch/dummy load and connect the
amp to the "mismatched load" .

Repeat this 6-step process for any significant frequency change.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2659. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 11:40:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125064055.17580.00000575@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32172

In article <MPG.16bab8e9d2efeb7f9896b6@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:

>> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>>
>> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
>> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>He sez..boy doies he sez. See previous posts with direct statements as
>made to the rrap NG from the keyboard of CS
>--

You only quoted the milder ones. Look up "electronic paintball wars" "dinosaur
dung encrusted regulations" "no setasides for legacy modes" and some other
gems. The quoted posts only skim the surface.

The real kicker for me was the "simulated HF" system he proposed. As if!

Now of course some folks will argue that Mr. S doesn't mean what we know he
means, but his attitude comes through pretty clearly.

The most surreal part of all this is that Mr. S comes back to rrap bragging
about
his license test scores (competitive game - the tests are pass/fail) and
country
total (no mention of mode, though). All worked with appliances - no homebrew.
Maybe he's changed - who knows?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2660. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 11:40:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125064056.17580.00000577@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32169

In article <3c50c04f_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>How many of us really live up to the Basis and Purpose?

I try to.

>How many of us
>really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?

I do. Always have.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2661. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 11:40:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125064056.17580.00000578@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32171

In article <3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
>> In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>>
>> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
>> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Oh really?

Yeah, really. The term "electronic paintball wars" was used in other posts.

>I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the "my
>radio is bigger than your radio" game.

I don't know that one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2662. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:05:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125080557.14663.00000326@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32173

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

> I hawked this point to the (SF Bay Area) Wireless Communications
> Alliance for the four years that I was a member, and except for a few
> hams such as Dewayne, no one even listened. The non-hams' feeling
> was that SS is like the Colgate Invisible Shield.

Yeah, but if you read the ISP-wireless reflector, even the Part 15 guys are creaming each other left and right. Somehow, some SS users don't realize that even a respectable 30 dB of process gain (loosly translate: interference rejection) doesn't compare to > 80 dB of off-channel rejection in a narrowband system. SS works well if all the other signals, SS and narrowband, are at approximately the same signal level. Even FHSS is not a panacea.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2663. Re: The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:09:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125080959.14663.00000328@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32174

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>There are some details I would haggle over (length of contest, for example)
>but they are just details. The basic concept is excellent. It's long overdue.

>Does ARRL Hq know about this?

I like it too, and will forward a copy to Dan Henderson et al.

Even more important, I will forward a copy to Tom Frenaye, my ARRL division director, with a note that I think the idea is a good one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2664. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:13:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125081354.14663.00000330@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32175

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it, no
>big deal.

I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.

What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2665. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:16:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125081603.14663.00000331@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32176

From: "W5TIT - Kim"

>> Lots did, When you consider that most of the military
>> conversions were "home brew" jobs that often involved
>> as much work at homebrewing.

>Uh, your witness Counse...er, Ed. ;)

Most hams of my era, the 1960s, did not use either homebrew or military converstions.

In fact, in my operating circles, QRP, more hams have homebrew rigs today than not.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2666. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:20:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125082017.14663.00000332@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32177

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?

>He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
>competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.

In the sum of many of his posts, I believe he had said just that. Do a google search on WA6VSE and the word "paintball warrior" and you will get the gist of his views.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2667. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 13:48:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201250548.168c853c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32178

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C5034A0.3CD41C95@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> > an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> > can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> > thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
>
> Where are you going to find a dummy load to exactly equal an antenna system
> with an unknown load impedance? Take 300+j300, for instance.
>
>
Ya don't tune out an 8.5 swr like that with the output network of the
transmitter - assuming the specific output network can do that. Ya
tune into an r5ï¿½+jï¿½ dummy load for at least two good reasons: Ham
transmitter output circuits are designed for optimum performance
assuming a 50 ohm resistive load. By "optimum performance" I mean
harmonic suppression in all cases and stability in some cases. Second,
a lo-pass filter simply won't do it's job if it's in a line with an
8.5 swr. Or if yer running any power and/or using one of the low-power
lo-pass filters ya toast it if ya have an 8.5 swr. So common-sense
good operating practice dictates that ya tune the transmitter into a
dummy load.
>
>
Then ya transform the r3ï¿½ï¿½+j3ï¿½ï¿½ antenna input impedance into a proper
r5ï¿½+jï¿½ impedance with an antenna tuner and bingo the swr is 1:1 and
the antenna is optimally matched to the transmitter. By using an
antenna analyzer, not by dumping the transmitter on the air to tweak
the tuner with an swr bridge.
>
>
Of course this is the first time you ever heard about any of this
hi-tech transmitter and antenna tuning stuff huh?
>
>
dit-dit
>
>
w3rv

2668. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 14:28:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201250628.a8d586a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32179

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0201240512.7d51f3b6@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0201240334.2eaa3a4@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Tuning up" means adjusting the transmitter to match the antenna/transmission
> > > line system. Older rigs, many tube-type linear amplifiers and most transmatches
> > > require adjustment that cannot be done with a dummy load unless the antenna
> > > just happens to have a perfect 1:1 SWR. It's not a question of being "too
> > > hard".
> > >
> > There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> > an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> > can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> > thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
> > >
> > Proper 2002 operating practice is to "tune up" antennas with one of
> > the inexpensive antenna analyzers which are out there now and an
> > antenna tuner, not by putting a dead carrier on the air and diddling
> > the pi net tanks in boat anchor transmitters and/or tube-type amps to
> > "fix" high swrs an antenna might present.
>
> > "Tuner upper" carrier = LID.
>
> I know a guy who has an older-model Kenwood rig - top of the line some
> years back. Has the built in ATU and nice filters, really good deal for
> just over a thousand bucks. The ATU cannot be manually adjusted by means
> of an external noise bridge or analyzer - it's part of the rig.
>
>
He can't manually tune ANYTHING involving matching the xcvr output
stage to an antenna - it ain't got no tuning knobs! Whatta stupid
radio . .
>
>
> Hooked to a G5RV, it does a decent job. The ATU deals with the moderate
> SWR of the G5RV. Nice setup - find a clear spot, punch the tune button
> and the servos grind away until a match is found.
>
>
Horsepucky. The servos found the sweet spot in how many milliseconds?
Didja pay any attention to the power output meter during that process?
>
>
> Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always

> IDs afterwards.
>
>
Last I heard he sed he'd ID his 940 tuner-upper signal as soon as some
K2 owner in that neighborhood ID's after he kerchunks some .195
machine . .
>
>
> Is he a lid?
>
>
Yeah. If his stupid MFJ antenna tuner hadn't crapped out he'd have
matched the g5rv to the radio with the antenna analyzer he had with
him and would not have gone anywhere near the ATU in his 940 and it's
tuner-upper signal. In fact that was the first time he ever used the
ATU, he had to dive into the manual to find out how to bring it up.
Heat of the moment thing, everybody is a lid once in awhile.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

2669. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 15:01:40 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <ore48.47$9d.5019@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 32180
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

But make sure to put his address on the return address spot too..... that way, one way or another, he is gonna pay for his spamming. Same thing goes for those annoying damned subscription cards that come inside of magazines. Put the ones in the mailbox with nothing filled out, as long as they are the ones that are postage paid.

"Monty" <Monty@McGinty.net> wrote in message
news:1011903941.20872.0.nnrp-12.d4e54c2a@news.demon.co.uk...
> Not if everyone sends an empty envelope with no stamp on it.
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C50665A.E2CF6D23@psu.edu...
> > Not for Ian it doesn't!
> >
> > I'd bet he makes a good bit of money on this scam.
> >
> > - Mike -
> >
> > Austere wrote:
> > >
> > > Sounds more like a golden opportunity to be a loser!
> > >
> > > ujhijq@winwinwin.com wrote in message ...
> > > >BE A WINNER!!!
> > > >
> > > >Send in US$5.00 to the address below and be a winner!
>
>

2670. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 15:31:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C517A4F.642A2684@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32181

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >How can an amp with adjustable pi-net tuning be tuned up into a mismatched
> >load without putting a carrier on the air?

> 2) Connect the transmatch to the dummy load and the analyzer to
> the transmatch.

There is no external transmatch. The pi-net tuner is built into the amp.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2671. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 15:33:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C517AE7.4A78C52B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32182

W1RFI wrote:
> In fact, in my operating circles, QRP, more hams have homebrew rigs today than
> not.

Ed, do you consider kit building to be homebrewing?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2672. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 15:38:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C517BE9.6BF47D03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32183

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Of course this is the first time you ever heard about any of this
> hi-tech transmitter and antenna tuning stuff huh?

I have never owned a high power antenna tuner. Without an external
antenna tuner between the amp and the antenna system, how do you
tune the amp's adjustable pi-net output curcuit without putting a
signal on the air? Use 100+j100 if that makes you more comfortable.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2673. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 15:43:43 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C517D2F.6AF4B370@psu.edu>
Source record: 32184
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Heh, heh, I like the way you think!!

- Mike -

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> But make sure to put his address on the return address spot too..... that
> way, one way or another, he is gonna pay for his spamming. Same thing goes
> for those annoying damned subscription cards that come inside of magazines.
> Put the ones in the mailbox with nothing filled out, as long as they are the
> ones that are postage paid.

2674. Re: The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 16:09:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OKFpSqbpBHA.1768@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32192

I've encouraged Ford to seek ARRL sponsorship.

73, de Hans, K0HB

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125000707.05154.00001445@mb-fm.aol.com...
> Hans,
>
> Thanks for posting this.
>
> There are some details I would haggle over (length of contest, for
example) but
> they are just details. The basic concept is excellent. It's long overdue.
>
> Does ARRL Hq know about this?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2675. Re: The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 16:23:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uYD0yxbpBHA.1768@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32193

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125000707.05154.00001445@mb-fm.aol.com...
> Hans,
>
> Thanks for posting this.
>
> There are some details I would haggle over (length of contest, for
example) but
> they are just details. The basic concept is excellent. It's long overdue.

I think the idea can be the basis for an interesting exercise. From another venue, below are some remarks by N0AX.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

----- Original Message -----
From: "Silver Ward" <hwardsil1@mindspring.com>
To: <cq-contest@contesting.com>

Contesting today is in a pretty narrow groove (or rut). It's a very high speed game of electronic tag with a number of variants of degree and not in nature.

N0FP's proposal regarding data transfer is an interesting proposal. Imagine a contest in which data files are passed from station to station, adding the relay history as it goes. You would get points for accurate relays, number of relays, amount of data relayed without error, and for the length of the error-free relay chains in which you participated. A path-dependent score is certainly a new concept - prototyped by the WAE QTC and the Internet Sprint which passes along names. A whole new set of strategy and technical variables come into play. I can imagine the resulting efforts to optimize data transfer prototocols for radio, much as today we try to optimize our CW and phone copying accuracy and pileup handling techniques.

The modern scenario of having a national official start the game and receive the results is not at all new. The first official transcontinental relay tests in January 1921 featured message exchanges between the Mayors of Portland, ME and Portland, OR, for example. ("200 Meters and Down" - p. 65)

Contesting was born of training and technical exercises. What such opportunities are there for us today?

73, Ward N0AX

2676. Brand new stuff at www.ab7sl.com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 17:05:42 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c519073@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 32185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Some new stuff has been added at www.ab7sl.com in the past few weeks....

1. Site search - the entire site is now indexed and searchable from the
homepage

2. Arizona Repeaters Page - covering all repeaters statewide
on ALL bands. Sorted by county,band and frequency.
This added some 20 pages to the site.....

3. Weather Page - shows temps for selected US cities , full weather
conditions
for Prescott,AZ and USA - World weather maps and forecasts...

4. Added a Grand Kids Photos page....they are so cute and adorable!

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

2677. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 17:18:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201250918.190f6c88@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32186

kelly@dvol.com wrote:

> > > There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
> > > an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
> > > can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
> > > thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
> > > >
> > > Proper 2002 operating practice is to "tune up" antennas with one of
> > > the inexpensive antenna analyzers which are out there now and an
> > > antenna tuner, not by putting a dead carrier on the air and diddling
> > > the pi net tanks in boat anchor transmitters and/or tube-type amps to
> > > "fix" high swrs an antenna might present.
> >
> > > "Tuner upper" carrier = LID.
> > >
> > I know a guy who has an older-model Kenwood rig - top of the line some
> > years back. Has the built in ATU and nice filters, really good deal for
> > just over a thousand bucks. The ATU cannot be manually adjusted by means
> > of an external noise bridge or analyzer - it's part of the rig.

> He can't manually tune ANYTHING involving matching the xcvr output
> stage to an antenna - it ain't got no tuning knobs! Whatta stupid
> radio . .

He kept telling me I oughta buy one. Or something like it. Far as I
know ALL
of the rigs made with ATUs work that way. No way to tune the ATU
without
putting a signal on the air.

> > Hooked to a G5RV, it does a decent job. The ATU deals with the moderate
> > SWR of the G5RV. Nice setup - find a clear spot, punch the tune button
> > and the servos grind away until a match is found.

> Horsepucky.

That's exactly how it works. It's how they all work. Some are smarter
than others in that they "remember" the settings afor the various
bands and start
there to reduce tune time.

> The servos found the sweet spot in how many milliseconds?

Several thousand.

> Didja pay any attention to the power output meter during that process?

Yeah - it went up and down. Put quite a few watts out while tuning -
something's gotta drive the SWR sensors.
> >
> > Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
> > IDs afterwards.
> >
> Last I heard he sed he'd ID his 940 tuner-upper signal as soon as some
> K2 owner in that neighborhood ID's after he kerchunks some .195
> machine . .

The Elecraft K2's ATU tunes very fast (<3 sec for most loads),
remembers the
settings and reduces power to 3W during tuneup. No servomotors,
either.

> > Is he a lid?

> Yeah. If his stupid MFJ antenna tuner hadn't crapped out he'd have
> matched the g5rv to the radio with the antenna analyzer he had with
> him and would not have gone anywhere near the ATU in his 940 and it's
> tuner-upper signal.

The analyzer costs how much and was made by whom?

Did the ATU work on all bands or was a manual tuner needed on one or
more? I
hear some ATUs have very limited range.

> In fact that was the first time he ever used the
> ATU, he had to dive into the manual to find out how to bring it up.

I think perhaps we are talking about two different people.

> Heat of the moment thing, everybody is a lid once in awhile.

I don't think it was a lid thing to do at all. Tuning up is allowed by
the
rules as long as you don't cause QRM in the process.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2678. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 17:48:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <DTg48.1900$Ab1.117766@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32187
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:ore48.47$9d.5019@newshog.newsread.com...
> But make sure to put his address on the return address spot too.....
that
> way, one way or another, he is gonna pay for his spamming. Same thing
goes
> for those annoying damned subscription cards that come inside of
magazines.
> Put the ones in the mailbox with nothing filled out, as long as they are
the
> ones that are postage paid.

Better yet, attach them to bricks. If it goes first class, they get to
pay for it.

2679. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 17:58:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125125856.18480.00000680@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32188

>Oh yeah.... had it not been for some VE's screwing up 13 years ago, I would
>have been a licensee then. They chose what rules they wished to follow, and
>made up their own.

Yea right, I guess you could find anybody in 13 Years that would read the rules
the way you wanted them READ, VERY LAME EXCUSS

2680. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 18:02:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125130225.18480.00000681@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32189

>Oh, by the way. Forgot to mention something. I am quite shocked that you
>guys would be so dismayed at some of the things you've put above. Sounds
>like Carl echoing you.
>
>Kim W5TIT

I will bet you loved Bill Clinton also

2681. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 18:29:03 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0201251029.7485d635@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32190

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> ... CSCE is sitting right at home for your ever-important
> code test! Don't have the need to send it in nor the equipment as well.

> ... I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written and
> the code test.

Well, first I must say congratulations to you for getting past
those tests. I have been through all of the tests and I know how
hard it is to fit in between work and school.

But, I don't understand the part about "sending it in". I thought
that all this stuff was taken care of by the testing station?
Well, at least mine was. I just paid my money, took the tests,
and then went home and waited for the license to show up.

Have they changed how this is done or is it done differently
depending on where you test?

If you do need to submit these things yourself, I would recomend
that you do it as quick as you can. I know that your time is tight
and you really don't have the equipment to use your new
privelages, but, a CSCE is only good for 1 year from date of issue.
Since your not losing any privelages, like some of the old license
classes did, it only makes sense to get it in the works. The FCC
is going to take their time with it anyway.

Well, just a thought. Congratulations again

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
employer.

2682. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 19:14:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201251114.117a4f17@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32191

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
>
>> >mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >> What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
>
> >He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> >competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>
> In the sum of many of his posts, I believe he had said just that. Do a google
> search on WA6VSE and the word "paintball warrior" and you will get the gist of
> his views.

The phrase to search on is "electronic paintball". "Paintball warrior"
won;t get you anything.

Here's a sample. This is far from the worst that Carl has to offer:

BEGIN QUOTE:

CS>I've stated the fact that the ARS has been perverted
CS>from what it used to be (technical leaders) to the electronic
paintball
CS>wars gamester competition playing field that the ARRL has made it.

END QUOTE

73 de Jim, N2EY

2683. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 20:38:57 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <phj48.85448$Ee7.5732783@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32194

Unfortunately, they don't stop at the 28 MHZ line. Listen to 28.085 and
28.115 AM. We've
got truckers up there complete with their stupid echos, squeaks, beeps and
other infantile noises
as well. We need to concentrate on getting those intruders out of there
instead of worrying about the so-called "freeband". If the lawful users of
that area below 28 MHZ want 'em out,
they'll holler about it. We need to protect our OWN turf! When you are out
on the interstate,
carry your camera/vid cam, or tape recorder and note book. Monitor the
lower portion of 10
meters and, if you spot a trucker a-beepin' an' a-squeakin' on 10 meters,
just take his 'pitcher'
and tag #, and send it to Riley. Get a recording of his activities. Do NOT
talk to the trucker--do not even let him know what you are doing, just
photograph, record and document and send it in.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Michael W. McGinley <mmcginley@kscable.com> wrote in message
news:YWs38.291010$8w3.68282468@typhoon.kc.rr.com...
>
> "Martin Meserve" <k7mem@myrealbox.com> wrote in message
> news:270a577d.0201221344.78f5663d@posting.google.com...
> > "rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
> news:<a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com>...
>
> Snipped to save bandwith----------
>
> > So let's see if I got this right. I already "volunteered" for a 20 WPM
> > test, and passed, but since then I got a vanity callsign, which
> > automatically renewed my license. Now you can't tell from the FCC
> > data base when I go my Extra, before or after the regulation change.
> > In a couple of years you won't be able to distinguish when any
> > of the licenses were originally obtained. Which, as far as I'm
> > concerned, is great.
>
> Forget this Code Vs. Nocode crap already...This hobby or Service depending
> on your point of view is basically bleeding at the seams over this tiring
> debate/flamewar....it don't matter if your a 13 WPM General or 5 WPM
General
> and weither or not anyone else knows that you rattle code off at 13+ - you

> know personally that you are capiable of doing cw at those speeds so
instead
> of arguing like little children grow up a little and learn to get along.
>
> and as for the socalled "freebanders " debate of them invading the
amatuer
> radio serivce
> like a swarm of locust's we will see a few but not in the numbers the
> naysayers are stating
> the Typical freebander does not want to be shackled by rules or
> regulations - they enjoy the anarchy that reins in between 27.405 - 27.995
> Mhz so as far as i am concerned that argument is invaled.
>
> Just my 1/50 of a dollars worth
>
> Michael W. McGinley - N0JVT
>
>
>
>
>
>

2684. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 21:04:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C51C87B.E890ACA2@uci.edu>
Source record: 32195

CAM wrote:

> I have never owned a high power antenna tuner. Without an external
> antenna tuner between the amp and the antenna system, how do you
> tune the amp's adjustable pi-net output curcuit without putting a
> signal on the air? Use 100+j100 if that makes you more comfortable.

Since you're the one who doesn't own the tuner, aren't you really asking
him how YOU tune YOUR load? Isn't the answer on your website?

2685. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 21:23:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201251323.1f2a4b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32196

>w1rfi@aol.com wrote:

>> From: n2ey@aol.com wrote:

> >I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it, no
> >big deal.
>
> I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.

Even if you practiced for it and the grading was similar to that used for Morse?
>
> What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?

I dunno. But is that the criteria for what should and should not be tested?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2686. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 21:36:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201251336.269de6ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32197

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >
> > > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
> >
> > He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> > competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
>
> Oh really? I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the "my
> radio is bigger than your radio" game.

Go to google

http://www.deja.com

and search on

wa6vse lazy mooch

and see what comes up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2687. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 21:50:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C51D341.C9E96952@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32198

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > I have never owned a high power antenna tuner. Without an external
> > antenna tuner between the amp and the antenna system, how do you
> > tune the amp's adjustable pi-net output curcuit without putting a
> > signal on the air? Use 100+j100 if that makes you more comfortable.
>
> Since you're the one who doesn't own the tuner, aren't you really asking
> him how YOU tune YOUR load? Isn't the answer on your website?

Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which included an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201 had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.

My present amp is an SGC-500 which has a fixed 50 ohm output and works into SWR's up to 6:1.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2688. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 22:48:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C51E0AD.74F015AE@uci.edu>
Source record: 32199

CAM wrote:

> Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which included
> an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201
> had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.

You can't tune an amp without putting a carrier through it, obviously.
I think the output network in most amps is mainly designed to match the
output section to 50 ohms over the bandwidth of the amp. It's not
necessarily supposed to be able to tune to a wide range of load
impedences. That's what a tuner is for. Or you could go to:

Well, I was going to give your website address, but Yahoo/GeoCities is
playing some funny tricks with your website.

There's a fine description of a 50 ohm multiband dipole there. With
that antenna (and no tuner), you could tune your amp into a dummy load,
without putting a carrier on the air.

I tune my antenna tuner so that the load is 50 ohms with the MFJ
analyzer, tune up the amp into a dummy load, and I'm ready to go on the
air. I'll perhaps make fine adjustments while I'm operating.

> My present amp is an SGC-500 which has a fixed 50 ohm output and works
> into SWR's up to 6:1.

It's either got a real forgiving output section, or it has one of their
autotuners in it. I've got an Amplifier Reasearch 200 watt amp here.
It doesn't care what load impedence it operates into. But the thing
weighs a pound per watt.

2689. APRS technology -- new use?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:02:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eo4IrQfpBHA.388@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32200

http://www.silicon.com/bin/bladerunner?30REQEVENT=&REQAUTH=21046&14001REQSUB
=REQINT1=50470

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

2690. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:46:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125184612.14663.00000434@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32201

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Ed, do you consider kit building to be homebrewing?

Yes, I do. I suppose one doesn't get the experience of finding parts, but nearly everything else is there. Think of it this way -- if one "dead bugs" a design, he or she doesn't get any PC-board stuffing and soldering experience.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2691. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:47:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125184746.14663.00000435@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32202

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.

>Even if you practiced for it and the grading was similar to that used for
>Morse?

One minute of solid typing without an error at 60 wpm? Not this boy. Fill in the blank by having someone ask questions about my watching someone else type?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2692. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:54:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125185458.14675.00000409@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32203

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
>pile-up?

It is quite a bit of fun, at least if the pileup is a small one. But I can say that some of the pileups I have heard where stations just keep sending their call whether the station is working someone else or not would really not be an enjoyable experience for me.

Of course, I would solve the problem by working every one of them, and not entering the QSO in the log. :-)

Now, smaller pileups are a fun thing. I have run them from W1AW, on the CW county hunters net (14.0565 MHz) and, for some real fun, as the QRP Fox in some of the QRP foxhunts. A real blast!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2693. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:56:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125185652.14675.00000410@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32204

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>I guess you're right. They prolly just needed to kill some time when
>they wrote Part 97.

That is an odd thing to say.

If the FCC expected individual amateurs to meet all of the requirements in their statements about the purpose of the Amateur Radio Service, they would have made the language specific to individual licensees, not to the service as a whole as they did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2694. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-25 23:59:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125185949.14675.00000411@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32205

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>The point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL
>amateur radio operators.

Not from a regulatory point of view. In the rules, it applies to the Amateur
Radio Service. I do not meet all of the criteterion described in the purpose of
Amateur Radio -- I do not do any emergency or public-service communcations.
Neither does the ham that does not operate at all. Could either of us receive
a citation for that?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2695. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 00:02:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125190214.14675.00000412@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32206

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>How many of us really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?

>I do. Always have.

I sure try to, but I have made operating errors that were rules violations. One good example is that from W1AW, I called CQ on SSB in the VHF 'test on 144.080 MHz. Oops. :-)

But I try hard to follow the rules, even to the extent of identifying that tuneup signal when I am done with it. It is so easy to say DE W1RFI AR after that 10-second test carrier.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2696. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 00:29:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C51F865.D0EF3C19@uci.edu>
Source record: 32207

I guess the point I was trying to make is that DX pile-ups are not
necessarily bad for international good will. I think that if I was a DX
station, it would be exciting to get on the air and have so many
stations wanting to exchange QSL's. In fact, the Dxpeditions depend on
that activity, and are disappointed when it doesn't work out that way.

73 de ac6xg

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
> >pile-up?
>
> It is quite a bit of fun, at least if the pileup is a small one. But I can say
> that some of the pileups I have heard where stations just keep sending their
> call whether the station is working someone else or not would really not be an
> enjoyable experience for me.
>
> Of course, I would solve the problem by working every one of them, and not
> entering the QSO in the log. :-)
>
> Now, smaller pileups are a fun thing. I have run them from W1AW, on the CW
> county hunters net (14.0565 MHz) and, for some real fun, as the QRP Fox in some
> of the QRP foxhunts. A real blast!
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2697. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 00:34:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C51F997.F19AD7E9@uci.edu>
Source record: 32208

Part 97 was written to regulate the Amateur Service. It is directed
toward everyone in the amateur service. There are not any certain
particular individuals within the service for whom it does not apply.
It is inclusive of all amateurs. Neither Part 97, nor I, claims that
everyone must build a radio. But what it does say applies to everyone.

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >I guess you're right. They prolly just needed to kill some time when
> >they wrote Part 97.
>
> That is an odd thing to say.
>
> If the FCC expected individual amateurs to meet all of the requirements in
> their statements about the purpose of the Amateur Radio Service, they would
> have made the language specific to individual licensees, not to the service as
> a whole as they did.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2698. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 00:37:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C51FA4F.94CCF2D3@uci.edu>
Source record: 32209

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >The point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to ALL
> >amateur radio operators.
>
> Not from a regulatory point of view. In the rules, it applies to the Amateur
> Radio Service. I do not meet all of the criteterion described in the purpose of
> Amateur Radio -- I do not do any emergency or public-service communcations.

Does Part 97 say you must? No, but it does give the impression that it
would be a good thing for you to do. Do you feel you, or anyone else
exempted from that?

2699. Even more laffs - for HAMS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 01:52:38 UTC
From: Realham <dxhound@srynet.com>
Message-ID: <3C520BE5.5597C46D@srynet.com>
Source record: 32210

Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
A. An iTard.

Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
A. Only one. But none will try.

Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?

A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.

Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!

Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval track race? One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.

An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio and which end went to the antenna.

Then there was the anti-coder who said a "heterodyne" is a restaurant for straights.

Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.

Q. What do you call the morgue at an AIDS hospital?
A. The anti-coder Hall of Fame.

Q. How many anti-coders can you stuff into a shoebox?
A. All of them.

Q. What do you call a bunch of anti-coders in a welfare office?
A. CBers at their watering hole.

Some anti-coders were told to to "dress for success." Then, the local Wal-Mart had a run on rainbow underwear.

Q. How does an anti-coder spell "relief" ?
A. He can't - he's afraid of the alphabet.

An anti-coder goes into a restaurant and sees some lobsters in a tank. Feeling sorry for them, he hides them under his shirt, takes them out to the woods and sets them free.

Two anti-coders were riding in the bed of a pickup truck. The truck goes off the highway into a lake. The driver rolled down the window and escaped to safety. The two anti-coders riding in the truck bed drowned,

because they couldn't lower the tailgate.

Hear about the anti-coder who applied for a Lewinsky class license? He said that all he had to do was blow the code and then he could blow the VE.

2700. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:05:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521083_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32211

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16bad27a739d14a19896b7@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2qeodqfh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > Kim's not mentioned anywhere in the posts below. Nor has
> > Kim's coments provided any indication she fits the
> > descriptions below.
>
> What about the "other people" you mention Bill. I can't believe someone
> who professes intelligence ever tries this weak ploy to evade the fact
> you got GOT!!!
>
> At times you amaze even me with your total lack of following your own
> threads.
>
> As to Kim fitting the Carl slacker profile, there's this gem.....
>
> Well, Hans, I've never made a secret of my belief that I put forth
> little effort for ham radio. My pleasure in ham radio is simply picking
> up something that is already put together, with a working microphone
> attached, and talking.....I have never really professed to be any more
> than an "appliance operator."
>
> (a perfect example of Carl's rant about a person who is better off on
> FRS or CB but not on amateur radio.)
>
> So that's 2 for 2 on the ooppps I did it again. You must have been a
> debate teams nightmare when you got up and spoke.
>

Jay, I think you are totally misreading the bits that you posted that are allegedly Carl's. I say allegedly because I take your word for it that they are really from posts of Carl's.

The items I see posted are expressions of disdain for people who treat the airwaves of the ARS as they would any other radio service, which is somewhat dismaying even to me. I think Carl means to berate those who attain a license and then get on the air with lingo, topics of discussion, mannerisms, etc., that are not desirable on the ham bands.

I don't think Carl means people like me. I do think you're presuming an awful lot to speak for him, though.

Kim W5TIT

2701. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:11:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5211e8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32212

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16bada50d90bb0b39896b8@news.earthlink.net...
>
> Gee, we seem to have a problem Bill. You state fact, get caught with
> erroneous information then back pedal..typical Kim fits the CS profile
> for a person who according to CS is not fit to have an amateur license.
> Period..end of sentence. Deal with it.
>

Could you tell me in what way you think Carl is speaking of me? I use proper operating procedure on the ham bands, don't carry on with topics inappropriate for ham radio (though, I have been known to include myself in innuendo at times), among other exemplary behaviors. I truly don't think Carl is speaking of people like myself as, while yes I am mostly an appliance operator, I don't add insult to injury by acting like an idiot on the air...

Carl, are you paying attention to any of this? Who's misinterpreting? Me, Jay? Believe me, I can handle your answer...LOL, either way. Because either way, you won't change me as a person and I do consider myself a darned good operator. So, if you'd care to comment, please do.

Kim W5TIT

2702. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:16:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521317_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32214

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:Vf448.1667$mU4.77648@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > "N2EY" wrote ...
>
> > > http://www.halls.md/body-mass-index/bmi.htm
>
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote
>
> > Hey, thanks. I took the BMI thingy for men (and got 23.7) I feel so
much
> > better now : -))
>
> I 'scored' a 30.1 ...
>
> It said I wasn't tall enough... ;-)
>
> Rich
>
>

heh heh heh, it scores me as "obese." While I consider myself overweight, I don't envision myself as obese in dimension. I don't look like a Mimi character, or a Roseanne Barr, maybe just slightly less than someone like Rosie O'Donnel (is that her name?).

Anyway, I found myself wondering today if our discussion of weight is to somehow place judgement on people for their over- or underweight status. Hopefully not, as it has nothing to do with a thing...

How'd we get talking about weight? LOL

Kim W5TIT

2703. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:18:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521370_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32216

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C50DA19.82E75180@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C5074C4.74652814@uci.edu...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all
> > amateurs
> > > > would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97.
> > >
> > > Thank you. That was my only point.
> >
> > And, my point is wish in one hand and shit in the other. See which one
> > fills up with reality the quickest.
>
> Yes. The 'hand' does seem to be filling up with that - and YOU'RE
> helping it.

Sorry you feel that way. I don't.

Kim W5TIT

2704. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:19:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5213e1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32218

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C50DA6B.D2B5D4E6@uci.edu...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > How many of us really live up to the Basis and Purpose? How many of us
> > really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?
>
> Some of us at least try.

I think many of us try. I think all of us should. However, the Basis and Purpose is not stating that it is an absolute that every ham be as the Basis and Purpose calls for. It's not much more than a recommendation.

Kim W5TIT

2705. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:21:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2t421$8hl$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32213

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16bada50d90bb0b39896b8@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <a2qgd3$p8c$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
> > You don't have any clue at all as to what role I play in
> > local "public service."
>
> I know you are legendary of discussing you public service exploits at
> the local NNJ hamfests. As if walking around with an HT is public
> service. Yet, no mention is ever made of the various walk-a-thons,
> marathons, civil events, etc etc Sorry, you are well known in the
> circles that you travel. Hey, come to think of it, I got a mailing
> about the SARA hamfest in a month. Will you be there giving a talk on
> all the great public service stuff you do. Remember, old stuff doesn't
> count. It's what you are doing today that makes the grade (D-)

I owe you nothing as to what I do, when or where...especially
when you choose to maintain your hidden identity.
I certainly have no expectation that you'd approve of anything
I do, nor do I care. Those that I know well know who I am
and whatever accomplishments I have made.

> > > Thanks again for trying. Maybe you should buy Debating for Dummies.
It
> > > will help you at least formulate a better response than what you
present
> > > here.
> >
> > Maybe you should have the courage to
> > come out from your anonomous internet login.
> > It's always easy to post the tripe comments of the nature
> > that you do when no one knows who you are.
>
> The people I want to know, know. Those that are on a need to know basis
> are..well...left out. Care to wager where you fit. Funny how you never
> seem to give that Aaron guy a line like that....hmmmm..come to think of
> it...UNK and Aaron always post within a few minutes of each other...then
> Aaron disappears..hmmmmm

I haven't a clue what you're talking about. Your hiding behind the
keyboard tells me mush about you anyway. I have no reason at
all to be anonomous...guess you find it necessary for reasons
known best to you.

> > >and Sorry dud err dude, that's a fact jack!!!!
> >
> > Just another example of why you apparently hide who
> > you are.
>
> I love it when you are baffled. Keep smiling Bill You are a great
> humanitarian. After all, you spent all that time and effort making sure
> that people can ride around with scanners in NJ.

You have a problem with that?

> BTW, what was your
> role in the recent NJ decision to allow amateur radio license plates. I
> don't remember seeing your name anywhere on all the reports. Aren't you
> an ARRL Government Liaison? Isn't that what you're suppose to be doing?

Are your claiming I haven't fullfiled that responsibility...if so, please
availyourself of making whatever notification you want to the ARRL.

Bill K2UNK

2706. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:22:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52147b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32219

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C50DCBA.51EC454A@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Each time I've been on the air on HF
> > with this callsign (twice), it's been a matter of just a few minutes and
> > I've had a pileup on me. Both times I was the one getting off the air
while
> > there were still all kinds of calls out there.
>
> Wow. So you're pretty experienced in this. We were talking DX
> pile-ups. You've been on the receiving end of a DX pile-up have you?

No, no DX. However, a rose by any other name is still a rose, right? Tell me what the difference would be between 150 or more calls from nothing but US stations would be like as opposed to 150 or more calls from all 'round the world? I am not sure I get your point and would appreciate some clarification.

And, that I am experienced is *your* words, not mine. I think you're sadly mistaken.

Kim W5TIT

2707. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:25:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2t45a$u2n$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32215

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C51FA4F.94CCF2D3@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >The point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to
ALL
> > >amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Not from a regulatory point of view. In the rules, it applies to the
Amateur
> > Radio Service. I do not meet all of the criteterion described in the
purpose of
> > Amateur Radio -- I do not do any emergency or public-service
communcations.
>
> Does Part 97 say you must?

EXACTLY!

No, but it does give the impression that it
> would be a good thing for you to do. Do you feel you, or anyone else
> exempted from that?

As you have aptly just noted...EVERYONE is exempted from being
REQUIRED to.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2708. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:26:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2t4ek$dp6$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32217

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:ZEV28.30344$Y17.2410388@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" ...
> >
> > Fair enough given the additional detail...but "rescue worker"
> > wouldn't routinely imply anything having to do with the NYPD.
> > Question...after 911, do you think anyone would have been challenged
> > for NOT having such an endorsement IF horses and riders may
> > have been needed in the initial response? Would someone in the
> > west be told...no, you can't go "off rode" to try and rescue someone
> > because we have to wait for a "qualified/licensed" horseman?
> > >
>
> As I read part 97, it allows for the operation of *any* equipment by
> *anyone* where the purpose is to save a life. No "horse endorsement"
> required.

I agree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2709. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:27:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521590_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32220

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125081603.14663.00000331@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim"
> But, Dick Carroll said first:
> >> Lots did, When you consider that most of the military
> >> conversions were "home brew" jobs that often involved
> >> as much work at homebrewing.
>
> >Uh, your witness Counse...er, Ed. ;)
>
> Most hams of my era, the 1960s, did not use either homebrew or military
> converstions.
>
> In fact, in my operating circles, QRP, more hams have homebrew rigs today
than
> not.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

<SNICKER> Somehow I am far more prone to believing you, Ed. :p

Kim W5TIT

2710. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:27:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5215b2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32221

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125081354.14663.00000330@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it,
no
> >big deal.
>
> I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.
>
> What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

Wow, now that would be pretty darned neat. I'd be a SuppaHam at 101 wpm,
eh?

Kim W5TIT

2711. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:37:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52184c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32222

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:ore48.47$9d.5019@newshog.newsread.com...
> But make sure to put his address on the return address spot too..... that
> way, one way or another, he is gonna pay for his spamming. Same thing
goes
> for those annoying damned subscription cards that come inside of
magazines.
> Put the ones in the mailbox with nothing filled out, as long as they are
the
> ones that are postage paid.
>
>

Hey, go full tilt. Every piece of junk mail you get, put the words "RETURN TO SENDER" on, ship it back to them and let *them* fill their landfills up. Yep, do it every day. Same thing with what you think is excessive packaging. Might cost a little, but ship it back and make it *their* problem. (I don't do that, but I know people who will). I do send the junkmail back, have a pen in my vehicle just for when I stop at the mailbox.

Kim W5TIT

2712. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:43:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521954_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32223

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125130225.18480.00000681@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Oh, by the way. Forgot to mention something. I am quite shocked that
you
> >guys would be so dismayed at some of the things you've put above. Sounds
> >like Carl echoing you.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> I will bet you loved Bill Clinton also

Nope. Do you?

Kim W5TIT

2713. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:47:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521a56_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32224

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0201251336.269de6ae@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > > In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
writes:
> > >
> > > > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
> > >
> > > He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> > > competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or
DXing.
> >
> > Oh really? I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the
"my
> > radio is bigger than your radio" game.
>
> Go to google
>
> http://www.deja.com
>
> and search on
>
> wa6vse lazy mooch
>
> and see what comes up.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You folks obviously have a lot more skin in this game than I do. I don't do
"searches" on stuff like newsposts.

Kim W5TIT

2714. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 02:51:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c521b46_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32225

Hmmmm, I just noticed that Jim's question never mentions a "DX" pileup. When I responded, he snitted that we were discussing DX pileups. Waddup wid dat, Jim? Your question doesn't say "DX" pileup, it just says pileup.

Kim W5TIT

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020125185458.14675.00000409@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Do you think anyone really minds being being on the receiving end of a
> >pile-up?
>
> It is quite a bit of fun, at least if the pileup is a small one. But I can say
> that some of the pileups I have heard where stations just keep sending their
> call whether the station is working someone else or not would really not be an
> enjoyable experience for me.
>
> Of course, I would solve the problem by working every one of them, and not
> entering the QSO in the log. :-)
>
> Now, smaller pileups are a fun thing. I have run them from W1AW, on the CW
> county hunters net (14.0565 MHz) and, for some real fun, as the QRP Fox in some
> of the QRP foxhunts. A real blast!
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2715. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 03:22:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52225e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32226

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C51FA4F.94CCF2D3@uci.edu...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >The point is that the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97 applies to
ALL
> > >amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Not from a regulatory point of view. In the rules, it applies to the
Amateur
> > Radio Service. I do not meet all of the criteterion described in the
purpose of
> > Amateur Radio -- I do not do any emergency or public-service
communcations.
>
> Does Part 97 say you must? No, but it does give the impression that it
> would be a good thing for you to do. Do you feel you, or anyone else
> exempted from that?

All right. Let's get into the meat of this matter:

[Code of Federal Regulations]:[Title 47, Volume 5]:[Revised as of October 1,
2001]:From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access:[CITE:
47CFR97.1]:
[Page 576]

TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

CHAPTER I--FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents

Subpart A--General Provisions

Sec. 97.1 Basis and purpose.

The rules and regulations in this part are designed to provide an
amateur radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the
following principles:
(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service
to the public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service,
particularly with respect to providing emergency communications.

(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to
contribute to the advancement of the radio art.
(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through
rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communication and
technical phases of the art.
(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio
service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.
(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to
enhance international goodwill.

First sentence: does not stipulate radio amateurs, but the "service" as a
whole. This could be deemed to mean "the majority," since it is a given
that an entire body of people is not going to fall exactly within the
specifications of the Basis and Purpose.

Are we each exempt from any of the above provisions of the Basis and
Purpose? As individuals, yes (it is not the Basis and Purpose that defines
how we should become an amateur radio service that has a fundamental
purpose). Does the implication of the FCC mean that *they* believe in the
basic goodness of the service and that people will govern themselves
accordingly? Yes. Does the same implication mean that the FCC chooses not
to dictate what it takes to *be* an amateur radio service meeting the above
Basis and Purpose? In my opinion, no. Otherwise, there would be no Rules &
Regulations.

Also, I will rest my point on the following, opening phrase of the FCC Title
47, Part 97 R&R: "The rules and regulations in this part are
d-e-s-i-g-n-e-d..." It is the *RULES AND REGULATIONS*, as specifically
written by the FCC, that are *DESIGNED* to bring about the behavior of the
amateur radio service to meet the stated Basis and Purpose. It is *NOT* the
Basis and Purpose that is saying a thing...it is the Rules & Regulations.

Are we exempt from a)-e), above? Sure. Are we exempt from the Rules &
Regulations of the FCC? No.

Kim W5TIT

2716. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 03:33:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201251933.7fc7ffaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32227

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C517BE9.6BF47D03@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Of course this is the first time you ever heard about any of this
> > hi-tech transmitter and antenna tuning stuff huh?
>
> I have never owned a high power antenna tuner. Without an external
> antenna tuner between the amp and the antenna system, how do you
> tune the amp's adjustable pi-net output curcuit without putting a
> signal on the air?
>
>
Ya chase the moths outta yer wallet and pop for or BUILD God Forbid a
high power antenna tuner and set up the tuner with an antenna analyzer
before ya dump the xcvr and amp on the air. Or if the moths just won't
go away and ya refuse to pop for the analyzer ya crank down the output
of the exciter, feed it's output into the tuner and use a swr bridge
to tweak the tuner to keep the qrm down. Then ya swap the jumper
feeding the tuner to the input of the amp and hook the output of the
amp to a dummy load and tune the amp for max output into the dummy
load. Then ya connect the jumper from the tuner input to the amp
output connector and tally-ho-ho-ho.
>
>
As if I needed to "explain" any of this "rocket science" to an EE.
Where the hell DID you pick up yer EE anyway? South Podunk Texass
Community Collitch?
>
>
RRAP needs a new vanity callsign: RRAT. Rec.Radio.Amateur.Troll
>
>
>Use 100+j100 if that makes you more comfortable.
>
>
See above re: rrat
>
>
dit-dit.
>
>
w3rv

2717. Re: The Mother of all Radiosport Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 03:47:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125224704.16072.00000543@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32229

Historic note:

Way back in the early 1930s, when the ARRL November Sweepstakes
was in its infancy, the rules were quite different.

For a contact between two stations to count for points, a genuine message, in ARRL standard format, with a text of at least 10 words, had to be sent between the two stations claiming the QSO. More than one message could be passed to earn more points. Messages could be originated by one of the stations, or relayed. The contest went on round-the-clock for 10 straight days.

The current SS exchange is based on the preamble of the ARRL message format.

The Ancient Ones had the right idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Everything old is new again.

2718. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 03:47:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125224706.16072.00000545@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32228

In article <3C51D341.C9E96952@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which included
>an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201
>had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.

Now I know you're not serious, Cecil.

What's an HW-201?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2719. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 03:47:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020125224706.16072.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32230

In article <a2qdgq$2mi$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote:)
>> My point is that testing is not a perfect indicator of something's
>> importance to amateur radio. I thought you'd agree with that
>> statement.
>
>OK, that I agree with.
>
>> For example, I think it's important for ALL hams to know the
>> standard phonetic alphabet (alfa, bravo, charlie...) well enough
>> that they don't stumble or make up nonstandard ones because they
>> can't remember the standard ones. Is that tested? Nope.
>
>It used to be part of the Novice pool.

Not when I was a Novice. I learned them anyway, even though I rarely operate
'phone.
The time to learn stuff like phonetics is before you need them.
>
>> I also think hams should know Ohm's Law for DC and its practical
>> applications well enough to avoid stuff like trying to power a 50
>> watt rig through 30 feet of #20 wire from a 12 volt battery. That's
>> not well tested, either - one can get all the Ohm's Law questions
>> wrong and still get an Extra.
>
>I have written suggestions to the "test creators" on the same point.

I put detailed ideas on written testing in my comments to the FCC. So did many
others.

Yet it's still possible to know absolutely nothing about Ohm's Law and pass all
of the writtens, right up to
Extra. That's just not right, IMHO. FCC doesn't think it's a problem, though.

>> >> > I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
>> >> > people that might be involved in any way with
>> >> > emergency comms are likly to have at least a
>> >> > familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
>> >> > able to type quickly to keep the communication going.
>> >>
>> >> All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
>> >
>> >But more than fast enough to type communication messages.
>>

>> Not if TIME is a concern...
>
>It rarely is of that much immediate concern.
>You are far more likly to have several people who
>can type at 20 wpm than CW operators at that speed.

All depends who you hang out with...

>> I would say that I can operate CW and do other things listed above
>> simultaneously for hours at astretch with only short breaks. Contesting
>> helped me develop those skills.
>
>But you still require those breaks...at which time,
>if CW was the only mode, the station is off the air.

Same is true with a voice operator.

>> >> If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal text
>> >> messages.
>> >
>> >I don't see any logic in that possibility.
>>
>> If you have to send a written message, CW with decent operators is
>> usually FASTER than voice because the voice ops have to spell out
>> and phoneticize. Being able to talk 200 wpm doesn't help if the
>> receiving op can only write at 25 wpm.
>
>IF you have the CW op with that ability.
>I still disagree in general.

That level of ability is not unusual among CW operators.
>
>> >> Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and tape
>> >> recorders.
>> >
>> >What is so special about a tape recorder?
>> >
>> Cecil cited a case where they sent simulated messages by voice at high
>speed
>> and then played them back for a professional stenographer to transcribe.
>Do all
>> the emergency stations you know have tape recorders set up like that?
>
>I'd think a "permanent" station might be smart to consider
>that today.

Sure. But would it be there in an emergency? Maybe - maybe not.
>
>> >> Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names
>> >> and some
>> >> other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW
>> >> circuit, decent

>> >> ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the
>> >> message
>> >> with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message faster?
>> >
>> >Let's be serious here, it will depend on each person.
>>
>> Sure. That's why I specified "decent ops - not beginners and not experts.
>
>It all still comes back to training, practice
>and skills...regardless of mode.

Yup. My point is simply that the modes most often used (voice) are not the
optimum ones
for certain types of communications.
>
>> >The vast majority
>> >of such traffic in none ham communications would be voice.
>>
>> It would? Why not use a data mode?
>
>They could do that also.
>
>> >If CW
>> >was any sustained and consistent clearcut winner then the military
>> >and all other services wouldn't have abondoned its use.
>>
>> Not that old saw!
>
>The truth, like it or not.

Military and commercial requirements and resources are completely different
from
amateur requirements and resources. The maritime folsk wanted to get rid of
radio officers on board ship, for example.

>> Since hams are unpaid and self-trained, we have a different paradigm.
>
>True, and if YOU wnat to do CW, then go for it. On the same
>basis, I don't propose its use for emergencies.
>
>> How much SSB and FM do the military and commercial services use?
>
>Probably a lot of FM these days.

I doubt it. Not secure.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2720. Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 04:16:26 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16bc3dc88edafda89896b9@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32231

***[snipped absolutely obscene listing of the outrageous volume
of competitive games cluttering and trashing the HF bands on
virtually every weekend ... there ought to be a ban ...]

Carl - wa6vse
wa6vse@fast.net

This ones for Kim... (note this applies to ALL people who like Kim are
not the least interested in the technical aspect of amateur radio (sorry
Kim..there's absolutely no other way to interpret CS's comments on this
one...maybe BS (Bill Sohl, he's favorite suck up can :-)))

***I have said that people who just want to yack, beep, chase DX,
contest, etc. WITHOUT interest in or understanding of RADIO principles,
theory, etc. are not true hams and belong in one of the other personal
radio services.

***Wex, most hams are not "techies" today. The bulk of the population
are appliance-operating communicators. A high percentage of those
on HF merely use the radio medium as a playing field for various
forms of electronic paintball wars (contests, busting DX pileups,
etc.) where radio is rather incidental to the real goal of "collecting
points" (or "wallpaper"). This "macho" stuff has little appeal to most
of the real "techies" I know.

And this gem from CS who so proudly puffed out his chest and proclaimed
he worked 76 countries 52 states, 8 provinces, 4 planetary bodies, 2
galaxies and 1 alternate dimension....

***So what??? You make it sound like DXCC is the pinacle of
achievement ... I could care less about chasing DX or
collecting senseless wallpaper.

So boys and gals..interpret away. Bill, begin the spin. I wonder
sometimes about you Bill. If Carl stops short, will your head actually
end up in his upper intestine?? Get the connection? Oh that's
right...I am an anon, a nameless faceless person, like so many here.
Guess that puts me at the advantage Bill. I know all about you and your
wondrous exploits of amateur radio NOT.

Oh well spin spin spin

Later..off to the winter wonderland..only a day late
--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2721. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 04:26:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201252026.2a8e9ffb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32232

>
> > He can't manually tune ANYTHING involving matching the xcvr output
> > stage to an antenna - it ain't got no tuning knobs! Whatta stupid
> > radio . .
>
> He kept telling me I oughta buy one. Or something like it. Far as I
> know ALL
> of the rigs made with ATUs work that way. No way to tune the ATU
> without
> putting a signal on the air.
>
>
I don't know of a single catalog 100w solid-state ham xcvr which has
manually tunable RF stages with or without an ATU.
>
>
> > > Hooked to a G5RV, it does a decent job. The ATU deals with the moderate
> > > SWR of the G5RV. Nice setup - find a clear spot, punch the tune button
> > > and the servos grind away until a match is found.
>
> > Horsepucky.
>
> That's exactly how it works. It's how they all work. Some are smarter
> than others in that they "remember" the settings afor the various
> bands and start
> there to reduce tune time.
>
>
I know quite well how and why the prior-tech ATUs work. Read on Jimbo.
>
> > The servos found the sweet spot in how many milliseconds?
>
> Several thousand.
>
>
Ship yer stopwatch to NIST and get it reclibrated. MAYBE a second and
a half on 15. More like a blink on 20.
>
>
> > Didja pay any attention to the power output meter during that process?
>
> Yeah - it went up and down. Put quite a few watts out while tuning -
> something's gotta drive the SWR sensors.
>

>
It went down a flock of dB.
>
>
>
> > > Of course a carrier goes out while this is being done, and the guy always
> > > IDs afterwards.
> > >
> > Last I heard he sed he'd ID his 940 tuner-upper signal as soon as some
> > K2 owner in that neighborhood ID's after he kerchunks some .195
> > machine . .
>
> The Elecraft K2's ATU tunes very fast (<3 sec for most loads),
> remembers the
> settings and reduces power to 3W during tuneup.
>
>
From five to three watts . . . really impressive . . there are HF
xcvrs out there now with ATUs which do not put a tuner-upper signal on
the air at all. The Mark V ATU follows the RECEIVER around the bands.
Now yer talkin' right-now technology, the ultimate tuner-upper signal
deleter. Tell yer buddies at Elecraft about it, maybe they'll ship ya
the Mark V firmware upgrade. If they ever figger out how Yaesu does
it.
>
>
>No servomotors,
> either.
>
>
It's amazing what ya can do when ya only have to deal with five watts
. . does the internal ATU in the 100w K2 amp have servomotors??
>
>
Uhhh . . now wait a minnit, something seems to be a tad outta whack
here . .
>
>

>
> > > Is he a lid?
>
> > Yeah. If his stupid MFJ antenna tuner hadn't crapped out he'd have
> > matched the g5rv to the radio with the antenna analyzer he had with
> > him and would not have gone anywhere near the ATU in his 940 and it's
> > tuner-upper signal.
>
> The analyzer costs how much and was made by whom?
>
>

His cost 190 bucks and is the biggest bang-for-the-buck investment he
ever made in the hobby by a huge margin. Whatta mean "who makes it?".
MFJ makes 'em. MFJ makes some intolerable shit. But they also make the
259B antenna analyzer and the best keyers on the planet. Like Ford
made Pintos but they've also made "a few" Cobras, Land Rovers, Aston
Martins and Jags. Your point sire?
>
>
> Did the ATU work on all bands or was a manual tuner needed on one or
> more? I
> hear some ATUs have very limited range.
>
>
Gimmee a break willya? Hisself scanned that 40m g5rv from 7.000 to
29.000 in 500Kc increments with Hisself's 259B analyzer and the swrs
were fine on 40, 20 & 10 but the swr on 15 was around 5:1. All of
which data were duly scribbled & logged. Yeah, a 5:1 is well outside
the advertised tuning range of any currently available hammie ATUs and
is very typical and predictable g5rv behavior. Funny thing though, the
artifact ATU in that old Kenwood nailed a 1:1 anyway. "Over to you."
>
>
> > In fact that was the first time he ever used the
> > ATU, he had to dive into the manual to find out how to bring it up.
>
> I think perhaps we are talking about two different people.
>
>
'Scuse me? You have knowledge of his use of the ATU in that radio
prior to the time of event under discussion?
>
>
> > Heat of the moment thing, everybody is a lid once in awhile.
>
> I don't think it was a lid thing to do at all. Tuning up is allowed by
> the
> rules as long as you don't cause QRM in the process.
>
The bottom line in all of this crappola is that by using the
technology now readily available and affordable down at the hobbyist
level once again there is no excuse for dumping a 1960s-style
twenty-over "tuner-upper" signal onto any HF ham freq tweakable
pi-nets or a lack thereof, sky-high swrs, a self-imposed lack of
curent-tech instrumentation and tuners, all non-sequiters.
>
>
To hell with whether or not a "tuner-upper" signal is legal, it's just
plain rude and is unacceptable 2002 operating practice.
>
>

. . . 1960s Tuner Upper sigs on the bands = LID
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

2722. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 05:27:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201252127.63045367@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32233

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<9f4bfe89.0201251323.1f2a4b3@posting.google.com>...
> >w1rfi@aol.com wrote:
>
> >> From: n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>
> > >I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it, no
> > >big deal.
> >
> > I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.
>
> Even if you practiced for it and the grading was similar to that used for Morse?
> >
> > What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?
>
> I dunno. But is that the criteria for what should and should not be tested?
>
Certainly it "has to do with the numbers." Whatta think would happen
"to the numbers" if PennDOT sed you had to be tested for and get a CDL
with a HazMat endorsemnent because you're hauling petrol around Radnor
Township in the gas tank of yer vehicle?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2723. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 06:18:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020126011845.21484.00000031@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32234

Don't forget to omit the return address, then.

BTW -- does anyone know if this is legal? I see a golden opportunity out there! Just the income from all the lazy, "I want something for nothing" no-coders would allow me to retire!

73 de Larry, K3LT

>Not if everyone sends an empty envelope with no stamp on it.
>
>"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3C50665A.E2CF6D23@psu.edu...
>> Not for Ian it doesn't!
>>
>> I'd bet he makes a good bit of money on this scam.
>>
>> - Mike -
>>
>> Austere wrote:
>> >
>> > Sounds more like a golden opportunity to be a loser!
>> >
>> > ujhijq@winwinwin.com wrote in message ...
>> > >BE A WINNER!!!
>> > >
>> > >Send in US$5.00 to the address below and be a winner!
>

2724. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 07:08:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201252308.715e7a6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32235

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C517A4F.642A2684@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >How can an amp with adjustable pi-net tuning be tuned up into a mismatched
> > >load without putting a carrier on the air?
>
> > 2) Connect the transmatch to the dummy load and the analyzer to
> > the transmatch.
>
> There is no external transmatch. The pi-net tuner is built into the amp.
>
>
With that piece of idiocy you just got yerself unanimously elected sysop for rrat.

2725. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 12:01:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126070136.17702.00000513@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32236

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>It used to be part of the Novice pool.

>Not when I was a Novice.

When I took my Novice, there were no questions about antennas, feed lines or propagation, either. Today, new hams have to learn something about the difference between the near-field and far-field regions around antennas to understand the questions about RF safety.

Nothing like the good old days, eh?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2726. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 12:05:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126070525.17702.00000514@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32237

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Hey, go full tilt. Every piece of junk mail you get, put the words "RETURN
>TO SENDER" on, ship it back to them and let *them* fill their landfills up.

The postal regulations on bulk rate mail don't return such mail to the sender. I am not sure if it would be disposed of by the local post office or if it would have to be sent to the dead letter office. All your suggestion would accomplish, however well intentioned it may be, is to cost the post office a bit of my money.

> Same thing with what you think is excessive
>packaging. Might cost a little, but ship it back and make it *their*
>problem. (I don't do that, but I know people who will).

So you are willing to spend the post office's money, but not your own...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2727. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 12:06:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126070641.17702.00000515@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32238

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>> What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?

>Wow, now that would be pretty darned neat. I'd be a SuppaHam at 101 wpm,
>eh?

And I would be a No-Keyboard Tech, or a slow-keyboard Tech+ at best. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2728. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 12:10:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126071043.17702.00000516@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32239

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Does Part 97 say you must? No, but it does give the impression that it
>would be a good thing for you to do. Do you feel you, or anyone else
>exempted from that?

That's what I said. The FCC encourages, but does not mandate, that individual hams meet the goals it has stated for the Service. I do not do public-service communications. My contributions to Amateur Radio are directed elsewhere.

Do you feel that Amateur Radio would benefit if I were to do less of what I do in ham radio and did some public-service communication instead?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2729. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:07:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126080714.16072.00000546@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32240

In article <3c521a56_2@newsa.ev1.net>, - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>> > Oh really? I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the
>"my
>> > radio is bigger than your radio" game.
>>
N2EY wrote:

>> Go to google
>>
>> http://www.deja.com
>>
>> and search on
>>
>> wa6vse lazy mooch
>>
>> and see what comes up.
>
> I don't do
>"searches" on stuff like newsposts.
>
Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2730. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:07:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126080715.16072.00000547@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32241

In article <20020126070136.17702.00000513@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>It used to be part of the Novice pool.
>
>>Not when I was a Novice.
>
>When I took my Novice, there were no questions about antennas, feed lines or
>propagation, either.

Yup. But the old Novice was only good for a year and was a one-shot deal. It was more a "learner's permit" than a permanent license.

> Today, new hams have to learn something about the
>difference between the near-field and far-field regions around antennas to
>understand the questions about RF safety.

BUT they DON'T have to UNDERSTAND those questions in order to get them right because the Q&A are not secret. And they can get ALL the RF safety questions WRONG and still p-ass all the writtens.
>
>Nothing like the good old days, eh?
>
When you tell the whole story, it looks a bit different.

--

You might be interested in a discussion started by Richard Plourde on what the US license structure should be like in a post-S25.5 setting. It's in a thread called "S25.5 Proposal Peoposal" or something like that. It answers the "200 page book for beginners" problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2731. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:08:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2u9qgcoc1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32242

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201252127.63045367@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<9f4bfe89.0201251323.1f2a4b3@posting.google.com>...
> > >w1rfi@aol.com wrote:
> >
> > >> From: n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> >
> > > >I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn
it, no
> > > >big deal.
> > >
> > > I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.

60 wpm typing is pretty fast...more than that required
by any company that had typing as a requirement
for a clerical position. These days, most every new hire
for any job comes with "keyboarding" skills, so they
"type" their own correspondence rather than hand
writing a draft or dictating same to a secretary.

> > Even if you practiced for it and the grading was similar to that used
for Morse?
> > >
> > > What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio
numbers?
> >
> > I dunno. But is that the criteria for what should and should not be
tested?
> >
> Certainly it "has to do with the numbers." Whatta think would happen
> "to the numbers" if PennDOT sed you had to be tested for and get a CDL
> with a HazMat endorsemnent because you're hauling petrol around Radnor
> Township in the gas tank of yer vehicle?

Really BAD example since PennDOT or any other state DOT doesn't
usually get to unilaterally make such demands. It is generally the
legislative body that writes the laws which establish drivers license
requirements. Even if the DOT could unilaterally create such
a requirement, the public outcry would kill such a dumb, "overkill"
requirement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2732. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:25:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2uar7$66l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32243

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125224706.16072.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <a2qdgq$2mi$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote:)

<SNIP> of agreed comments

> >> For example, I think it's important for ALL hams to know the
> >> standard phonetic alphabet (alfa, bravo, charlie...) well enough
> >> that they don't stumble or make up nonstandard ones because they
> >> can't remember the standard ones. Is that tested? Nope.
> > >
> > >It used to be part of the Novice pool.
> >
> > Not when I was a Novice. I learned them anyway, even though I rarely
operate
> > 'phone.
> > The time to learn stuff like phonetics is before you need them.

True...BUT, in truth, there's nothing sacrid about saying Alpha, Bravo,
Charlie... then using Apple, Boy, Cable if you didn't know the
actual international phonetic alphabet. Non-hams do that all
the time.

> >> I also think hams should know Ohm's Law for DC and its practical
> >> applications well enough to avoid stuff like trying to power a 50
> >> watt rig through 30 feet of #20 wire from a 12 volt battery. That's
> >> not well tested, either - one can get all the Ohm's Law questions
> >> wrong and still get an Extra.
> > >
> > >I have written suggestions to the "test creators" on the same point.
> >
> > I put detailed ideas on written testing in my comments to the FCC. So did
many
> > others.
> >
> > Yet it's still possible to know absolutely nothing about Ohm's Law and
pass all
> > of the writtens, right up to
> > Extra. That's just not right, IMHO. FCC doesn't think it's a problem,
though.

The only solution to what you focus on is to break up the tests into
subgroups of subject matter which then must each be passed with

a minimum score. Odds are, however, that there's only a finite
breakdown that makes sense...e.g. Rules, Safety, Theory...and
in doing such, someone could probably still pass the theory segment
and never do a calculation requiring a formula.

> >> >> > I'd venture it a safe guess that the vast majority of
> >> >> > people that might be involved in any way with
> >> >> > emergency comms are likly to have at least a
> >> >> > familiarity with a keyboard. One need not be
> >> >> > able to type quickly to keep the communication going.
> >> >>
> >> >> All true - but many people's typing skills are pretty slow.
> >> >
> >> >But more than fast enough to type communication messages.
> >>
> >> Not if TIME is a concern...
> >
> >It rarely is of that much immediate concern.
> >You are far more likly to have several people who
> >can type at 20 wpm than CW operators at that speed.
>
> All depends who you hang out with...

More that it depends on who is available in case
of an actual emergency.

> >> I would say that I can operate CW and do other things listed above
> >> simultaneously for hours at astretch with only short breaks. Contesting
> >> helped me develop those skills.
> >
> >But you still require those breaks...at which time,
> >if CW was the only mode, the station is off the air.
>
> Same is true with a voice operator.

But, as said before, anyone (i.e. any non-ham) can fill in
as a voice operator if the ham needs a break...not so for CW.

> >> >> If time is the issue, then CW usually wins over voice for formal
text
> >> >> messages.
> >> >
> >> >I don't see any logic in that possibility.
> >>
> >> If you have to send a written message, CW with decent operators is
> >> usually FASTER than voice because the voice ops have to spell out
> >> and phoneticize. Being able to talk 200 wpm doesn't help if the
> >> receiving op can only write at 25 wpm.
> >
> >IF you have the CW op with that ability.
> >I still disagree in general.
>

> That level of ability is not unusual among CW operators.
> >
> >> >> Unless you have special facilities like skilled stenographers and
tape
> >> >> recorders.
> >> >
> >> >What is so special about a tape recorder?
> >> >
> >> Cecil cited a case where they sent simulated messages by voice at high
> >speed
> >> and then played them back for a professional stenographer to
transcribe.
> >Do all
> >> the emergency stations you know have tape recorders set up like that?
> >
> >I'd think a "permanent" station might be smart to consider
> >that today.
>
> Sure. But would it be there in an emergency? Maybe - maybe not.

I know of at least one town that has a well setup "mobil" station
vehicle that is, I believe, in an old ambulance. It has as much
gear as a base station.

> >> >> Thought experiment: A message consisting of a list of 50 or so names
> >> >> and some
> >> >> other text needs to be passed. You have a voice circuit and a CW
> >> >> circuit, decent
> >> >> ops at both ends of both circuits, and they have to write down the
> >> >> message
> >> >> with pencil and paper. Who do you think will pass the message
faster?
> >> >
> >> >Let's be serious here, it will depend on each person.
> >>
> >> Sure. That's why I specified "decent ops - not beginners and not
experts.
> >
> >It all still comes back to training, practice
> >and skills...regardless of mode.
>
> Yup. My point is simply that the modes most often used (voice) are not the
> optimum ones
> for certain types of communications.
> >
> >> >The vast majority
> >> >of such traffic in none ham communications would be voice.
> >>
> >> It would? Why not use a data mode?
> >
> >They could do that also.

> >
> >> >If CW
> >> >was any sustained and consistent clearcut winner then the military
> >> >and all other services wouldn't have abondoned its use.
> >>
> >> Not that old saw!
> >
> >The truth, like it or not.
>
> Military and commercial requirements and resources are completely
different
> from
> amateur requirements and resources. The maritime folsk wanted to get rid
of
> radio officers on board ship, for example.

And I have yet to see/hear of any local emergency
people (non-hams) that have any affinity for morse
being used. Those local emergency people prefer to
Not be needing an interpreter (which is what the CW op
really is doing) but rather they prefer to hear the actual
voice statements or read the text immediately off a terminal.

> >> Since hams are unpaid and self-trained, we have a different paradigm.
> >
> >True, and if YOU wnat to do CW, then go for it. On the same
> >basis, I don't propose its use for emergencies.
> >
> >> How much SSB and FM do the military and commercial services use?
> >
> >Probably a lot of FM these days.
>
> I doubt it. Not secure.

Is "commercial" permitted to encrypt? The military certainly
can, but the vast majority of operations don't require
encryption. Likewise, local police don't do that much encryption.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2733. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:28:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2ub0cffv1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32244

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020125224706.16072.00000545@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3C51D341.C9E96952@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which
included
> >an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201
> >had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.
>
> Now I know you're not serious, Cecil.
>
> What's an HW-201?

Isn't that the old Heathkit linear?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2734. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 13:41:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a2ubon$5s$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32245

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16bc3dc88edafda89896b9@news.earthlink.net...

<SNIP>

> So boys and gals..interpret away. Bill, begin the spin. I wonder
> sometimes about you Bill. If Carl stops short, will your head actually
> end up in his upper intestine?? Get the connection?

The connection is that your postings have gone continually
down hill to the level of infantile name calling and insinuations.
Any effort at acting as an adult is gone from your rantings.
Its time to just ignore your postings.

> Oh that's
> right...I am an anon, a nameless faceless person, like so many here.
> Guess that puts me at the advantage Bill. I know all about you and your
> wondrous exploits of amateur radio NOT.

Yet another reason to drop you from those that deserve any
reply. If you don't have the courage to identify yourself,
you don't deserve the respect of any reply.

You are, of course, free to disagree.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2735. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:17:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32246

Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air. Plus, I am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either method as being the only proper way to tune. Your posts, such as below, are a truly uncalled for attitude.

Kim W5TIT

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201251933.7fc7ffaa@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C517BE9.6BF47D03@IEEE.org>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > Of course this is the first time you ever heard about any of this
> > > hi-tech transmitter and antenna tuning stuff huh?
> >
> > I have never owned a high power antenna tuner. Without an external
> > antenna tuner between the amp and the antenna system, how do you
> > tune the amp's adjustable pi-net output curcuit without putting a
> > signal on the air?
> >
> >
> Ya chase the moths outta yer wallet and pop for or BUILD God Forbid a
> high power antenna tuner and set up the tuner with an antenna analyzer
> before ya dump the xcvr and amp on the air. Or if the moths just won't
> go away and ya refuse to pop for the analyzer ya crank down the output
> of the exciter, feed it's output into the tuner and use a swr bridge
> to tweak the tuner to keep the qrm down. Then ya swap the jumper
> feeding the tuner to the input of the amp and hook the output of the
> amp to a dummy load and tune the amp for max output into the dummy
> load. Then ya connect the jumper from the tuner input to the amp
> output connector and tally-ho-ho-ho.
> >
> >
> As if I needed to "explain" any of this "rocket science" to an EE.
> Where the hell DID you pick up yer EE anyway? South Podunk Texass
> Community Collitch?
> >
> >
> RRAP needs a new vanity callsign: RRAT. Rec.Radio.Amateur.Troll
> >
> >
> >Use 100+j100 if that makes you more comfortable.
> >
> >

> See above re: rrat
> >
> >
> dit-dit.
> >
> >
> w3rv

2736. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:24:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52bd8c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32247

Jay: There are support groups for your malady. I really don't see the correlation between Carl's dismay with piss-poor ham operators and those who--like me--*are* the embodiment of a non-technical ham *BUT* conduct themselves within all accepted operating practices on the air. I think you are painting much too much into Carl's posts. However, you also seem to be reacting in a way that leads me to believe *you* would be one of his targets. You sure do act like it in your posts.

Buhbye, ain't got time for your rambling, and CBish style warring.

Kim W5TIT

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message news:MPG.16bc3dc88edafda89896b9@news.earthlink.net...
> ***[snipped absolutely obscene listing of the outrageous volume
> of competitive games cluttering and trashing the HF bands on
> virtually every weekend ... there ought to be a ban ...]
>
> Carl - wa6vse
> wa6vse@fast.net
>
>
> This ones for Kim... (note this applies to ALL people who like Kim are
> not the least interested in the technical aspect of amateur radio (sorry
> Kim..there's absolutely no other way to interpret CS's comments on this
> one...maybe BS (Bill Sohl, he's favorite suck up can :-)))
>
> ***I have said that people who just want to yack, beep, chase DX,
> contest, etc. WITHOUT interest in or understanding of RADIO principles,
> theory, etc. are not true hams and belong in one of the other personal
> radio services.
>
>
>
> ***Wex, most hams are not "techies" today. The bulk of the population
> are appliance-operating communicators. A high percentage of those
> on HF merely use the radio medium as a playing field for various
> forms of electronic paintball wars (contests, busting DX pileups,
> etc.) where radio is rather incidental to the real goal of "collecting
> points" (or "wallpaper"). This "macho" stuff has little appeal to most
> of the real "techies" I know.
>
>
> And this gem from CS who so proudly puffed out his chest and proclaimed
> he worked 76 countries 52 states, 8 provinces, 4 planetary bodies, 2

> galaxies and 1 alternate dimension....
>
> ***So what??? You make it sound like DXCC is the pinacle of
> achievement ... I could care less about chasing DX or
> collecting senseless wallpaper.
>
> So boys and gals..interpret away. Bill, begin the spin. I wonder
> sometimes about you Bill. If Carl stops short, will your head actually
> end up in his upper intestine?? Get the connection? Oh that's
> right...I am an anon, a nameless faceless person, like so many here.
> Guess that puts me at the advantage Bill. I know all about you and your
> wondrous exploits of amateur radio NOT.
>
> Oh well spin spin spin
>
> Later..off to the winter wonderland..only a day late
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

2737. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:26:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52be27$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32248

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020126011845.21484.00000031@mb-fi.aol.com...
> Don't forget to omit the return address, then.
>
> BTW -- does anyone know if this is legal? I see a golden
> opportunity out there! Just the income from all the lazy, "I want
> something for nothing" no-coders would allow me to retire!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No wonder you've never gotten anywhere financially, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

2738. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:35:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <T6z48.78460$Y17.5056917@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32249

"Kim" wrote ...
>
> heh heh heh, it scores me as "obese." While I consider myself overweight,
I
> don't envision myself as obese in dimension. I don't look like a Mimi
> character, or a Roseanne Barr, maybe just slightly less than someone like
> Rosie O'Donnel (is that her name?).
>
> Anyway, I found myself wondering today if our discussion of weight is to
> somehow place judgement on people for their over- or underweight status.
> Hopefully not, as it has nothing to do with a thing...
>
> How'd we get talking about weight? LOL
>

I would hope that we wouldn't use how much someone weighs as a measure of their value in life. (although being an appropriate weight is a good and healthy thing) The other point is, don't take the test *too* seriously. I am at the upper edge of the standard height/weight charts. I am 5-10, 165 and don't think putting on a few pounds would hurt me a bit. I took one of these on-line health tests once, and it said that I should weigh 163. They suggested that I go on a diet and lose the two pounds because I was above the average for my height. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2739. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:35:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c045$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32250

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126070525.17702.00000514@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >Hey, go full tilt. Every piece of junk mail you get, put the words
"RETURN
> >TO SENDER" on, ship it back to them and let *them* fill their landfills
up.
>
> The postal regulations on bulk rate mail don't return such mail to the
sender.
> I am not sure if it would be disposed of by the local post office or if it
> would have to be sent to the dead letter office. All your suggestion
would
> accomplish, however well intentioned it may be, is to cost the post
office a
> bit of my money.
>

According to my sister, who works as a postal worker, there are differing circumstances--probably one of which you mention above--and sometimes the post office *does* end up with the stuff in the dead letter file. However, enough of that and the post office won't be so indifferent to the problem of junk mail and its impact on our environment.

> >
> > Same thing with what you think is excessive
> >packaging. Might cost a little, but ship it back and make it *their*
> >problem. (I don't do that, but I know people who will).
>
> So you are willing to spend the post office's money, but not your own...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Shipping a package back that contains excessive packaging for the originating offender to dispose of would be paid for by the shipper, not the post office. As I said, the people I have known in the past (many years ago when I "green" conscious) who did this were willing to spend the bucks it took to send the packaging back. If I recall correctly, and I may be way off-base, this was either thought up by Ralph Nader or he was one of the responsible people for "spreading the word" on it. I believe that packaging today comes more into line with reasonable, as a result of the threat of this idea catching on. Some people also used to go so far as to purchase

the product, unwrap right there at the store, and leave the packaging there.

But, this is all way off topic of ham radio, unless you know of manufacturers who package their radios excessively.

Kim W5TIT

2740. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:36:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c067_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32251

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126070641.17702.00000515@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >> What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio
numbers?
>
> >Wow, now that would be pretty darned neat. I'd be a SuppaHam at 101 wpm,
> >eh?
>
> And I would be a No-Keyboard Tech, or a slow-keyboard Tech+ at best. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

The irony....LOL ;)

Kim W5TIT

2741. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:37:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c0c4$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32252

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126080714.16072.00000546@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c521a56_2@newsa.ev1.net>, - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >> > Oh really? I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the
> >"my
> >> > radio is bigger than your radio" game.
> >>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >> Go to google
> >>
> >> http://www.deja.com
> >>
> >> and search on
> >>
> >> wa6vse lazy mooch
> >>
> >> and see what comes up.
> >
> > I don't do
> >"searches" on stuff like newsposts.
> >
> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here? I am
truly confused by such a statement.

Kim W5TIT

2742. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:39:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c141$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32253

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2uar7$66l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> True...BUT, in truth, there's nothing sacrid about saying Alpha, Bravo,
> Charlie... then using Apple, Boy, Cable if you didn't know the
> actual international phonetic alphabet. Non-hams do that all
> the time.
>

I hear *hams* do it all the time, too!

Kim W5TIT

2743. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:42:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c1d9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32254

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a2ubon$5s$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16bc3dc88edafda89896b9@news.earthlink.net...
>
> <SNIP>
>
> > So boys and gals..interpret away. Bill, begin the spin. I wonder
> > sometimes about you Bill. If Carl stops short, will your head actually
> > end up in his upper intestine?? Get the connection?
>
> The connection is that your postings have gone continually
> down hill to the level of infantile name calling and insinuations.
> Any effort at acting as an adult is gone from your rantings.
> Its time to just ignore your postings.
>

Yep. Sounds quite like what one would hear on some of the local CB war
channels, or on 38___ (whatever that frequency is...LOL).

> >
> > Oh that's
> > right...I am an anon, a nameless faceless person, like so many here.
> > Guess that puts me at the advantage Bill. I know all about you and your
> > wondrous exploits of amateur radio NOT.
>
> Yet another reason to drop you from those that deserve any
> reply. If you don't have the courage to identify yourself,
> you don't deserve the respect of any reply.
>
> You are, of course, free to disagree.
>
> No cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

Oh gosh. Wanna bet on whether he will or not? Oh yeah, people like this
are very predictable so it would be worth betting.

Kim W5TIT

2744. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 14:51:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c52c3e5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32255

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:T6z48.78460$Y17.5056917@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Kim" wrote ...
> >
> > heh heh heh, it scores me as "obese." While I consider myself
overweight,
> I
> > don't envision myself as obese in dimension. I don't look like a Mimi
> > character, or a Roseanne Barr, maybe just slightly less than someone
like
> > Rosie O'Donnel (is that her name?).
> >
> > Anyway, I found myself wondering today if our discussion of weight is to
> > somehow place judgement on people for their over- or underweight status.
> > Hopefully not, as it has nothing to do with a thing...
> >
> > How'd we get talking about weight? LOL
> >
>
> I would hope that we wouldn't use how much someone weighs as a measure of
> their value in life. (although being an appropriate weight is a good and
> healthy thing) The other point is, don't take the test *too* seriously.
I
> am at the upper edge of the standard height/weight charts. I am 5-10, 165
> and don't think putting on a few pounds would hurt me a bit. I took one
of
> these on-line health tests once, and it said that I should weigh 163.
They
> suggested that I go on a diet and lose the two pounds because I was above
> the average for my height. : -))
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

I'm with you on people-value. Yeah, while I am definitely overweight--hell,
no argument there--I "carry" it well I think. Heh heh, it's all over! I've
also had the "advantage" (if you could call it that) of going from one
extreme to the other. All through my teen-age years and up to about 30, I
was anywhere from 118 lbs. at my first son's birth to fluctuating between
121 and 130. When I met my southern husband (re: lots of fried foods for

eating), I put on maybe 10 pounds for the first few years. Then, we started going out a lot for eating--yep, I think that has a *lot* to do with it--and, then I quit smoking five years ago--although I really don't think that had that much to do with it because I don't *think* I ate like most people who quit do.

So, I've gone from skinny (actually quite shapely if I say so myself...LOL) to not-so today (however, I've still got curves at my waist). I'm also nearing 50 and would dare nearly anyone to meet whatever pretend standards they develop that say we should still be our shapely, young selves. As we grow older, in my opinion, we begin to realize the things that *really* matter in good people: honesty, kindness, cleanliness, ethical, etc.

Kim W5TIT

2745. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:11:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126121150.13187.00000533@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32256

In article <3c521317_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <writes:

>How'd we get talking about weight?

You started talking about size and weight, Kim

73 de Jim, N2EY

2746. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:11:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32257

In article <3c52c0c4$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >> Go to google
>> >>
>> >> http://www.deja.com
>> >>
>> >> and search on
>> >>
>> >> wa6vse lazy mooch
>> >>
>> >> and see what comes up.
>> >
>> > I don't do
>> >"searches" on stuff like newsposts.
>> >
>> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
>
>Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?

The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit you
might be mistaken"

What I'm saying is that you suspect that doing the search would show
you facts you won't like. People are often afraid of new information
because it may destroy cherished illusions.

> I am
>truly confused by such a statement.

Read the post that comes up when you do the search (only one post
comes up).

If you're not afraid, that is. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2747. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:11:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126121153.13187.00000535@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32258

In article <a2ub0cffv1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> What's an HW-201?
>
>Isn't that the old Heathkit linear?
>
Nope.

In Heathkit terminology, the HW-prefix means "transceiver". HW-7, HW-8, HW-12,
HW-16, HW-17, HW-22, HW-29, HW-32, HW-99, HW-100,
HW-101, HW-104, HW-202, HW-2026, HW-2036 to name a few. ;-)

Heath's most popular HF linear amplifiers were the SB-200 (pair of 572Bs) and
SB-220 (pair of 3-500Zs). These were slightly modifeid and renumbered SB-201
and SB-221 when the FCC came out with the external RF amplifier rules in 1978.

There was also the KL-1 "Chippewa", a true deskcrushing BA (pair of 4-400As)
and the much less expensive HA-10 (quad of 811-As).

Then there was the HA-14 (pair of 572Bs) that was meant for MOBILE (!) use -
but it had a fixed pi-net loading cap.

Finally the SB-1000 (single 3-500Z) came along, last of the line.

HW-202 was a 2 meter FM rig, xtal controlled.

2748. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:38:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C52E9A2.D605C65D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32259

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Part 97 was written to regulate the Amateur Service. It is directed
> toward everyone in the amateur service. There are not any certain
> particular individuals within the service for whom it does not apply.
> It is inclusive of all amateurs. Neither Part 97, nor I, claims that
> everyone must build a radio. But what it does say applies to everyone.

How does an inactive amateur radio operator meet any of the goals?
Should amateur radio activity be a requirement?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2749. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:49:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C52EC2C.35696A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32260

Bill Sohl wrote:
> True...BUT, in truth, there's nothing sacrid about saying Alpha, Bravo,
> Charlie... then using Apple, Boy, Cable if you didn't know the
> actual international phonetic alphabet. Non-hams do that all
> the time.

Not to mention the changes over time. In 1957, I was William Five
David X-ray Peter. If I remember correctly, 'D' was 'Dog' in the
early 50's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2750. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 17:53:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C52ED07.F5C1981@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32261

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > There is no external transmatch. The pi-net tuner is built into the amp.
> >
> With that piece of idiocy you just got yerself unanimously elected sysop for rrat.

I'm serious, Brian. My HW-201 was like that. I assume most of the
Ameritron amps are like that today. Why would anyone spring for
a $400 external tuner when the pi-net tuner is built in?

Of course, I don't have that problem since the impedance seen by
my SGC-500 amp is always between 25 ohms and 100 ohms.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2751. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 18:01:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C52EEE6.A2B8089B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32262

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which included
> >an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201
> >had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.
>
> Now I know you're not serious, Cecil. What's an HW-201?

Do I have the part number wrong? I had a Heathkit KW amp but I sold it.
Apparently I don't remember the part number?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2752. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 18:06:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C52F026.FC3EDC06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32263

Brian Kelly wrote:
> As if I needed to "explain" any of this "rocket science" to an EE.
> Where the hell DID you pick up yer EE anyway? South Podunk Texass
> Community Collitch?

Well, it certainly seems foolish to shell out $400 for an external
antenna tuner when the amp has a built in pi-net tuner. When I ran
an SB-201, I had a chart on the wall that got me close but I fine-
tuned the amp on the air. For years, I have been running my present
SGC-500 and preadjusting the length of my ladder-line for a match
so I don't have to tune up on the air any more.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2753. Re: Will it...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 19:52:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C530917.A436A678@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 32264
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

rasw wrote:

> ...make my ANTENNA bigger too?
>

Only your rubber duckie. :-)

==========
Take the money and Enron! :-(

2754. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 19:59:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201261159.379082e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32265

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not
> required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air. Plus, I
> am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either
> method as being the only proper way to tune.
>
>
You just did Sweetie, and written by three Amateur Extra Class
graduate engineers. You want it documented in First Corinthians or
what?
>
>
>
>Your posts, such as below, are
>a truly uncalled for attitude.
>
>
Yes mother.
>
>
> Kim W5TIT

2755. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 20:00:08 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <hTD48.79581$Y17.5206836@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32266

"CAM" wrote ...

> Not to mention the changes over time. In 1957, I was William Five
> David X-ray Peter. If I remember correctly, 'D' was 'Dog' in the
> early 50's.

And A-Able -- D-Day in the 40's.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2756. Re: More good ones - for HAMS only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 20:01:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C530B16.B51E2305@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 32267

Richard McCollum wrote:

> If a compromise it be. What I think will come of this is that we will
> have a lot of guys who will need to unlearn a lot of bad habits to get the
> the journeyman 16-20 level after they have been subjected to 5.

Shouldn't be a problem, as the tests are done Farnsworth style.
That is, the characters are sent at some higher speed like 13, but
are spaced out at intervals that average it out to 5wpm. The
theory goes that once you can do that test, it doesn't take all
that many hours of operating to find yourself operating at high
speed.

==========
Take the money and Enron! :-(

2757. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 21:07:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126160710.16311.00000492@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 32268

In article <a2uar7$66l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>there's nothing sacrid about saying Alpha, Bravo,
>Charlie... then using Apple, Boy, Cable if you didn't know the
>actual international phonetic alphabet. Non-hams do that all
>the time.

The Alpha Bravo Charlie phonetics were chosen for several reasons:

- None of them rhyme or even sound alike much
- People tend to say them the same way even with accents
- Almost none of them are place names (India, Lima, maybe Sierra)

Result is that you can punch a phoneticized voice transmision full of holes and
still understand it. The use of nonstandard phonetics can mess up that feature.

For example, if somebody uses "December" for D after using "November" for N,
it can cause confusion.

>> >> I also think hams should know Ohm's Law for DC and its practical
>> >> applications well enough to avoid stuff like trying to power a 50
>> >> watt rig through 30 feet of #20 wire from a 12 volt battery. That's
>> >> not well tested, either - one can get all the Ohm's Law questions
>> >> wrong and still get an Extra.
>> >
>> >I have written suggestions to the "test creators" on the same point.
>>
>> I put detailed ideas on written testing in my comments to the FCC. So did
>many
>> others.
>>
>> Yet it's still possible to know absolutely nothing about Ohm's Law and
>pass all
>> of the writtens, right up to
>> Extra. That's just not right, IMHO. FCC doesn't think it's a problem,
>though.
>
>The only solution to what you focus on is to break up the tests into
>subgroups of subject matter which then must each be passed with
>a minimum score.

Which I suggested.

> Odds are, however, that there's only a finite
>breakdown that makes sense...e.g. Rules, Safety, Theory...and
>in doing such, someone could probably still pass the theory segment

>and never do a calculation requiring a formula.

Not all the way to Extra if the tests were done right.

Rules, Safety, Theory is a good breakdown, btw.

>And I have yet to see/hear of any local emergency
>people (non-hams) that have any affinity for morse
>being used. Those local emergency people prefer to
>Not be needing an interpreter (which is what the CW op
>really is doing) but rather they prefer to hear the actual
>voice statements or read the text immediately off a terminal.

How many of them have been exposed to Morse used by operators with
decent skills?
>
>> >> Since hams are unpaid and self-trained, we have a different paradigm.
>> >
>> >True, and if YOU wnat to do CW, then go for it. On the same
>> >basis, I don't propose its use for emergencies.
>> >
>> >> How much SSB and FM do the military and commercial services use?
>> >
>> >Probably a lot of FM these days.
>>
>> I doubt it. Not secure.
>
>Is "commercial" permitted to encrypt?

Yes. We aren't.

>The military certainly
>can, but the vast majority of operations don't require
>encryption. Likewise, local police don't do that much encryption.

But that's the trend. Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
posts! But we hams are specifically prohibited from it.

73 de jim, N2EY

2758. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-26 23:09:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org>
Source record: 32269

On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>
> Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
> posts!

I'll bite. Who? And why?

Jon

2759. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 00:06:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rwH48.4133$Ab1.256552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32270

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
> > posts!
>
> I'll bite. Who? And why?
>
> Jon

As will I.

Two rules if one is planning to use his encryption technique for long:
never encrypt the same thing twice and never encrypt what the enemy
already knows. The Japanese made both mistakes at Midway and it cost them
their lunch.

2760. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:06:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020126200653.16072.00000572@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32271

In article <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not
>required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.

He's not arguing legality. Just good operating practice.

>Plus, I
>am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either
>method as being the only proper way to tune.

How much reading on the subject have you done, Kim? You told me recently
that you don't find QST interesting and yours goes unread.

>Your posts, such as below, are
>a truly uncalled for attitude.

His addytood is all warm and fuzzy snuggles compared to the guy who wrote this
gem:

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=wa6vse+lazy+mooch&hl=en&selm=79668t%24qs
4%241%40news1.fast.net&rnum=2

73 de Jim, N2EY

2761. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:35:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c53591c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32272

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126121150.13187.00000533@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3c521317_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <writes:
>
> >How'd we get talking about weight?
>
> You started talking about size and weight, Kim
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

OH, wow. No I didn't. You know what it was? I think there was some kind of round table on RRAP and taking on some acting roles, or some such...

Anyway,

Kim W5TIT

2762. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:38:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5359d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32273

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
> >
> >Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?
>
> The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit you
> might be mistaken"
>

I am usually the first to say when I am mistaken. I have no problems with
being mistaken; and think it's rather childish when people expect perfection
all the time.

>
> What I'm saying is that you suspect that doing the search would show
> you facts you won't like. People are often afraid of new information
> because it may destroy cherished illusions.
>

I don't know that I have a personality for "facts I don't like." And I can
assure you that, at least where a newsgroup is concerned, I have no
"cherished" anything...ROFLMAO!

> >
> > I am
> >truly confused by such a statement.
>
> Read the post that comes up when you do the search (only one post
> comes up).
>
> If you're not afraid, that is. ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I'll take your word for it.

Kim W5TIT

2763. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:41:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c535a8f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32274

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:hTD48.79581$Y17.5206836@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Not to mention the changes over time. In 1957, I was William Five
> > David X-ray Peter. If I remember correctly, 'D' was 'Dog' in the
> > early 50's.
>
> And A-Able -- D-Day in the 40's.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

Man! The more you OFs (said affectionately and with tongue in cheek) talk,
the more I really begin to wonder about whether ham radio truly ever did
have any "traditions." ;)

Kim W5TIT

2764. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:43:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c535afc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32275

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201261159.379082e7@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is
not
> > required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.
Plus, I
> > am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either
> > method as being the only proper way to tune.
> >
> >
> You just did Sweetie, and written by three Amateur Extra Class
> graduate engineers. You want it documented in First Corinthians or
> what?
> >

Brian, darling, don't you think it would be rather foolish of one to take
the three from this newsgroup and take it as policy across the ARS that it
is forbidden to tune on the air?

> >
> >Your posts, such as below, are
> >a truly uncalled for attitude.
> >
> >
> Yes mother.
> >
> >
> > Kim W5TIT

Sorry, you know what I mean, though.

Kim W5TIT

2765. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 01:56:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c535df5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32276

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126200653.16072.00000572@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not
> >required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.
>

I just noticed my severe mistake above. The last part of that sentence
should read "and does n-o-t break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier
on-air."

>
> He's not arguing legality. Just good operating practice.
>

Oh, bore. Another one of those magical gentlemens' agreements? I'll tune
on the air if the FCC ain't gonna bust me for it. If you don't like it,
Jim, or if anyone else don't like it, you can move your prejudices to
another frequency--I suppose. Or, you can choose to let it ruffle your
feathers from here to the next century.

> >
> >Plus, I
> >am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either
> >method as being the only proper way to tune.
>
> How much reading on the subject have you done, Kim? You told me recently
> that you don't find QST interesting and yours goes unread.
>

Well, knock me down and call me stupid. I *forgot* to ask every darned
amateur radio operator there is in existence before I made such a wild, wild
statement as *I AM NOT SURE* (a blaring uncertainty there). You're not
going to tell me that QST is the only source for information are you now,
Jim? Tell you what, there's a good poll for the ARRL to conduct: "How do
you tune for transmission?"

A) Through a dummy load
B) Through carrier on the air
C) Tune? I didn't know we're allowed music on the air

My *bet* (yes, there is a definitive statement for you, Jim) is that the
majority of tuning occurs on the air.

> >
> >Your posts, such as below, are
> >a truly uncalled for attitude.
>
> His addytood is all warm and fuzzy snuggles compared to the guy who wrote
this
> gem:
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?q=wa6vse+lazy+mooch&hl=en&selm=79668t%24qs
> 4%241%40news1.fast.net&rnum=2
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I could see the above has the wa6vse reference, which leads me to believe that it's probably something from Carl, again. If you guys are so hell bent on being angry with Carl, you really ought not try to get others involved in your argument. I have no problem with Carl.

Kim W5TIT

2766. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:07:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127000721.16072.00000584@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32279

In article <3c5359d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> >> >
>> >> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
>> >
>> >Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?
>>
>> The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit you
>> might be mistaken"
>
>I am usually the first to say when I am mistaken.

Not here on rrap.

>> What I'm saying is that you suspect that doing the search would show
>> you facts you won't like. People are often afraid of new information
>> because it may destroy cherished illusions.
>
>I don't know that I have a personality for "facts I don't like."

That's pretty obvious.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2767. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:07:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127000722.16072.00000586@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32277

In article <pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
>> posts!
>
>I'll bite. Who? And why?

It's a joke, Jon. Sorry it wasn't clear.

Think about PGP signatures.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2768. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:07:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127000722.16072.00000585@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32278

In article <3c535afc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Brian, darling, don't you think it would be rather foolish of one to take
>the three from this newsgroup and take it as policy across the ARS that it
>is forbidden to tune on the air?

Obviously Kim has missed the simple fact that two of those three think it's OK
to
tune up on the air if done in a considerate fashion.

What has been documented are ways of tuning up without emitting a signal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2769. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:10:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C537FBE.D92525DB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32280

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to and
> > > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> > >
> > > I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good will.
> >
> > Could that be because you have never been in one, and thus have a very
> > incomplete understanding of what is involved?
>
> I've been listening for 50 years, Dick. Manners have gotten a lot worse
> over that 50 years. I hear twenty junkyard dogs barking over their KW
> systems fighting over a DX bone and I just shake my head and keep on
> tuning.

Ah. So in 50 years you've never actually participated in the
hunt for a new one, but only sat aside and formed your detached opinions while
the hunt was actively conducted by the real hunters. Sort of a kibitzer. And
in so doing, you learned all about it. We see.

2770. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:36:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5385D1.953970C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32281

K0HB wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote
>
> > The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
> > to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators.
>
> As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The military
> abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war
> in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.
>

I'd wager the Special Forces had developed no contingency
plans to become horse calvary either.(a la recent operations in Afghanistan)

> Been there, tried that, it didn't work.

Worked for the Special Forces! Obviously there is nothing to be gained in
using less than than optimal modes where better are available, especially in
those circumstances. Police departments nationwide used radiotelegraphy for
routine long distance communications for several decades beyond the arrival of
TTY/RTTY, for cost saving reasons. They merely hired dispatchers who were also
CW operators, and they did dual duty. Lots of them were hams.

2771. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 05:46:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C538836.287074C8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32282

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Thu, 24 Jan 2002 18:41:23 -0500, Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > I suppose
> > that being a MCPO and drinking that retched coffee for all those years
> > can do those things to ya.
>
> I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
> do! :-)

Jon, evidently you were never in the military :-0

2772. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 06:02:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C538BE2.5B3B38BC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32283

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
> >> In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >>
> >> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
> >>
> >> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> >> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or DXing.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>
> >Oh really?
>
> Yeah, really. The term "electronic paintball wars" was used in other posts.
>
> >I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the "my
> >radio is bigger than your radio" game.
>
> I don't know that one.

Not to worry, Jim. She still thinks in CB.

2773. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 06:39:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C53948F.B5B36F05@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32284

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org...
> > On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
> > > posts!
> >
> > I'll bite. Who? And why?
> >
> > Jon
>
> As will I.

I figured you guys had read some of Carl Stevenson's diatribes. He uses PGP
on each and every post. Why?
<:-0

2774. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 11:02:16 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Y6R48.236$TS2.115561@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32285

Think about that one for a sec... A CSCE is only valid for one year.

I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders should be jumping for joy!

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message news:hv248.58552$Y17.4340664@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "KC8PMX" wrote in part ...
>
> >I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written and the code
> test.
> >
>
> Just curious -- CSCE for 5, 13, or 20?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
>
>

2775. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 11:02:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Z6R48.237$TS2.115489@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32286

By all rights asshole, I did pass the 5wpm test then and also by todays rule. The Old Fart VE's at the time changed the rules on their own. What a dumbass.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020125125856.18480.00000680@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Oh yeah.... had it not been for some VE's screwing up 13 years ago, I would
> >have been a licensee then. They chose what rules they wished to follow, and
> >made up their own.
>
> Yea right, I guess you could find anybody in 13 Years that would read the rules
> the way you wanted them READ, VERY LAME EXCUSS

2776. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 11:02:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <a7R48.5119$S67.301274@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32287

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C53948F.B5B36F05@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org...
> > > On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup
> > > > posts!
> > >
> > > I'll bite. Who? And why?
> > >
> > > Jon
> >
> > As will I.
>
> I figured you guys had read some of Carl Stevenson's diatribes. He uses
PGP
> on each and every post. Why?
> <:-0
>

He said something cryptic once about people trimming his posts. I let it
go in one head and out the other.

2777. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 11:25:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <vsR48.5129$S67.302049@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32288

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:Y6R48.236$TS2.115561@monger.newsread.com...
> Think about that one for a sec... A CSCE is only valid for one year.
>
> I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
> never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
> should be jumping for joy!
>

One of the better bits of advice my dad laid on me during a glandular
argument was not to overestimate my importance to the rest of the world.

2778. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:08:47 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <lJT48.104735$Ee7.7022115@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32289

"KC8PMX" wrote ...

> Think about that one for a sec... A CSCE is only valid for one year.
>
> I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
> never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
> should be jumping for joy!
>
>

I am fully aware of the period of validation for a CSCE. I just wanted to see you say it. You made it sound like it was the most difficult thing in your life to accomplish. But think, if you upgrade within the year, you will never have to deal with it again.

I do agree that you have met the requirements at the time of testing. That is something that we don't have any control over.

What I don't understand is why you wouldn't upgrade within the year so you could use the privileges you earned. I was an Advanced class and still didn't have an HF radio. I did get one shortly thereafter. However, that didn't mean that I couldn't use a club station rig or go to someone's shack and operate until I did.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2779. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:14:25 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.27.09.14.25.421214.20451@arrl.org>
Source record: 32290

On Sun, 27 Jan 2002 01:39:28 -0500, Dick Carroll wrote:
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
>> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>> news:pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org...
>> > On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup posts!
>> >
>> > I'll bite. Who? And why?
>> >
>> > Jon
>>
>> As will I.
>
> I figured you guys had read some of Carl Stevenson's diatribes. He uses
> PGP
> on each and every post.

That's not encryption, though. It's just digital signing. I figured that's what Jim meant but thought maybe he was referring to something different that I had missed.

> Why?

He claims that people have forged posts in his name. And that's not exactly unknown on Usenet. Using PGP signatures make it impossible to do that undetectably. Whether that's paranoia or prudence is a matter of opinion.

Jon

2780. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:43:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127094358.13814.00001019@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 32291

>I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
>never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
>should be jumping for joy!
>

Then why havent you upgraded, it isnt that really really tough written test, is
it?
I know that written can really cause you trouble, it has some really tough
Questions , like your Name, Addresse. And for alot of you Mentally Challenged,
those can be really tough Questions. So again why havent you upgraded??

2781. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:45:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127094508.13814.00001021@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 32292

>You made it sound like it was the most difficult thing in
>your life to accomplish.

It probably was

2782. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:50:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127095010.13814.00001022@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 32293

>What I don't understand is why you wouldn't upgrade within the year so you
>could use the privileges you earned.

You know why as well as I do. He probably doesnt have the CW CSCE, he is probably waiting for the next FREE handout by the FCC. Either that or he just loves being a CBplusser,or he has reached his Mental Capacity. 10-4 GOOD BUDDY

2783. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:56:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127095614.13814.00001025@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 32294

>By all rights asshole, I did pass the 5wpm test then and also by todays
>rule. The Old Fart VE's at the time changed the rules on their own. What a
>dumbass.
>

This guy is a GEM, the VEs cheated me, I knew I passed it, he says, the VEs just would not go along with me, they Cheated me. MOMMY MOMMY go talk to those mean old VEs, make them belive I passed, they just dont like me thats why they Flunked me.
You have to be ONE of the best examples of CBplussers I have ever run across.

2784. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 14:59:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541780_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32296

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127000721.16072.00000584@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c5359d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> >> >
> >> >> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
> >> >
> >> >Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?
> >>
> >> The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit
you
> >> might be mistaken"
> >
> >I am usually the first to say when I am mistaken.
>
> Not here on rrap.
>

Sorry, now *you're* wrong.

> >> What I'm saying is that you suspect that doing the search would show
> >> you facts you won't like. People are often afraid of new information
> >> because it may destroy cherished illusions.
> >
> >I don't know that I have a personality for "facts I don't like."
>
> That's pretty obvious.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, seems to me you're pretty set that I should be thinkin' some way I'm
not and that rubs you wrong.

Kim W5TIT

2785. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:05:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5418af_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32297

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127000722.16072.00000585@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c535afc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian, darling, don't you think it would be rather foolish of one to take
> >the three from this newsgroup and take it as policy across the ARS that
it
> >is forbidden to tune on the air?
>
> Obviously Kim has missed the simple fact that two of those three think
it's OK
> to
> tune up on the air if done in a considerate fashion.
>
> What has been documented are ways of tuning up without emitting a signal.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Oh, gosh, sorry. My point is that three people discussing the ways of tuning on RRAP are not a good "poll" Jim. I haven't read the text in all the posts on tuning, as I don't care how you or Brian, or Joe Schmoe tunes. I'll tune with a carrier.

Point is, there's nothing illegal about it. Three peoples' opinions here on RRAP do not a majority make. Get the ARRL to do the poll.

Kim W5TIT

2786. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:07:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127100726.17580.00000648@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32295

In article <a7R48.5119$S67.301274@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>He said something cryptic once about people trimming his posts. I let it
>go in one head and out the other.

I knew Zaphod Beeblebrox would show up on rrap sooner or later.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Make mine a Pan-Galactic Gargle Blaster

2787. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:07:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541946_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32298

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C537FBE.D92525DB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > > Don't you think the FCC wishes for all amateurs to subscribe to
and
> > > > > follow the goals set forth in Part 97?
> > > >
> > > > I don't see how dog-eat-dog DX pileups spread international good
will.
> > >
> > > Could that be because you have never been in one, and thus have a
very
> > > incomplete understanding of what is involved?
> >
> > I've been listening for 50 years, Dick. Manners have gotten a lot worse
> > over that 50 years. I hear twenty junkyard dogs barking over their KW
> > systems fighting over a DX bone and I just shake my head and keep on
> > tuning.
>
> Ah. So in 50 years you've never actually participated in the
> hunt for a new one, but only sat aside and formed your detached opinions
while
> the hunt was actively conducted by the real hunters. Sort of a kibitzer.
And
> in so doing, you learned all about it. We see.
>

;) 'Reckon he learned that kibitzer word as successfully as all he learned
about the Islam faith?

ROFLMAO...Kim W5TIT

2788. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:08:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541989_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32299

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C538BE2.5B3B38BC@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3c50c23b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20020124185954.02371.00001635@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > >> In article <3C503245.D52F71D3@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
writes:
> > >>
> > >> > What exactly are these infantile, competitive games?
> > >>
> > >> He doesn't actually say, but one can surmise it means any sort of
> > >> competitive on-air activity such as contesting, award hunting, or
DXing.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >>
> > >
> > >Oh really?
> >
> > Yeah, really. The term "electronic paintball wars" was used in other
posts.
> >
> > >I assumed that it was people who get on still playing the "my
> > >radio is bigger than your radio" game.
> >
> > I don't know that one.
>
> Not to worry, Jim. She still thinks in CB.
>

Ain't it cute how Dick C. is "ignoring" me? heh heh heh

Kim W5TIT

2789. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:11:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541a39_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32300

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:vsR48.5129$S67.302049@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:Y6R48.236$TS2.115561@monger.newsread.com...
> > Think about that one for a sec... A CSCE is only valid for one year.
> >
> > I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
> > never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
> > should be jumping for joy!
> >
>
> One of the better bits of advice my dad laid on me during a glandular
> argument was not to overestimate my importance to the rest of the world.
>
>

He left out the "or underestimate"?

Kim W5TIT

2790. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:15:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541b03_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32301

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.27.09.14.25.421214.20451@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002 01:39:28 -0500, Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> >> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> >> news:pan.2002.01.26.18.09.17.643701.25388@arrl.org...
> >> > On Sat, 26 Jan 2002 16:07:10 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Heck, I know somebody who encrypts his newsgroup posts!
> >> >
> >> > I'll bite. Who? And why?
> >> >
> >> > Jon
> >>
> >> As will I.
> >
> > I figured you guys had read some of Carl Stevenson's diatribes. He uses
> > PGP
> > on each and every post.
>
> That's not encryption, though. It's just digital signing. I figured that's
> what Jim meant but thought maybe he was referring to something different
> that I had missed.
>

Aw, you've taken away my husband and I's private joke--we've been giggling
over this one a few days...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2791. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:16:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c541b60_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32302

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127095614.13814.00001025@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >By all rights asshole, I did pass the 5wpm test then and also by todays
> >rule. The Old Fart VE's at the time changed the rules on their own.
What a
> >dumbass.
> >
>
> This guy is a GEM, the VEs cheated me, I knew I passed it, he says, the
VEs
> just would not go along with me, they Cheated me. MOMMY MOMMY go talk to
those
> mean old VEs, make them belive I passed, they just dont like me thats why
they
> Flunked me.
> You have to be ONE of the best examples of CBplussers I have ever run
across.

Yep, and you're sounding just like a plain 'ol CBer, no plus to it.

Kim W5TIT

2792. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:25:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127102505.18485.00001326@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32303

>Get the ARRL to do the poll.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Better yet get NCI to do the Poll

2793. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:30:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201270730.26c2619e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32304

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C52ED07.F5C1981@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > There is no external transmatch. The pi-net tuner is built into the amp.
> > >
> > With that piece of idiocy you just got yerself unanimously elected sysop for rrat.
>
> I'm serious, Brian. My HW-201 was like that.
>
>
An HW-xxx would have been an xcvr, there was an SB-200 amp, pair of
572Bs.
>
>
> I assume most of the
> Ameritron amps are like that today.
>
>
Yes.
>
>
> Why would anyone spring for
> a $400 external tuner when the pi-net tuner is built in?
>
>
First off it was SOP in days of yore to dump tuner-upper signals on
the bands for exactly the reason you cite. IF all yer antennas
have/had swrs which fell/fall within some short range around r5ï¿½+jï¿½. I
always had a homebrewed Kw tuner in the line because my lo-band
antennas were usually not nice tame coax-fed dipoles. And yes, I
dumped out tuner-upper signals because all I had was an swr bridge.
But I cranked the power 'way back to set up the tuner then I put the
amp online and did just what you did/do.
>
>
But that was in the days of yore. Technology improves and becomes more
affordable and time marches on. My *only* point is that these days
there are ways available to eliminate or at least greatly reduce the
volume of tuner-upper signals on the bands and that we have an inate
responsibility to do so.
>
>
Your mileage may vary but I haven't put a tuner-upper on the air for

several years.
>
>
> Of course, I don't have that problem since the impedance seen by
> my SGC-500 amp is always between 25 ohms and 100 ohms.
>
>
Good example of where it's all headed. That amp can't be "tuned"
either just like my 940 can't be tuned. Add rcvr-following kW ATUs
feeding coax-fed antennas and there ya go, no tuner-upper signals even
from the QRO crowd. Gonna happen.
>
>
w3rv

2794. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:31:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c541d64_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32305

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.24.19.53.08.320310.26516@arrl.org...
> On Thu, 24 Jan 2002 18:41:23 -0500, Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > I suppose
> > that being a MCPO and drinking that retched coffee for all those years
> > can do those things to ya.
>
> I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
> do! :-)
>
> Jon

Jon,

You're not refering to that infamous stuff that Ed brews in
the ARRL lab, are you? :-) :-) :-)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

2795. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:42:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201270742.2633faa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32306

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c535df5_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020126200653.16072.00000572@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not
> > >required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.
> >
>
> I just noticed my severe mistake above. The last part of that sentence
> should read "and does n-o-t break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier
> on-air."
>
> >
> > He's not arguing legality. Just good operating practice.
> >
>
> Oh, bore. Another one of those magical gentlemens' agreements? I'll tune
> on the air if the FCC ain't gonna bust me for it. If you don't like it,
> Jim, or if anyone else don't like it, you can move your prejudices to
> another frequency--I suppose. Or, you can choose to let it ruffle your
> feathers from here to the next century.
>
> > >
> > >Plus, I
> > >am not even sure I've ever even seen that much written to support either
> > >method as being the only proper way to tune.
> >
> > How much reading on the subject have you done, Kim? You told me recently
> > that you don't find QST interesting and yours goes unread.
> >
>
> Well, knock me down and call me stupid. I *forgot* to ask every darned
> amateur radio operator there is in existence before I made such a wild, wild
> statement as *I AM NOT SURE* (a blaring uncertainty there). You're not
> going to tell me that QST is the only source for information are you now,
> Jim? Tell you what, there's a good poll for the ARRL to conduct: "How do
> you tune for transmission?"
>
> A) Through a dummy load
> B) Through carrier on the air

> C) Tune? I didn't know we're allowed music on the air
>
> My *bet* (yes, there is a definitive statement for you, Jim) is that the
> majority of tuning occurs on the air.
>
> > >
> > >Your posts, such as below, are
> > >a truly uncalled for attitude.
> >
> > His addytood is all warm and fuzzy snuggles compared to the guy who wrote
> this
> > gem:
> >
> > http://groups.google.com/groups?q=wa6vse+lazy+mooch&hl=en&selm=79668t%24qs
> > 4%241%40news1.fast.net&rnum=2
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I could see the above has the wa6vse reference, which leads me to believe
> that it's probably something from Carl, again. If you guys are so hell bent
> on being angry with Carl, you really ought not try to get others involved in
> your argument. I have no problem with Carl.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
Completely predictable attitude, set of values, technical cluelessness
& response, right outta 27Mhz . . one more CB motormouth cum hammie.

2796. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:43:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5421ac_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32308

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127000721.16072.00000584@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c5359d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> >> >
> >> >> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
> >> >
> >> >Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?
> >>
> >> The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit
you
> >> might be mistaken"
> >
> >I am usually the first to say when I am mistaken.
>
> Not here on rrap.
>

In fact, here ya go (by the way, this is the last time you'll ever see a
Search done by me in the newsgroups). There's eight posted below:

****
From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: FCC Non-Renews for "Character"?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: (This is the only article in this thread) | Original Format
Date: 2000/05/10

Also, sorry to use "revoke." Bad mistake

Kim W5TIT

K0HB@uswest.net wrote in article <8fbp3s$6tp$1@news.netmar.com>...
> In a previous article, "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >Could someone provide some background information on this? Is there a
web
> >page or some other source of information where one could learn how this
> >story begins and how it got to this today?
>
> The FCC did not revoke his license. They simply declined to renew it,
based

> on his felony conviction regarding fraud in other telecommunications
> matters.

****
From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: 24-35 Mhz
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (3 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2000-10-05 19:03:11 PST

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20001005213103.23109.00000704@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<83545A62CD1D6200.29E2D9E6F85A1EE9.6A091A1438B035B8@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >Strike the "channel 36-40" comment made in another post by me....ROFLMAO.
I
> >was discussing with my husband this whole thing and made the same
> >observation. LOL
>
> A typical W5TIT posting. She wants you to ignore something *she*
> said as if she never said it, but would never extend the same
> consideration to you -- particularly if you disagree with her!
>

Er, hey, Larry. Yeah, you. The one who apparently is still a little cloudy
on thoughtwaves. I didn't tell anyone to ignore that I made a really,
really stupid mistake. And, I also have never said I couldn't. Big
difference between me and you--I can admit when I am wrong.

****
From: Kim-W5TIT (nospam@none.net)
Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (2969 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2001-11-22 22:11:45 PST

Sorry, Jim! No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the
"criteria."

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com...
> In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> >> Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> >> >
> >> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >> >
> >> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> >> >
> >> > Larry
> >> > Dick Carroll
> >> > Richard McCollum
> >> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> >> > Dave Heil
> >> >

****
From: Kim-W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: YES!! L.A. kicks BSA out of town
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (239 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2000-12-04 19:15:15 PST

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3A2C1F7A.1CCA@bellsouth.net...
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > What would be your answer then, to people
> > > who would have to have unwanted children
> > > with anti-abortion laws in place?
> >
> Kim,
>
> Would *HAVE* to have unwanted children?

That sentance should have been ". . .to people who would have unwanted
children. . ." Excuse the mistake.

****
From: Kim-W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: Seven people die because of no gun control
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (302 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2000-12-28 17:02:59 PST

"Keith Wood" <kw@bctv.com> wrote in message
news:3A4BDD8D.9547C03B@bctv.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:92fsu6$2mq$3@208.206.142.84...
> > >

> > >
> > > Aaron Jones wrote:
> > > >
> > > > If a guy walks up behind you at an ATM and sticks a gun in your
face,
> > > > being armed won't help much. He will just get your money *and* your
> > > > gun...
> > > >
> > > If a guy walks up behind you at an ATM it's because you're not paying
> > > attention, and what he should find is that object in your hand isn't
> > > your ATM card after all......
> > >
> >
> > Oh, yeah, that's just what I'd love to picture--everyone at an ATM
having a
> > gun in their hand. Yeah, that's a *cough* pretty picture indeed...
> >
> > Man, you must be a paranoid type!
>
> Hmmmm . . .you are afraid of concealed weapons, yet you call someone
> ELSE "paranoid"?

If I said "afraid" of concealed weapons (and I don't think I did), then it
was purely a mistake. I *DON'T AGREE* with concealed weapons (guns to be
specific) not because I am afraid of them or they scare me--but because I
believe in open carry as the greatest deterrent to threat, the greatest
education on gun safety, and the greatest tool for desensitizing fearful
fools.

****
From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: ARRL Secret Elections Coming
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (432 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2000/02/18

Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >However, is it the opinion of some that one must be a
> licensed amateur to have opinions on the hobby, the laws governing the
hobby,
> the very nature of the hobby? I would really find that kind of
> anti-democratic, if so...<
>
[I SNIPPED THIS ONE DUE TO LENGTH]
> The Twerp in question is a hate-mongerer. He has nothing
constructive to
> offer this NG other than to be a muck-raker.
>

Well, I actually considered changing my thoughts above when I read this
(I never "read ahead" when I respond to these things--my mistake,
huh?). BUT, I left it so that you could *maybe* see how, out here, it
looks like you yourself are "hating" as much as you claim someone else
is.

****
From: W5TIT - Kim (seventythree@eightyeight.net)
Subject: Re: ??? for Mr DX
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (45 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2002-01-26 18:04:59 PST

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126200653.16072.00000572@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is not
> >required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.
>

I just noticed my severe mistake above. The last part of that sentence
should read "and does n-o-t break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier
on-air."

****
From: W5TIT, Kim Walker (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: R&O is out ... Major victory for NCI and ham radio in general
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
View: Complete Thread (395 articles) | Original Format
Date: 2000/01/09

Lenof21 wrote:
>
>
> Whoops, sorry, not quite the right answer. One doesn't "learn" by
> just "being on the air." Operate on the wrong frequencies or using
> too much power than in regulations are all offenses...there is no
> defense in "just learning." Memorizing the answers to test
> questions won't handle everything after being licensed.
>
[I SNIPPED THIS ONE TOO]
I will always be sure to be operating within regulations, either by
having learned through repetition or by always being sure that I have
resources nearby to "look up" things. So, to learn by being on the air
is relative...and it was my mistake to generalize what I meant by that.
If I suddenly decide right this minute that I want to go do some CW on
any other band than 10M...I would have to look up my frequency
priviledges.

73 Kim W5TIT

2797. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:45:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c542225_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32309

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127102505.18485.00001326@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Get the ARRL to do the poll.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Better yet get NCI to do the Poll

Are you being deliberately belligerent? The NCI doing a poll on the most popular method of tuning (on or off the air) would be pretty stupid.

Kim W5TIT

2798. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:49:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c542198_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32307

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.01.19.19.24.25.77003.32668@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002 14:49:59 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >I'd suggest you consult with Ed on the
> > dangers of wagering with me :-)
>
> Why, has he been harmed because of it? AFAIK, he ended up having a
nice
> dinner out of the deal, even if he did have to pay for it. Talk
about your
> win-win proposition! Besides, Carl, despite what you think, you're
not
> ALWAYS right. :-)
>
> Jon

Jon,

If I had thought that Ed would be harmed, I wouldn't have
entered into the friendly wager ... and I hope that Ed enjoyed
it as much as I did.

(And I *know* I'm not always right about everything ... I don't
believe I've ever claimed I was ...)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQhbZe+N6+q84HiEQKNhwCghf7GKPVqj/MSbi3/K/+Lp0Wa324Anipr
xGdBTD2REmHuwORmd7O3Oxmm
=zu4u
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2799. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:50:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c542341_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32314

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201270742.2633faa@posting.google.com...
> >
> >
> Completely predictable attitude, set of values, technical cluelessness
> & response, right outta 27Mhz . . one more CB motormouth cum hammie.

Glad we understand each other, Brian. You act like one, too. I am beginning to wonder, really, what the difference is between a CBer who doesn't like someone and a ham who doesn't like someone. They act exactly the same way, to a 'T'.

Kim W5TIT

2800. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:50:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5421CF.94AE93E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32310

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah. So in 50 years you've never actually participated in the
> hunt for a new one, but only sat aside and formed your detached opinions while
> the hunt was actively conducted by the real hunters.

I'm not a masochist, Dick. Why should I participate in something I
find to be a pain in the neck? What is wrong with live and let live?
Why do all hams have to be DXers? I've said before, if something is
difficult, I'm not interested in doing it.

From something you said on r.r.a.a, I assume you don't like anything
except 50 ohm antenna systems (no reflections). I like experimenting
with all sorts of antenna systems including non-resonant systems.
Does that make me a better ham than you? Of course not. It simply
means that there are all kinds of interesting things in ham radio
for individual hams to enjoy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2801. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:54:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127105408.24338.00000459@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32311

>Yep, and you're sounding just like a plain 'ol CBer, no plus to it.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Hey TIT Bite me, but do it with your Teeth out.

2802. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:55:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5422FD.CF40589E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32313

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I figured you guys had read some of Carl Stevenson's diatribes. He uses PGP
> on each and every post. Why?

PGP is Carl's way of proving a posting is his or not his.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2803. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:56:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c542360_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32312

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120072837.13095.00002587@mb-dd.aol.com...
> I don't know the positions of most of the ARRL Board on code
testing. Has NCI
> ever had some of its members contact their ARRL Division Director
and ask him
> what his policy position actually is? That position could be made
public,
> although it would be the ethical thing to tell the Director what use
would be
> made of his position statement. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

We are aware of the positions of *some* of the ARRL directors,
(for or against I'm not saying ...) but in most cases, those views
have been given in some sort of confidence and it would be
unethical of NCI to make such private conversations public (as
you point out).

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPFQjNZe+N6+q84HiEQLvmgCgm652UkYcMyjxXsG7ITQMFeRVYbYAnRUm
OwiIovcrDo3lfht1vUxMkY8f
=rrRP
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2804. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 15:59:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5423E9.8AE95E05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32315

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I'm serious, Brian. My HW-201 was like that.
> >
> An HW-xxx would have been an xcvr, there was an SB-200 amp, pair of
> 572Bs.

I had an HW-100 and an SB-201. Got the numbers mixed up.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2805. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:02:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5424A4.FA6A72B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32316

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I was an Advanced class and still didn't have an HF radio.

Isn't that a violation of the "Basis and Purpose"? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2806. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:06:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5425a2_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32317

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4DB9A2.A3C70421@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a2cem0$1sr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > >
> > > Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c49a898_1@news7.fast.net...
> > > > In my view, the idea
> > > > that QST suscription is inseparable from membership
> > > > in the ARRL quite arguably inflates "membership,"
> > > > since there are quite likely quite a few "members" who
> > > > are actually more accurately characterized as "QST
> > > > subscribers."
> > > >
> > > How can you minimize the significance of paid membership
> > > in the ARRL without minimizing to an even further extent, the
> > > significance of the unpaid "membership" of NCI?
> > >
> >
> > I wonder just how significant the interest is in QST.
>
> Carl is saying that's the main reason people join the ARRL.

SIight correction: "Carl is saying that, IMHO, and from comments
I've heard/seen from many, the subscription to QST is a SIGNIFICANT
reason that MANY people join ARRL." It is clearly not the ONLY
reason,
but, as I stated, IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.

BTW ... I would NOT be one of them.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
```

Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQlcpe+N6+q84HiEQIo6gCgnoTerUlkyveqJwOXaSakhcUsnrkAnjvB
bLmXOpzPgVM623xfib6qDs5+
=SuER
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2807. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:15:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5427e2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32318

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020123080721.17580.00000527@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c49f6b5_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020119140515.09750.00001817@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >>
> >> >Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
> >> >the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
> >> >those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
> >> >the ARRL's former policy on Morse???
>
> How could such a change ever be measured?

That's actually a very good question ... I suspect it could
only be "measured," ... more accurately, I guess, infered,
from the results.

> If every single US member of NCI who is not now an ARRL member
joined,
> how many would that add to the ARRL membership? Probably less than
1%.

If you re-read my original post, I believe you'll find I said "If NCI
encouraged every no-code/slow-code amateur who's not an
ARRL member to join ... " etc. I don't believe I limited the target
population to NCI members.

[snip]

Getting down to the quote which I didn't see until I scrolled down,
I'm gratified to see that my memory has not failed ...

> >I have occasionally thought that one of the smartest things
> >we as NCI might do would be to actively encourage every
> >no code/slow code ham in the US to join the ARRL right
> >away and elect a slate of directors who would PROMISE
> >*in no uncertain* terms to vigorously support the elimination
> >of Morse testing in US rules as soon as the ITU Radio
> >Regulations permit.
>
```

> That would work IF the number of nocodetest hams in the USA were
> significant enough to make a difference in director elections.

If you look at current ARRL membership as a % of the number
of licensed hams in the US and also look at the number of
no-code/slow-code hams relative to "fast-code" hams, I think
one could correctly infer that the numbers are very likely large
enough to make a significant difference in the outcome of an
ARRL election, if those folks all joined, nominated a slate of
director candidates who *promised* to follow their views, and
voted for same.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQntJe+N6+q84HiEQJsJwCdF/XdKmq3GHk8c0bQYJLbrrDFybkAn1IO
7tnJV3gBhm4EpPQYH9DCyedE
=PGb+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2808. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:21:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c542acd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32319

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127105408.24338.00000459@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >Yep, and you're sounding just like a plain 'ol CBer, no plus to it.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Hey TIT Bite me, but do it with your Teeth out.

Now you're begging like a CBer. Does it get any worse?

Kim W5TIT

2809. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:37:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c542cfd_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32320

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201200047250.5484-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
> >> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >> >In fact, the notebook at the operating position
> >> >that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
> >> >switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
> >> >802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
> >> >802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
> >> >connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
> >> >devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
> >> >and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
> >> >other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
> >> >ham shack, and electronics lab.
> >> >
> >> >I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
> >> >(ROTFLMAO!)
> >> >
> >> >I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
> >> >802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
> >> >that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
> >> >I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
> >> >none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)
> >>
> >> You have an understanding problem:
> >
> >I would assert that perhaps YOU do instead ... as Ed
> >pointed out, it's a shame that amateurs are not availing
> >themselves of some of the techniques (and perhaps even
> >inexpensive equipment) that's been developed in commercial
> >circles ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> >lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
>
> Until recently, there was an impediment to such - the amateur rules
themselves.
> SS transmissions had to follow a specific sequence defined by the
FCC, but
> commercial equipment had no such restriction. The removal of the
restriction
```

> was so quietly done that hardly anyone noticed until some of us were made aware
> of it here....

Gee ... it was pretty well publicized by the FCC, ARRL, TAPR, etc. Where were you?

> >> I'm talking about AMATEUR SS on 2.4, not commercial.
> >
> >See the paragraph above ...
>
> But we are NOT permitted to avail ourselves to the equipment itself because it
> GOES OUT OF BAND (see the paragraph you quoted below). Therefore, we can't
> recognize the advantage of using this stuff with higher power, etc..., without
> substantial modification - which generally requires (besides skill) information
> (e.g. schematics) that the commercial manufacturers routinely DON'T PROVIDE.

The 2.4 GHz gear I'm talking about allows the user to select the channel(s) of operation within its capability via software ... no reason that hams couldn't limit their operation to the channels which fall within the band segment that hams are allowed to use ... no mods or schematics required.

Also, higher power, if needed, would be added with an external "brick" in all probablity, though I recently did a link budget calculation for a 6 mile link from my QTH to my company's closest facility and with a 20" grid dish at each end, I'd have link margin to burn for super reliability at 11 Mbps with a transmitter output of only +15 dBm (std output from the PCMCIA card) ... if I were willing to settle for a couple of Mbps (at least a T1 equivalent), I could either use smaller antennae, drop the power, or support a longer path with the same antennae and power.

[snip]

> Then why do manufacturers publish their ranges in feet.

The largest volume is in the PC-client to Access Point LAN environment ... I assume that you've seen data on products optimized for that market space ...

>Also, your example is
> not consistent in that you are adding antennas (the dishes) at each end, which
> is NOT part of the part 15 spec because the devices, as approved, don't come
> with dishes, but instead, these flimsy antennas that are more like an HT's

> "rubber duck" than anything else.

There are provisions for external antennas ... and Part 15
does not disallow their use ... Part 15 allows DSSS devices
transmitter output power of up to 1W (most devices don't
transmit near that power level because it's not needed in
most applications) and an antenna gain of up to 6 dBi without
a reduction in transmitter output power. Above 6 dBi antenna
gain, there is a backoff equation ... which requires a 1 dB
reduction from the 1W transmitter output limit for each 3 dB
that the antenna gain exceeds 6 dBi ... thus it is possible to
achieve fairly substantial EIRPs ...

> >This technology is inexpensive, reliable, and within the reach
> >of amateurs ... like Ed said, it seems a shame that more hams
> >aren't using it (or developing something like it ...)
>
> And as I have said, there are problems with that idea, as noted
above. It is
> not "as inexpensive ... [or] within the reach of amateurs ..." as
you say.

The going street price for an 802.11b 2.4 GHZ 11Mbps wireless
LAN card is well under $100 these days ... I'd call that "inexpensive"
for the capability it can provide ... certainly an EXCELLENT value,
compared to a 1200 or even 9600 bps "TNC" when one considers
the fact that the entire radio solution and all software are included
and
the significant increase in performance provided.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQsfpe+N6+q84HiEQKOOgCgtp15uolhx1+hO28zFCYmtX3B4VcAnRUC
LSv0U/Sij3YM3QYe4sIAurE3
=u/jl
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2810. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 16:50:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54301c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32321

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120001029.17580.00000459@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c49f0e8_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
> >users is
> >> allegedly very small.
> >
> >But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
> >high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
> >channel right away at any time of day or night ...
>
> Ya missed the point, Carl. Snipped it right out.
>
> On the one hand, I read that there are areas where no repeater pairs
are
> available. On 2 meters, anyway. On the other hand, I read that the
> assigned pairs sit idle 95% of the time.
>
> My question is, if there are so many repeaters on the air already
that
> are so quiet, why do we need more?

I don't believe I was asserting that we necessarily need more
repeaters (though coverage and reliability might be enhanced
by having more, if they could share the spectrum effectively).

> >
> >> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
> >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
> >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...
>
> Maybe.
>
> Let's say it's true. What of it? Repeaters don't build themselves. A
group
> puts up money, time, and effort to get a repeater on the air and
```

keep it
> operating. Often a repeater is the work of a few dedicated
individuals,
> supported by a larger group who simply pay the dues. It's natural
> for them to want control over their machine and its frequency pair.
>
> > this causes
> >repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
> >be producively using them ...
>
> How does having a dedicated pair cause it to be idle?

In the case of many metropolitan areas, at least, the pairs
have been "gobbled up" and given coordination to a user
group who may only infrequently actually USE the system,
but keep it closed to "outsiders" and refuse to share the
pair with another system.

> The REAL problem, it seems to me, is that there are more repeaters
> than hams who want to use them. I count 53 or so pairs from 146 to
148,
> plus simplex. If they were all busy, I could see a problem - but
they're not.

See above ...

> > the "rub" is when someone else
> >who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
> >there first ...
> >
> How often does this happen?
>
> >The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
> >telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
> >COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
> >to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
> >"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
> >that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
> >served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
> >is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
> >of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
> >"tied" to a dedicated channel ...
>
> I know all that. The trouble is that amateur radio is not the
> phone company.

No, but "the phone company" employed some of the brightest
minds in the world, who over the years developed a great deal
of insight into how to build ecomomical, effective, high capacity
communications systems. Much of that body of knowledge is
directly applicable to improving ham radio's use of it spectrum,
the availability of interference-free channels on demand, etc.

(IF we are willing to accept something "new" ... that may have
been invented and put into commercial practice many years
ago ...)

> >In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
> >integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
> >while maintianing a level of service that would keep
> >folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
> >MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
> >could ever handle.
>
> All depends on the demand distribution.

No ... what I'm contending is that a properly designed
system where bandwidth is dynamically allocated on
demand will outperform a system where channels lie
fallow because their use is artificially "restricted" to
certain uses (which may not be in demand at any given
moment, while bandwidth for some other use IS in demand)

> > The distinction between "voice channels"
> >and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
> >would disappear, because to the users, the system would
> >be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
> >"turf wars")
> >
> You're missing the point. Again.
>
> It's clear that hams could build repeater systems that are much
> more advanced than the current stand-alone, one-freq-in-
> one-freq-out systems we have today - IF we wanted to. But
> most hams don't want to because they don't see the need, nor the
> possibilities.

I personallly think that the REAL problem is that too few hams
can see the possibilities (or like Dick, flat out refuse to accept
the possiblity that any change from "the way things have always
been" could result in true benefits.)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQv5pe+N6+q84HiEQLDQACdGznMWJiqEOzEsk0ulxfW2H3JYSEAn0gO
8AG9M4Dy94BQq7YySNsNOtnW
=OWAb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2811. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:01:14 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31bbf$5h4$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32374

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126080715.16072.00000547@mb-fz.aol.com...
> BUT they DON'T have to UNDERSTAND those questions in order to get them
> right because the Q&A are not secret.

Ahh, so that's why I don't understand it. All this time I've been blaming
it on those darn Maxwell equations.

Secrecy, the root to all understanding.

2812. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:01:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5432a1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32322

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020120065238.13095.00002579@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
> >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
> >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...
>
> Given the useage of amateur frequencies on most bands, such waiting
is not at
> all likely. One would only have to wait if all available
frequencies were in
> use.

I think you're missing my point, Ed ... most repeaters
have a certain user group (plus or minus "transient
users") ... those folks have developed a mindset that
"their channel" (the repeater pair) is always available
for their (more or less) exclusive use. So they tend to
stay parked on that channel, "waiting for Joe to show
up so they can talk to him."

If another group were to put another repeater on the
same pair, then the two groups would have to wait for
each other to finish using the shared channel. So, it's
not a question of ALL frequencies being busy at any
moment ... it's a question that users don't want their
preferred frequency to be occuptied by "outsiders"
when they want to use it ... this has resulted in many
"repeater wars" over the years.

All I'm saying is that dynamically allocated use of
the spectrum (as in commercial trunking systems)
would result in the ability to support more users
without contention (for the media, as well as politically
and emotionally :-)

> The real rub is that there IS a need for such a system, even in the
relatively
> little used system of Amateur repeaters. Yes, there are ways that
the
> coordination process should be improved so that little used pairs
could be more

> easily deallocated to those who would really like to use them, but a
system
> that dynamically allocated frequencies in the Amateur bands would
allow
> everyone equal access to the bands in such a way that 99% of the
time, everyone
> who wanted to use the band could be accomodated.
>
> Yes, there ARE existing architectures that need to be considered and
there
> would be pain in the changeover, but real-world radio goes through
this, at
> much greater pain, when it has to. What is really ironic is that
when such a
> need arises, industry competitors are able to create committees and
find
> solutions, because they fully understand that having common
standards is better
> than not having them, and that it often goes past merely benefitting
everyone
> -- in many cases, having those common standards is a matter of
survival.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

And such "industry consensus" standards evolve to meet expanding
needs ... I just spent last week in Dallas at the IEEE 802.11 meeting
(an every 2 months event) with a whole (huge) hotel full of others
working
on just such things ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQybZe+N6+q84HiEQJVjgCg9KNrTG+fL85BrGfYw8hUdOOa7HIAn3f7
BPlhEHf/NnW8PN4ekvE5gijY
=ODda
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2813. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:04:11 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31bh0$5ha$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32376

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c5213e1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C50DA6B.D2B5D4E6@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > How many of us really live up to the Basis and Purpose? How many of
us
> > > really live up fully to the FCC R&R, period?
> >
> > Some of us at least try.
>
> I think many of us try. I think all of us should. However, the Basis and
> Purpose is not stating that it is an absolute that every ham be as the
Basis
> and Purpose calls for. It's not much more than a recommendation.

Do we also agree on the lack of value in being an exception to the stated
goals of the Basis and Purpose?

2814. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:09:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31bqg$5kq$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32373

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020126071043.17702.00000516@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Does Part 97 say you must? No, but it does give the impression that it
> >would be a good thing for you to do. Do you feel you, or anyone else
> >exempted from that?
>
> That's what I said. The FCC encourages, but does not mandate, that
individual
> hams meet the goals it has stated for the Service.

How did the word 'mandate' enter into the discussion? Either Part 97
applies to everyone, or it applies to no one.

I do not do public-service
> communications. My contributions to Amateur Radio are directed elsewhere.
> Do you feel that Amateur Radio would benefit if I were to do less of what
I do
> in ham radio and did some public-service communication instead?

Don't be absurd.

2815. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:12:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31c10$5pn$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32371

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c521370_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C50DA19.82E75180@uci.edu...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C5074C4.74652814@uci.edu...
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > > I am sure that the FCC, as a governing body, may *wish* that all
> > > amateurs
> > > > > would subscribe to and follow the goals set forth in Part 97.
> > > >
> > > > Thank you. That was my only point.
> > >
> > > And, my point is wish in one hand and shit in the other. See which
one
> > > fills up with reality the quickest.
> >
> > Yes. The 'hand' does seem to be filling up with that - and YOU'RE
> > helping it.
>
> Sorry you feel that way. I don't.

I think you were the one who told us about the hand filling up. Wasn't it
true?

2816. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:14:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31c46$5pq$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32375

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c52147b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C50DCBA.51EC454A@uci.edu...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > Each time I've been on the air on HF
> > > with this callsign (twice), it's been a matter of just a few minutes
and
> > > I've had a pileup on me. Both times I was the one getting off the air
> while
> > > there were still all kinds of calls out there.
> >
> > Wow. So you're pretty experienced in this. We were talking DX
> > pile-ups. You've been on the receiving end of a DX pile-up have you?
>
> No, no DX. However, a rose by any other name is still a rose, right?
Tell
> me what the difference would be between 150 or more calls from nothing but
> US stations would be like as opposed to 150 or more calls from all 'round
> the world? I am not sure I get your point and would appreciate some
> clarification.

Sure. The topic was international good will.

2817. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:16:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31c7o$5pv$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32372

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c521b46_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Hmmmm, I just noticed that Jim's question never mentions a "DX" pileup.
> When I responded, he snitted that we were discussing DX pileups. Waddup
wid
> dat, Jim?

Waddup wid dat? You're not paying attention, that's waddup.

2818. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:19:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a31ceb$5t2$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32370

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C52E9A2.D605C65D@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Part 97 was written to regulate the Amateur Service. It is directed
> > toward everyone in the amateur service. There are not any certain
> > particular individuals within the service for whom it does not apply.
> > It is inclusive of all amateurs. Neither Part 97, nor I, claims that
> > everyone must build a radio. But what it does say applies to everyone.
>
> How does an inactive amateur radio operator meet any of the goals?

I don't think he does. How does one go about factoring him in?

> Should amateur radio activity be a requirement?

Radio activity can be harmful to the health, particularly if the material is
ingested.

2819. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:38:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c543b4b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32323

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020121001026.13187.00000371@mb-cs.aol.com...
>
> The thing to be doing now is discussing what the new ARS license
structure
> should be without S25.5.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And what's wrong with the 3-class license structure we have
now? (except for the unnecessary, except for S25.5, code
test element, of course)

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFQ7Fpe+N6+q84HiEQKCJgCcCnAveKtN9Z6kwjE/DFQX/qrPbG0AoKli
QDBLPjRUrtQ2xLwlUCNFOR8r
=fj3z
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2820. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 17:48:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127124803.14898.00001259@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 32324

>Now you're begging like a CBer. Does it get any worse?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Just trying to get to your level

2821. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 18:22:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5445a4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32325

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201202120340.7029-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
> >>measured in feet, not miles.
> >
> >Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is
permitted 1 W peak
> >power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over
that, the
> >power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi
gain would be
> >about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of
about 400
> >watts. Feet?
>
> Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the external
equipment
> as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't regularly
done.....

Your assumption is not entirely correct ...

> >Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving
tens of miles
> >easily.
> >
> >Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham
bands, as is,
> >by merely selecting one of the available channels whose modulation
products
> >fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power
control, we can
> >run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could relatively
easily
> >achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.
>
> Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS
device? You
> must be making some sort of assumption I am not.

All 802.11b devices that I am aware of (and my employer has ~50%
market share) come with software which allows the user to define
a number of network setup parameters, including which channel, from
the allowable ones, the network will use.

> >Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from
harmful
> >interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would
not.
>
> Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL
SWD
> convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is a
JOKE on
> 2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already
exist....
>
> >Carl, as I am sure you are still hanging on, in what way does the
IEEE 802.11b
> >protocol handle the encoding of the network name? If I name my
local network
> >W1RFI, I am wondering whether that is transmitted in such a way
that it meets
> >the FCC identification requirements? You are our resident IEEE
802.11 expert,
> >so please fill us in.

I have replied via e-mail to Ed that I can't explain off the top of my
head
how the network name is distributed ... I'm more of a "PHY" (physical
layer)
guy than a "MAC" (medium access control) guy ... the network name is
obviously distributed, as all nodes in a network know it, but I don't
know
all of the exact details on format, how often, etc. I will try to get
the answer
to this question.

The easiest solution would be to persuade the FCC (if it hasn't
already been done, it should be) that the use of IP addresses
from the ampr.org domain are functionally equivalent as IDs to
callsigns, since they map one to one and the mapping is publically
available

> That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't
provide
> the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to
readily
> modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
> - To stay below 2450MHz, and

No problem, as Ed and I have both pointed out ... simply set the
right channel in the provided configuration software. No modification

required that I can see ...

> - To identify (in mode)(*)
>
> (*) - Due to its frequency hopping,

While the 802.11 standard does define a FHSS mode,
it is virtually unused ... the 802.11b DSSS-CCK extension
to the standard has taken over the market, since it provides
11 Mbps vs. the 2 Mbps maximum of the older base standard.

> I don't believe that ID'ing in morse code
> would be practical (or valid)

Nor should it be required ... IDing in Morse would be extremely
wasteful.

> unless the code is slow enough that every "dot"
> happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the
hop pattern.
> Id'ing in mode would have to occur. However, as an unrelated
problem, how
> would another amateur be able to tell the difference (from remote -
just by the
> signal) between a modified system as amateur vs. part 15 (its
original
> origins)? Not everyone has a spectrum analyzer, etc....

I believe that the easiest way would be to only "join" networks with
IP
addresses in the ampr.org domain ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFRFaJe+N6+q84HiEQI5dwCcD8cx6shuCnyXo7fKJSVYNcoOfwYAn2aC
GoqBNKT/JYyA0exFZICrlG2T
=cGfu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2822. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 18:25:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54465a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32326

Thanks for the example, Mario ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

"Mario" <hello_nasty@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:7578ddcf.0201201841.13e7562c@posting.google.com...
> > That gets to my other problem. Manufacturers of this hardware don't
provide
> > the necessary information (i.e. trade secret) for us to be able to
readily
> > modify this equipment. We clearly have two requirements:
> > - To stay below 2450MHz, and
> > - To identify (in mode)(*)
> >
> > (*) - Due to its frequency hopping, I don't believe that ID'ing in morse
code
> > would be practical (or valid) unless the code is slow enough that every
"dot"
> > happens to have part of itself land on every used frequency in the hop
pattern.
> > Id'ing in mode would have to occur. However, as an unrelated problem,
how
> > would another amateur be able to tell the difference (from remote - just
by the
> > signal) between a modified system as amateur vs. part 15 (its original
> > origins)? Not everyone has a spectrum analyzer, etc....
>
>
> Here is an example of ID'ing via ICMP packets on a wireless network:
> http://www.gbppr.org/pingid.html

2823. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 18:39:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54498b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32327

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>
> So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM across the
entire
> band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a
manufacturer,
> especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).

It is spread spectrum, according to the Part 15 rules ... however,
a single channel doesn't use the entire 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM
band ... nor do/did the Part 15 rules ever require it to do so ...
Im not sure where you got the (apparent) idea that a single device
used the entire band at once.

Carl - wa6vse

2824. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 18:55:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c544d55_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32328

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 21 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> >D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
> >>On 20 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >>>>However, also remember the range of your wireless LAN - it's
> >>>>measured in feet, not miles.
> >>>
> >>>Ah, if only it were so. An SS Part 15 device on 2.4 GHz is
permitted 1 W peak
> >>>power and 6 dBi antenna gain. For each 3 dB of antenna gain over
that, the
> >>>power needs to be reduced by 1 dB. So, 100 milliwatts and 36 dBi
gain would be
> >>>about the top end of the practicality limit. This is an EIRP of
about 400
> >>>watts. Feet?
> >>
> >>Only if the part 15 device received its acceptance with the
external equipment
> >>as an option. It's my understanding that this isn't regularly
done.....
> >
> >No. Optional equipment can be approved separately for use with the
> >transceiver and this is done quite often. This allows third
parties to
> >produce the optional equipment, which I guess is good for
competition.
> >For example, see http://www.hyperlinktech.com
> >
> >I used 24 dBi antennas and pole-top external amplifiers (to
compensate
> >for the coax losses) to support an 802.11 link over 4 miles at my
old
> >house. This worked fine, in fact it was overkill since it
continued to
> >work even after the power supply for one of the amplifiers fried
itself.
> >
> >>>Some of the hobbyist users of wireless LANs have been achieving
```

tens of miles
> >>>easily.
> >>>
> >>>Hams, btw, can use these Part 15 devices quite legally in the ham
bands, as is,
> >>>by merely selecting one of the available channels whose
modulation products
> >>>fall entirely within the ham bands. Without automatic power
control, we can
> >>>run up to 1 watt and unlimited antena gain, so we could
relatively easily
> >>>achieve 4kW EIRP and do some serious work.
> >>
> >>Ah, but since when does the user have frequency control of a SS
device? You
> >>must be making some sort of assumption I am not.
> >
> >He's talking about IEEE 802.11b devices. For the U.S. the standard
divides
> >the band into 11 overlapping channels at 5 MHz spacing, each about
20 MHz
> >wide, and you pretty much always get to pick which channel to use.
Channels
> >1 (center at 2412) through 6 (center at 2437) will keep it within
the amateur
> >band. Note also that 802.11b is DSSS, and at 11 Mbps in a 22 MHz
channel
> >isn't getting much coding gain either. Since it copes with noise
by
> >falling back in speed to increase the coding gain, using this stuff
to
> >best advantage in the presence of other 2.4 GHz devices requires
picking
> >frequencies carefully. For my house I ended up on channel 6, at
the middle
> >of the band, since going much higher or lower caused grief to my
Siemens
> >cordless phones. This, of course, maximizes my exposure to
interference
> >from the microwave oven, but this only causes trouble within about
10'
> >of the oven.
>
> So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM across
the entire
> band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a
manufacturer,
> especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).
>
> >Unfortunately 802.11 FHSS equipment, which is lower speed but more

> >robust, will by default hop across the entire band. It may be
possible
> >to reduce this at the programming interface to the chip (the
hardware
> >must support reduced bandwidth hopping sequences if it is to be
sold
> >in countries where the 2.4 GHz band isn't as wide as in the U.S.,
the
> >only question is whether it can be told to do this at lower
frequencies),
> >so to use these you'd need to know something about the hardware.
>
> That's my point. The manufacturers won't tell.

The issue of 802.11 FHSS equipment is rather moot, since that
part of the standard effectively died years ago when the 11 Mbps
802.11b extension to the standard came to market ...

BTW ... the IEEE 802.11 standard and its released extensions
should be available for FREE download at:

http://standards.ieee.org/getieee802/

(be prepared for quite a bit of reading ...)

> >>>Amateur use of 2.4 GHz would be unconditionally protected from
harmful
> >>>interfernece from the SS operation, but Part 15 operation would
not.
> >>
> >>Right, but as I mentioned when we talked face-to-face at the ARRL
SWD
> >>convention for 2001 in Riverside, CA, "protection" from part 15 is
a JOKE on
> >>2.4GHz, considering all the "bad" part 15 devices that already
exist....
> >
> >I don't get it. 2.4 GHz is a shared band and will never be quiet,
> >but the Part 15 devices themselves seem to cope within their
constraints
> >and that includes links that extend for miles. It may be you need
to
> >use modulation and coding as robust as the Part 15 devices do, and
it
> >may be that it is way too noisy to support a 60 mile link at 1/4
Watt,
> >but as an amateur you aren't limited to 1/4 Watt either. It
reduces
> >to an engineering problem.

The paragraph above makes a VERY good point ... Part 15 devices
"live" quite well in the shared band environment because they are

applied sensibly and the modulation, coding, and protocols are
robust enough to provide reliable operation despite the interference
environment in which they must operate.

The solution to reliable operation (for hams as well) is to use
good engineering techniques to arrive at a solution that works,
rather than always expecting some minimalist approach to work,
based in the idea that the channel will always be "clear."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFRM65e+N6+q84HiEQJmWQCgi2wmEi2HuDIUYDbyz+WNkdgfY08AoM3O
21MdTeg1AiebR/JnI4vd6sZv
=FTsD
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2825. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:05:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54508e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32329

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212123070.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>
> If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do NOT
assume that
> the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it also
says that it
> can be

The user's manual fro my Yaesu Ft-847 lists a rather impressive
range of operating frequencies. Do I assume that it operates on
every frequency in that range simultaneously? Of course not ...
in fact, I think it goes without saying that I (and others) would be
most upset if it did ... :-)

I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...

> >
> >Typing "DE WIRFI" every 10 minutes would do it. The computer could
do it for
> >you.
>
> But who can read it? Don't the wireless lan stuff encrypt so only
devices on
> the same virtual lan can read the packets....?

Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on now
:-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFRPbZe+N6+q84HiEQKvYwCcDsruQfYQBAGs7WyynucIRLZtLVYAoKoQ
FPRbkbhPmZ2skwYvTBYOlrOB
=ghoK
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2826. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Propos...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:09:01 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54508f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32330

It was "Proverbial" ... an ancient herbal beer :-)

Carl - wa6vse

"Bill, KD0HG" <shoot@spammersonsight.org> wrote in message
news:30jp4u85bnd5v5ij4vb6tf6inqeof8rp64@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 22 Jan 2002 02:06:15 GMT, "Bill, KD0HG"
<shoot@spammersonsight.org>
> wrote:
>
> >rusty beer can
> (snip)
>
> Man, talk about entering old-fartdom- It's been a while since I've seen
one of
> those.
>
> Was it Falstaff or Schlitz?
>
> -Bill/HG
>
>

2827. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:13:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c545180_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32331

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> > lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
>
> You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?

Jim,

I believe you know full-well that I was talking about
the average level of tehcnical competence, relative
to the state of the art in communications technology,
as well as willingness to accept new things that
are different from "the way it's always been."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFRRO5e+N6+q84HiEQIe3gCfU4oj1BdpUpSQp6adEC4+9GtydHIAn1Gk
zT55sh8JLlD2qYIRIZ+adpGl
=zOMO
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2828. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:25:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5455a9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32332

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127124803.14898.00001259@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Now you're begging like a CBer. Does it get any worse?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Just trying to get to your level

Dude, lemme assure you, you'd be out of breath long before you ever get up
that many steps.

Kim W5TIT

2829. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:35:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <uEY48.5327$Ab1.341183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32333

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127100726.17580.00000648@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a7R48.5119$S67.301274@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >He said something cryptic once about people trimming his posts. I let
it
> >go in one head and out the other.
>
> I knew Zaphod Beeblebrox would show up on rrap sooner or later.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Make mine a Pan-Galactic Gargle Blaster

Couple of those and you will be firing up the Infinite Improbability Drive
and sanitizing a telephone.

2830. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 19:45:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127144536.13187.00000587@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32334

"Kim" writes:

>"N2EY" writes:
>>
>> >How'd we get talking about weight?
>>
>> You started talking about size and weight, Kim

>OH, wow. No I didn't.

Yes, you did:

From google, a few days ago:

Kim wrote:

(begin quote)

>You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
>clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:

(end quote)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2831. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 20:24:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5463a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32335

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127144536.13187.00000587@mb-cs.aol.com...
> "Kim" writes:
>
> >"N2EY" writes:
> >>
> >> >How'd we get talking about weight?
> >>
> >> You started talking about size and weight, Kim
>
> >OH, wow. No I didn't.
>
> Yes, you did:
>
> From google, a few days ago:
>
> Kim wrote:
>
> (begin quote)
>
> >You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size
20
> >clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:
>
> (end quote)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Ah, yes, so true. However, you're quite wrong about my bringing size and weight up first. The line you have so carefully chosen out of context in order to attempt to prove a point that does not exist--except for possibly in your own mind--is one that was in reponse to the boring Jay, who had the following to say--thus being the first comment on size and weight (NOTE: Care to keep up with retrieving old posts, by the way?):

Jay's post:

In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.

> >
>
> ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable, Bill!
> I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

And, then, here's my post in response:

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> > > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> > > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
> > >
> >
> > ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> > committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,
Bill!
> > I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
> when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
> Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:

Q: Know why women have a hard time with math?
A: Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"

Kim W5TIT

2832. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 21:01:17 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <3MZ48.106645$Ee7.7173903@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32336

"CAM" wrote ...

> Isn't that a violation of the "Basis and Purpose"? :-)

Nope, I was still on the air (borrowed rig) and building antennas. : -))

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2833. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 21:07:57 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <kSZ48.106682$Ee7.7177130@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32337

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote ...

> Ed,
>
> We are aware of the positions of *some* of the ARRL directors,
> (for or against I'm not saying ...) but in most cases, those views
> have been given in some sort of confidence and it would be
> unethical of NCI to make such private conversations public (as
> you point out).
>

Why would knowing the position of a BoD of ARRL be unethical? I would think
they would *want* the membership to know. Unless, of course, it went
against the grain of what the majority of members wanted, Hmmmmm.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2834. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 21:17:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127161710.01332.00001107@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32338

>Dude, lemme assure you, you'd be out of breath long before you ever get up
>that many steps.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

I take it you use an Escalator

2835. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 21:18:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127161807.01332.00001109@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32339

>Dude

By the way Im not your Dude

2836. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 21:21:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127162132.01332.00001111@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32340

> Because men have always tried to convince them that 2" is really 8"
>
>Kim W5TIT

Whats sad is most women believe it

2837. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 22:00:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272143080.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32341

```
On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201200047250.5484-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
>> >> On Sat, 19 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >> >In fact, the notebook at the operating position
>> >> >that I'm typing this message on is linked to my 100 mbps
>> >> >switched hub Ethernet LAN by an 11 mbps 2.4 GHz
>> >> >802.11b link from a PCMCIA card in the notebook to my
>> >> >802.11b residential gateway ... that box provides the
>> >> >connection to the outside world for both wired and wireless
>> >> >devices , dishes out DHCP addresses for both wired
>> >> >and wireless devices, and bridges the wireless clients to the
>> >> >other computers on the wired LAN here in my home office,
>> >> >ham shack, and electronics lab.
>> >> >
>> >> >I'm REALLY disappointed to hear that it doesn't work
>> >> >(ROTFLMAO!)
>> >> >
>> >> >I'll have to tell the 1000+ engineers at the IEEE Project
>> >> >802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee meeting in Dallas
>> >> >that I'm attending this coming week the bad news :-)
>> >> >I'm sure that they'll be equally disappointed to hear that
>> >> >none of our products work :-) (ROTFLMAO!)
>> >>
>> >> You have an understanding problem:
>> >
>> >I would assert that perhaps YOU do instead ... as Ed
>> >pointed out, it's a shame that amateurs are not availing
>> >themselves of some of the techniques (and perhaps even
>> >inexpensive equipment) that's been developed in commercial
>> >circles ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
>> >lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
>>
>> Until recently, there was an impediment to such - the amateur rules
>themselves.
>> SS transmissions had to follow a specific sequence defined by the
>FCC, but
>> commercial equipment had no such restriction. The removal of the
```

>restriction
>> was so quietly done that hardly anyone noticed until some of us were
>made aware
>> of it here....
>
>Gee ... it was pretty well publicized by the FCC, ARRL, TAPR, etc.
>Where were you?

The change to the SS part of the rules I missed, because as a volunteer examiner, there were many more changes that I had to actually pay attention to.

What TAPR says is unimportant. Too many people have placed so much artificial importance in that group, their statements on anything are effectively worthless. A TAPR endorsement of anything is basically detrimental.

>> >> I'm talking about AMATEUR SS on 2.4, not commercial.
>> >
>> >See the paragraph above ...
>>
>> But we are NOT permitted to avail ourselves to the equipment itself
>because it
>> GOES OUT OF BAND (see the paragraph you quoted below). Therefore,
>we can't
>> recognize the advantage of using this stuff with higher power,
>etc..., without
>> substantial modification - which generally requires (besides skill)
>information
>> (e.g. schematics) that the commercial manufacturers routinely DON'T
>PROVIDE.
>
>The 2.4 GHz gear I'm talking about allows the user to select the
>channel(s) of operation within its capability via software ... no
>reason that hams couldn't limit their operation to the channels
>which fall within the band segment that hams are allowed to
>use ... no mods or schematics required.

But as Ed Hare noted, these devices usually DON'T say so on the box, but simply say something like, "Frequency range: 2400-2483.5" even if they only choose a 20MHz window in that range. Are we supposed to GUESS?

>Also, higher power, if needed, would be added with an external
>"brick" in all probablity, though I recently did a link budget
>calculation for a 6 mile link from my QTH to my company's
>closest facility and with a 20" grid dish at each end, I'd have
>link margin to burn for super reliability at 11 Mbps with a
>transmitter output of only +15 dBm (std output from the PCMCIA
>card) ... if I were willing to settle for a couple of Mbps (at least a
>T1 equivalent), I could either use smaller antennae, drop the power,
>or support a longer path with the same antennae and power.
>
>[snip]
>

>> Then why do manufacturers publish their ranges in feet.
>
>The largest volume is in the PC-client to Access Point LAN
>environment ... I assume that you've seen data on products
>optimized for that market space ...

Isn't all the 2.4 wireless lan stuff (since it must meet part 15) "products
optimized for that market space"?

>>Also, your example is
>> not consistent in that you are adding antennas (the dishes) at each
>end, which
>> is NOT part of the part 15 spec because the devices, as approved,
>don't come
>> with dishes, but instead, these flimsy antennas that are more like
>an HT's
>> "rubber duck" than anything else.
>
>There are provisions for external antennas ... and Part 15
>does not disallow their use ... Part 15 allows DSSS devices
>transmitter output power of up to 1W (most devices don't
>transmit near that power level because it's not needed in
>most applications) and an antenna gain of up to 6 dBi without
>a reduction in transmitter output power. Above 6 dBi antenna
>gain, there is a backoff equation ... which requires a 1 dB
>reduction from the 1W transmitter output limit for each 3 dB
>that the antenna gain exceeds 6 dBi ... thus it is possible to
>achieve fairly substantial EIRPs ...
>
>> >This technology is inexpensive, reliable, and within the reach
>> >of amateurs ... like Ed said, it seems a shame that more hams
>> >aren't using it (or developing something like it ...)
>>
>> And as I have said, there are problems with that idea, as noted
>above. It is
>> not "as inexpensive ... [or] within the reach of amateurs ..." as
>you say.
>
>The going street price for an 802.11b 2.4 GHZ 11Mbps wireless
>LAN card is well under $100 these days ... I'd call that "inexpensive"
>for the capability it can provide ... certainly an EXCELLENT value,
>compared to a 1200 or even 9600 bps "TNC" when one considers
>the fact that the entire radio solution and all software are included
>and
>the significant increase in performance provided.

Now, that someone has finally said that it is possible to use WITHOUT
MODIFICATION (because what the manufacturers publish on their packaging is
misleading and/or just plain wrong), that makes a difference.

As noted by Mr. Hare too: Mr. Ham goes into store. Mr. Ham sees 2.4GHz wireless lan stuff. Mr. Ham picks up box, reads "2400-2483.5" as the range, and puts it down, because, not knowing this well-hidden variation to the standard, Mr. Ham does not know that this means a 20MHz window in that range, and thus discounts the complete idea because modifying the equipment to keep it in band (a necessary step perceived by Mr. Ham due to improper disclosure on the box) is too difficult or takes too much time.

What is wrong with that picture? Nowhere was Mr. Ham able to find and learn about this 20Mhz window of operation feature that makes otherwise [perceived] unusable equipment (due to out of band transmission) usable (and wholly in band).

As a person involved in manufacture, shouldn't you be telling your potential [secondary target] market about this?

Personally, until this thread surfaced in this group, I was like the fictitious Mr. Ham above - not knowing the difference between the .11 and .11b standards. I admit that I have learned something.

2838. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 22:04:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272204000.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32342

On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>>
>> So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM across the
>entire
>> band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a
>manufacturer,
>> especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).
>
>It is spread spectrum, according to the Part 15 rules ... however,
>a single channel doesn't use the entire 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM
>band ... nor do/did the Part 15 rules ever require it to do so ...
>Im not sure where you got the (apparent) idea that a single device
>used the entire band at once.

From the fact that the box of such a device specifies the ENTIRE band as its frequency range, that implies that its hop sequence includes frequency slices across the ENTIRE band, not a limited subset of it.

2839. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-27 22:11:16 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272206100.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32343

On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212123070.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>>
>> If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do NOT
>assume that
>> the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it also
>says that it
>> can be
>
>The user's manual fro my Yaesu Ft-847 lists a rather impressive
>range of operating frequencies. Do I assume that it operates on
>every frequency in that range simultaneously? Of course not ...
>in fact, I think it goes without saying that I (and others) would be
>most upset if it did ... :-)

No, but you do assume that it CAN operate on any (within the channelization resolution of the VCO, etc.) frequency in the range.

With SS, one generally assumes that the device may hop to any frequency within its range. Owners of such devices don't have control over the hop pattern - such is the firmware's responsibility.

If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without indicating that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there a reason for someone to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range given, especially considering that such was in the older specification of the standard it followed (and not being aware of the changes in the standard)?

>I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
>necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...

Of course not - that would be "wide band," not spread spectrum. However, unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do assume that a SS signal may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.

>> >Typing "DE WIRFI" every 10 minutes would do it. The computer could
>do it for
>> >you.
>>
>> But who can read it? Don't the wireless lan stuff encrypt so only
>devices on
>> the same virtual lan can read the packets....?

>
>Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
>obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
>encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
>the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
>that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on now

Again, a non-evident user choice.

2840. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201036.05631.00001957@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32345

In article <3c52bd8c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Jay: There are support groups for your malady. I really don't see the
>correlation between Carl's dismay with piss-poor ham operators and those
>who--like me--*are* the embodiment of a non-technical ham *BUT* conduct
>themselves within all accepted operating practices on the air. I think you
>are painting much too much into Carl's posts. However, you also seem to be
>reacting in a way that leads me to believe *you* would be one of his
>targets. You sure do act like it in your posts.
>
>Buhbye, ain't got time for your rambling, and CBish style warring.

This "Jay" pseudonym is another in a family of handles (such as
"Funguy") which originate from Steve Adell, KF2TI.

There is direct, distinctive proof for all who can get the full message
content. Send a private message and I will point it out.

2841. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201037.05631.00001958@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32347

In article <3C5385D1.953970C7@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>K0HB wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" wrote
>>
>> > The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
>> > to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators.
>>
>> As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The military
>> abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war
>> in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.
>>
>
> I'd wager the Special Forces had developed no contingency
>plans to become horse calvary either.(a la recent operations in Afghanistan)
>
>> Been there, tried that, it didn't work.
>
> Worked for the Special Forces!

There is NO evidence that U.S. Army Special Forces have used
telegraphy or radiotelegraphy in Afghanistan in 2001 or 2002 or
that the U.S. military has used it in the Gulf War of 1990-1991.

>Obviously there is nothing to be gained in
>using less than than optimal modes where better are available, especially in
>those circumstances. Police departments nationwide used radiotelegraphy for
>routine long distance communications for several decades beyond the arrival
>of TTY/RTTY, for cost saving reasons. They merely hired dispatchers who were
>also CW operators, and they did dual duty. Lots of them were hams.

...the mythos and misinformation continues to be propagated
through the "C Layer." :-)

Anyone interested in radios used in the police departements of
a small state such as California can look into the California
Highway Patrol radio history site at -

www.mbay.net/~wb6nvh/chpradio.htm

www.mbay.net/!wb6nvh/motodata.htm

(second one for Motorola equipment used before WW2)

For Jack Webb fans there is a larger site about the Los Angeles Police Department, including a couple of pages of their radio history, past and present, at -

www.snowcrest.net/marnells/kma367.htm

www.qsl.net/n6uru/kma367.htm

(second one is alternate entry for first, vice-versa)

Those sites have links to San Diego, San Francisco CA PDs, Denver, Lake County IL, Detroit, Bayonne NJ, Trenton NJ, Toledo OH, San Antonio TX, plus some cities in Australia and New Zealand PDs.

Best regards...and "Book 'em, Danno!"

2842. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201042.05631.00001959@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32348

In article <3c535a8f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:hTD48.79581$Y17.5206836@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>> "CAM" wrote ...
>>
>> > Not to mention the changes over time. In 1957, I was William Five
>> > David X-ray Peter. If I remember correctly, 'D' was 'Dog' in the
>> > early 50's.
>>
>> And A-Able -- D-Day in the 40's.
>>
>> Arnie -
>> KT4ST
>>
>> www.qsl.net/kt4st
>> Home of Walt's World on the web

>
>Man! The more you OFs (said affectionately and with tongue in cheek) talk,
>the more I really begin to wonder about whether ham radio truly ever did
>have any "traditions." ;)

If it has been published in the "official" tradition publications of the
ARRL, it is the honest-to-God TRVTH.

If it has been published in newsgroups by long-time OFs with one-
by-twos, it is the honest-to-God TRVTH. Even if some of the
truthsayers disagree with one another...they speak the TRVTH as
if it were engraved in old Roman marble, everlasting through time. :-)

The NATO phonetic alphabet was first activated in 1955 for the
entire U.S. military and for the militaries of NATO member nations
to clarify communications of all kinds. It was, and remains, a
compromise system as a result of liguistic studies by several
NATO nations. The ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization)
picked it up for civil airways communications clarification purposes
later the same year...the standard radio voice language on civil
airways had already been adopted as English (vast majority of
pilots on and in civil airways of the 1950s spoke English).

How do I know this with such surety? In 1955 I was in my third
year of active duty with the U.S.Army Signal Corps, a somewhat
new E-5 ("three up, one down" on the sleeves) with a supervisor,
operation-and-maintenance MOS. We (everyone at ADA and all

the radio units in the Far East Command) got a whole two weeks to memorize this (then) new phonetic alphabet...and "unlearn" the old one right after the cut-over.

1955 was a time when the Cold War was becoming very hot indeed...only 5 years after the start of the Korean War and only 7 years after the infamous Berlin Blockade. NATO was not some sort of political bureaucracy, it had more to do with Survival for all. The USSR existed and had The Bomb. The China mainland had been taken over by Chinese communists. SAC had started its "loiter" operations just outside the USSR borders. We in military communications didn't do emergency comm as a "public service," but WERE the first-line Survival Emergency Communications, 24/7, all year long.

A great number of phonetic alphabets existed prior to and during World War 2. For those interested in linguistics, there's quite a complete listing of different phonetic alphabets at -

www.bckelk.uklinux.net/menu.html

As to the standard U.S. military phonetic alphabet prior to the NATO system, here is what we Signal Corpsmen learned in 1952:

Able, Baker, Charlie, Dog, Easy, Fox, George, How, Item, Jig, King, Love, Mama, Nan, Oboe, Papa, Queen, Roger, Sugar, Tare, Uncle, Victor, William, Xray, Yoke, Zebra.

...odd how something once so familiar looks so "different" 47 years later after using the NATO phonetic alphabet so long. :-)

Roger that...

2843. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201044.05631.00001960@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32344

In article <20020125081354.14663.00000330@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>I can do 30-40 wpm. If the license required 60 wpm typing, I'd learn it, no
>>big deal.
>
>I don't think I could manage 60 wpm typing on a good day.
>
>What do you think a 60 wpm typing test would do to amateur radio numbers?

What's so "bad" about high-speed touch typing? Why are you young whipper-snappers so "afraid" to learn something "new?"

Heck, as a middle-school student in 1947 I could touch-type at 60 WPM no problem...on typewriters that had NO markings on the keys!! All you kids are a bunch of "lossers!" :-) :-) :-)

Love How Able

2844. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201045.05631.00001961@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32346

In article <#TJY6KPpBHA.1804@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote
>
>> The reason the military/commercial services stopped using Morse/CW was
>> to eliminate the need to train and PAY skilled operators.
>
>As much as I enjoy using Morse, the above is simply not true. The military
>abandoned Morse because it is simply impossible to run a modern war
>in a multi-threat environment at 25WPM.
>
>Been there, tried that, it didn't work.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

Thank you, Hans.

The U.S. military abandoned morse codings for IMPORTANT
communications before the USA was struck into WW2,
like around 1938. The U.S. Navy was one of the first military
branches to adopt on-line teleprinter encryption/decryption
with the U.S. Army sharing information (notably in cryptologic
methods courtesy of William Friedman's Army group) with the
Navy. As far as a lot of nit-picky crypto historians have been
able to determine, the U.S. military's "rotor" system of WW2
days was never broken...yet the U.S. broke the Japanese
rotor system and retransmitted intercepts to fleet and land
units over the U.S. system. :-)

The website of the USS Pampanito (submarine for landlubbers)
has some nice information on the old U.S. teleprinter encrypt/
decrypt system, plus links on other U.S. crypto sites. The NSA
website is now open with more crypto and detailed government
historical data from WW2.

Regardless of the charm, affection, and (sometimes) lust that
some have for morse modes, the old 60 WPM teleprinters
still beat the most expert 40 WPM morsemen and could do so
24/7. In 1940 and in 1955. A half century ago.

Unfortunately, some old-timers (some as old as 47) who have
never, ever served in any military branch purport to be "expert"
on the U.S. military. Misinformation marches on... :-)

Love How Able
ex-RA16508336 (1952-1960)

2845. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201047.05631.00001962@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32349

In article <20020127000722.16072.00000585@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c535afc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>writes:
>
>>Brian, darling, don't you think it would be rather foolish of one to take
>>the three from this newsgroup and take it as policy across the ARS that it
>>is forbidden to tune on the air?
>
>Obviously Kim has missed the simple fact that two of those three think it's
>OK to tune up on the air if done in a considerate fashion.
>
>What has been documented are ways of tuning up without emitting a signal.

No, what "has been documented" is a lot of one-upmanship-in-messaging
by those want to be "right" at any cost trying to show that they are
"expert" in whatever they choose to talk about...including a lot of
not-subtle female bashing by those this as a male enclave. :-)

Whatever analyzer ever made used EMITS A SIGNAL. [you can't get a
response without a stimulus in any antenna measurement]

What has been nattered so far on this thread so far overlooks a very
basic rule in ANY multi-user spectrum environment, ANY multi-user
radio service: LISTEN BEFORE TRANSMITTING.

"Pi-Networks" are in a category of 3-component IMPEDANCE
MATCHING NETWORKS. That they are able to match a variety
of low-magnited complex impedances to a high-magnitude impedance
vacuum tube amplifiers with a minimum of components led to their
widespread use in HF transmitters, especially to penurous hams.

There is NO magic in a Pi-Net and it does NOT ALWAYS act as a
low-pass filter and it CAN match a variety of different impedances.
Gosh, that should be quite apparent to someone who has
"mastered the Smith Chart," no? :-)

Can one assume that all transmitters can run at reduced power for
"antenna tune-up?" No, some tubes have different source
impedances at reduced levels and/or reduced plate voltages. To
some degree that is true for solid-state PAs but the Class A to
Class B solid-state PAs can be designed to run at 5 to 10 percent
maximum power and still present the same source impedance as
at maximum.

So, with an "old style" Pi-Net final configuration, one NEEDS some kind of fancy memory-holding autotuner? Ever hear of pencil and paper jotting down knob and dial markings for "tuning memory?" [pen/pencil and paper predates morse messaging]

I am just so underwhelmed by the Technical Expertise displayed by some in this newsgroup... :-)

2846. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:10:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127201057.05631.00001963@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32350

In article <d22b54c3.0201250548.168c853c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3C5034A0.3CD41C95@IEEE.org>...
>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>> > There is no excuse today for dumping a signal on the air to "tune up"
>> > an xcvr, amp or transmitter tube or solid state types. Those tuneups
>> > can and should be done into a dummy load - which costs what?? A lousy
>> > thirty bucks for a kilowatt version?
>>
>> Where are you going to find a dummy load to exactly equal an antenna system
>> with an unknown load impedance? Take 300+j300, for instance.
>>
>Ya don't tune out an 8.5 swr like that with the output network of the
>transmitter - assuming the specific output network can do that.

Any Pi-Net can handle that...PROVIDED the builder put in enough "output" capacitor variable range along with enough series inductance. Of course, if one wants to make it cheaply, the range is restricted and it becomes the "specific" network mysteriously alluded to...:-)

>Ya
>tune into an r5ï¿½+jï¿½ dummy load for at least two good reasons: Ham
>transmitter output circuits are designed for optimum performance
>assuming a 50 ohm resistive load.

ALL "ham transmitter output circuits" are designed that way? :-)

>By "optimum performance" I mean
>harmonic suppression in all cases and stability in some cases.

Tsk, tsk. Another mythos repeated that a Pi-Net is *ALWAYS* a "low pass filter?" Show your work, senor. :-)

Harmonic suppression depends on many things including drive level to a Class-C tube PA plus the load line selected for the particular tube.

"Stability?" Undefined there. Parasitic instability, more common in tube circuits than solid-state, is seldom a function of the output matching circuit.

> Second,
>a lo-pass filter simply won't do it's job if it's in a line with an
>8.5 swr.

Sorry, if that external low pass filter has more than two sections
it WILL do harmonic suppression...it won't do it as well as
working into a "proper" resistive termination, but that is a whole
lot of variables to toss in. Bottom-line: An external low pass
filter still works at weird terminations (antenna impedance).

You can check that out on the official ARRL Radio Designer
program if you like. :-)

> Or if yer running any power and/or using one of the low-power
>lo-pass filters ya toast it if ya have an 8.5 swr.

Sigh. Another technical misinformative statement. Go back to
Basic Networks 101 and come up with branch currents and
node voltages for different complex impedance combinations.
ANY low power external gizmo can become "toast" at perfect
match conditions using higher-than-rated power.

>So common-sense
>good operating practice dictates that ya tune the transmitter into a
>dummy load.

For the first time in checking a transmitter. :-)

>Then ya transform the r3ï¿½ï¿½+j3ï¿½ï¿½ antenna input impedance into a proper
>r5ï¿½+jï¿½ impedance with an antenna tuner and bingo the swr is 1:1 and
>the antenna is optimally matched to the transmitter. By using an
>antenna analyzer, not by dumping the transmitter on the air to tweak
>the tuner with an swr bridge.

The analyzer is very nice but what about NOT having one? Suppose
the transmitter is an "old" tube type with a Pi-Net output? Are you
trying to say the Pi-Net "only works into 50 ohms resistive loads" or
what? Suppose one is using 450 or 600 ohm characteristic
impedance balanced lines? :-)

>Of course this is the first time you ever heard about any of this
>hi-tech transmitter and antenna tuning stuff huh?

Dunno 'bout Cecil but I first heard of it all in 1953...after tuning
up transmitters ranging from 1 KW to 15 KW on HF using their
built-in output networks...into balanced lines terminating in
rhombics or delta-match dipoles. Learned a few things since.

Of course, I can't possibly match the terrific technical expertise
brought on by 20+ WPM morse mode skill so I will defer to the
kind civility displayed by all those long-time extras. :-)

2847. South Georgia - VP8GEO now QRV

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:48:11 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c54add9$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 32351
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

VP8GEO (South Georgia Island) came up on 20m CW around 00:02 UTC
28-Jan-2002

QSL via VE3GCO

VE3GCO
THE MAPLE LEAF RADIO SOCIETY
5 MCLAREN AVENUE
LISTOWEL, ON N4W 3K1
CANADA
--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

2848. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:52:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C54AED3.22DFCC04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32353

Len Over 21 wrote:
> There is NO evidence that U.S. Army Special Forces have used
> telegraphy or radiotelegraphy in Afghanistan in 2001 or 2002 or
> that the U.S. military has used it in the Gulf War of 1990-1991.

I'll bet the special forces are capable of monitoring any CW
used by the other side.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2849. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 01:52:38 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u59bn6fk47oc4c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32352

N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:

> They [the FCC] could just as easily say that while electronics theory
> is good to know, there is no reason to TEST for it beyond the level
> necessary for rules compliance and public safety considerations.

indeed. I've held a license for over a decade now, but due to lack of available time and elmers once I got to college it lapsed, and I've only recently renewed it [1] at the jabbing requests of some friends. I'm a little rusty on the specific rules and regs after all this time [2], but the one thing that seems to be lacking from the [3] test pool are questions involving operating protocol. I know what frequencies I can operate on, and with what modes, but truth be told I'm still a little shaky on protocol, never having owned a working HF rig. [4]

the test seems to cover the physical layer and wire-level protocols of communication, so to speak, but doesn't really cover much in the way of actual communications protocol.

> Most of the other services wanted ham radio to go away - that's why we
> got banished to "200 meters and down".

and here I thought it was because the antennas get too big. ;)

> The real question is this: Does multiple-level theory testing cause
> today's ham radio to be more modern technologically than it would be
> without such testing?

or is such the point of modern amateur radio anymore? or has the art advanced as far as it can by amateur means?

[1] ex-KC6PVE, now KD7PNB.
[2] of course I'm reviewing... a lot has apparently changed while I was away. 5WPM to get a general? I must be going crazy.
[3] c. 1994 general pool
[4] I have a sick heath HW-101 I've been lugging around since 1992, hoping to fix one of these days. it's become a quest. ;)
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

2850. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:19:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020127211954.01770.00000055@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 32354

In article <3c52be27$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>No wonder you've never gotten anywhere financially, Larry.
>
>Kim W5TIT

What makes you think I haven't "gotten anywhere" financially, Kim?
You been sneaking a peek at my Czeching accounts, IRA's, etc.???
As usual, you don't know what you're talking about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2851. Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:24:54 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u59djmhv5mca28@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32355

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> If Squiggy's lunacy goes on long and far enough who knows the results?
> If you don't believe he's a crack pot, consider how many usenet
> posters use PGPon each and every post. I know of none other than him
> who use it or anything like it at all. Paranoia personified,.

you should get out more. I see plenty of PGP posters elsewhere on
usenet, and on a few mailing lists from time to time. the
authentication PGP provides can be very useful.

> His rangting on the subject is legendary, and nolt for the weak of
> stomach.

I'm actually browsing http://www.nocode.org/ looking for it. I recently
returned to ham radio after an almost decade-long college-induced hiatus
and came back to having my tech plus license turned into a technician
upon renewal. right now I'm trying to ressurrect my rig and figure out
where to put up an antenna so I can start listening to QSOs and slowly
start operating. I was originally planning on working primarily morse,
hoping to increase my speed to 13WPM to pass the general, (I had passed
the written years ago, but lack of practice kept me from passing the
code,) and lo and behold I now find I can get a general without 13WPM?
Odd.

> The man's mental stability is seriously in question, and I'm sure any
> mental health professional would so note.

let's leave that to the mental health professionals, shall we?

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

2852. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:25:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54b721_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32356

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:kSZ48.106682$Ee7.7177130@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote ...
>
> > Ed,
> >
> > We are aware of the positions of *some* of the ARRL directors,
> > (for or against I'm not saying ...) but in most cases, those views
> > have been given in some sort of confidence and it would be
> > unethical of NCI to make such private conversations public (as
> > you point out).
> >
>
> Why would knowing the position of a BoD of ARRL be unethical? I
would think
> they would *want* the membership to know. Unless, of course, it
went
> against the grain of what the majority of members wanted, Hmmmmm.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Arnie ... don't try to make something out of nothing. Ed said he
didn't know the positions of all of the ARRL directors. I said that
we knew the postions of some, but that they were the result of
private conversations and it would be unethical to "go public"
with them on that basis ... if they want to state their own positions,
fine ... but it's not my place (or NCI's) to state them for them.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFS2gpe+N6+q84HiEQKuFwCfYpzHyFm5+LK7PmvUMVvTZc89z+AAn15R
XcRyT9/JWdgMuIR+NG2ZZ4eK
=hy5g
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2853. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:38:48 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54ba4c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32357

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272143080.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> >The 2.4 GHz gear I'm talking about allows the user to select the
> >channel(s) of operation within its capability via software ... no
> >reason that hams couldn't limit their operation to the channels
> >which fall within the band segment that hams are allowed to
> >use ... no mods or schematics required.
>
> But as Ed Hare noted, these devices usually DON'T say so on the box,
but simply
> say something like, "Frequency range: 2400-2483.5" even if they
only choose a
> 20MHz window in that range. Are we supposed to GUESS?

No, as they've said here on the internet for years, you're
supposed to "RTFM!"

[snip]

> Now, that someone has finally said that it is possible to use
WITHOUT
> MODIFICATION (because what the manufacturers publish on their
packaging is
> misleading and/or just plain wrong), that makes a difference.

Nothing "misleading and/or just plain wrong" in what we print on
our packaging.

> As noted by Mr. Hare too: Mr. Ham goes into store. Mr. Ham sees
2.4GHz
> wireless lan stuff. Mr. Ham picks up box, reads "2400-2483.5" as
the range,
> and puts it down, because, not knowing this well-hidden variation to
the
> standard, Mr. Ham does not know that this means a 20MHz window in
that range,
> and thus discounts the complete idea because modifying the equipment
to keep it
> in band (a necessary step perceived by Mr. Ham due to improper
disclosure on
```

> the box) is too difficult or takes too much time.

I suppose you went into the store as a tech+ and looked at all
the HF rigs which said their 80m coverage was 3.5-4.0 MHz
and didn't buy one because you were only allowed to use the
novice band at 3.675-3.725 MHz??? Duh!

> What is wrong with that picture? Nowhere was Mr. Ham able to find
and learn
> about this 20Mhz window of operation feature that makes otherwise
[perceived]
> unusable equipment (due to out of band transmission) usable (and
wholly in
> band).

RTFM

> As a person involved in manufacture, shouldn't you be telling your
potential
> [secondary target] market about this?

Reality check ... it's up to hams to be knowledgeable enough to
be able apply gear that wasn't specifically designed for their use
if they wish to apply it to ham radio ... tons and tons of Motorola
commercial mobile radio gear has been converted to service in
the ham bands (often with some actual modifications required) ...
does Motorola provide directions on how to modify their gear for
use in the ham bands with every unit (let alone on the box)???
I don't think so ...

> Personally, until this thread surfaced in this group, I was like the
fictitious
> Mr. Ham above - not knowing the difference between the .11 and .11b
standards.
> I admit that I have learned something.

Glad to hear it ... have you checked out the link to the standards
on the IEEE website? The standard is the definitive source for
information.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFS5hpe+N6+q84HiEQJU2wCg5I/Itqmd0hW6CHdMz4AkIZyATfEAnim+
t9rhaZjFo2kg/UZF6uVFHTYy
=GjrL
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2854. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:42:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54bb1c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32358

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272204000.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >>
> >> So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM
across the
> >entire
> >> band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a
> >manufacturer,
> >> especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).
> >
> >It is spread spectrum, according to the Part 15 rules ... however,
> >a single channel doesn't use the entire 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM
> >band ... nor do/did the Part 15 rules ever require it to do so ...
> >Im not sure where you got the (apparent) idea that a single device
> >used the entire band at once.
>
> From the fact that the box of such a device specifies the ENTIRE
band as its
> frequency range, that implies that its hop sequence includes
frequency slices
> across the ENTIRE band, not a limited subset of it.
>

The 802.11b stuff on the market today is NOT a FHSS system. It's
DSSS ... the FHSS option of the original standard never really made
it because .11b came along with so much better performance that
the other stuff just died off before it ever even got much of a start.

Thus, there is no "hop sequence" ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFS6hZe+N6+q84HiEQKhbQCeNNwGmmddYbhyJIAesZ+D/e7nowIAniGa
L9/fqNn0+ECjNH/+HpLGAqZO
=0rKZ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2855. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 02:51:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c54bd36_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32359

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272206100.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >Hash: SHA1
> >
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212123070.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >>
> >> If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do
NOT
> >assume that
> >> the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it
also
> >says that it
> >> can be
> >
> >The user's manual fro my Yaesu Ft-847 lists a rather impressive
> >range of operating frequencies. Do I assume that it operates on
> >every frequency in that range simultaneously? Of course not ...
> >in fact, I think it goes without saying that I (and others) would
be
> >most upset if it did ... :-)
>
> No, but you do assume that it CAN operate on any (within the
channelization
> resolution of the VCO, etc.) frequency in the range.
>
> With SS, one generally assumes that the device may hop to any
frequency within
> its range. Owners of such devices don't have control over the hop
pattern -
> such is the firmware's responsibility.
>
> If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without
indicating
> that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there a reason
for someone
> to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range given, especially
considering
> that such was in the older specification of the standard it followed
```

(and not
> being aware of the changes in the standard)?
>
> >I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
> >necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...
>
> Of course not - that would be "wide band," not spread spectrum.
However,
> unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do assume that a
SS signal
> may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.

With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD
use (spread over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier
in the middle and using a chipping rate that would spread it that
wide, but then there would be only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if
the
data rate was low enough, one might get enough processing gain to
be able to do CDMA overlay and have multiple users, but not at the
data rates that today's LANs need to carry.

You seem to have some confusion about the characteristics of FHSS
vs. DSSS systems ... the ARRL publishes at least one reasonably
good tutorial book on the subject. One of the definitive references
on
the subject of SS is "Spread Spectrum Systems" by Dixon, published
by Wiley ... I recommend it highly for even the semi-serious student
of
SS.

> >Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
> >obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
> >encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
> >the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
> >that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on
now
>
> Again, a non-evident user choice.

Again, RTFM ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFS8mpe+N6+q84HiEQLjTQCeIZJtWgln+1lr+xK7R3SFJIsZ1xYAoIhb
DXl6P01AltrrSd4ac4KSKaod
=pj4K
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2856. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 03:29:25 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <_r358.110875$Ee7.7381673@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32360

"CAM" Wrote ...

> I'll bet the special forces are capable of monitoring any CW
> used by the other side.

Since the SF Communications Specialists are *still* required to learn it, I'm sure you're correct, Cecil. Of course Len over 21 will disagree that this could ever possibly be happening. He would also probably argue that they would *never* use horses as a means of transportation either --- Oops, they *did* do that, didn't they?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2857. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 03:40:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MK358.5901$Ab1.386055@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32361

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:_r358.110875$Ee7.7381673@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> "CAM" Wrote ...
>
> > I'll bet the special forces are capable of monitoring any CW
> > used by the other side.
>
> Since the SF Communications Specialists are *still* required to learn
it,
> I'm sure you're correct, Cecil. Of course Len over 21 will disagree
that
> this could ever possibly be happening. He would also probably argue
that
> they would *never* use horses as a means of transportation either ---
Oops,
> they *did* do that, didn't they?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web

One wonders if somewhere in the Army logistics snake, there aren't a whole bunch of McClellan saddles ready and able to make 'blisterbutts' of our troops once again.

2858. Two Meter Realities

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:15:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201272015.1ec6545@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32362

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5432a1_2@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020120065238.13095.00002579@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> > >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
> > >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
> > >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...
> >
> > Given the useage of amateur frequencies on most bands, such waiting
> is not at
> > all likely. One would only have to wait if all available
> frequencies were in
> > use.
>
> I think you're missing my point, Ed ... most repeaters
> have a certain user group (plus or minus "transient
> users") ... those folks have developed a mindset that
> "their channel" (the repeater pair) is always available
> for their (more or less) exclusive use. So they tend to
> stay parked on that channel, "waiting for Joe to show
> up so they can talk to him."
>
>
That's fact but so what? I "camp" on one of the popular machines
myself. It's the club machine owned by a large, very active
neighborhood club so a specific collection of club members and others
hang out on that pair which is very predictable social behavior. I'm
not a member but as do many others I leave the audio down and mostly
just monitor on the side. When one of the guys I'm close to shows up
we use the machine freely. I have never been hassled about any aspect
of those ops. I don't see anything wrong with any of it.
>
>
> If another group were to put another repeater on the
> same pair, then the two groups would have to wait for
> each other to finish using the shared channel. So, it's
> not a question of ALL frequencies being busy at any
> moment ... it's a question that users don't want their
> *preferred* frequency to be occuptied by "outsiders"

> when they want to use it ... this has resulted in many
> "repeater wars" over the years.
>
>
The repeater wars are a relic from the days before coordination, there hasn't been a good 'ole fashioned repeater war around here for decades. There are predictable verbal brawls between idiots and groups of idiots on some machines but those are no worse than their HF equivalents.
>
>
> All I'm saying is that dynamically allocated use of
> the spectrum (as in commercial trunking systems)
> would result in the ability to support more users
> without contention (for the media, as well as politically
> and emotionally :-)
>
>
With 98% of the 2m band dead spectrum space at an average point in time we're gonna move into trunking with it's monstrous infrastructure? Right. I should live so long . .
>
>
I have a little secret I'll share with you Squiggy: I can come up with my own 100% "private channel" on 2m any time I want one. Done it any number of times gong back to tube radio days. The scenario goes something like "Hey Jon, let's get off the machine and run simplex on 147.xxx." and off we go. Yeah, SIMPLEX, no machine, wash my mouf. Lost art. No stupid roger beeps or timeouts either and we only occupy one freq, not a pair.
>
>
Current 2m bandplan provides 830 Khz of open space for 2m simplex ops if you stretch the intentions of the bandplan a bit wrt respect to the 144.900-145.100 segment and stay away from the packet stations which lurk there. All of which I might metion are simplex operations. That 830 Khz is 230% the size of the entire twenty-meter band. 10 Khz spacing between channels works fine in most cases. What's my point you say? The opportunity to conduct 75 or more simultaneous private non-iterfering qsos in only 21% of the 2m band is my point. Without any changes in the regs or current off-the-shelf "technology" and with ZERO infrastructure including a repeater.
>
>
I've done all day all nite simplex comms on 2m. Couple three four guys agree to a freq and land on it, it's like a hardwired office-to-office intercom. Ya park the radio on the freq, squelch out the noise and go about the rest of yer life. Randomly toss out a question or comment, somebody in the group comes back. Otherwise absolute dead silence for hours and even days on end.

>
>
I'm sure you get my drift Squig . . .
>
>
> > The real rub is that there IS a need for such a system, even in the
> relatively
> > little used system of Amateur repeaters. Yes, there are ways that
> the
> > coordination process should be improved so that little used pairs
> could be more
> > easily deallocated to those who would really like to use them, but a
> system
> > that dynamically allocated frequencies in the Amateur bands would
> allow
> > everyone equal access to the bands in such a way that 99% of the
> time, everyone
> > who wanted to use the band could be accomodated.
> >
> > Yes, there ARE existing architectures that need to be considered and
> there
> > would be pain in the changeover, but real-world radio goes through
> this, at
> > much greater pain, when it has to. What is really ironic is that
> when such a
> > need arises, industry competitors are able to create committees and
> find
> > solutions, because they fully understand that having common
> standards is better
> > than not having them, and that it often goes past merely benefitting
> everyone
> > -- in many cases, having those common standards is a matter of
> survival.
>
>
All of those industry committees have one bottom line reason for
existing: MONEY. Ham radio is very pointedly NOT about money. Wrong
model.
>
>
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> And such "industry consensus" standards evolve to meet expanding
> needs ... I just spent last week in Dallas at the IEEE 802.11 meeting
> (an every 2 months event) with a whole (huge) hotel full of others
> working
> on just such things ...
>

> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPFQybZe+N6+q84HiEQJVjgCg9KNrTG+fL85BrGfYw8hUdOOa7HIAn3f7
> BPlhEHf/NnW8PN4ekvE5gijY
> =ODda
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
>
w3rv

2859. encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:27:12 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u59kp0b7am5i05@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32363

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

> Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
> obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
> encryption turned off.

not that having encryption turned on is an insurmountable deterrent, in any case. the crypto used by 802.11b is weak and has been beaten by at least two independent academic teams. I would be surprised if there _wasn't_ a sniffer tool floating around now.

> (but don't get me started on how I think the blanket prohibition on
> encryption is unnecessarily stringent, that's a whole 'nuther subject
> that I'd rather not get started on now :-)

I'd like to go there, as I've been thinking about this recently. I wonder if authentication would be permissible? it seems like cryptographically secure authentication would fall under the provisions for tele-operation in the R&R. having to announce your callsign is more or less a low-tech way of doing it. authentication seems like it'd accomplish the same thing while still leaving the packets sniffable to eavesdroppers^Wother listeners.

how do packet mailboxes work? obviously you don't want some yahoo deleting all your mail, but what's to stop them from posing as you, reading it all, then deleting it? or hijacking your communication and sending delete commands as you're reading your mail? even if no malice, wrongdoing, or ill will is intented?

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

2860. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:46:12 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u59lskqpjus0b5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32364

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:

> If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without
> indicating that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there
> a reason for someone to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range
> given, especially considering that such was in the older specification
> of the standard it followed (and not being aware of the changes in the
> standard)?

maybe the "b" in 802.11b should be capitalized?

> >Encryption can be turned on or off
>
> Again, a non-evident user choice.

again, part of the 802.11b standard referred to on the box.

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

2861. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:47:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127234731.05631.00001967@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32366

In article <MK358.5901$Ab1.386055@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>One wonders if somewhere in the Army logistics snake, there aren't a whole
>bunch of McClellan saddles ready and able to make 'blisterbutts' of our
>troops once again.

Excuse me, but sophisticated, snarly mentions of KIPLING works are missing from this remark. Please revise and repost with the appropriate quoting from an author who was never in any military anywhere but picked up all his Brit army lore in bars and cafes.

In fact, you have stated you have not served in any military anywhere. Several in here HAVE, including argementers on both sides of the code issue. Are you going to manufacture a whole new thread and rail against the Army in ex-hippie style? If so, take it to another dimension since slamming the military is not de rigeur these days.

If you wish, you can FIND OUT whether saddles exist or not. It will take some searching, so get Arnie to help you out there. No doubt he might find some mention of it in Special Forces training. :-) Considering that U.S. Army Cavalry was ARMOR (read "very heavy vehicles" emitting noxious exhaust fumes) in my time, those saddles, if they existed then, are mighty dry now. :-)

I'm sure you can make some wonderful acerbic postings about all of the above, quote Kipling and other authors. It wouldn't hurt you to find out something of modern-day military communications would it? It's out there. How about Harris Corporations' "Falcon II" SDR that goes 1.6 to 512 MHz? Data, voice, encryption, the works in a man-pack to vehicular family. Tsk, tsk, not a morsekey in it.

2862. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:47:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127234731.05631.00001968@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32367

In article <_r358.110875$Ee7.7381673@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>"CAM" Wrote ...
>
>> I'll bet the special forces are capable of monitoring any CW
>> used by the other side.
>
>Since the SF Communications Specialists are *still* required to learn it,
>I'm sure you're correct, Cecil. Of course Len over 21 will disagree that
>this could ever possibly be happening.

Nope. I've not disagreed with that. I just won't lap up your argument
as anything of proof that morse is VITAL for anything BECAUSE
one or two Special Forces MOSs require it.

Monitoring, doing ELINT intercepts is a function of M.I., not S.F.

You should KNOW that if you work for the Department of the Army.
[did you lose your job?]

>He would also probably argue that
>they would *never* use horses as a means of transportation either --- Oops,
>they *did* do that, didn't they?

Sorry you had to manufacture an argument that never existed.
I had high hopes that you might become civil and rational in here
but you are still covertly libeling those who have climbed on you
in the past. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Not that it matters, but as far as I knew, the last permanent horse
unit in the U.S. Army was in D.C. and used for ceremonial
purposes...such as funeral processions.

I've mentioned in here that the U.S. mounted cavalry was the
first to use "horse mobile" radio on horseback. You can find
reference to it on the web with some looking. You must info-shop
on the web because you've sure as hell not gone out to observe
a modern-day Signal Battalion or Regiment in the field...or maybe
you did and got pissed that they weren't using CW? :-)

2863. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 04:47:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020127234732.05631.00001969@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 32365

In article <3C54AED3.22DFCC04@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> There is NO evidence that U.S. Army Special Forces have used
>> telegraphy or radiotelegraphy in Afghanistan in 2001 or 2002 or
>> that the U.S. military has used it in the Gulf War of 1990-1991.
>
>I'll bet the special forces are capable of monitoring any CW
>used by the other side.

Doesn't matter if they are capable or not, Cecil. In the land forces of the US, Electronic Intelligence (ELINT, passive interception) is the province of the M.I., Military Intelligence. In the U.S. Army Fort Huachuca is the training center for M.I. UAV operations are learned there as well as morsemodes. :-)

What "CW used by the other side?" Who has evidence of any kind that the Taliban did communications by any kind of OOK?

If you wait a bit of time until the Afghanistan fracas has simmered down, read the resulting historical data such as might be posted by NSA or other Intelligence community, you would find out exactly what, whom, and how many were communicating on "the other side" (assumed meaning Taliban in Afghanistan). Here's a clue: It wasn't CW and the Taliban weren't using surplus AN/GRC-9s. :-)

By the way, Afghanistan was being monitored for several years, ever since the USSR gave up the place and the Taliban took over. Special Forces weren't doing it, Special Operations weren't doing it, Rangers weren't doing it, SEALS weren't doing it. Plain old ordinary unglamorous M.I. folkses were doing it. Newsies don't like that because it robs stories of "glamour" and "excitement!" :-)

2864. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 05:45:03 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u59pav8131d4f8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32368

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> It's obvious that you still do not understand Shannon's theorem. If
> PSK31 is 50Hz wide and CW is 250Hz wide, the comparison is not a fair
> one. The only fair way to compare PSK31 and CW is to copy CW through a
> 50Hz filter. Do that and get back to us on your ability to copy it.
> (P.S. You won't be able to copy it unless it is dog slow.)

alternately is there a variant or relative of psk31 that takes up the
same bandwidth (250Hz) as CW?

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

2865. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 06:28:47 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <La658.94092$Y17.5989292@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32369

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> Nope. I've not disagreed with that. I just won't lap up your argument
> as anything of proof that morse is VITAL for anything BECAUSE
> one or two Special Forces MOSs require it.
>
Heck, it took me about six months to get you to admit that SF even required their troops to know Morse. I *never* said it was vital to their operations, I said it was required of the Communications Specialists. Quote *any* post I've ever written that states that Morse was VITAL to modern military operations (go ahead, I dare ya) You just continue to make it up as you go trying to fit those round thoughts into a square hole. Nothing has changed with you. BTW -- SF would *never* be in *monitor* mode as they are totally dependent on MI for intel, right?

Feel free to use the argument that I was never in military service or had direct contact with SF. That seems to be a favorite with you. Oops, can't use either one of those -- too bad.

> Sorry you had to manufacture an argument that never existed.
> I had high hopes that you might become civil and rational in here
> but you are still covertly libeling those who have climbed on you
> in the past. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
I actually had high hopes for you as well, but after reading some of your recent posts here, (see Len over 21 response to on air tuning thread) decided that *you* are still the same old Len of 21 that you have always been. You have aged, but not with much grace. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2866. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:07:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128070741.17706.00000917@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32377

Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

>If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without
>indicating that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there a reason
for
>someone to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range given, especially
>considering that such was in the older specification of the standard it
>followed (and not being aware of the changes in the standard)?

I don't think that manufacturers should be required to print their entire specification on the box. Sooner or later, we have to assume some personal responsibility and learn a bit about the products we want to buy and use, especially if we want to use them in the ham bands. The box on my unit does say IEEE 802.11b, and a quick web search will turn up reams of information the b addition to the 802.11 standard.

>>I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
>>necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...

>Of course not - that would be "wide band," not spread spectrum.

Spread spectrum COULD hop or spread over the entire 2.4 GHz ISM band. Why do you feel that a relatively narrow spread (20 MHz) is spread spectrum, but going to an 85.5 MHz spread (if I recall the ISM band width correctly) would not be spread spectrum?

> However, unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do assume that a
SS
> signal may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.

But you just said that you didn't think that a device that did so would be spread spectrum. ???

>>> But who can read it? Don't the wireless lan stuff encrypt so only
>>devices on
>>> the same virtual lan can read the packets....?

>>Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
>>obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
>>encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
>>the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
>>that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on now

>Again, a non-evident user choice.

Not to those that learn about a product from reading detailed information about it instead of expecting that the marketing information on the box tells them everything they need to know about the product.

Again, there is a lot of free information about spread spectrum and the IEEE 802.11 specifications.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2867. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:13:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128071302.17706.00000918@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32378

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Part 15 devices
>"live" quite well in the shared band environment because they are
>applied sensibly and the modulation, coding, and protocols are
>robust enough to provide reliable operation despite the interference
>environment in which they must operate.

By the discussions by various WISPs on the ISP-wireless email reflector, interference is a pretty common problem. The majority are from Part-15 devices interfering with each other. The process gain used in most Part 15 devices is just enough to meet the FCC regs that allow them to run higher power instead of being limited to the much lower power of the general radiated emissions limits for intentional radiators.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2868. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:14:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128071453.17706.00000919@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32379

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>From the fact that the box of such a device specifies the ENTIRE band as its
>frequency range, that implies that its hop sequence includes frequency slices
>across the ENTIRE band, not a limited subset of it.

The box on most transceivers indicate that the unit operates over a certain
frequency range. I do not expect that it uses all of those frequencies
simultaneously. It simply is not possible to reproduce the entire 802.11b spec'
on the box of a product.

73.
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2869. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:17:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128071756.17706.00000920@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32380

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>And what's wrong with the 3-class license structure we have
>now? (except for the unnecessary, except for S25.5, code
>test element, of course)

If the S25.5 requirement is dropped, Carl, there is probably plenty that could and should be changed in the license structure. Just as one example, it would then make no sense to limit the first tier of license class to VHF only. Either a 3-class system that had a first tier limited by power, or by subsets of each band, or a 2- or even 1-class system might make more sense. The VHF/HF, no-code/code distinction was only to comply with S25.5.

73,
Ed Hare

2870. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:23:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128072352.17706.00000922@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32381

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>I think you're missing my point, Ed ... most repeaters
>have a certain user group (plus or minus "transient
>users") ... those folks have developed a mindset that
>"their channel" (the repeater pair) is always available
>for their (more or less) exclusive use. So they tend to
>stay parked on that channel, "waiting for Joe to show
>up so they can talk to him."

I didn't miss the point at all, Carl, but I may not have chosen the best words for my post. Even in a system that dynamically allocated frequency for a specific use, the information channel could remain transparent to the user. So if one accessed the information channel named "Local Club," Joe would still be there. Joe might not know exactly what frequency in the band his hardware was using, but he would still be able to find all of his buddies just as easily as he can right now.

The difference is that every single ham who wanted access to a similar channel in that band could have it, limited only by the fact that only N number of people could use that band *at the same time.*

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2871. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:34:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128073419.17706.00000925@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32382

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>>Gee ... it was pretty well publicized by the FCC, ARRL, TAPR, etc.
>>Where were you?

>The change to the SS part of the rules I missed, because as a volunteer
>examiner, there were many more changes that I had to actually pay attention
>to.

Yes, but that didn't stop you from posting that the changes were never
publicized...

>What TAPR says is unimportant. Too many people have placed so much
>artificial
>importance in that group, their statements on anything are effectively
>worthless. A TAPR endorsement of anything is basically detrimental.

Not to most hams with a digital interest. I have learned quite a bit about
digital radio from the http://www.tapr.org web site.

>But as Ed Hare noted, these devices usually DON'T say so on the box, but
>simply
>say something like, "Frequency range: 2400-2483.5" even if they only choose
>a
>20MHz window in that range. Are we supposed to GUESS?

No, but guessing is exactly what you did when you posted all sorts of
mis-information about their operation.

>>> Then why do manufacturers publish their ranges in feet.

I know that the IEEE 802.11b devices I bought to play with in the lab came with
a very small dielectric antenna mounted on the PC board. They are often used in
environments that will be subject to all sorts of scatter. Having done a bit
more research than reading the box, I knew that they would operate with about
20 milliwatts or so -- a power level capable of much more range than "feet."

>Isn't all the 2.4 wireless lan stuff (since it must meet part 15) "products
>optimized for that market space"?

The wireless LAN stuff is generally more expensive and operates at higher power
and usually uses higher-gain antennas. The ISP-wireless list often talks about
ranges of tens of miles.

>Now, that someone has finally said that it is possible to use WITHOUT
>MODIFICATION (because what the manufacturers publish on their packaging is
>misleading and/or just plain wrong), that makes a difference.

Someone "finally" said that a few years ago. The "finally" here is that you "finally" read it.

The misleading and wrong I have seen has not been on the box. It has been in your posts and assumptions about how the products work.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2872. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:37:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128073730.17706.00000926@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32383

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>If I had thought that Ed would be harmed, I wouldn't have
>entered into the friendly wager ... and I hope that Ed enjoyed
>it as much as I did.

And, to set the record straight, it was I who initially offered the wager, and
you who accepted.

And to really set the record straight, win or lose, either way, I was eating
lobster!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2873. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:41:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128074129.17706.00000927@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32384

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
>membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.

Not many at all, Carl. If many members chose not to receive QST, dues would have to be increased significantly, or the things that ARRL did would have to be scaled back significantly, to make up for the lost revenues from advertising. When ARRL dues go up a dollar, there are a few thousand members who quit in outrage. Imagine the effect of seeing the dues almost double.

For many hams, especially newcomers, those QST articles are a good way of keeping track of some of what is happening in ham radio. In today's age, the www also lets them do that to some extent, but I enjoy some of the articles in QST nearly every month. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2874. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:42:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128074225.17706.00000928@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32385

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I've had wretched coffee, but never retched coffee -- and I hope I never
>> do! :-)

> Jon, evidently you were never in the military :-0

No, but he has had some of the coffee made in the ARRL Lab coffee pot. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2875. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:48:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128074827.17706.00000929@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32386

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I'll tune
>on the air if the FCC ain't gonna bust me for it.

You won't be arrested for passing gas in church, either, Kim. If you feel a need to flaunt tuning up on the air, go for it, but many of the tunup signals I have heard go past "gentlemen's agreements" and cross over the line into being just plain inconsiderate.

There are many things you can do that you won't get arrested for. I hope you don't do them all.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2876. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:51:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128075135.17706.00000931@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32387

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Are you being deliberately belligerent? The NCI doing a poll on the most
>popular method of tuning (on or off the air) would be pretty stupid.

Now, Kim, you do understand that most tune-up signals are the only real "CW"
use on the band. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2877. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:57:46 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <eVb58.411$TS2.172591@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32388

Yep... and quite a few others..... Too bad there isn't a way to dig up these old trolls who did the testing back then. I am not the only other one they screwed over I have run across.

No... not one bit of anything I have said, would lead anyone to think I wanted my mommy or anything else.

Now wonderboy.... what constitutes a passing score under either 1989 rules or 2002 rules for the code endorsement? Hmmm.... a certain percentage of correct answers then, and of course now. Also, 1 solid minute of code copied correctly then and now. I had both.

Think I am not qualified? Dig up any test from Novice to General from the year you tested till now and I will guarantee I will pass those tests with an above average score.

Regardless of anything else, I finally figured out why you are so pissed off and cannot positively contribute anything to any newsgroup. You have offended and irritated all of the existing hams with HF priviliges and are pissed that there are people you can't offend because of license status.

Get a freakin' life, grow up and do something with your life. This will be my last response to this particular thread.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127095614.13814.00001025@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >By all rights asshole, I did pass the 5wpm test then and also by todays
> >rule. The Old Fart VE's at the time changed the rules on their own.
What a
> >dumbass.
> >
>
> This guy is a GEM, the VEs cheated me, I knew I passed it, he says, the
VEs
> just would not go along with me, they Cheated me. MOMMY MOMMY go talk to
those
> mean old VEs, make them belive I passed, they just dont like me thats why
they
> Flunked me.
> You have to be ONE of the best examples of CBplussers I have ever run
across.

2878. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:57:48 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <gVb58.412$TS2.172929@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32389

Look under sarcasm.....

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:vsR48.5129$S67.302049@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:Y6R48.236$TS2.115561@monger.newsread.com...
> > Think about that one for a sec... A CSCE is only valid for one year.
> >
> > I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
> > never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
> > should be jumping for joy!
> >
>
> One of the better bits of advice my dad laid on me during a glandular
> argument was not to overestimate my importance to the rest of the world.
>
>

2879. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:57:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <iVb58.413$TS2.172770@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32390

I could care less about the HF frequencies..... everything I have heard on the HF frequencies is either "CQ Contest" or the usual CB crap on 14.313 and so on. I have been so turned off by the "mature" level of operators, these people being the ones who had to go to their testing session bare foot in 3 feet of snow up hill both ways to the exam, who are acting just like those who acuse others of being CB'ers.

Approximately 95% of my operation right now entails public service related transmissions. Getting involved in nets also would fit into that category. Public service and emergency communications is the main reason why I got into amateur radio in the first place. The other 5% is the occaisional contact made via simplex or repeater, and that usually winds up transferring to a conversation on the phone anyways.

Thanks for the support and maybe if I ever get enough time off from my jobs, I will definitely be doing some travel. How's about a cup of coffee on me? :)

Ryan

> I do agree that you have met the requirements at the time of testing.
That
> is something that we don't have any control over.
>
> What I don't understand is why you wouldn't upgrade within the year so you
> could use the privileges you earned. I was an Advanced class and still
> didn't have an HF radio. I did get one shortly thereafter. However, that
> didn't mean that I couldn't use a club station rig or go to someone's
shack
> and operate until I did.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
>
>

2880. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 12:57:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <jVb58.414$TS2.172494@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32391

What is the need to "cash" those in? I only did it to satisfy me. HF has
no interest to me.
Just did it to prove something to myself. The comment in the quoted text
was sarcasm, you fool.

Grow up, get a life idiot.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020127094358.13814.00001019@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >I have met the requirements at the time of testing. It is a mode I will
> >never use, but I passed the test, so all the freakin' adament Pro-Coders
> >should be jumping for joy!
> >
>
> Then why havent you upgraded, it isnt that really really tough written
test, is
> it?
> I know that written can really cause you trouble, it has some really
tough
> Questions , like your Name, Addresse. And for alot of you Mentally
Challenged,
> those can be really tough Questions. So again why havent you upgraded??

2881. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:07:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128080726.20370.00001065@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 32393

In article <3c543b4b_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020121001026.13187.00000371@mb-cs.aol.com...
>>
>> The thing to be doing now is discussing what the new ARS license
>structure
>> should be without S25.5.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>And what's wrong with the 3-class license structure we have
>now?

Let's presume for a moment that it's late 2003 and the FCC has simply
dumped Element 1, but made no other changes.

Here's what's wrong:

- New hams have to pass the 35 question Tech written - but to do so, they
are handed the "200 page book", as W1RFI so often mentions. What Techs
get for their effort is ALL VHF/UHF at 1.5 kW power, but extremely limited
HF/MF.
Only tiny slices of four bands, and only two modes! I think the "entry level"
license
should allow more spectrum and modes but less power. Remember, RF safety was
not a concern back when the structure was created.

-The additional modes and spectrum granted upon upgrade do not match the
additional knowledge gained. For example, a Tech can use any authorized
mode at full power on 50-54 MHz, but not 28-29.7 MHz. Except for some
regulations and propagation knowledge, why is another test needed for
HF/MF?

-The tests are too full of minor regulations and too little weighted with
safety and
real theory questions. This is particularly true of the Extra.

-The license structure tends to push new hams into starting off on VHF/UHF
rather than HF/MF. That's a good thing, because it introduces them to
local amateur radio, but a not-so-good-thing because it limits their world-view
and tends to push them into using only manufactured rigs. (How many new hams
do you know who started out with homebuilt VHF/UHF rigs?)

- The existing structure is a patchwork job that dates back to over a
half-century ago.

--

What is YOUR vision for US amateur radio licensing beyond S25.5?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2882. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:07:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128080727.20370.00001066@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 32394

In article <3c5463a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020127144536.13187.00000587@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> "Kim" writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" writes:
>> >>
>> >> >How'd we get talking about weight?
>> >>
>> >> You started talking about size and weight, Kim
>>
>> >OH, wow. No I didn't.
>>
>> Yes, you did:
>>
>> From google, a few days ago:
>>
>> Kim wrote:
>>
>> (begin quote)
>>
>> >You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size
>20
>> >clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:
>>
>> (end quote)
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

> Ah yes, so true.

Glad you agree.

> However, you're quite wrong about my bringing size and
>weight up first.

Nope. You mentioned it quite a ways back, then reiterated it here with the
above.

>The line you have so carefully chosen out of context in
>order to attempt to prove a point that does not exist--except for possibly
>in your own mind--is one that was in reponse to the boring Jay, who had the
>following to say--thus being the first comment on size and weight

Nope. Jay is talking about seismic activity.

> (NOTE:
>Care to keep up with retrieving old posts, by the way?):
>
It seems you can retrieve them when it suits your purpose. And you avoid it
when
you are afraid of what the results will show.

>Jay's post:
>
>In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>says...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>> >
>> > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
>> > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
>> > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.

>> ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
>> committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable, Bill!
>> I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>>
>when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
>Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
>
>--
>6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

So where is the mention of size and weight?
>
>And, then, here's my post in response:
>
>"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
>news:MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net...
>> In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>> says...
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>> > >
>> > > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
>> > > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
>> > > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
>> > >
>> >
>> > ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
>> > committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,

>Bill!
>> > I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
>> Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
>>
>> --
>> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
>You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size 20
>clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:

See? You mention it in reply to Jay.

Actually, you only mention size (height and clothing size). You only implied
weight.

My mistake - sorry.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2883. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:07:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128080728.20370.00001067@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 32395

In article <3c5427e2_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020123080721.17580.00000527@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3c49f6b5_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020119140515.09750.00001817@mb-cq.aol.com...
>> >> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>> >>
>> >> >Want to bet that, with that particular shift in position,
>> >> >the ARRL will see an increase in membership from
>> >> >those who perviously felt quite "disenfranchised" by
>> >> >the ARRL's former policy on Morse???
>>
>> How could such a change ever be measured?
>
>That's actually a very good question ... I suspect it could
>only be "measured," ... more accurately, I guess, infered,
>from the results.

What results?

If the ARRL does have an increase in membership, who is to
say why that increase occurred unless some sort of poll or
survey is done? Membership increase could come from a
bunch of sources:

- Fundraising efforts cause more hams to realize the threats to
amateur allocations
- Increased interest in amateur radio caused by restructuring,
sunspots, economic changes, technology changes and
other changes results in more members.
- Increase in the number of hams results in more ARRL members
>
>> If every single US member of NCI who is not now an ARRL member
>joined,
>> how many would that add to the ARRL membership? Probably less than
>1%.
>
>If you re-read my original post, I believe you'll find I said "If NCI
>encouraged every no-code/slow-code amateur who's not an
>ARRL member to join ... " etc.

Sure. That's what you wrote, but not what I wrote. You ASSUME that
all no-codetest/slowcodetest amateur would side with you. That's not
a valid assumption at all.

Right in this newsgroup there are hams who supported the end of
13 and 20 wpm testing but think total code test elimination is a bad
idea. At least one regular poster here says he quit NCI because he
thought 5 wpm was the right amount of testing.

>I don't believe I limited the target
>population to NCI members.
>
The number of nocode international members is known (at least to some).
The number of amateurs opposed to code testing is not known.
>
>Getting down to the quote which I didn't see until I scrolled down,
>I'm gratified to see that my memory has not failed ...
>
>> >I have occasionally thought that one of the smartest things
>> >we as NCI might do would be to actively encourage every
>> >no code/slow code ham in the US to join the ARRL right
>> >away and elect a slate of directors who would PROMISE
>> >*in no uncertain* terms to vigorously support the elimination
>> >of Morse testing in US rules as soon as the ITU Radio
>> >Regulations permit.
>>
>> That would work IF the number of nocodetest hams in the USA were
>> significant enough to make a difference in director elections.
>
>If you look at current ARRL membership as a % of the number
>of licensed hams in the US and also look at the number of
>no-code/slow-code hams relative to "fast-code" hams, I think
>one could correctly infer that the numbers are very likely large
>enough to make a significant difference in the outcome of an
>ARRL election, if those folks all joined, nominated a slate of
>director candidates who *promised* to follow their views, and
>voted for same.

Sure - IF they ALL supported the no-code-test agenda. That's not
a valid assumption at all. It's your wish, nothing more.

Equating the set of hams who have not taken code tests beyond 5 wpm
with the set of hams who want code testing totally abolished is not
logically valid.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2884. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:07:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128080729.20370.00001068@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 32392

In article <kSZ48.106682$Ee7.7177130@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>> Ed,
>>
>> We are aware of the positions of *some* of the ARRL directors,
>> (for or against I'm not saying ...) but in most cases, those views
>> have been given in some sort of confidence and it would be
>> unethical of NCI to make such private conversations public (as
>> you point out).
>>
>
>Why would knowing the position of a BoD of ARRL be unethical? I would think
>they would *want* the membership to know. Unless, of course, it went
>against the grain of what the majority of members wanted, Hmmmmm.
>
Arnie,

I don't think most of the BoD want their votes to be widely known.

The policy change was not done by a recorded vote. Their was a motion to have
a roll call/recorded vote, but it was not approved. Which means most of the BoD

did not want their votes on the policy change recorded.

All of this is in acordance with the bylaws and paliamentary procedure. But one

has to wonder WHY a director would not want his/her vote recorded, if they
really believe in what they voted for.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2885. Re: Even more laffs - for HAMS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:26:41 UTC
From: rsdalton1 <rsdalton1@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <lkc58.1009$By6.172690@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32396

ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZ
"Realham" <dxhound@srynet.com> wrote in message
news:3C520BE5.5597C46D@srynet.com...
> Q. What do you call an anti-coder with an Apple computer?
> A. An iTard.
>
> Q. How many anti-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb?
> A. Only one. But none will try.
>
> Q. How can you get an anti-coder to speak intimate terms of endearment?
>
> A. Super-glue a picture of Al Gore to his mike.
>
> Q. Why did the anti-coder smear grease all over his antenna?
> A. So dem SWR's will slide right off!
>
> Did you hear about the anti-coder who made ten pit stops at an oval
> track race? One stop for gas, the other nine for directions.
>
> An anti-coder goes into a ham store and picks up a 50 foot roll of
> coax. After staring at it for 10 minutes, he was asked what he was
> doing. He said he was trying to figure out which end went to the radio
> and which end went to the antenna.
>
> Then there was the anti-coder who said a "heterodyne" is a restaurant
> for straights.
>
> Q. Why were the roomful of anti-coders crying?
> A.. The local welfare office closed for a month.
>
> Q. What do you call the morgue at an AIDS hospital?
> A. The anti-coder Hall of Fame.
>
> Q. How many anti-coders can you stuff into a shoebox?
> A. All of them.
>
> Q. What do you call a bunch of anti-coders in a welfare office?
> A. CBers at their watering hole.
>
> Some anti-coders were told to to "dress for success." Then, the local
> Wal-Mart had a run on rainbow underwear.
>
> Q. How does an anti-coder spell "relief" ?
> A. He can't - he's afraid of the alphabet.

>
> An anti-coder goes into a restaurant and sees some lobsters in a tank.
> Feeling sorry for them, he hides them under his shirt, takes them out to
> the woods and sets them free.
>
> Two anti-coders were riding in the bed of a pickup truck. The truck goes
> off the highway into a lake. The driver rolled down the window and
> escaped to safety. The two anti-coders riding in the truck bed drowned,
> because they couldn't lower the tailgate.
>
> Hear about the anti-coder who applied for a Lewinsky class license? He
> said that all he had to do was blow the code and then he could blow the
> VE.
>
>
>
>

2886. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:26:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128082648.27059.00000386@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32397

>Yep... and quite a few others..... Too bad there isn't a way to dig up these
>old trolls who did the testing back then. I am not the only other one they

PURE BS

2887. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:29:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128082910.27059.00000387@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32398

>I could care less about the HF frequencies.

Then why would you even consider upgrading???

2888. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 13:31:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128083142.27059.00000389@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32399

>What is the need to "cash" those in? I only did it to satisfy me. HF has
>no interest to me.

And thats why you got so upset that the VEs cheated you, yea right

2889. Re: The states of Morse (was Re: Hey Carl . . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 14:24:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C555F2A.631CEE86@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32400

"Aaron J. Grier" wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > It's obvious that you still do not understand Shannon's theorem. If
> > PSK31 is 50Hz wide and CW is 250Hz wide, the comparison is not a fair
> > one. The only fair way to compare PSK31 and CW is to copy CW through a
> > 50Hz filter. Do that and get back to us on your ability to copy it.
> > (P.S. You won't be able to copy it unless it is dog slow.)
>
> alternately is there a variant or relative of psk31 that takes up the
> same bandwidth (250Hz) as CW?

PACTOR II takes up approximately the same bandwidth as CW. It has
higher throughput and better signal to noise capabilities than CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2890. ROGER WISEMAN WILL STILL SUCK YOUR COCK AND RIM YOUR ASSHOLE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 19:20:50 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <3C55A516.5030607@alt.net>
Source record: 32401
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.gayteen,alt.homosexual.music

Woger Wiseman will suck your cock:

http://home.gay.com/Woger/
http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=Woger

Woger Wiseman Gallery of Shame:

"Don't bring a knife to a gun fights you illarate fuck!"
Woger explains his battle plan in ^^^^^^^
9ujg6hpa@dosa.alt.net

"Dr. Seuss is above your reading level you. You fucker illerate"
kc8jbo@alt.net Woger demonstrates his superior sentence ^^^^^^
structure and spelling ability.

"...I never went to high school..."
Woger laments his lack of education in (a129t$i578@pita.alt.net)

Mehehe... Well, "grammer" sic boy, you definately have no room
to talk... (9viq9f$2@dosa.alt.net) ^^^^^^^

Woger Wiseman Newsgroups:

news://news.epita.fr/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache0.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache3.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache1.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://ftp.tomica.ru/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache2.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

2891. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 19:29:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C55A681.A6B19590@uci.edu>
Source record: 32402

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> SIight correction: "Carl is saying that, IMHO, and from comments
> I've heard/seen from many, the subscription to QST is a SIGNIFICANT
> reason that MANY people join ARRL." It is clearly not the ONLY
> reason,
> but, as I stated, IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
> membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.
>
> BTW ... I would NOT be one of them.

But don't you see the difference between saying it that way, and the way you said it before? One is accurate, and the other is purely derogatory. You almost always opt for the derogatory. That's what makes a lot of what you say so irritating.

2892. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 19:31:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C55A70E.9ECD1BDD@uci.edu>
Source record: 32403

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> > > lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
> >
> > You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?
>
> Jim,
>
> I believe you know full-well that I was talking about
> the average level of tehcnical competence, relative
> to the state of the art in communications technology,
> as well as willingness to accept new things that
> are different from "the way it's always been."

So, you mean't to deride everyone except yourself. Yes, that IS the way
it seemed.
```

2893. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 19:59:06 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0201281159.2fc3dd98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32404

I'm seriously confused. If the CSCE for the code was current and
presented when the CSCE for General element was awarded, the VEs
would've filed both CSCEs with the FCC, resulting in the issuance of
the General license. I don't believe you need to send it to the FCC.
What am I missing here? You have "unfiled" CSCEs for code and the
General element? Is it that the code CSCE had expired when the General
element was passed? In that case, filing the code CSCE would do no
good. For all intents and purposes, you still need to pass the code
again. Notice, I am not judging your reasons, just trying to figure
out the sequence.

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:<ec048.84$ys1.12796@newshog.newsread.com>...
> Hey dumb fuck..... CSCE is sitting right at home for your ever-important
> code test! Don't have the need to send it in nor the equipment as well. My
> dead ass as you call it works between 55-70 hours per week as well as
> pursuing university courses? So who has the dead ass here? At least I
> either to try to support others here or inject a little humor once in a
> while. I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written and
> the code test.
>
> Oh yeah.... had it not been for some VE's screwing up 13 years ago, I would
> have been a licensee then. They chose what rules they wished to follow, and
> made up their own.
>
> Get a life loser.
>
>
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020123192049.17829.00000154@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > >And where the hell were you when all these changes that you detest so
> much?
> > >
> > >Did you bother working towards a "positive goal" at least as what is
> > >percieved in your own mind? Did you do anything towards the promotion of
> > >your beliefs other that bitching and moaning here?
> > >
> > >My guess is no. My guess is you are the type that enjoys bitching about
> > >everything with doing nothing to make it better. Not once have I ever
> see
> > >you post a positive message, nor a contributory one either. Even some of
> > >the other "sticks in the mud" in this newsgroup at least contribute
> > >positively to a debate, or provide some information.

> > >
> > >Find a counselor or someone who can help you with your negativity. It is
> not
> > >healthy.
> >
> >
> > SCREW OFF, just as I figured, checked the Qrz DATA Base and of course
> you are
> > one of them there CBplussers. Why dont you get off your Dead ASS and get a
> Real
> > Ham License, havent you heard they are basically giving them away.

2894. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 20:28:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C56F7FF.8F481E15@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32405

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > That's like saying you can be required to own a car because you are issued a
> >drivers license after being tested to prove you can drive a car. Silly boy,
> >Ed.
>
> Yes, it is rather silly to think that the licensing requirements are directly
> related to emergency communications.

I believe FCC pretty well addressed that situation with the rule that says in a
life threatening situation "anything goes".

2895. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 20:55:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128155510.28299.00004215@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 32406

In article <20020127211954.01770.00000055@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3c52be27$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
>>No wonder you've never gotten anywhere financially, Larry.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>What makes you think I haven't "gotten anywhere" financially, Kim?
>You been sneaking a peek at my Czeching accounts, IRA's, etc.???
>As usual, you don't know what you're talking about.

Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
A BUS! :-)

2896. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 20:55:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128155510.28299.00004214@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 32407

In article <La658.94092$Y17.5989292@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> Nope. I've not disagreed with that. I just won't lap up your argument
>> as anything of proof that morse is VITAL for anything BECAUSE
>> one or two Special Forces MOSs require it.
>>
>Heck, it took me about six months to get you to admit that SF even required
>their troops to know Morse.

Wrong again. The original subject thread concerned MORSE IN MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS. Communications of the two-way kind.

I stated, on the basis of early experience and periodic later observation, that the U.S. military had GIVEN UP ON MORSE for tactical or routine military communications. That was re-enforced by giving several web addresses for information on current (as of 1984 and later) publicly-available documentation on signal equipment in-use by the U.S. military land forces.

There was a long off-shoot of that thread concerning the SINCGARS family of small-unit (squad to battalion, ground-air support) radios which are coming up on 14 operational years in service. SINgle-Channel Ground Air Radio System has voice and data modes, in-clear or encrypted, but no OOK morse modes. Earlier, in another thread, I had pointed out that portable equipment operating in the military aviation band (225-400 MHz) was PROBABLY in use "behind the lines" in Kuwait-Iraq during the Gulf War for the reason that it could link with airborne relay craft or satellites, sending data at up to 1200 Baud with VERY low probability of intercept due to very directional antennas and the capability of pointing UP rather than spreading all the RF horizontally.

Somewhere in that convoluted timeline Macy jumps in with making a Big Deal of "special forces 'Using' morse" as if that is the exception disproving the regular routine or tactical military communications modes not using morse.

Since Macy is a proponent of morse he had some kind of burr under his shoulder holster about any PUBLIC, FACTUAL information that did not support the morse myths. Macy kept harping about "check out the MOS requirements" and kept

insisting that I should call long-distance to some name and
rank to "prove that special forces need to know morse," etc.

I DID agree that (through checking elsewhere through public-
access information Army sources) ONE special forces MOS
requires morse ability. Macy then tried to manuever the sub-
thread into my "insistence that I disagreed with him" and
"would not admit to Macy being right (about SF)."

In the larger context of the thread, I STILL DO NOT AGREE
WITH MACY on the U.S. military USING MORSE MODES
FOR TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS. They don't. The
tactical and strategic doctrine for special forces are NOT
PUBLIC IN THEIR ENTIRETY nor should they be.

>I *never* said it was vital to their
>operations, I said it was required of the Communications Specialists.

In the words written in here, yes. In the implication that BECAUSE
the SF (in one MOS) require morse ability, the U.S. military uses
morse modes, that is a piece of MISINFORMATION. If that is too
strong a charge, call it "guilt by omission." And there is a LOT of
omission in trying to use ONE MOS as some kind of exception
to what signal units in all branches have been using for decades.

>... You just continue to make it up
>as you go trying to fit those round thoughts into a square hole. Nothing
>has changed with you.

I am simply pointing out publicly-available information sources that
are available to anyone, even radio amateurs (the Army TM on
inventory of signal equipment is linked on at least two ham-oriented
websites). I don't post long-distance telephone numbers and demand
that others call it (at their charge) to "prove" a posting. I prefer to let
others see the evidence at their leisure and make up their own mind.

I gave the website to Fort Huachuca in here, explained that the M.I.
school there trains all government personnel in morse cognition,
even mentioned the specific unit down to the company level. All from
their website (an interesting one if one is into M.I. data). From their
website information (open to the public) they have the number of
students per class, the number of classes for the year, a summary
of the particular courses. It's fairly easy to see that the total number
of students will exceed the number of morseMOS troops in the
special forces. [Macy may disagree with that but TS, baby]

Now, let me level a charge against Macy: As a civilian employee of
the Department of the Army, Macy has easier access to information
on communications methods, equipment, and personnel than most
other newsgroup participants...whether it is classified or released to
the public. Macy has NOT MENTIONED ANYTHING about accessing
such information. NOTHING. Not even the websites provided in here
by myself and others. Yet the public, civilian defense contractors,

manufacturers, sellers and buyers of military equipment can all access public information on U.S. military equipment, personnel (full Army MOS precis from one site, course materials at Fort Gordon at another!).

All of the above will indicate (without reasonable doubt) that morse methods are GONE from regular, routine, tactical U.S. military communications. They've been gone for a long while. However, morse proponents are loathe to admit it, want to waltz around any statements of factual information so as to preserve their own myths and dreams that "their" ability will somehow be a "salvation of society when the Big Emergency comes along." Ergo, the amateur radio morse test for a license MUST be continued...to reinforce those dreams by forcing newcomers to do as they had to do once. Pfui.

>BTW -- SF would *never* be in *monitor* mode as they
>are totally dependent on MI for intel, right?

Accusatory, manufacturing an "argument" and baseless charge that never existed. Poor tactics.

Special Forces, Special Operations, Rangers, SEALS never go into the field without intelligence information. They aren't cowboys in the movie sense of the word. The SOURCE of intel can be from many places, different units. Most often that source IS from M.I.

>Feel free to use the argument that I was never in military service or had
>direct contact with SF. That seems to be a favorite with you. Oops, can't
>use either one of those -- too bad.

Again, a baseless "charge" about an "argument" that never existed.

I don't care if Macy co-wrote "Ballad of the Green Berets" or did a High Altitude Low Opening (HALO) drop into denied territory.

Those of us who had taken a military service OATH and served our country as part of the military are, in my book, quite qualified to argue ABOUT the U.S. military. Those who haven't aren't qualified. That qualification is on a helluva lot higher level than any test for a radio amateur license or DX honor roll standings or other hobby activities.

If Macy is a veteran, fine with me. I am. Status AS a veteran is NO qualification for an opinion being "more correct" than opinions from OTHER veterans. Keep that in mind.

You have aged, but not with much grace. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Yeah, three months older since last posting. So is Macy. The PCTAs are still as graceless and uncivil as before.

2897. WOGER'S NEW WEB PAGE!!!!! REPORT HIM TO THE FCC!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 21:02:48 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <3C55BCFC.302@alt.net>
Source record: 32408
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.ameteur.misc,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WOGER'S PAGE 2:

http://home.gay.com/Woger/sux.html

Report him to Riley at the FCC for jammin' on 20 meters!

Woger Wiseman will suck your cock:

http://home.gay.com/Woger/
http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=Woger

_____
Woger Wiseman Gallery of Shame:

"Don't bring a knife to a gun fights you illarate fuck!"
Woger explains his battle plan in ^^^^^^^
9ujg6hpa@dosa.alt.net

"Dr. Seuss is above your reading level you. You fucker illerate"
kc8jbo@alt.net Woger demonstrates his superior sentence ^^^^^^
structure and spelling ability.

"...I never went to high school..."
Woger laments his lack of education in (a129t$i578@pita.alt.net)

Mehehe... Well, "grammer" sic boy, you definately have no room
to talk... (9viq9f$2@dosa.alt.net) ^^^^^^^

_____
Woger Wiseman Newsgroups:

news://news.epita.fr/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache0.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache3.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache1.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://ftp.tomica.ru/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache2.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

2898. Re: GENO's NEW FORGERY!!!!! REPORT HIM TO THE FCC!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 21:31:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a34g48ogp1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 32409
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,alt.flamenet,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Poor Geno.....

Path:
news.alt.net!peer1-sjc1.usenetserver.com!usenetserver.com!newsfeeds-atl1.use
netserver.com!cox.net!news2.east.cox.net.POSTED!53ab2750!not-for-mail
Message-ID: <3C55BCFC.302@alt.net>
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:0.9.4)
Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2
X-Accept-Language: en-us
MIME-Version: 1.0
Newsgroups:
alt.flame,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.ameteur.misc,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.am
ateur.policy
Subject: WOGER'S NEW WEB PAGE!!!!! REPORT HIM TO THE FCC!!!!!!
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Lines: 43
Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 21:02:48 GMT
NNTP-Posting-Host: 68.12.68.200
X-Complaints-To: abuse@cox.net
X-Trace: news2.east.cox.net 1012251768 68.12.68.200 (Mon, 28 Jan 2002
16:02:48 EST)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 16:02:48 EST
Organization: Cox Communications
Xref: news alt.flame:806420 alt.flamenet:69381 alt.personals.gay:238838
rec.radio.amateur.policy:193818

> WOGER'S PAGE 2:
>
> http://home.gay.com/Woger/sux.html
>
>
> Report him to Riley at the FCC for jammin' on 20 meters!

Geno's not too bright........

2899. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:12:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C57106C.A02CBFE5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32410

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> > matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> > technical support.
>
> No, it's a matter of being prepared for operation with the *maximum*
> feasible level of technical support. It doesn't do much good to
> prepare for an emergency after it happens.

I fervently hope you're not ignoran t enough to believe that is
is possible to be fully prepared for any possible circumstance. The best
possible way to be prepared is
to hae the maximum number of options. That includes
CW skill in this case. Since virtually every HF ham rig
made includes the mode with no further additional overhead
other than operator knowledge, it is sheer avoidance and
irresponsibility for hams to fail to do so. I know that you
know this, but prefer to continue on your jihad against the mode.

2900. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:35:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128173522.10434.00000926@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32411

>Subject: Re: ??? for Mr DX
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127201047.05631.00001962@mb-bd.aol.com>

I was hoping yours had been a "permanent" departure, but I guess God isn't done torturing us yet.

>No, what "has been documented" is a lot of one-upmanship-in-messaging
>by those want to be "right" at any cost trying to show that they are
>"expert" in whatever they choose to talk about...including a lot of
>not-subtle female bashing by those this as a male enclave

Here we go with the "one-upmanship" and other "lodgehall" accusations by someone who himself is the master of having been there first or done it better.

What a creep.

Except for overt comments by ONE respondent here vis-a-vis Kim's appearance, almost all of the comments have been relative to her choice of callsigns.

And Lennie...Check your grammar.

Yours always,

Steve

2901. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:39:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128173904.10434.00000928@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32412

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127201037.05631.00001958@mb-bd.aol.com>

>There is NO evidence that U.S. Army Special Forces have used
>telegraphy or radiotelegraphy in Afghanistan in 2001 or 2002 or
>that the U.S. military has used it in the Gulf War of 1990-1991.

That's not what was said, but of course you won't let facts bother you.

>...the mythos and misinformation continues to be propagated
>through the "C Layer."

And lying in support of your own arguments continues to propagate via
RRAP.

As Always,

Steve

2902. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:44:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128174423.10434.00000932@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32413

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 10:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127234731.05631.00001967@mb-bd.aol.com>

>In fact, you have stated you have not served in any military anywhere.
>Several in here HAVE, including argementers on both sides of the
>code issue

There is no code issue any more. Simply squabbling about what COULD of happened.

>If so, take it to another
>dimension since slamming the military is not de rigeur these days.

You do it, both against certain veterans in particular and branches in general when it suits your rants.

>It wouldn't hurt you to
>find out something of modern-day military communications would it?

Why should he? You don't.

Observingly Yours,

Steve

2903. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:50:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128175035.14720.00000891@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 32414

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>When you tell the whole story, it looks a bit different.

Not really, Jim. The point that when I entered ham radio, that first rung was a very small one and that now, it is a much much larger step does not change.

IMHO, this does explain why we have far fewer 13 year olds entering ham radio than in the Novice heyday. More hams are entering ham radio now than then, but they are doing it at an older age.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

2904. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 22:55:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128175501.10434.00000933@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32415

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 10:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127234731.05631.00001968@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Nope. I've not disagreed with that. I just won't lap up your argument
>as anything of proof that morse is VITAL for anything BECAUSE
>one or two Special Forces MOSs require it.

And IF just ONE SF operator intercepts a message that leads to Osama's capture, how "unimportant" will Morse skill have been?

Everything about Osama's tactics have indicated "low tech" applications. Why would his communcations be any different?

>Monitoring, doing ELINT intercepts is a function of M.I., not S.F. >You should KNOW that if you work for the Department of the Army.

And how many MI folks are within simplex range of these emplacements? How many SF folks are?

>>He would also probably argue that
>>they would *never* use horses as a means of transportation either --- Oops,
>>they *did* do that, didn't they?
>
>Sorry you had to manufacture an argument that never existed.

What "manufactured"...?!?! Time, Newsweek, CNN, and every major news media has reported US forces on horseback in Afghanistan.

>I had high hopes that you might become civil and rational in here
>but you are still covertly libeling those who have climbed on you
>in the past.

And I had high hopes that you had done the same. Appears I was wrong. However YOUR "libeling" is more overt than covert.

>Not that it matters, but as far as I knew, the last permanent horse
>unit in the U.S. Army was in D.C. and used for ceremonial
>purposes...such as funeral processions.

Not that facts matter, but no one said anything about "permanent" horse units in ANY branch of the Armed Forces. I do know that facts in your rants are few and far between, but I am sure you have gotten your wind after this last sabatical.

>You must info-shop
>on the web because you've sure as hell not gone out to observe

>a modern-day Signal Battalion or Regiment in the field...or maybe
>you did and got pissed that they weren't using CW?

Lennie, Lennie, Lennie.....

Your own "info-shopping" has more often than not left you clueless and only half-informed. I am surprised that you would make such a foolish suggestion to another.

Cautiously yours,

Steve

2905. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:11:14 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <KSk58.105829$Y17.6276133@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32416

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> Wrong again. The original subject thread concerned MORSE IN
> MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS. Communications of the two-way
> kind.
>
Here's what you said ... (my emphasis added)

"None of the public information even hints at any "use" of ook cw codings as either being commsec, valuable, versatile, or as any part of US military communications doctrine. OOK CW CODINGS ARE NOT USED IN US MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS. There is absolutely no need to maintain any "pool of trained CW [OOK CW] operators" for any national security reason."

I replied that the SF still used Morse and you jumped on me with both hooves saying that they DID NOT train in, USE, or NEED OOK CW. After a very lengthy debate, you finally admitted that they were required to learn it and that it might be used on a very limited basis.

>
> Somewhere in that convoluted timeline Macy jumps in with
> making a Big Deal of "special forces 'Using' morse" as if
> that is the exception disproving the regular routine or
> tactical military communications modes not using morse.
>

Never said, implied, hinted or otherwise wrote that it was in *routine* use. I said it was used by SF, that's all I have ever said. You *still* seem to have a real problem with this.

> I DID agree that (through checking elsewhere through public-
> access information Army sources) ONE special forces MOS
> requires morse ability. Macy then tried to manuever the sub-
> thread into my "insistence that I disagreed with him" and
> "would not admit to Macy being right (about SF)."
>

You called me some pretty ugly names, then finally and, by God, it was just like pulling teeth, you admitted that I was correct in my original statement that SF used Morse.

>
> I am simply pointing out publicly-available information sources that
> are available to anyone, even radio amateurs (the Army TM on
> inventory of signal equipment is linked on at least two ham-oriented
> websites). I don't post long-distance telephone numbers and demand

> that others call it (at their charge) to "prove" a posting. I prefer to
let
> others see the evidence at their leisure and make up their own mind.
>

You wouldn't have *dared* call that number because it would have proven you WRONG, and you would never let that happen. Like I said, you haven't changed a bit, so WRT you, I won't either.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2906. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:14:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128181428.10434.00000935@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32417

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/28/2002 2:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020128155510.28299.00004214@mb-ck.aol.com>

>>Heck, it took me about six months to get you to admit that SF even required
>>their troops to know Morse.
>
>Wrong again. The original subject thread concerned MORSE IN
>MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS. Communications of the two-way
>kind.

Nope. Lying again. You steadfastly denied ANY application of Morse Code skills in the Armed Forces.

>There was a long off-shoot of that thread concerning the
>SINCGARS...(SNIP)

Yes, yes, yes, Lennie...We are WELL aware of your numerous quotes and recitals on the SINCGARS system. Anytime you start getting backed into a corner that YOU painted, you trot it out and try to impress us with your ability to quote from the spec sheet and editorialize on how this system is the end-all of MILCOM.

Phooie. It impresses no one.

>Somewhere in that convoluted timeline Macy jumps in with
>making a Big Deal of "special forces 'Using' morse" as if
>that is the exception disproving the regular routine or
>tactical military communications modes not using morse.

YOU stated it was NOT in use and NOT taught at any level for ANY reason. Arnie has repeatedly proven you wrong, but you continue to flail away, hoping that SOMEONE will believe you.

Sorry.

>In the larger context of the thread, I STILL DO NOT AGREE
>WITH MACY on the U.S. military USING MORSE MODES
>FOR TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS. They don't.

Prove it. Prove that there is NO use of Morse Code ANYWHERE by ANY branch of the Armed Forces, Lennie.

>Now, let me level a charge against Macy: As a civilian employee of
>the Department of the Army, Macy has easier access to information
>on communications methods, equipment, and personnel than most
>other newsgroup participants...whether it is classified or released to

>the public. Macy has NOT MENTIONED ANYTHING about accessing
>such information. NOTHING.

He has, but you have "dismissed" it as "PCTA misinformation" on frequent occassions.

And if it's classified, WHY would Arnie jeopardize his career over it in THIS forum? You flatter yourself again, Lennie.

>All of the above will indicate (without reasonable doubt) that morse
>methods are GONE from regular, routine, tactical U.S. military
>communications.

Does absence of data on a website "prove" that something doesn't exist? Or does it (more realistically) mean that someone doesn't want to discuss it for "whatever" reason?

>Accusatory, manufacturing an "argument" and baseless charge
>that never existed. Poor tactics.

Those in glass houses.............

>>Feel free to use the argument that I was never in military service or had
>>direct contact with SF. That seems to be a favorite with you. Oops, can't
>>use either one of those -- too bad.
>
>Again, a baseless "charge" about an "argument" that never existed.

And once again Lennie propagates a "mistruth" in his own defense.

>If Macy is a veteran, fine with me. I am. Status AS a veteran is
>NO qualification for an opinion being "more correct" than opinions
>from OTHER veterans. Keep that in mind.

You too, Lennie.

>Yeah, three months older since last posting. So is Macy. The
>PCTAs are still as graceless and uncivil as before.

And you still have a pulse and poisoned pen. Somethings just never seem to get better, do they?

As Always,

Steve

2907. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:19:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128181936.10434.00000936@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32418

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127201044.05631.00001960@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Heck, as a middle-school student in 1947 I could touch-type at
>60 WPM no problem...on typewriters that had NO markings on
>the keys!! All you kids are a bunch of "lossers!

That's My Lennie! Did it first, did it better...!

Lovingly,

Steve

2908. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:22:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128182201.10434.00000937@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32419

>Subject: Re: Noting but niceness from CS
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127201036.05631.00001957@mb-bd.aol.com>

>There is direct, distinctive proof for all who can get the full message
>content. Send a private message and I will point it out.

If you can't print it here, it is probably not factual.

But I am sending this anyway, altho I doubt it will be anything
substantial.

Doubtingly yours,

Steve

2909. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:27:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128182751.10434.00000938@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32420

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020127201045.05631.00001961@mb-bd.aol.com>

>The U.S. military abandoned morse codings for IMPORTANT
>communications before the USA was struck into WW2,
>like around 1938.

"AIR RAID PEARL HARBOR X THIS IS NOT A DRILL"

>Regardless of the charm, affection, and (sometimes) lust that
>some have for morse modes, the old 60 WPM teleprinters
>still beat the most expert 40 WPM morsemen and could do so
>24/7. In 1940 and in 1955. A half century ago.

Then why did it take until the 1970's for the Armed Forces to completely
"abandon" Morse Code?

>Unfortunately, some old-timers (some as old as 47) who have
>never, ever served in any military branch purport to be "expert"
>on the U.S. military. Misinformation marches on...

Including from those who haven't taken an Amateur Radio examination.

>Love How Able

(L)ying (H)am-baiting (A)ntagonist

Recurringly yours,

Steve

2910. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:37:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c55e253_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32422

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128080727.20370.00001066@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3c5463a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020127144536.13187.00000587@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> "Kim" writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >How'd we get talking about weight?
> >> >>
> >> >> You started talking about size and weight, Kim
> >>
> >> >OH, wow. No I didn't.
> >>
> >> Yes, you did:
> >>
> >> From google, a few days ago:
> >>
> >> Kim wrote:
> >>
> >> (begin quote)
> >>
> >> >You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a
size
> >20
> >> >clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:
> >>
> >> (end quote)
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> > Ah yes, so true.
>
> Glad you agree.
>
> > However, you're quite wrong about my bringing size and
> >weight up first.
>
> Nope. You mentioned it quite a ways back, then reiterated it here with the

> above.
>

Just for the sake of argument, I don't think so.

> >
> >The line you have so carefully chosen out of context in
> >order to attempt to prove a point that does not exist--except for
possibly
> >in your own mind--is one that was in reponse to the boring Jay, who had
the
> >following to say--thus being the first comment on size and weight
>
> Nope. Jay is talking about seismic activity.
>

OK. Whatever, Jim.

> >
> > (NOTE:
> >Care to keep up with retrieving old posts, by the way?):
> >
> It seems you can retrieve them when it suits your purpose. And you avoid
it
> when
> you are afraid of what the results will show.
>

Jim, as I've said before, I don't why or how one should "fear" being proved
wrong. What's going to happen? C'mon. Do *you* really think about it that
much?

> >
> >Jay's post:
> >
> >In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >says...
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> >
> >> > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency efforts,
> >> > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> >> > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
>
> >> ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> >> committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,
Bill!
> >> I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
> >>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> >>
> >>

> >>
> >when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on the
> >Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
> >
> >--
> >6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
> So where is the mention of size and weight?
> >
> >And, then, here's my post in response:
> >
> >"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
> >news:MPG.16b9883fb331484f9896af@news.earthlink.net...
> >> In article <3c4f6f25$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >> says...
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:a2lfhk$2ve$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> > >
> >> > > If you are trying to pick a leader for your local emergency
efforts,
> >> > > then I can see making some estimate as to commitment...but odds
> >> > > are it is only the commited that volunteer anyway.
> >> > >
> >> >
> >> > ROFLMAO!!!! I don't know if the humor is intended, but that only the
> >> > committed (as in committed to insanity) volunteer is quite probable,
> >Bill!
> >> > I'm nuts, I just don't have the papers to prove it...LOL
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5TIT
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> when you roll on the floor laughing your ass off does it register on
the
> >> Cal Tech seismometers??? I think it does
> >>
> >> --
> >> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
> >
> >You guys just crack me up. If you think a 5' 5-6" woman who wears a size
20
> >clothing is that huge, I can only think of the joke that goes:
>
> See? You mention it in reply to Jay.
>
> Actually, you only mention size (height and clothing size). You only
implied
> weight.
>

> My mistake - sorry.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Well, in my opinion, this has been pretty silly exchange.

Kim W5TIT

2911. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:38:22 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020128183822.02219.00000800@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32421

>What is YOUR vision for US amateur radio licensing beyond S25.5?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Technician - Element 2

Technician Plus - Elements 1 & 2

General - Elements 1, 2, & 3

Extra - Elements 1, 2, 3, & 4

I know...wishful thinking. :-(

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2912. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:42:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c55e396_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32423

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C55A681.A6B19590@uci.edu...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > SIight correction: "Carl is saying that, IMHO, and from comments
> > I've heard/seen from many, the subscription to QST is a SIGNIFICANT
> > reason that MANY people join ARRL." It is clearly not the ONLY
> > reason,
> > but, as I stated, IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
> > membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.
> >
> > BTW ... I would NOT be one of them.
>
> But don't you see the difference between saying it that way, and the way
> you said it before? One is accurate, and the other is purely
> derogatory. You almost always opt for the derogatory. That's what
> makes a lot of what you say so irritating.

Well, think about it. I don't subscribe to the "PCTA" and "NCTA" labels;
however, for the sake of demonstration...

When the two sides begin debate it doesn't matter which side it is, *both*
get derogatory pretty damned quick. I mean, I often think that the greatest
motivation isn't ham radio itself--or the pride of it, history of it, or
whatever of it. I wonder if most people in this newsgroup don't use it as
an excuse to just act like assholes, myself included. Think I'd get like I
do with someone on the air, or over the phone, or at work, or even at play?
I'm pretty cocky here in this newsgroup, but I am not that way at all in
person. That's because *most* of us in person would also act a whole lot
differently toward each other.

Kim W5TIT

2913. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:47:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c55e4e8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32425

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C57106C.A02CBFE5@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> > > matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> > > technical support.
> >
> > No, it's a matter of being prepared for operation with the *maximum*
> > feasible level of technical support. It doesn't do much good to
> > prepare for an emergency after it happens.
>
> I fervently hope you're not ignoran t enough to believe that is
> is possible to be fully prepared for any possible circumstance. The best
> possible way to be prepared is
> to hae the maximum number of options. That includes
> CW skill in this case. Since virtually every HF ham rig
> made includes the mode with no further additional overhead
> other than operator knowledge, it is sheer avoidance and
> irresponsibility for hams to fail to do so. I know that you
> know this, but prefer to continue on your jihad against the mode.
>

How many languages do you speak, Dick? How much HAZMAT gear do you have, Dick? Have you got a mobile phone? Have you got some FRS radios? Have you got a CB radio ready to be on the air? I could go on and on. To use your analogy (a piss-poor one, I'd add), then anyone who doesn't "arm" themselves with extra language capability, extra contact cabability, and so on, is *not* to have the maximum number of options.

You're all hot air. However, if you'd come up with some truly viable argument for your passion for CW, then we'd all be probably more than willing to listen. I know I would be.

Kim W5TIT

2914. [Fwd: Re: kc8jbo aka Roger Wiseman's Jamming on 20 meters]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-28 23:50:07 UTC
From: Jesus Slut Fucker <pparis7@cox.net>
Message-ID: <3C55E432.6020207@cox.net>
Source record: 32424
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,alt.flamenet,alt.alien.vampire.flonk.flonk.flonk,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
-------- Original Message --------
From: - Mon Jan 28 17:10:26 2002
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001
X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
Message-ID: <3C55DA5D.70506@cox.net>
Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 17:10:21 -0600
From: Jesus Slut Fucker <pparis7@cox.net>
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:0.9.4)
Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2
X-Accept-Language: en-us
MIME-Version: 1.0
Newsgroups:
alt.flamenet,alt.flame,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.ama
teur.misc,alt.ham-radio.ssb

Subject: [Fwd: Re: kc8jbo aka Roger Wiseman's Jamming on 20 meters]
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="------------020001050409070009030302"

-------- Original Message --------
From: - Mon Jan 28 17:04:18 2002
X-UIDL: <20020128230332.24445.qmail@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
X-Mozilla-Status: 0011
X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
Return-Path: <r_hollingsworth_fcc@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13004.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.174.14]) by
larc.infor.7.umail (InterMail vM.5.01.04.05
201-2523-142-172-105-2001131) with SMTP id
<20020128230331.OZVP1935.lakemtai04.mgt.cox.net@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
for <pparis7@cox.net> ; Mon, 28 Jan 2002 18:03:31 -0500
Message-ID: <20020128230332.24445.qmail@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [68.12.68.200] by web13004.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon,
28 Jan 2002 15:03:32 PST
Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 15:03:32 -0800 (PST)
From: Riley Hollingsworth <r_hollingsworth_fcc@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: kc8jbo
To: <pparis7@cox.net>
In-Reply-To: <3C55BD45.5040307@cox.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

wrote:
```

Yes, thank you for the information. Let me assure you that steps are being taken to already. Mr. Wiseman is under investigation at this moment which is all I can really say at this time. Please feel free to send me any additional information you have about this matter.

Sincerely yours,

W. Riley Hollingsworth

_____
Do You Yahoo!?
Great stuff seeking new owners in Yahoo! Auctions!
http://auctions.yahoo.com

2915. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:05:02 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290000490.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32426

```
On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272143080.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >
>> >The 2.4 GHz gear I'm talking about allows the user to select the
>> >channel(s) of operation within its capability via software ... no
>> >reason that hams couldn't limit their operation to the channels
>> >which fall within the band segment that hams are allowed to
>> >use ... no mods or schematics required.
>>
>> But as Ed Hare noted, these devices usually DON'T say so on the box,
>but simply
>> say something like, "Frequency range: 2400-2483.5" even if they
>only choose a
>> 20MHz window in that range. Are we supposed to GUESS?
>
>No, as they've said here on the internet for years, you're
>supposed to "RTFM!"
>
>[snip]
>
>> Now, that someone has finally said that it is possible to use
>WITHOUT
>> MODIFICATION (because what the manufacturers publish on their
>packaging is
>> misleading and/or just plain wrong), that makes a difference.
>
>Nothing "misleading and/or just plain wrong" in what we print on
>our packaging.
>
>> As noted by Mr. Hare too: Mr. Ham goes into store. Mr. Ham sees
>2.4GHz
>> wireless lan stuff. Mr. Ham picks up box, reads "2400-2483.5" as
>the range,
>> and puts it down, because, not knowing this well-hidden variation to
>the
>> standard, Mr. Ham does not know that this means a 20MHz window in
>that range,
>> and thus discounts the complete idea because modifying the equipment
```

>to keep it
>> in band (a necessary step perceived by Mr. Ham due to improper
>disclosure on
>> the box) is too difficult or takes too much time.
>
>I suppose you went into the store as a tech+ and looked at all
>the HF rigs which said their 80m coverage was 3.5-4.0 MHz
>and didn't buy one because you were only allowed to use the
>novice band at 3.675-3.725 MHz??? Duh!

That's not a failure of the equipment or the manufacturer (or packaging).

>> What is wrong with that picture? Nowhere was Mr. Ham able to find
>and learn
>> about this 20Mhz window of operation feature that makes otherwise
>[perceived]
>> unusable equipment (due to out of band transmission) usable (and
>wholly in
>> band).
>
>RTFM

But one can't "read the manual" until AFTER purchase. Your reasoning is
circular.

However, here's another example: A cordless phone package. It states "15 user
selectable channels" on the box. In that case, no one would assume the entire
frequency range.

The problem is that often, this wireless LAN stuff DOESN'T say that one may
pick a subset of the range.

>> As a person involved in manufacture, shouldn't you be telling your
>potential
>> [secondary target] market about this?
>
>Reality check ... it's up to hams to be knowledgeable enough to
>be able apply gear that wasn't specifically designed for their use
>if they wish to apply it to ham radio ... tons and tons of Motorola
>commercial mobile radio gear has been converted to service in
>the ham bands (often with some actual modifications required) ...
>does Motorola provide directions on how to modify their gear for
>use in the ham bands with every unit (let alone on the box)???
>I don't think so ...

Motorola does offer SERVICE MANUALS for their equipment which do contain
schematics. This example is not comparable.

>> Personally, until this thread surfaced in this group, I was like the
>fictitious
>> Mr. Ham above - not knowing the difference between the .11 and .11b
>standards.
>> I admit that I have learned something.

>
>Glad to hear it ... have you checked out the link to the standards
>on the IEEE website? The standard is the definitive source for
>information.

How many people have time to read 1,000 page documents? Only those who are retired or don't need to work even have the potential for such time.

2916. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:08:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290006170.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32427

On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272204000.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >>
>> >> So, you're telling me that this stuff ISN'T SPREAD SPECTRUM
>across the
>> >entire
>> >> band (2400-2483.5)?.... That's not evident to anyone who isn't a
>> >manufacturer,
>> >> especially considering the original spec. (indicated below).
>> >
>> >It is spread spectrum, according to the Part 15 rules ... however,
>> >a single channel doesn't use the entire 2400-2483.5 MHz ISM
>> >band ... nor do/did the Part 15 rules ever require it to do so ...
>> >Im not sure where you got the (apparent) idea that a single device
>> >used the entire band at once.
>>
>> From the fact that the box of such a device specifies the ENTIRE
>band as its
>> frequency range, that implies that its hop sequence includes
>frequency slices
>> across the ENTIRE band, not a limited subset of it.
>>
>
>The 802.11b stuff on the market today is NOT a FHSS system. It's
>DSSS ... the FHSS option of the original standard never really made
>it because .11b came along with so much better performance that
>the other stuff just died off before it ever even got much of a start.
>
>Thus, there is no "hop sequence" ...

FHSS and DSSS have no meaning to those not familiar with spread spectrum. You should avoid using "industry insider" terms without defining them. Also, I couldn't care if it's a direct sequence or another pattern - because the actual pattern doesn't matter when one is considering on what frequencies it COULD go to.

2917. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:13:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290010110.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32428

```
On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272206100.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>> >Hash: SHA1
>> >
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212123070.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >>
>> >> If the box says that the frequency range is: 2400-2483.5, I do
>NOT
>> >assume that
>> >> the device can be limited to a subset of that range unless it
>also
>> >says that it
>> >> can be
>> >
>> >The user's manual fro my Yaesu Ft-847 lists a rather impressive
>> >range of operating frequencies. Do I assume that it operates on
>> >every frequency in that range simultaneously? Of course not ...
>> >in fact, I think it goes without saying that I (and others) would
>be
>> >most upset if it did ... :-)
>>
>> No, but you do assume that it CAN operate on any (within the
>channelization
>> resolution of the VCO, etc.) frequency in the range.
>>
>> With SS, one generally assumes that the device may hop to any
>frequency within
>> its range. Owners of such devices don't have control over the hop
>pattern -
>> such is the firmware's responsibility.
>>
>> If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without
>indicating
>> that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there a reason
>for someone
>> to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range given, especially
>considering
>> that such was in the older specification of the standard it followed
>(and not
>> being aware of the changes in the standard)?
```

>>
>> >I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
>> >necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...
>>
>> Of course not - that would be "wide band," not spread spectrum.
>However,
>> unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do assume that a
>SS signal
>> may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.
>
>With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD use (spread
>over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier in the middle and
>using a chipping rate that would spread it that wide, but then there would be
>only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if the data rate was low enough, one might
>get enough processing gain to be able to do CDMA overlay and have multiple
>users, but not at the data rates that today's LANs need to carry.

I assume wrong? By the fact that you just confirmed that it could spread over the entire band, you just VALIDATED my assumption, not contradicted it.

>You seem to have some confusion about the characteristics of FHSS vs. DSSS
>systems ... the ARRL publishes at least one reasonably good tutorial book on
>the subject. One of the definitive references on the subject of SS is "Spread
>Spectrum Systems" by Dixon, published by Wiley ... I recommend it highly for
>even the semi-serious student of SS.

Who said that I was confused? Generally, these items simply say "SS" and don't tell us how or which particular algorithm it uses internally. Now, you are correct that I can be confused over which method a particular device uses, especially if the BOX/packaging DOESN'T SAY (or say something that leads to method identification). That's my point. It doesn't say.

>> >Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
>> >obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
>> >encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
>> >the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
>> >that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on
>now
>>
>> Again, a non-evident user choice.
>
>Again, RTFM ...

Again, one only has access to the manual AFTER purchase. How can one make an informed decision beforehand? Circular reasoning.

2918. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:20:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290015590.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32429

On 28 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal
>>If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range without
>>indicating that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is there a reason
>for
>>someone to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE range given, especially
>>considering that such was in the older specification of the standard it
>>followed (and not being aware of the changes in the standard)?
>
>I don't think that manufacturers should be required to print their entire
>specification on the box. Sooner or later, we have to assume some personal
>responsibility and learn a bit about the products we want to buy and use,
>especially if we want to use them in the ham bands. The box on my unit does
>say IEEE 802.11b, and a quick web search will turn up reams of information the
>b addition to the 802.11 standard.
>
>>>I just don't get where you got the idea that DSSS devices, of
>>>necessity, used the entire ISM band at once ...
>
>>Of course not - that would be "wide band," not spread spectrum.
>
>Spread spectrum COULD hop or spread over the entire 2.4 GHz ISM band. Why do
>you feel that a relatively narrow spread (20 MHz) is spread spectrum, but going
>to an 85.5 MHz spread (if I recall the ISM band width correctly) would not be
>spread spectrum?

I didn't say that. He said "at once."

In spreading, SS transmits on a narrow segment of the band, then moves to
another segment. It does NOT transmit on the entire band simultaneously.

>> However, unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do assume that a
>SS
>> signal may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.
>
>But you just said that you didn't think that a device that did so would be
>spread spectrum. ???

Wrong. It's not placing RF energy across the entire band simultaneously. It's
only placing it at a particular point, then moving to another point, etc....

If one averages over a long enough period, one could get a spectrum analysis of
an SS signal that looks like a wide band signal, but the two signal types are
arrived at in different ways.

>>>> But who can read it? Don't the wireless lan stuff encrypt so only
>>>devices on
>>>> the same virtual lan can read the packets....?
>
>>>Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
>>>obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
>>>encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I think
>>>the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily stringent,
>>>that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started on now
>
>>Again, a non-evident user choice.
>
>Not to those that learn about a product from reading detailed information about
>it instead of expecting that the marketing information on the box tells them
>everything they need to know about the product.
>
>Again, there is a lot of free information about spread spectrum and the IEEE
>802.11 specifications.

Ah - but I note that you keep citing it as 802.11, which is apparently
different from 802.11b. There's part of the issue right there! Those
"standards" are different.

2919. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:27:50 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290022120.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32430

On 28 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>
>>From the fact that the box of such a device specifies the ENTIRE band as its
>>frequency range, that implies that its hop sequence includes frequency slices
>>across the ENTIRE band, not a limited subset of it.
>
>The box on most transceivers indicate that the unit operates over a certain
>frequency range. I do not expect that it uses all of those frequencies
>simultaneously. It simply is not possible to reproduce the entire 802.11b spec'
>on the box of a product.

But as I said, one could expect that the device (in the absence of additional information) could enter any frequency in the band, and since the amateur band is NOT the entire ISM band, from the amateur point of view, an out-of-band transmission possibility clearly exists. Now, if the amateur in question is unaware that there is sufficient user control to limit the range to a subset of the stated product range, he will dismiss the item as unsuitable because of the possibility of the out-of-band transmission (assuming he intended to use the device in a way that exceeds part 15). My issue is knowledge: The product doesn't say so. Many people have other things to do in life than to bother looking up some document for some minor part of text that in fact can tell them that it can be limited.

Remember what some of the early cordless phones said: Frequency 49MHz. 10 selectable channels. (Now, 25 channels) I think you get the point. Those devices made it clear that there was a subset they could operate on. The wireless lan stuff doesn't.

2920. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:28:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55EC99.42C89B6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32432

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Prove it. Prove that there is NO use of Morse Code ANYWHERE by ANY branch
> of the Armed Forces, Lennie.

Not a valid challenge, Steve. Can you prove that you have never used illegal drugs?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2921. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:30:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290029460.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32431

On 28 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>Gee ... it was pretty well publicized by the FCC, ARRL, TAPR, etc.
>>>Where were you?
>
>>The change to the SS part of the rules I missed, because as a volunteer
>>examiner, there were many more changes that I had to actually pay attention
>>to.
>
>Yes, but that didn't stop you from posting that the changes were never
>publicized...
>
>
>>What TAPR says is unimportant. Too many people have placed so much
>>artificial
>>importance in that group, their statements on anything are effectively
>>worthless. A TAPR endorsement of anything is basically detrimental.
>
>Not to most hams with a digital interest. I have learned quite a bit about
>digital radio from the http://www.tapr.org web site.
>
>>But as Ed Hare noted, these devices usually DON'T say so on the box, but
>>simply
>>say something like, "Frequency range: 2400-2483.5" even if they only choose
>>a
>>20MHz window in that range. Are we supposed to GUESS?
>
>No, but guessing is exactly what you did when you posted all sorts of
>mis-information about their operation.

I didn't post misinformation. I complained about a lack of correct information.

>>>> Then why do manufacturers publish their ranges in feet.
>
>I know that the IEEE 802.11b devices I bought to play with in the lab came with
>a very small dielectric antenna mounted on the PC board. They are often used in
>environments that will be subject to all sorts of scatter. Having done a bit
>more research than reading the box, I knew that they would operate with about
>20 milliwatts or so -- a power level capable of much more range than "feet."
>
>>Isn't all the 2.4 wireless lan stuff (since it must meet part 15) "products
>>optimized for that market space"?
>
>The wireless LAN stuff is generally more expensive and operates at higher power
>and usually uses higher-gain antennas. The ISP-wireless list often talks about

>ranges of tens of miles.
>
>>Now, that someone has finally said that it is possible to use WITHOUT
>>MODIFICATION (because what the manufacturers publish on their packaging is
>>misleading and/or just plain wrong), that makes a difference.
>
>Someone "finally" said that a few years ago. The "finally" here is that you
>"finally" read it.
>
>The misleading and wrong I have seen has not been on the box. It has been in
>your posts and assumptions about how the products work.

2922. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:31:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55ED47.E9E5F5AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32433

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> > > matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> > > technical support.
> >
> > No, it's a matter of being prepared for operation with the *maximum*
> > feasible level of technical support. It doesn't do much good to
> > prepare for an emergency after it happens.
>
> I fervently hope you're not ignorant enough to believe that is
> is possible to be fully prepared for any possible circumstance.

I believe it is best to be as fully prepared as is feasible.
Sorry you disagree.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2923. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:35:19 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <1%l58.114313$Ee7.7921173@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32434

Dick wrote in part ...

"... That includes CW skill in this case. Since virtually every HF ham rig made includes the mode with no further additional overhead other than operator knowledge, it is sheer avoidance and irresponsibility for hams to fail to do so. I know that you know this, but prefer to continue on your jihad against the mode."

Kim responded in part ...

"How many languages do you speak, Dick? How much HAZMAT gear do you have, Dick? Have you got a mobile phone? Have you got some FRS radios? Have you got a CB radio ready to be on the air? I could go on and on. To use your analogy (a piss-poor one, I'd add), then anyone who doesn't "arm" themselves with extra language capability, extra contact cabability, and so on, is *not* to have the maximum number of options."

I think Dick makes a valid point here, Kim. The radio already has the ability "built -in". Why not take full advantage of it. Exchange a microphone for a key and the same amount of external equipment can give you twice the capability. It's not like going out and purchasing or building additional equipment, merely a case of taking advantage of what's already there.

One analogy I can think of would be using a vacuum cleaner. We could lift up the vacuum to clean the drapes -- or -- take advantage of the built-in attachments to do the job. Simply a matter of learning how to use them.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2924. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:35:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55EE65.90690F00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32435

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >When you tell the whole story, it looks a bit different.
>
> Not really, Jim. The point that when I entered ham radio, that first rung was
> a very small one and that now, it is a much much larger step does not change.
>
> IMHO, this does explain why we have far fewer 13 year olds entering ham radio
> than in the Novice heyday. More hams are entering ham radio now than then, but
> they are doing it at an older age.

When I got my first ham license at age 14, my family didn't even own a TV.
Now my grandsons have cell phones, video game boxes, TV, computers, CB, FRS,
and the Web.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2925. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:38:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C55EEFC.E731277E@uci.edu>
Source record: 32436

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C55A681.A6B19590@uci.edu...
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > SIight correction: "Carl is saying that, IMHO, and from comments
> > > I've heard/seen from many, the subscription to QST is a SIGNIFICANT
> > > reason that MANY people join ARRL." It is clearly not the ONLY
> > > reason,
> > > but, as I stated, IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
> > > membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.
> > >
> > > BTW ... I would NOT be one of them.
> >
> > But don't you see the difference between saying it that way, and the way
> > you said it before? One is accurate, and the other is purely
> > derogatory. You almost always opt for the derogatory. That's what
> > makes a lot of what you say so irritating.
>
> Well, think about it. I don't subscribe to the "PCTA" and "NCTA" labels;
> however, for the sake of demonstration...
>
> When the two sides begin debate it doesn't matter which side it is, *both*
> get derogatory pretty damned quick. I mean, I often think that the greatest
> motivation isn't ham radio itself--or the pride of it, history of it, or
> whatever of it. I wonder if most people in this newsgroup don't use it as
> an excuse to just act like assholes, myself included. Think I'd get like I
> do with someone on the air, or over the phone, or at work, or even at play?
> I'm pretty cocky here in this newsgroup, but I am not that way at all in
> person. That's because *most* of us in person would also act a whole lot
> differently toward each other.

Why not try it here too?

2926. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:40:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55EF78.48FEC9AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32437

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
> A BUS! :-)

Most computers drive a bus.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2927. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:44:46 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <sem58.106272$Y17.6334195@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32438

"CAM" wrote ...

> Not a valid challenge, Steve. Can you prove that you have never used
illegal drugs?

Sure it is.

Example :

Due to employment security requirements, I am "randomly" tested for illegal drugs numerous times a year. Since I can never be fully prepared for those tests (and have always passed them) I can state with certainty that I have never used illegal drugs.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2928. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:53:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55F280.3AF35BEA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32440

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "CAM" wrote ...
>
> > Not a valid challenge, Steve. Can you prove that you have never used
> illegal drugs?
>
> Sure it is.
>
> Example :
>
> Due to employment security requirements, I am "randomly" tested for illegal
> drugs numerous times a year. Since I can never be fully prepared for those
> tests (and have always passed them) I can state with certainty that I have
> never used illegal drugs.

You can certainly state it but that doesn't prove validity. Can you prove
that you didn't use illegal drugs in high school or college? Can you prove
that you don't have access to a secret antidote that renders illegal drugs
undetectable? It is logically impossible to prove a non-exclusive negative,
Arnie. That has been known to be a fact for centuries. Your abive feeble
attempt to turn it into an exclusive negative failed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2929. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:55:01 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <vhm58.114327$Ee7.7938327@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32439

"CAM" wrote ...

> When I got my first ham license at age 14, my family didn't even own a TV.
> Now my grandsons have cell phones, video game boxes, TV, computers, CB,
FRS,
> and the Web.

Agree with you on this one, Cecil. That's why we need to work even harder
to get young people interested in Ham radio. I sometimes talk about CW and
"sell" it as that cool code they can use to talk to each other. I also tell
them that they can shoot moonbounce, talk to the space-station, use computer
controlled rigs, program, and build to their heart's content (but don't
mention that hot solder can burn the living crap out of ya)

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2930. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 00:57:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C55F379.272F177F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32441

Arnie Macy wrote:
> I think Dick makes a valid point here, Kim. The radio already has the
> ability "built -in". Why not take full advantage of it?

'Cause she doesn't choose to commit unnatural acts? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2931. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:14:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c560593_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32442

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128071756.17706.00000920@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >And what's wrong with the 3-class license structure we have
> >now? (except for the unnecessary, except for S25.5, code
> >test element, of course)
>
> If the S25.5 requirement is dropped, Carl, there is probably plenty
that could
> and should be changed in the license structure. Just as one
example, it would
> then make no sense to limit the first tier of license class to VHF
only.
> Either a 3-class system that had a first tier limited by power, or
by subsets
> of each band, or a 2- or even 1-class system might make more sense.
The
> VHF/HF, no-code/code distinction was only to comply with S25.5.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare

Ed,

I was taking it as a given that, absent S25.5, the entry level
class would have at least limited HF privileges (based on
technical knowledge, rather than Morse proficiency).

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYFbpe+N6+q84HiEQLhwgCfRv0bZQVZg5x7Tje2VH29uI199nIAnjlA
ZAo3Y37OtT8xlZ5hmWIRw+3v
=lGjo
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2932. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:31:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c560993_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32443

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote in message
news:u59kp0b7am5i05@corp.supernews.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
> > Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams
would,
> > obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
> > encryption turned off.
>
> not that having encryption turned on is an insurmountable deterrent,
in
> any case. the crypto used by 802.11b is weak and has been beaten by
at
> least two independent academic teams. I would be surprised if there
> _wasn't_ a sniffer tool floating around now.

The security in 802.11b has been improved (at least in my
company's products) with "enhanced WEP" ... though I still
use a VPN for real security on my company communications
via my residential gateway ...

Also, IEEE 802.11 has a task group working as we speak on
even better security ... should be MUCH better from what I've
seen.

> > (but don't get me started on how I think the blanket prohibition
on
> > encryption is unnecessarily stringent, that's a whole 'nuther
subject
> > that I'd rather not get started on now :-)
>
> I'd like to go there, as I've been thinking about this recently. I
> wonder if authentication would be permissible? it seems like
> cryptographically secure authentication would fall under the
provisions
> for tele-operation in the R&R. having to announce your callsign is
more
> or less a low-tech way of doing it. authentication seems like it'd
> accomplish the same thing while still leaving the packets sniffable
to
> eavesdroppers^Wother listeners.
```

Authentication might be arguably permissable ... though someone
would probably try to make the argument that a series of digital
signatures could be used, over time, to convey "secret information."

I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd certainly
like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like
control links, for example.

> how do packet mailboxes work? obviously you don't want some yahoo
> deleting all your mail, but what's to stop them from posing as you,
> reading it all, then deleting it? or hijacking your communication
and
> sending delete commands as you're reading your mail? even if no
malice,
> wrongdoing, or ill will is intented?

AFAIK, they are TOTALLY insecure ... but I haven't been on a packet
mailbox in nearly 10 years.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYJbZe+N6+q84HiEQIIvACfbeOvIuN41h1xM5uTm2sRIv5kU0UAoPkM
f73Km74BqFgCM16tt+9olQZ5
=mTDs
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2933. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:32:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5609e2$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32444

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote in message
news:u59lskqpjus0b5@corp.supernews.com...
> D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>
> > If the packaging for an SS device gives its frequency range
without
> > indicating that it can be adjusted to a subset of the range, is
there
> > a reason for someone to assume that it won't hop over the ENTIRE
range
> > given, especially considering that such was in the older
specification
> > of the standard it followed (and not being aware of the changes in
the
> > standard)?
>
> maybe the "b" in 802.11b should be capitalized?

Nope ... lower case is correct.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYJvZe+N6+q84HiEQK1UACeJTdtOlaqUTnE4+t0P3Eq1H00IkMAnjmL
Bb4JV6XKHvYgut66EUfzQF8r
=CsJd
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2934. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:41:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c560bff_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32445

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290015590.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>
> In spreading, SS transmits on a narrow segment of the band, then
moves to
> another segment. It does NOT transmit on the entire band
simultaneously.

You are apparently refering to FHSS ... DSSS doesn't hop at all ...
it just sits on one (carrier) frequency and spreads over some
bandwidth that's wider than necessary to convey the underlying
information (with the width being determined by the rate of the PN
spreading sequence ...)

Again, with all due respect, I'd suggest a good tutorial on SS for
you ... you're spreading a lot of misinformation that will
mal-educate
those who don't know any better.

> >> However, unless it is stated that only a subset is used, I do
assume that a
> >SS
> >> signal may hop onto any frequency in its defined range.

Again, ONLY ONE TYPE OF SS "hops" ... that's FHSS ... DSSS
does NOT hop (though you can build a hybrid system which is a
DSSS which does hop, the DSSS in use in Part 15 devices does
not)

> Ah - but I note that you keep citing it as 802.11, which is
apparently
> different from 802.11b. There's part of the issue right there!
Those
> "standards" are different.

802.11 is the BASE standard ... which defines several PHYs (IR,
FHSS, and DSSS) and a single MAC ... the IR and FHSS have
died off.

802.11b is an EXTENSION which defines the parts necessary
to get to 11 Mbps in the 2.4 GHz band.

802.11a is another EXTENSION which defines the parts necessary
to get to 54 Mbps in the 5 GHz band.

Again ... RTFM, please ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYL05e+N6+q84HiEQJbjwCghpOwHgh/w/RFw85EiRYzponABHIAoMUv
RzbzPtUXw2SoNC92maqxZf9s
=8Prn
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2935. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:48:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c560da2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32446

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290006170.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> >The 802.11b stuff on the market today is NOT a FHSS system. It's
> >DSSS ... the FHSS option of the original standard never really made
> >it because .11b came along with so much better performance that
> >the other stuff just died off before it ever even got much of a
start.
> >
> >Thus, there is no "hop sequence" ...
>
> FHSS and DSSS have no meaning to those not familiar with spread
spectrum. You
> should avoid using "industry insider" terms without defining them.
Also, I
> couldn't care if it's a direct sequence or another pattern - because
the actual
> pattern doesn't matter when one is considering on what frequencies
it COULD go
> to.

FHSS = Frequency Hopping Spread Spectrum
DSSS= DIrect Sequence Spread Spectrum

Again, I respectfully recommend you buy or borrow a tutorial book
on the subject ... you ARE spreading much misinformation and for
someone who just admitted above that they are not familiar enough
with SS to even know the MOST BASIC terminology, you've certainly
complained enough about products not working to your (mis)conceptions
about how they ought to work.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYNdpe+N6+q84HiEQKisACgmq1rxlaVqUKLZGmPudwfZbhLUOIAnjqJ
FL3o4NoJxeESjrDB4G4MFFoI
=+uwb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2936. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 02:56:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c560f8c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32447

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290010110.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> >With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD use
(spread
> >over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier in the
middle and
> >using a chipping rate that would spread it that wide, but then
there would be
> >only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if the data rate was low enough,
one might
> >get enough processing gain to be able to do CDMA overlay and have
multiple
> >users, but not at the data rates that today's LANs need to carry.
>
> I assume wrong? By the fact that you just confirmed that it could
spread over
> the entire band, you just VALIDATED my assumption, not contradicted
it.

I said that it COULD ... not that real world systems DO as a practical
matter ... you're looking for "validation" of your flawed ASSumptions
now ...

> >You seem to have some confusion about the characteristics of FHSS
vs. DSSS
> >systems ... the ARRL publishes at least one reasonably good
tutorial book on
> >the subject. One of the definitive references on the subject of SS
is "Spread
> >Spectrum Systems" by Dixon, published by Wiley ... I recommend it
highly for
> >even the semi-serious student of SS.
>
> Who said that I was confused? Generally, these items simply say
"SS" and don't
> tell us how or which particular algorithm it uses internally. Now,
you are
> correct that I can be confused over which method a particular device
uses,
> especially if the BOX/packaging DOESN'T SAY (or say something that

leads to
> method identification). That's my point. It doesn't say.

Your entire dissertation in this thread has continually talked about
"hopping" ... when the products you're trying to talk about don't
do that ... I'd say that in itself demonstrates pretty convincingly
that
you're confused about SS and don't understand (at least correctly)
even the basics of the differenty types of SS and how they work.

Why don't you learn a bit about SS ... then come back and try to
talk intelligently about it?

> >> >Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams
would,
> >> >obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
> >> >encryption turned off. (but don't get me started on how I
think
> >> >the blanket prohibition on encryption is unnecessarily
stringent,
> >> >that's a whole 'nuther subject that I'd rather not get started
on
> >now
> >>
> >> Again, a non-evident user choice.
> >
> >Again, RTFM ...
>
> Again, one only has access to the manual AFTER purchase. How can
one make an
> informed decision beforehand? Circular reasoning.

BS ... I gave you a URL where you could download the entire 802.11b
standard ... again, I suggest you engage in some learning before you
engage in spouting off about things you obviously know little about.

BTW ... I'm losing patience with your diatribe ... I probably won't
respond to it further.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYPQJe+N6+q84HiEQI5DQCfcyI9YAbNlKS91uvmsitIo0iPmwYAoND8
XRHf11D3wc3CFV7e4RUzF4zm
=YoDX
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2937. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 03:03:48 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c56113a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32448

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128072352.17706.00000922@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >I think you're missing my point, Ed ... most repeaters
> >have a certain user group (plus or minus "transient
> >users") ... those folks have developed a mindset that
> >"their channel" (the repeater pair) is always available
> >for their (more or less) exclusive use. So they tend to
> >stay parked on that channel, "waiting for Joe to show
> >up so they can talk to him."
>
> I didn't miss the point at all, Carl, but I may not have chosen the
best words
> for my post.

I stand corrected ... your explaination is, of course, EXACTLY
correct. (and is the point that I've been trying to make for
some time, but lots of folks "just don't seem to get it."

> Even in a system that dynamically allocated frequency for a
> specific use, the information channel could remain transparent to
the user. So
> if one accessed the information channel named "Local Club," Joe
would still be
> there. Joe might not know exactly what frequency in the band his
hardware was
> using, but he would still be able to find all of his buddies just as
easily as
> he can right now.
>
> The difference is that every single ham who wanted access to a
similar channel
> in that band could have it, limited only by the fact that only N
number of
> people could use that band *at the same time.*

And the physical channels could be assigned without regard to
whether the traffic was voice or data ... the "virtual channels"
would be all the users would "notice" or care about in an operational
sense.

Moreover, when the statistical nature of "traffic offered" is
considered
via the Erlang equation, it can be easily shown that a VASTLY larger
number of users can be served with a much lower "blocking probability"
when a pool of channels is assigned dynamically than when the same
number of channels are assigned in a fixed, inflexible manner.
(classical trunking theory ... another communications principle that's
over 50 years old and still rejected by the majority of hams ...)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYRD5e+N6+q84HiEQJkPwCg0jTc37wEV798hkzhtvhOtkVwa20AoKTP
adMN/UQXwrdNAwRXeJcp1Ysa
=D/AD
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2938. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 03:06:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5611ed_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32449

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128074129.17706.00000927@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable from
> >membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.
>
> Not many at all, Carl. If many members chose not to receive QST,
dues would
> have to be increased significantly, or the things that ARRL did
would have to
> be scaled back significantly, to make up for the lost revenues from
> advertising. When ARRL dues go up a dollar, there are a few thousand
members
> who quit in outrage. Imagine the effect of seeing the dues almost
double.
>
> For many hams, especially newcomers, those QST articles are a good
way of
> keeping track of some of what is happening in ham radio. In today's
age, the
> www also lets them do that to some extent, but I enjoy some of the
articles in
> QST nearly every month. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I think you have my "theory" sort of "inside out" ... I was expressing
the view that, if membership and the QST subsctiption were
separable, that quite a few would subscribe to QST and not be
members ... you turned it around ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYRtpe+N6+q84HiEQJMjACfci83oNsk3ba7QHAp4JhjAvg6VkEAn34r
l+sNxRdP48N3bjcnCvxk8V0q

```
=FKTZ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2939. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 03:09:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c56128a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32450

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C55A70E.9ECD1BDD@uci.edu...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> > > > lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
> > >
> > > You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?
> >
> > Jim,
> >
> > I believe you know full-well that I was talking about
> > the average level of tehcnical competence, relative
> > to the state of the art in communications technology,
> > as well as willingness to accept new things that
> > are different from "the way it's always been."
>
> So, you mean't to deride everyone except yourself. Yes,
> that IS the way it seemed.

NO, I *didn't* "mean to deride everyone except myself" ...
all I was doing was stating what I view to be a simple,
and indisputable fact of life.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFYSYJe+N6+q84HiEQL3ZQCfTRMC64aNuYmpqZBl4/kAq77FoK0An2jP
HAKaH16jy8qsnLZFGBPxhdDL
=Ht4Q
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2940. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:01:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gqodcl4.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32451

On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 02:31:12 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd certainly
>like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like
>control links, for example.

And woth strong encryption how is the FCC going to discharge their
obligatory functions of identifying the station and verifying compliance
with the rules on permissible and proscribed content? Are we going
to get mired in the key escrow swamp ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2941. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:14:40 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <jjp58.108210$Y17.6483327@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32452

"CAM" wrote ...

> You can certainly state it but that doesn't prove validity. Can you prove
> that you didn't use illegal drugs in high school or college? Can you prove
> that you don't have access to a secret antidote that renders illegal drugs
> undetectable? It is logically impossible to prove a non-exclusive
negative,
> Arnie. That has been known to be a fact for centuries. Your abive feeble
> attempt to turn it into an exclusive negative failed.

Not a feeble attempt at all. It's quite logical. Given a reasonable set of
circumstances (exclusive of your extreme possiblities) the average person
would easily conclude that I don't use illegal drugs.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

2942. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:27:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5624B8.F34E8AAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32453

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> FHSS = Frequency Hopping Spread Spectrum
> DSSS= DIrect Sequence Spread Spectrum
>
> Again, I respectfully recommend you buy or borrow a tutorial book
> on the subject ...

The latest ARRL Handbooks have a couple of pages of useful information.
The graph of power Vs frequency on DSSS shows a ((sin x)/x)^2 curve
indicating that a DSSS signal could indeed occupy the entire band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2943. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:36:26 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.01.28.23.36.25.772242.2085@arrl.org>
Source record: 32454

On Mon, 28 Jan 2002 21:31:12 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> Authentication might be arguably permissable ...

I have a vague recollection -- might be mistaken -- that someone (Phil Karn?) queried the FCC on this point once and got back an okay for use of digital signing. In any case, I don't see a problem since there is no intent to hide anything as long as the text itself is in the clear.

> though someone would
> probably try to make the argument that a series of digital signatures
> could be used, over time, to convey "secret information."

Maybe someone would, but it would be an easily overturned argument.

> I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd certainly
> like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like control
> links, for example.

Encryption provides little benefit and significant risk. Strong authentication, which I believe is presently allowable, is sufficient to protect against unauthorized use of systems. Encryption is too easily abused.

Jon

2944. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:38:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C576AD0.F1430EB9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32455

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You know full well that there is no limit to the possibilities. It's a
> > > > matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
> > > > technical support.
> > >
> > > No, it's a matter of being prepared for operation with the *maximum*
> > > feasible level of technical support. It doesn't do much good to
> > > prepare for an emergency after it happens.
> >
> > I fervently hope you're not ignorant enough to believe that is
> > is possible to be fully prepared for any possible circumstance.
>
> I believe it is best to be as fully prepared as is feasible.

No, if you believed that then you'd fully support a code qualification for
ALL ham radio operators. QED.

>
> Sorry you disagree.
> --

You don't even agree with yourself!

2945. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:39:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C562789.55176613@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32457

Arnie Macy wrote:
> Not a feeble attempt at all. It's quite logical. Given a reasonable set of
> circumstances (exclusive of your extreme possiblities) the average person
> would easily conclude that I don't use illegal drugs.

I'm not talking about guilt/innocence in a court of law. I'm talking about formal logical proof. It doesn't matter what the average person concludes, you cannot logically prove that you have never used illegal drugs. For the same reason, it is impossible to prove that no one in the military uses CW. Asking someone to prove a non-exclusive negative is showing one's ignorance of the formal logic branch of mathematics.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2946. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:44:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C576C3D.3AA0D7B7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32456

CAM wrote:

> Arnie Macy wrote:
> > I think Dick makes a valid point here, Kim. The radio already has the
> > ability "built -in". Why not take full advantage of it?
>
> 'Cause she doesn't choose to commit unnatural acts? :-)

Isn't it obvious by now? When it comes to ham radio,
Kim *IS* an unnatural act.

2947. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:53:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C562AC2.8499F232@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32458

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> No, if you believed that then you'd fully support a code qualification for
> ALL ham radio operators. QED.

Logically false. I don't support the Morse code test but I encourage
all hams to develop CW skill.

> > Sorry you disagree.

> You don't even agree with yourself!

For years, you have confused CW skill with Morse code testing. Why are
you such a slow learner?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2948. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 04:59:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020128235953.28299.00004233@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 32459

In article <KSk58.105829$Y17.6276133@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> Wrong again. The original subject thread concerned MORSE IN
>> MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS. Communications of the two-way
>> kind.
>>
>Here's what you said ... (my emphasis added)
>
>"None of the public information even hints at any "use" of ook cw codings as
>either being commsec, valuable, versatile, or as any part of US military
>communications doctrine. OOK CW CODINGS ARE NOT USED IN US MILITARY
>COMMUNICATIONS. There is absolutely no need to maintain any "pool of
>trained CW [OOK CW] operators" for any national security
>reason."
>
>I replied that the SF still used Morse and you jumped on me with both hooves
>saying that they DID NOT train in, USE, or NEED OOK CW. After a very
>lengthy debate, you finally admitted that they were required to learn it and
>that it might be used on a very limited basis.

Now, now, my petulant Inspector Clue-so, you are getting all fired up... :-)

What Macy has just done is some careful selective editing to
"prove" his case...which is no "proof" that Macy is right.

Macy, as an ardent supporter of morse modes, forgot that the
EVIDENCE was merely that a certain Special Forces MOS
required morse code skill. Period. Special Forces doctrine is
not yet released in its entirety for public viewing.

What was at issue was morse modes as COMMUNICATIONS IN
THE U.S. MILITARY whether routine, regular, or tactical in its
use. Morse modes are NOT in COMMUNICATIONS, as in two-
way communications for routine, regular, or tactical purposes.
Voice, data, imagery, is in single-channel and multichannel
carrier, in-clear or encrypted. NO morse modes.

That is public data, may be verified through many public-access
sources.

Special Forces doctrine published for public viewing, does NOT
state or imply that morse modes ARE used in SF
communications. All the information can state is that an MOS

for SF requires morse skill.

Passive, one-way interception of radio signals may involve morse
skill to "read" sufficiently well to ascertain if the signal is worth
recording. That is in the descriptors of the morse intercept
training courses given at Fort Huachuca.

Passive, one-way interception is NOT "communications" in the
normal sense.

>> Somewhere in that convoluted timeline Macy jumps in with
>> making a Big Deal of "special forces 'Using' morse" as if
>> that is the exception disproving the regular routine or
>> tactical military communications modes not using morse.
>
>Never said, implied, hinted or otherwise wrote that it was in *routine* use.
>I said it was used by SF, that's all I have ever said. You *still* seem to
>have a real problem with this.

Macy DID IMPLY, allude to the Special Forces communications
MOS as stating that morse skill disproves any blanket statement
that morse modes are not used in the U.S. military for regular,
routine, or tactical communications.

Of course, the inspector STILL refuses to check any OTHER
Army or U.S. military information on what modes ARE BEING
USED. He cannot since that disproves his allegation that
"morse is used in the U.S. military" (because an SF comm
MOS requires the skill).

>> I DID agree that (through checking elsewhere through public-
>> access information Army sources) ONE special forces MOS
>> requires morse ability. Macy then tried to manuever the sub-
>> thread into my "insistence that I disagreed with him" and
>> "would not admit to Macy being right (about SF)."
>
>You called me some pretty ugly names, then finally and, by God, it was just
>like pulling teeth, you admitted that I was correct in my original statement
>that SF used Morse.

What "ugly names," inspector? :-)

Is it UGLY that I don't agree with your insistence that the U.S.
military still uses morse? It must be, since you are fixated on
US-military-uses-morse-because-SF-Comm-MOS-requires-the-
skill...and haven't YET gone on to check what the U.S. military
REALLY USES TODAY.

Show us your PROOF that signal battalions and signal regiments
regularly, routinely, or even tactically USE MORSE MODES
TODAY or even ten years ago. There are plenty of periodicals
where you can read up on what is used, see pictures, and all
that. Try snagging a copy of SIGNAL magazine...it's an Army

publication.

>> I am simply pointing out publicly-available information sources that
>> are available to anyone, even radio amateurs (the Army TM on
>> inventory of signal equipment is linked on at least two ham-oriented
>> websites). I don't post long-distance telephone numbers and demand
>> that others call it (at their charge) to "prove" a posting. I prefer to
>> let others see the evidence at their leisure and make up their own mind.
>
>You wouldn't have *dared* call that number because it would have proven you
>WRONG, and you would never let that happen. Like I said, you haven't
>changed a bit, so WRT you, I won't either.

Macy posted a "blind" telephone number, perhaps thinking that all
had an AUTODIN or AUTOVON directory at hand to "verify" it. :-)
Sorry, no Caller ID works in reverse, sport. You merely BLUFFED,
got caught at it, are now pissed that I didn't bite. :-)

Macy has to go research in his own Army backyard, to see, first
hand, what the Army uses for modes, methods, manpower skills
in regular, routine, tactical communications. GO AND DO THAT.
Macy is in a unique position there, can do a bit of calling through
official channels of many kinds to verify that.

It won't happen, Macy will DENY it, the truth, whatever else in
order to prove "he was right in his messaging." Matters not to
anyone else, only Macy. The U.S. Army Signal Corps has its
own plans, as does USN, USAF, and USCG communications.
It NO LONGER involves morse modes.

Try, please TRY to accept the truth.

2949. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 05:08:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129000808.13187.00000634@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32460

In article <iVb58.413$TS2.172770@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>I could care less about the HF frequencies..... everything I have heard on
>the HF frequencies is either "CQ Contest" or the usual CB crap on 14.313 and
>so on. I have been so turned off by the "mature" level of operators, these
>people being the ones who had to go to their testing session bare foot in 3
>feet of snow up hill both ways to the exam, who are acting just like those
>who acuse others of being CB'ers.

I don't hear any of that on HF/MF amateur radio. But I only use CW on those
bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2950. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 05:15:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C57735B.803DBA30@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32461

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > No, if you believed that then you'd fully support a code qualification for
> > ALL ham radio operators. QED.
>
> Logically false. I don't support the Morse code test but I encourage
> all hams to develop CW skill.
>

Un-huh. SO did the FCC when they required a actual proficiency level test.
So you're really stupid enough to believe that any serious of number of new hams
will actually go to all the trouble to learn MOrse code when there is no
requirement for
them to do so. Not too surprising, from you. I guess you were asleep all the
years
when so many were whining about "I just don't have time...."

>
> > > Sorry you disagree.
>
> > You don't even agree with yourself!
>
> For years, you have confused CW skill with Morse code testing. Why are
> you such a slow learner?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2951. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 06:36:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129013651.11862.00000154@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32462

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/28/2002 6:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C55EC99.42C89B6@IEEE.org>
>
>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>> Prove it. Prove that there is NO use of Morse Code ANYWHERE by ANY
>branch
>> of the Armed Forces, Lennie.
>
>Not a valid challenge, Steve. Can you prove that you have never used illegal
>drugs?

Probably a lot easier than Lennie can substantiate any of his chronic lying. If you'd care to pay for it, you are welcome to do a forensic tissue sampling on myself to assertain the historical presence of any "illegal" drugs.

And it IS a "valid" challenge. Lennie has repeatedly asserted that Morse Code was NOT "used", pasively or actively, and yet it is still taught BY the Armed Forces to some segment of it's members.

HE made the assertion, he is now challenged to make good his claim.

He will, of course, sling mud then run for cover.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2952. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 07:00:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129020008.11862.00000159@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32463

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/28/2002 10:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020128235953.28299.00004233@mb-ck.aol.com>

>Now, now, my petulant Inspector Clue-so, you are getting all fired up

>What Macy has just done is some careful selective editing to
>"prove" his case...which is no "proof" that Macy is right

Unable to escape the fact that he has again been tripped up by his OWN posting misdeeds, Lennie immediately resorts to his patented "insult and lie" method of responding.

No "selective editing" on Arnie's part occured. The assertion by Leonard H. Anderson is a lie.

(Use of terms like "error", "mistruth", etc are sugar coated ways to say he lied, ergo I shall not use them. They are "PC" coverups)

>Macy, as an ardent supporter of morse modes, forgot that the
>EVIDENCE was merely that a certain Special Forces MOS
>required morse code skill. Period. Special Forces doctrine is
>not yet released in its entirety for public viewing.

And to this date Lennie the Clueless cannot present one shred of enplanation as to why the Armed Forces of the United States would TEACH Morse Code techniques to it's personnel and yet then have no expectation that they'd be USED for that purpose.

>What was at issue was morse modes as COMMUNICATIONS IN
>THE U.S. MILITARY whether routine, regular, or tactical in its
>use. Morse modes are NOT in COMMUNICATIONS, as in two-
>way communications for routine, regular, or tactical purposes.
>Voice, data, imagery, is in single-channel and multichannel
>carrier, in-clear or encrypted. NO morse modes.

Prove it.

>That is public data, may be verified through many public-access
>sources.

And I am willing to bet there are projects in the works at Lockheed's Skunk Works of which there is NO public-access sources. Does that lack of documentation mean that they aren't there?

>Passive, one-way interception of radio signals may involve morse
>skill to "read" sufficiently well to ascertain if the signal is worth

>recording. That is in the descriptors of the morse intercept
>training courses given at Fort Huachuca.

How do these operators determine the validity of those signals without
being practiced in thier use?

>Passive, one-way interception is NOT "communications" in the
>normal sense.

There is absolutely nothing normal about any of your rationale's, Lennie.

>Macy DID IMPLY, allude to the Special Forces communications
>MOS as stating that morse skill disproves any blanket statement
>that morse modes are not used in the U.S. military for regular,
>routine, or tactical communications.

"IMPLY", Your Abusiveness? So now we are to try and "assume" what he
meant?

>Of course, the inspector STILL refuses to check any OTHER
>Army or U.S. military information on what modes ARE BEING
>USED. He cannot since that disproves his allegation that
>"morse is used in the U.S. military" (because an SF comm
>MOS requires the skill).

And you have yet to prove they do not use them. You have SAID they do
not, but cannot prove to us. You simply IMPLY that they do not by lack of
reference to them in websites.

>Is it UGLY that I don't agree with your insistence that the U.S.
>military still uses morse?

What's ugly is that a person (notice the lack of reference to the term
"man") such as yourself INTENTIONALLY sets out to be abusive, decietful and
decieving...What's PITIFUL is that it is fed back to you by NUMEROUS other
posters, yet you continue to lie.

>Show us your PROOF that signal battalions and signal regiments
>regularly, routinely, or even tactically USE MORSE MODES
>TODAY or even ten years ago. There are plenty of periodicals
>where you can read up on what is used, see pictures, and all
>that. Try snagging a copy of SIGNAL magazine...it's an Army
>publication.

Prove that they don't.

>Macy posted a "blind" telephone number, perhaps thinking that all
>had an AUTODIN or AUTOVON directory at hand to "verify" it. :-)
>Sorry, no Caller ID works in reverse, sport. You merely BLUFFED,
>got caught at it, are now pissed that I didn't bite.

Got caught at what? He posted names, numbers and detailed
points-of-contact. Something YOU have NEVER done. YOU are the one who's upset
at having been outmaneuvered by someone who uses FACT rather than fiction.

>Macy is in a unique position there, can do a bit of calling through
>official channels of many kinds to verify that.

Yes he is. And it appears, on more occasion than one that he DID do his homework.

YOU, on the otherhad, try and "dismiss" his information.

>It won't happen, Macy will DENY it, the truth, whatever else in
>order to prove "he was right in his messaging."

From you, a compliment...erroneous, but a backhanded compliment none-the-less.

>Matters not to
>anyone else, only Macy. The U.S. Army Signal Corps has its
>own plans, as does USN, USAF, and USCG communications.
>It NO LONGER involves morse modes.
>
>Try, please TRY to accept the truth.

Any suggestion from Leonard H Anderson about someone ELSE accepting "the truth" is tragically comical.

Lennie, you couldn't tell the truth if it were your wife's life.

Laughingly Yours,

Steve

2953. Re: Noting but niceness from CS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 07:04:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129020425.11862.00000163@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32464

BTW,

Lennie's e-mailed "response" to this was to simply click on the email and reforward it back without any of the information he promised in the enclosed post.

Always the liar. Always the fool.

Steve

>Subject: Re: Noting but niceness from CS
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 1/28/2002 5:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020128182201.10434.00000937@mb-ct.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: Noting but niceness from CS
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 1/27/2002 7:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20020127201036.05631.00001957@mb-bd.aol.com>
>
>>There is direct, distinctive proof for all who can get the full message
>>content. Send a private message and I will point it out.
>
> If you can't print it here, it is probably not factual.
>
> But I am sending this anyway, altho I doubt it will be anything
>substantial.
>
>Doubtingly yours,
>
>Steve
>
>
>
>

2954. article on irlp internet repeater linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 08:24:41 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3c565b4f.2756237@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32465

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/photos/radcom.htm

73 ian

2955. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 09:15:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201290115.28f2128b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32466

>
> Can one assume that all transmitters can run at reduced power for
> "antenna tune-up?" No, some tubes have different source
> impedances at reduced levels and/or reduced plate voltages. To
> some degree that is true for solid-state PAs but the Class A to
> Class B solid-state PAs can be designed to run at 5 to 10 percent
> maximum power and still present the same source impedance as
> at maximum.
>
> So, with an "old style" Pi-Net final configuration, one NEEDS some
> kind of fancy memory-holding autotuner? Ever hear of pencil and
> paper jotting down knob and dial markings for "tuning memory?"
> [pen/pencil and paper predates morse messaging]
>
> I am just so underwhelmed by the Technical Expertise displayed
> by some in this newsgroup... :-)
>
>
Hoo-boy, the Virus of RRAP pops up once again, talk about
"underwhelming".
>
>
Hey Lenny you pore artifact - I long ago decided that picking the
fuzzies out of my navel is a much more productive use of my time than
is "debating" any more of your twisted old repetitive diatribes in
this NG. Toodles & Happy Trolling.
>
>
w3rv

2956. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 10:32:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129053248.19259.00000973@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32467

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>I think you have my "theory" sort of "inside out" ... I was expressing
>the view that, if membership and the QST subsctiption were
>separable, that quite a few would subscribe to QST and not be
>members ... you turned it around ...

Okay. I do that from time to time.

Personally, I think that more people join ARRL to support its spectrum efforts than to receive QST. This is especially true now that ARRL is not being so secretive about what it does in that area. The information on the ARRL web page, and the new regular feature on the page about "What Has ARRL Done Lately" are, IMHO, positive and overdue moves.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

2957. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 10:37:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129053736.19259.00000974@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32468

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Moreover, when the statistical nature of "traffic offered" is
>considered
>via the Erlang equation, it can be easily shown that a VASTLY larger
>number of users can be served with a much lower "blocking probability"
>when a pool of channels is assigned dynamically than when the same
>number of channels are assigned in a fixed, inflexible manner.
>(classical trunking theory ... another communications principle that's
>over 50 years old and still rejected by the majority of hams ...)

Now, in fairness, Carl, most of today's ham radio operation is done using commercially available amateur equipment. If such features were available in modern ham gear, I think that hams would use them. In pointing out what is possible, I do not mean to blame hams for not using what is not available to them.

As software-defined radio becomes more entrenched in modern radio, I think that we will see SDRs in use in the ham bands, too. Writing the code to make a universal radio a ham-band radio will be the easiest way for a manufacturer to produce ham gear.

I am hoping that the programmability of the SDRs will be available, giving hams the ability to experiment with coding to improve the radios. Come to think of it, the IEEE 802.11b devices are also quite programmable, although I believe that at this time, the programmability is a closely guarded trade secret. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2958. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 10:42:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129054226.19259.00000975@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32469

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>I was taking it as a given that, absent S25.5, the entry level
>class would have at least limited HF privileges (based on
>technical knowledge, rather than Morse proficiency).

Even if the entry level were given HF priveleges similar to the current Tech+, it makes little sense to have an "entry level" license that gives full priveleges on VHF-daylight, including the right to use 1500 watts, and severely limiting HF access and power. IMHO, it would make more sense to have an entry class that is reasonably easy to obtain, but with power and frequency limits evenly spread across the bands. Just as an example, perhaps voice/data/cw priveleges on 75/80 M, 40 M, 15 M, 10 M, and operation on 2 meters, limited to 100 watts would be a reasonable starting point. The 75/80 M and 2 M operation would help the new ham be better connected to his or her locals, and the 40, 15 and 10 M would give the ham some interesting DX priveleges.

Just my personal view at this time. I am sure that my views will evolve as we get closer to the point where the FCC has to consider what to do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2959. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 10:44:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129054450.19259.00000976@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32470

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Those
>devices made it clear that there was a subset they could operate on. The
>wireless lan stuff doesn't.

The box on my Elecraft K2 doesn't make it clear that it does not operate on all
of its specified frequenices either.

I think that Amateur Radio is better off if the ham who only wants to receive
information from the boxes of products he or she might use on ham radio does
not do any experimentation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2960. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 11:18:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a360gm$1ir$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32471

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C57735B.803DBA30@worldnet.att.net...

> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > No, if you believed that then you'd fully support a code
qualification for
> > > ALL ham radio operators. QED.
> >
> > Logically false. I don't support the Morse code test but I encourage
> > all hams to develop CW skill.
>
> Un-huh. SO did the FCC when they required a actual proficiency level
test.
> So you're really stupid enough to believe that any serious of number of
new hams
> will actually go to all the trouble to learn MOrse code when there is no
> requirement for
> them to do so. Not too surprising, from you. I guess you were asleep all
the
> years
> when so many were whining about "I just don't have time...."

WHY must there be a "serious" number of new hams that learn
morse code anyway? No one has shown any reason for there
to be any large number of hams engaged in morse knowledge/use
anymore than anyone showing there are large (serious) numbers
of hams engaged in public service, homebrewing, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2961. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 11:20:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a360p7$8q6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32472

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gqodcl4.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 02:31:12 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd certainly
> >like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like
> >control links, for example.
>
> And woth strong encryption how is the FCC going to discharge their
> obligatory functions of identifying the station and verifying compliance
> with the rules on permissible and proscribed content? Are we going
> to get mired in the key escrow swamp ??
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

How does the FCC do it for non-ham services that allow encryption.
Another posted said encryption IS allowed for private radio
services?

Just curious.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2962. Re: Re: kc8jbo aka Roger Wiseman's Jamming on 20 meters]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 11:56:27 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a36496ips0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 32475
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,alt.flamenet,alt.alien.vampire.flonk.flonk.flonk,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
FORGER and CONVICTED FELON still forges yet an FCC e-mail
"Rhesus Butt Fucker" <pparis7@cox.net> slobbered in message
news:3C55E432.6020207@cox.net...
>
>
> -------- Original Message --------
> From: - Mon Jan 28 17:10:26 2002
> X-Mozilla-Status: 0001
> X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
> Message-ID: <3C55DA5D.70506@cox.net>
> Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 17:10:21 -0600
> From: Jesus Slut Fucker <pparis7@cox.net>
> User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:0.9.4)
> Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2
> X-Accept-Language: en-us
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Newsgroups:
>
alt.flamenet,alt.flame,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy
,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.ham-radio.ssb
>
> Subject: [Fwd: Re: kc8jbo aka Roger Wiseman's Jamming on 20 meters]
> Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> boundary="------------020001050409070009030302"
>
>
>
>
>
> -------- Original Message --------
> From: - Mon Jan 28 17:04:18 2002
> X-UIDL: <20020128230332.24445.qmail@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
> X-Mozilla-Status: 0011
> X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
> Return-Path: <r_hollingsworth_fcc@yahoo.com>
> Received: from web13004.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.174.14]) by
> larc.infor.7.umail (InterMail vM.5.01.04.05
> 201-2523-142-172-105-2001131) with SMTP id
> <20020128230331.OZVP1935.lakemtai04.mgt.cox.net@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
> for <pparis7@cox.net> ; Mon, 28 Jan 2002 18:03:31 -0500
> Message-ID: <20020128230332.24445.qmail@web13004.mail.yahoo.com>
> Received: from [68.12.68.200] by web13004.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon,
> 28 Jan 2002 15:03:32 PST
```

> Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2002 15:03:32 -0800 (PST)
> From: Riley Hollingsworth <r_hollingsworth_fcc@yahoo.com>
> Subject: Re: kc8jbo
> To: <pparis7@cox.net>
> In-Reply-To: <3C55BD45.5040307@cox.net>
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>
>
>
> wrote:
>
>
> Yes, thank you for the information. Let me assure you that
> steps are being taken to already. Mr. Wiseman is
> under investigation at this moment which is all I can
> really say at this time. Please feel free to send me
> any additional information you have about this matter.
>
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
>
> W. Riley Hollingsworth
>
> _____
> Do You Yahoo!?
> Great stuff seeking new owners in Yahoo! Auctions!
> http://auctions.yahoo.com
>

Dumbfuck, Riley doesn't e-mail from Yahoo, you fucking incompetent frog
fuckwit.
Now, enjoy the fact I'm going to forward this to him.

--
Pussy Geno Paris self-describes his (f)laming style as
follows:
"Be sure and file it under "lame unimaginative bullshit".
in Message-ID: <3C1C9656.9050504@home.com>.

Geno finally comes clean so to speak about his deepest, innermost desires in
<3C3CF304.3080507@NOFUCKINGSPAMhome.com> :
"I would like to give mucho oral sex to your doggie and Woger Wiseman."

2963. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 12:13:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129071312.16072.00000634@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32474

In article <3c5432a1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020120065238.13095.00002579@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
>> >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
>> >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...
>>
>> Given the useage of amateur frequencies on most bands, such waiting
>is not at
>> all likely. One would only have to wait if all available
>frequencies were in
>> use.
>
>I think you're missing my point, Ed ... most repeaters
>have a certain user group (plus or minus "transient
>users") ... those folks have developed a mindset that
>"their channel" (the repeater pair) is always available
>for their (more or less) exclusive use. So they tend to
>stay parked on that channel, "waiting for Joe to show
>up so they can talk to him."

Maybe where you are, Carl, but not where I've lived and operated.

Here in southeast PA most repeaters are "open". During busy times there is
a roundtable going on, to which all who follow the rules are invited. During
quiet times stations will make specific calls or simply announce their presence

to drum up QSOs. Most repeaters also have scheduled nets for a variety of
purposes, ranging from SKYWARN to swapnets to special event talk-ins.

If I want to "talk to Joe", I'll simply call him on the repeater(s) he's known
to monitor. If I find him on a busy machine, we'll go simplex or jump to a
quiet repeater.

All it takes is a simple "call please" and those using the repeater stand by
for a quick call.

>If another group were to put another repeater on the
>same pair, then the two groups would have to wait for
>each other to finish using the shared channel.

They also have to put up with their repeater being keyed up unintentionally
unless they use PL tones.

>So, it's
>not a question of ALL frequencies being busy at any
>moment ... it's a question that users don't want their
>*preferred* frequency to be occuptied by "outsiders"
>when they want to use it ... this has resulted in many
>"repeater wars" over the years.

Not around Philly - and this is a big metro area.
>
>All I'm saying is that dynamically allocated use of
>the spectrum (as in commercial trunking systems)
>would result in the ability to support more users
>without contention (for the media, as well as politically
>and emotionally :-)

It would also mean the existing equipment owned by hams and repeater
groups would become almost useless. Would it increase the number of possible
simultaneous conversations on a given band? Not unless the mode were changed.
>
>> The real rub is that there IS a need for such a system, even in the
>relatively
>> little used system of Amateur repeaters. Yes, there are ways that
>the
>> coordination process should be improved so that little used pairs
>could be more
>> easily deallocated to those who would really like to use them, but a
>system
>> that dynamically allocated frequencies in the Amateur bands would
>allow
>> everyone equal access to the bands in such a way that 99% of the
>time, everyone
>> who wanted to use the band could be accomodated.

Is that not true today? Are amateurs being turned away because 2 meters is too
busy?
>>
>> Yes, there ARE existing architectures that need to be considered and
>there
>> would be pain in the changeover, but real-world radio goes through
>this, at
>> much greater pain, when it has to.

Ed - is amateur radio not "real world"??

>What is really ironic is that
>when such a
>> need arises, industry competitors are able to create committees and
>find
>> solutions, because they fully understand that having common
>standards is better
>> than not having them, and that it often goes past merely benefitting
>everyone
>> -- in many cases, having those common standards is a matter of

>survival.

There is also the fact that commercial enterprises have a vested interest in equipment turnover.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2964. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 12:13:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129071313.16072.00000635@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32473

In article <3c5418af_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020127000722.16072.00000585@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3c535afc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian, darling, don't you think it would be rather foolish of one to take
>> >the three from this newsgroup and take it as policy across the ARS that
>it
>> >is forbidden to tune on the air?
>>
>> Obviously Kim has missed the simple fact that two of those three think
>it's OK
>> to
>> tune up on the air if done in a considerate fashion.
>>
>> What has been documented are ways of tuning up without emitting a signal.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Oh, gosh, sorry

You are forgivenm, my child. ;-)

>My point is that three people discussing the ways of
>tuning on RRAP are not a good "poll" Jim.

Wasn't meant to be. It's a discussion that involves both technical and
operating matters. I say tuning up on-air is OK IFF it's done considerately.

>I haven't read the text in all
>the posts on tuning, as I don't care how you or Brian, or Joe Schmoe tunes.

So your attitude is that you don't want to learn new things, or even discuss
them.
Interesting.

>I'll tune with a carrier.

What rigs do you have that require being tuned up in the first place?
>
>Point is, there's nothing illegal about it.

Actually, unnecessary tuning IS illegal. So is causing avoidable interference
to
other amateurs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2965. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 12:49:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129074948.19863.00000002@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32476

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>In spreading, SS transmits on a narrow segment of the band, then moves to
>another segment. It does NOT transmit on the entire band simultaneously.

This is absolutely incorrect for direct-sequence spread spectrum.

>Wrong. It's not placing RF energy across the entire band simultaneously.
>It's
>only placing it at a particular point, then moving to another point, etc....

This is absolutely incorrect for direct sequence spread spectrum.

>If one averages over a long enough period, one could get a spectrum analysis
>of
>an SS signal that looks like a wide band signal, but the two signal types are
>arrived at in different ways.

Both frequency hopping and direct sequence are known are types of spread
spectrum.

>>Again, there is a lot of free information about spread spectrum and the IEEE
>>802.11 specifications.
>
>Ah - but I note that you keep citing it as 802.11, which is apparently
>different from 802.11b. There's part of the issue right there! Those
>"standards" are different.

My useage has been correct. When I am discussing 802.11b, I say "802.11b." When
I tell you that information is available about the IEEE 802.11 family of
standards, I call the 802.11 standards.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2966. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 12:55:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129075522.19863.00000003@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32477

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>>With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD use (spread
>>over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier in the middle and
>>using a chipping rate that would spread it that wide, but then there would
>be
>>only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if the data rate was low enough, one
>might
>>get enough processing gain to be able to do CDMA overlay and have multiple
>>users, but not at the data rates that today's LANs need to carry.
>
>I assume wrong? By the fact that you just confirmed that it could spread
>over
>the entire band, you just VALIDATED my assumption, not contradicted it.

Your assumption is wrong if it is an assumption about the 2.4 GHz, 11 Mb/s
wireless devices. Although a DSSS device could be designed to spread over any
arbitrary frequency range, those particular devices as described in the IEEE
802.11b standard do not.

>Who said that I was confused? Generally, these items simply say "SS" and
>don't
>tell us how or which particular algorithm it uses internally.

You are confused. The devices state, even on the box, that they use the IEEE
802.11b protocols.

> Now, you are
>correct that I can be confused over which method a particular device uses,
>especially if the BOX/packaging DOESN'T SAY (or say something that leads to
>method identification). That's my point. It doesn't say.

The box I have says that it uses the IEEE 802.11b protocol. That tells me
exactly how the device will work.

>Again, one only has access to the manual AFTER purchase. How can one make an
>informed decision beforehand? Circular reasoning.

Carl has posted a number of URLs that have all sorts of information about the
IEEE 802.11 standards. He is suggesting that you read them so you will not
continue to post misinformation about what they are and what they do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2967. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:01:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129080139.19863.00000004@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32478

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>FHSS and DSSS have no meaning to those not familiar with spread spectrum.
>You
>should avoid using "industry insider" terms without defining them.

Carl and I have both used the full terms -- frequency hopping spread spectrum
and direct sequence spread system -- at some points in this thread.

>Also, I
>couldn't care if it's a direct sequence or another pattern - because the
>actual
>pattern doesn't matter when one is considering on what frequencies it COULD
>go
>to.

I don't even understand this. What do you mean by "direct sequence or another
pattern?" You are correct, for DSSS, the pattern used for the spreading does
not have much effect on the occupied bandwidth. That is a function of the
speed of the spreading code and the nature of the modulation. Those are very
well defined in the IEEE 802.11 standards.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2968. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:05:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <V6x58.662$TS2.410633@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32479

Forget that..... Forget NCI or KCI too. Look out for ACI ALL CODE INTL.
A group proposing a minimum mandatory 5wpm capability in morse code for ALL
radio services. If hams are forced to qualify for this test, then all other
transmitters should too. (cell phones and cordless phones are the only
exception) If one group is forced, they ALL should be forced.

Heard this recently.....

"rasw" <atdot.dotat@at.sorry> wrote in message
news:a2k9er$3i4ig$1@rn.area.com...
> If the government won't do it, maybe we should.
>
> Make a "voluntary" 20WPM test (a REAL test, like they did when I took it,
> not a multiple-guess test), and keep an online registry of REAL EXTRAS who
> passed this test.
>
> See if we can get sites like QRZ.com to include the info as to whether or
> not the person passed the 20WPM test and is a real extra or a no-code
extra.
>
>
>
>

2969. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:05:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <X6x58.663$TS2.410824@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32480

Only in your mind. Tsk, Tsk Tsk.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128082648.27059.00000386@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >Yep... and quite a few others..... Too bad there isn't a way to dig up
these
> >old trolls who did the testing back then. I am not the only other one
they
>
> PURE BS

2970. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:06:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <_6x58.664$TS2.410496@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32481

Whatever.... get a life Troll.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020128083142.27059.00000389@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >What is the need to "cash" those in? I only did it to satisfy me. HF
has
> >no interest to me.
>
> And thats why you got so upset that the VEs cheated you, yea right

2971. Re: clarification

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:06:04 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <07x58.665$TS2.410707@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32482

There is nothing there that says I *have* to submit the CSCE's.... If I feel the need to, I will. But not because others want me to. Merely because I want to. HF right now has no appeal to me, but who knows, maybe later. I am interested in learning more about some of the digital modes, and unfortunately, that is the only area where most of the activity is. I am aware that there is some amount of VHF/UHF digital modes being used, but not alot around here. Digipeaters are deader than the regular repeaters. Who knows, I have a much more important priority in my life, and that is finishing the rest of my training and certification in field of employment. After all, this is only a hobby service, not a career. Even in the Amateurs Code it states that a well balance between Amateur Radio and other parts of a persons life is necessary. Unfortunately some people don't get that fact.

Maybe later this summer I will dig back in to the hobby alot more, but in the meantime I have much greater priorities at hand, and if I do not focus on that, someone could die, including my partners.

To clarify, I took the test in 1989. I passed the novice and tech written. I passed the code test not by answering the questions correctly, but I did however have one solid minute of code copied correctly. I also learned that this particular VE team was not accepting that method of passing, and the only acceptable *passing* score was a 100%. (not the 7 or 8 or 9 out of ten) They would not accept anything else. I have come to figure out they were wrong.

As far as recent tests, I had already taken the technician written, thus resulting in current callsign. Later on I had passed the written for the general class and have a CSCE for that. Recently I have passed the code test and requested the CSCE for that. Hopefully that clears things up a little.

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:77f1797e.0201281159.2fc3dd98@posting.google.com...
> I'm seriously confused. If the CSCE for the code was current and
> presented when the CSCE for General element was awarded, the VEs
> would've filed both CSCEs with the FCC, resulting in the issuance of
> the General license. I don't believe you need to send it to the FCC.
> What am I missing here? You have "unfiled" CSCEs for code and the
> General element? Is it that the code CSCE had expired when the General
> element was passed? In that case, filing the code CSCE would do no
> good. For all intents and purposes, you still need to pass the code
> again. Notice, I am not judging your reasons, just trying to figure
> out the sequence.
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message

news:<ec048.84$ys1.12796@newshog.newsread.com>...
> > Hey dumb fuck..... CSCE is sitting right at home for your ever-important
> > code test! Don't have the need to send it in nor the equipment as well.
My
> > dead ass as you call it works between 55-70 hours per week as well as
> > pursuing university courses? So who has the dead ass here? At least I
> > either to try to support others here or inject a little humor once in a
> > while. I earned my license, and the CSCE for both the General written
and
> > the code test.
> >
> > Oh yeah.... had it not been for some VE's screwing up 13 years ago, I
would
> > have been a licensee then. They chose what rules they wished to follow,
and
> > made up their own.
> >
> > Get a life loser.
> >
> >
> >
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020123192049.17829.00000154@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > > >And where the hell were you when all these changes that you detest so
> > much?
> > > > >
> > > > >Did you bother working towards a "positive goal" at least as what is
> > > > >percieved in your own mind? Did you do anything towards the
promotion of
> > > > >your beliefs other that bitching and moaning here?
> > > > >
> > > > >My guess is no. My guess is you are the type that enjoys bitching
about
> > > > >everything with doing nothing to make it better. Not once have I
ever
> > see
> > > > >you post a positive message, nor a contributory one either. Even
some of
> > > > >the other "sticks in the mud" in this newsgroup at least contribute
> > > > >positively to a debate, or provide some information.
> > > > >
> > > > >Find a counselor or someone who can help you with your negativity. It
is
> > not
> > > > >healthy.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > SCREW OFF, just as I figured, checked the Qrz DATA Base and of
course
> > you are

> > > one of them there CBplussers. Why dont you get off your Dead ASS and
get a
> > Real
> > > Ham License, havent you heard they are basically giving them away.

2972. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:06:05 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <17x58.666$TS2.410670@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32483

> >
> >And what's wrong with the 3-class license structure we have
> >now?
>
> Let's presume for a moment that it's late 2003 and the FCC has simply
> dumped Element 1, but made no other changes.
>
> Here's what's wrong:
>
> - New hams have to pass the 35 question Tech written - but to do so, they
> are handed the "200 page book", as W1RFI so often mentions.

Who was handing out the books? I had to buy mine!

What Techs
> get for their effort is ALL VHF/UHF at 1.5 kW power, but extremely limited
> HF/MF.

Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges. Although they may have privileges of up to 1500 watts, I do not see why that level is necessary. At a maximum of 200-300 watts should allow communications with another station just about anywhere in any state, on any of the bands from 50Mhz on up as far as mobiles are concerned. And residential setups with a decent antenna system should definitely have better luck there.

> Only tiny slices of four bands, and only two modes! I think the "entry
level"
> license
> should allow more spectrum and modes but less power. Remember, RF safety
was
> not a concern back when the structure was created.

I would support a entry level of licensure that would give a taste of 1 HF band, say like 10m and say 2 meters. Then have the General, Advanced and Extra Class licenses testing go back to what it was 15-30 years ago. What to do with all the various licensees during the changes of the past 20 years or so, I don't have the solution to that, but making them upgrade to General as a minimum seems like the only solution. Who knows.....

>

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2973. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:36:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129083641.11381.00000021@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32484

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net

>Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.

This is incorrect. Technician Class operators can operate on all bands 6 M and up. >have privileges of up to 1500 watts, I do not see why that level is >necessary. At a maximum of 200-300 watts should allow communications with >another station just about anywhere in any state, on any of the bands from >50Mhz on up as far as mobiles are concerned.

Unless you are working one of the super stations, 1500 watts is needed for conventional moonbounce. Some hams have recently been experimenting with long-term integration to accomplish moonbounce at QRP levels, though.

>I would support a entry level of licensure that would give a taste of 1 HF >band, say like 10m and say 2 meters.

If you limit the entry level too much, no one will want to play.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2974. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 13:41:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129084126.11381.00000023@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32485

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>How many people have time to read 1,000 page documents? Only those who are
>retired or don't need to work even have the potential for such time.

Here is a 7-page tutorial on IEEE 802.11:

http://www.wirelessethernet.org/downloads/IEEE_80211_Primer.pdf

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2975. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 14:28:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129092857.09884.00000004@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32487

>Only in your mind. Tsk, Tsk Tsk

I guess only in your mind, your the one with all the Lame Excusses

2976. Re: GENO PARIS WILL STILL SUCK YOUR COCK AND RIM YOUR ASSHOLE before he forges posts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 14:31:14 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a36bjf$5bg$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 32486
Cross-posted to: alt.flamenet,alt.personals.homosexual,alt.gayteen,alt.homosexual.music,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 28 Jan 2002 16:11:58 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
Message id: <a34erelca2@dosa.alt.net>:

[...]

>Give some of Geno's neighbors a call, too:

DYOFDW, Wiseman.

--
================================>8====================================
From: "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net>

<president-mcnamara@theovaloffice.REMOVEcom> wrote (to Roger Wiseman) in
message ID <a1l33h$eg1$1@paradoxa.ogoense.net>
> [Time to feed the troll.]

"Did that toilet overflow onto the floor of that basement gheto apartment
again?"

Roger Wiseman, Usenet doormat and resident shit-eater, autoflames himself
in message ID: <a1mqqb56a@dosa.alt.net>
================================>8====================================

2977. Re: NEWS FLASH NEW HAM TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 14:31:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129093143.09884.00000005@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32488

>Whatever.... get a life Troll.

I have a life, now you thats another story. If you would stop your Whinning on how you were cheated, and do some memorizing you to could be a Real Ham.

2978. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 14:56:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020129095654.28060.00000033@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32489

In article <3C55EF78.48FEC9AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
>> A BUS! :-)
>
>Most computers drive a bus.

Cecil:

Right. Now, I just have to figure out how to get a PowerStroke Diesel
engine into my computer!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2979. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 14:56:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020129095655.28060.00000034@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32490

In article <20020128155510.28299.00004215@mb-ck.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>What makes you think I haven't "gotten anywhere" financially, Kim?
>>You been sneaking a peek at my Czeching accounts, IRA's, etc.???
>>As usual, you don't know what you're talking about.
>
>Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
>A BUS! :-)

Lennie:

Yes, that is correct. I was also making my living driving a limousine before, during, and after my recent college studies and graduation. As it happens, I have a degree in Human Resources Management, but my position as a Paratransit Operator pays better than most jobs in this field -- which I have been unable to get, mainly due to my age, sex, and lack of minority status. My job involves providing safe, accommodating transportation to people who are elderly, ill, or who possess various physical or mental challenges. It is far more than merely being a "bus driver." It is a very satisfactory job, has a fairly low stress level, and permits me to "be my own boss" to a very great extent. I have already declined a position as a supervisor/dispatcher, because after trying it for a week, I decided I liked driving better -- and I missed the people I was working with.

I have already spent the best years of my adult life as a supervisor and manager -- I have nothing to prove to myself or anyone else with regard to my ability to accept responsibility. I could accept a position as a Street Supervisor if I remain with my company long enough; I have other irons in the fire as of the last few weeks, and another career change could occur. BTW -- among my "bus driver" colleagues are several others with college degrees, a former Dentist, and a Baptist Minister with a Master's in Divinity.

I don't recall ever making fun of your occupation, Len. To what do I owe this treatment?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2980. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:14:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56BC6F.9FE975FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32491

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> If you'd care to pay for it, you are welcome to do a forensic tissue
> sampling on myself to assertain the historical presence of any "illegal"
> drugs.

That wouldn't prove that you didn't use illegal drugs when you were a
teenager. It is impossible for you to prove that you have never used
illegal drugs. It is impossible for anyone to prove that the military
doesn't use Morse code.

> And it IS a "valid" challenge. Lennie has repeatedly asserted that Morse
> Code was NOT "used", pasively or actively, and yet it is still taught BY the
> Armed Forces to some segment of it's members.

I'm not talking about something in particular, Steve. It is a generalization
applicable to *all* logical proofs. The onus of proof is upon the person who
asserts the *positive* premise. In this case, that would be you and Arnie.

To prove the military uses Morse code takes one example and is relatively
easy to prove. To prove the military doesn't use Morse code takes an almost
infinite number of samples and is impossible to prove.

> HE made the assertion, he is now challenged to make good his claim.

It is impossible for anyone to prove that Morse code is not used by the
military, i.e. a non-exclusive negative premise cannot be proven. That's
an accepted rule of classical logic. But IMO, there's a high probability
that our special forces can monitor the enemy's CW transmissions. I
wouldn't be surprised if some of those guys were hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2981. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:21:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129102148.11129.00000015@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32492

>Subject: Re: Be A Winner! 5001
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 1/29/2002 8:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020129095655.28060.00000034@mb-ba.aol.com>

>I don't recall ever making fun of your occupation, Len. To what do I
>owe this treatment?

Larry,

You need to ask? Consider the source.

73

Steve

2982. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:24:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56BE95.67C0102B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32493

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you're really stupid enough to believe that any serious of number of new hams
> will actually go to all the trouble to learn MOrse code when there is no
> requirement for them to do so.

There is no requirement for them to become hams. There is no requirement
for them to use SSB. There is no requirement for them to use FM.

Your negative opinion of Morse code is showing again, Dick. I believe that
CW has enough merit that a lot of new hams will choose to learn Morse code.
It's obvious you believe that CW doesn't have much merit, i.e. is a waste
of time, so nobody will choose to learn Morse code. With friends like you,
CW doesn't need any enemies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2983. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:27:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020129102738.28060.00000040@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32494

In article <20020129053248.19259.00000973@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Okay. I do that from time to time.
>
>Personally, I think that more people join ARRL to support its spectrum
>efforts
>than to receive QST.

Ed:

This has to be one of the most childishly naive comments I've ever seen on this newsgroup. If QST wern't an automatic by-product of ARRL membership, said membership would dwindle to next to nothing -- and you bloody damn well know it! To the average Joe Sixpack Bagadonuts no-coder I'mAWannaBeHamOrJustLookLikeOne, the ARRL just publishes a slick magazine with lots of pretty pictures to look at every month, and handy articles like The Doctor Is In that answer the same embarrassingly simplistic questions every month.

> This is especially true now that ARRL is not being so
>secretive about what it does in that area. The information on the ARRL web
>page, and the new regular feature on the page about "What Has ARRL Done
>Lately"
>are, IMHO, positive and overdue moves.

The thing that is overdue from the ARRL is a nationwide, major mass-media campaign to publicize the ARS, in order to help us gain public support through vastly increased numbers of licensees. Instead, the ARRL depends on local No-coders wearing a pretty ARRL Public Information Officer badge to club meetings, but doing absolutely nothing to get meaningful press/media exposure for our hobby/service -- while hams are being voted out of existence with CC&R's all over the country. Give me a break!

The only thing that could possibly save ham radio is to get some PSA's on the TV during Prime Time. I don't care if the ARRL HQ building has to be sold, QST reduced to a newsprint rag, and the ARRL HQ staff converted into a handful of unpaid volunteers shivering in a tent and taking turns sending W1AW code practice with a J-38. All the fat, comfortable, and financially secure ARRL staffers are convinced they are working to "save" ham radio. HA!!! How could that ever be possible, when some teen-ager with multiple body piercings and a cell phone can out-communicate the average entry-level ham by several orders of magnitude? Get us on TV -- Get us on MTV --

or we're going to be extinct in a few years.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2984. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:33:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129103304.11129.00000017@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32495

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/29/2002 9:14 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C56BC6F.9FE975FF@IEEE.org>

>To prove the military uses Morse code takes one example and is relatively
>easy to prove. To prove the military doesn't use Morse code takes an almost
>infinite number of samples and is impossible to prove.

Cecil, I'd be satisfied if The Licenseless One could produce ONE person in position of authority or responsibility in DoD that would be willing to say "The Armed Forces of the United States no longer uses manual telegraphy for ANY on-going communications, tactical or strategic, small unit or large."

He cannot.

However Arnie HAS produced points-of-contact within DoD who CAN verify that Morse Code IS not only taught, but has practical application in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Lennie says it's a ruse, however he has himself admitted a lack of resolve to call the numbers himself.

I am reminded of the closing moments of "Star Trek: The Motion Picture" when V'ger short-circuits itself rather than hear the truth.

>It is impossible for anyone to prove that Morse code is not used by the
>military, i.e. a non-exclusive negative premise cannot be proven. That's
>an accepted rule of classical logic. But IMO, there's a high probability
>that our special forces can monitor the enemy's CW transmissions. I
>wouldn't be surprised if some of those guys were hams

I hope they are, but don't care if they are not. As long as the snivveling bastards in the caves die a miserable death. At least THEY will know what hit them and why.

Paratus et Vigilans

Steve, K4YZ

2985. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 15:49:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56C493.35DC5C0C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32496

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >But IMO, there's a high probability
> >that our special forces can monitor the enemy's CW transmissions. I
> >wouldn't be surprised if some of those guys were hams
>
> I hope they are, but don't care if they are not. As long as the
> snivveling bastards in the caves die a miserable death. At least THEY will
> know what hit them and why.

If our military cannot monitor CW transmissions, I don't think
the prognosis is good for eliminating terrorism.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2986. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:10:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c56c9c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32497

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020129054226.19259.00000975@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >I was taking it as a given that, absent S25.5, the entry level
> >class would have at least limited HF privileges (based on
> >technical knowledge, rather than Morse proficiency).
>
> Even if the entry level were given HF priveleges similar to the
current Tech+,

I didn't mean THAT limited ...

> it makes little sense to have an "entry level" license that gives
full
> priveleges on VHF-daylight, including the right to use 1500 watts,
and severely
> limiting HF access and power. IMHO, it would make more sense to
have an entry
> class that is reasonably easy to obtain, but with power and
frequency limits
> evenly spread across the bands. Just as an example, perhaps
voice/data/cw
> priveleges on 75/80 M, 40 M, 15 M, 10 M, and operation on 2 meters,
limited to
> 100 watts would be a reasonable starting point. The 75/80 M and 2 M
operation
> would help the new ham be better connected to his or her locals, and
the 40, 15
> and 10 M would give the ham some interesting DX priveleges.

Power limits can be linked to (and justified on) the demonstrated
level of technical proficiency ... frequency limits are more arbitrary
and therefore more debatable. (What's the *real* difference between
7220 and 7230, for example, in terms of the technical competence
required?)

> Just my personal view at this time. I am sure that my views will
evolve as we
> get closer to the point where the FCC has to consider what to do.

Ditto ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFbJYJe+N6+q84HiEQL8HwCgvO7BUNprAZsgGZz9utYrMgzcyUgAoOZM
Apcy0hhSdYKYy0/WflRaSGsP
=Jtv0
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2987. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:15:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c56caef_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32498

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gqodcl4.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 02:31:12 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd
certainly
> >like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like
> >control links, for example.
>
> And woth strong encryption how is the FCC going to discharge their
> obligatory functions of identifying the station and verifying
compliance
> with the rules on permissible and proscribed content? Are we
going
> to get mired in the key escrow swamp ??

Heavens, no ... I would envision IDing in the clear with only limited
command/control functional data allowed to be encrypted. I think
such limitations could satisfy the FCC's needs in all practical
respects.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFbKkZe+N6+q84HiEQL6aACbBbsGsU8Edy9TJM2QvBWeykEiTVwAn1wZ
4zrfQ5LNktHP/P97ro5mbg9W
=MVea
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2988. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:17:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C580E87.5330E52@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32499

Bill Sohl wrote:

WHY must there be a "serious" number of new hams that learn

> morse code anyway? No one has shown any reason for there
> to be any large number of hams engaged in morse knowledge/use
> anymore than anyone showing there are large (serious) numbers
> of hams engaged in public service, homebrewing, etc.

Well, Slick, if you haven't seen the light by now there's no help for you and
you're doomed to al ifetime of cluelessness. Poor fella.

2989. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:19:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a36hli$4qr$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32500

```
Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge rather than
it's leading edge? Your glass just half full?

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c56128a_2@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C55A70E.9ECD1BDD@uci.edu...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > > Hash: SHA1
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > > ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> > > > > lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
> > > >
> > > > You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?
> > >
> > > Jim,
> > >
> > > I believe you know full-well that I was talking about
> > > the average level of tehcnical competence, relative
> > > to the state of the art in communications technology,
> > > as well as willingness to accept new things that
> > > are different from "the way it's always been."
> >
> > So, you mean't to deride everyone except yourself. Yes,
> > that IS the way it seemed.
>
> NO, I *didn't* "mean to deride everyone except myself" ...
> all I was doing was stating what I view to be a simple,
> and indisputable fact of life.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

>
> iQA/AwUBPFYSYJe+N6+q84HiEQL3ZQCfTRMC64aNuYmpqZBl4/kAq77FoK0An2jP
> HAKaH16jy8qsnLZFGBPxhdDL
> =Ht4Q
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
>
>

2990. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:38:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a36ioa$581$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32502

Old Roman marble. Perhaps the source of the old expression, 'a chip on the shoulder.'

Kim, please don't feed the animals.

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020127201042.05631.00001959@mb-bd.aol.com...
> If it has been published in the "official" tradition publications of the
> ARRL, it is the honest-to-God TRVTH.
>
> If it has been published in newsgroups by long-time OFs with one-
> by-twos, it is the honest-to-God TRVTH. Even if some of the
> truthsayers disagree with one another...they speak the TRVTH as
> if it were engraved in old Roman marble, everlasting through time. :-)

2991. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:39:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5813DF.63305C0A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32501

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you're really stupid enough to believe that any serious of number of new hams
> > will actually go to all the trouble to learn MOrse code when there is no
> > requirement for them to do so.
>
> There is no requirement for them to become hams. There is no requirement
> for them to use SSB. There is no requirement for them to use FM.
>
> Your negative opinion of Morse code is showing again, Dick. I believe that
> CW has enough merit that a lot of new hams will choose to learn Morse code.
> It's obvious you believe that CW doesn't have much merit, i.e. is a waste
> of time, so nobody will choose to learn Morse code. With friends like you,
> CW doesn't need any enemies.

Pardon, Sir, but your Troll light is on again. It's YOU who
constantly downplay the value of not only CW but ham radio
in its entirety, a la "Ham radio itself is trivial...". And then you accuse me of
being an enemy of CW when I assert the plain
truth - that it has almost universal communications value, but
only when hams learn it, which has been made clear by all the
codebashing whiners they will NOT do, even when it was a requirement for licensing,
much less when there is no licensing requirement.
What a fool you continue to be..

2992. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:48:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5815CD.7C9EF64D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32503

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> To the average Joe Sixpack Bagadonuts

> no-coder I'mAWannaBeHamOrJustLookLikeOne, the ARRL just
> publishes a slick magazine with lots of pretty pictures to look at every
> month

Distressingly accurate, as noted by our own resident CBer-cum-Tech-Plus {WOW!}
(size plus, too by her own desription)
-yeah, our own W5TITS, who has a QST lying around some-
where but has never actually looked inside it. To her
"The Doctor Is In" has another, entirely different connotation.
She's not even bright enough to get anything out of the pictures.
Cheezz..., what have we come to? More to the point, where are we going?

2993. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 16:54:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C581748.B380F345@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32504

CAM wrote:

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > >But IMO, there's a high probability
> > >that our special forces can monitor the enemy's CW transmissions. I
> > >wouldn't be surprised if some of those guys were hams
> >
> > I hope they are, but don't care if they are not. As long as the
> > snivveling bastards in the caves die a miserable death. At least THEY will
> > know what hit them and why.
>
> If our military cannot monitor CW transmissions, I don't think
> the prognosis is good for eliminating terrorism.

Hmm... I believe you're one who derided my statement a few years ago right here when I said that when/if aliens (earthlings, not extraterrestial) ever invade us they would do well to use CW for all their communications because by then no one will be able tell what it is, much less what they're saying. Changed your mind???

2994. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 17:00:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C58189C.4954ED0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32505

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge rather than
> it's leading edge?

Gosh, Jim, I thought that was obvious- It's where he has resided for
his entire time in the hobby.

>Your glass just half full?

Um, can we say he's just half-vast??

>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3c56128a_2@news7.fast.net...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C55A70E.9ECD1BDD@uci.edu...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > > > Hash: SHA1
> > > >
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C4DDE10.54EC20F4@uci.edu...
> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > > > ... amateurs used to lead in technology ... now they
> > > > > > lag by something on the order of 20-50 years ...
> > > > >
> > > > > You're an amateur, aren't you, Carl?
> > > >
> > > > Jim,
> > > >
> > > > I believe you know full-well that I was talking about
> > > > the average level of tehcnical competence, relative
> > > > to the state of the art in communications technology,
> > > > as well as willingness to accept new things that
> > > > are different from "the way it's always been."
> > >
> > > So, you mean't to deride everyone except yourself. Yes,
> > > that IS the way it seemed.

```
> >
> > NO, I *didn't* "mean to deride everyone except myself" ...
> > all I was doing was stating what I view to be a simple,
> > and indisputable fact of life.
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wa6vse
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> > Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
> >
> > iQA/AwUBPFYSYJe+N6+q84HiEQL3ZQCfTRMC64aNuYmpqZBl4/kAq77FoK0An2jP
> > HAKaH16jy8qsnLZFGBPxhdDL
> > =Ht4Q
> > -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
> >
> >
> >
```

2995. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 17:22:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bTA58.263$0J6.19211@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32506

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020129095655.28060.00000034@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <20020128155510.28299.00004215@mb-ck.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >>What makes you think I haven't "gotten anywhere" financially, Kim?
> >>You been sneaking a peek at my Czeching accounts, IRA's, etc.???
> >>As usual, you don't know what you're talking about.
> >
> >Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
> >A BUS! :-)
>
> Lennie:
>
> Yes, that is correct. I was also making my living driving a limousine
before,
> during, and after my recent college studies and graduation. As it
happens,
> I have a degree in Human Resources Management, but my position as
> a Paratransit Operator pays better than most jobs in this field -- which
> I have been unable to get, mainly due to my age, sex, and lack
> of minority status. My job involves providing safe, accommodating
> transportation to people who are elderly, ill, or who possess various
> physical or mental challenges. It is far more than merely being a "bus
> driver." It is a very satisfactory job, has a fairly low stress level,
and
> permits me to "be my own boss" to a very great extent. I have already
> declined a position as a supervisor/dispatcher, because after trying it
> for a week, I decided I liked driving better -- and I missed the people
I
> was working with.
>
> I have already spent the best years of my adult life as a supervisor and
> manager -- I have nothing to prove to myself or anyone else with
> regard to my ability to accept responsibility. I could accept a
position
> as a Street Supervisor if I remain with my company long enough; I
> have other irons in the fire as of the last few weeks, and another
career
> change could occur. BTW -- among my "bus driver" colleagues are
> several others with college degrees, a former Dentist, and a Baptist
> Minister with a Master's in Divinity.
>

> I don't recall ever making fun of your occupation, Len. To what do I
> owe this treatment?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

If it makes you happy, Len, I drive a bus as well and I have TWO degrees including a Masters. I did my cubical rat thing for 25 years and am about a year from collecting a nice retirement check and tapping a 6 figure IRA/401k. I drive because I want to: as Larry points out is it a useful, low-stress occupation that pays decently. And I have nothing to prove to you or anyone else.

Years ago I ate at the Blackhawk Cafe in the Chicago Loop with a group that included a PhD garbage man. He got the biggest chuckle out of wondering what the yuppies at the next table would think about eating with a G-Man. He had nothing to prove either.

Dick NBK

2996. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 17:39:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201290939.6e39545e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32507

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020128175035.14720.00000891@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >When you tell the whole story, it looks a bit different.
>
> Not really, Jim.

Yes, really, Ed. The "entry level" Novice license of the 1960s was
a whole different animal from the "entry level" Tech of today.

Maybe we are saying the same thing different ways.

> The point that when I entered ham radio, that first rung was
> a very small one and that now, it is a much much larger step does not change.

Which is why the thread about a post-S25.5 US license structure was
started by Mr. Plourde.

> IMHO, this does explain why we have far fewer 13 year olds entering ham radio
> than in the Novice heyday. More hams are entering ham radio now than then, but
> they are doing it at an older age.

It's only one reason, and a minor reason at that. Here are some more:
1) There are lots of 2-way electronic communication "hobbies"
besides ham radio today. Back in the "Novice heyday" a teenager had
very few other options
2) Antenna restrictions and RFI concerns make ham radio difficult or
impossible for many young people. Heck, I started out with the
proverbial one-tube oscillator transmitter feeding the end-fed wire
out to the apple tree. Many 13 year olds today can't put up any kind
of antenna, even if they have the yard and antenna.
3) Lack of publicity (relates to 1))
4) Perceived high cost of getting started. (note "perceived")
5) Demographics

But let's fix what can be fixed. See the "S25.5 proposal proposal" thread
for some ideas.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2997. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 17:49:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a36mun$7bv$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32508

Hi Kim,

Looks like Hans was the first to admit your mistake. :-)

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c5421ac_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020127000721.16072.00000584@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c5359d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20020126121152.13187.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> Afraid of what you'll find - that's pretty clear.
> > >> >
> > >> >Jim, I have to ask. *Why* would fear come into play at all here?
> > >>
> > >> The word "afraid" has a few meanings. "Afraid" as in "afraid to admit
> you
> > >> might be mistaken"
> > >
> > >I am usually the first to say when I am mistaken.
> >
> > Not here on rrap.
> >
>
> In fact, here ya go (by the way, this is the last time you'll ever see a
> Search done by me in the newsgroups). There's eight posted below:
>
> **********
> From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Re: FCC Non-Renews for "Character"?
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: (This is the only article in this thread) | Original Format
> Date: 2000/05/10
>
>
> Also, sorry to use "revoke." Bad mistake
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> K0HB@uswest.net wrote in article <8fbp3s$6tp$1@news.netmar.com>...
> > In a previous article, "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

> >
> > >Could someone provide some background information on this? Is there a
> web
> > >page or some other source of information where one could learn how this
> > >story begins and how it got to this today?
> >
> > The FCC did not revoke his license. They simply declined to renew it,
> based
> > on his felony conviction regarding fraud in other telecommunications
> > matters.
>
> **********
> From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Re: 24-35 Mhz
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (3 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2000-10-05 19:03:11 PST
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20001005213103.23109.00000704@nso-fi.aol.com...
> > In article
> <83545A62CD1D6200.29E2D9E6F85A1EE9.6A091A1438B035B8@lp.airnews.net>,
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
> >
> > >Strike the "channel 36-40" comment made in another post by
me....ROFLMAO.
> I
> > >was discussing with my husband this whole thing and made the same
> > >observation. LOL
> >
> > A typical W5TIT posting. She wants you to ignore something *she*
> > said as if she never said it, but would never extend the same
> > consideration to you -- particularly if you disagree with her!
> >
>
> Er, hey, Larry. Yeah, you. The one who apparently is still a little
cloudy
> on thoughtwaves. I didn't tell anyone to ignore that I made a really,
> really stupid mistake. And, I also have never said I couldn't. Big
> difference between me and you--I can admit when I am wrong.
>
> **********
> From: Kim-W5TIT (nospam@none.net)
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (2969 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2001-11-22 22:11:45 PST
>
> Sorry, Jim! No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
> make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the

> "criteria."
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com...
> > In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > >news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> > >> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> > >> >
> > >> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's
see:
> > >> >
> > >> > Larry
> > >> > Dick Carroll
> > >> > Richard McCollum
> > >> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > >> > Dave Heil
> > >> >
>
> **********
> From: Kim-W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Re: YES!! L.A. kicks BSA out of town
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (239 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2000-12-04 19:15:15 PST
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3A2C1F7A.1CCA@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > What would be your answer then, to people
> > > > who would have to have unwanted children
> > > > with anti-abortion laws in place?
> > >
> > Kim,
> >
> > Would *HAVE* to have unwanted children?
>
> That sentance should have been ". . .to people who would have unwanted
> children. . ." Excuse the mistake.
>
> **********

> From: Kim-W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Re: Seven people die because of no gun control
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (302 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2000-12-28 17:02:59 PST
>
> "Keith Wood" <kw@bctv.com> wrote in message
> news:3A4BDD8D.9547C03B@bctv.com...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:92fsu6$2mq$3@208.206.142.84...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Aaron Jones wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If a guy walks up behind you at an ATM and sticks a gun in your
> face,
> > > > > > being armed won't help much. He will just get your money *and*
your
> > > > > > gun...
> > > > >
> > > > > If a guy walks up behind you at an ATM it's because you're not
paying
> > > > > attention, and what he should find is that object in your hand isn't
> > > > > your ATM card after all......
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Oh, yeah, that's just what I'd love to picture--everyone at an ATM
> having a
> > > > gun in their hand. Yeah, that's a *cough* pretty picture indeed...
> > > >
> > > > Man, you must be a paranoid type!
> > >
> > > Hmmmm . . .you are afraid of concealed weapons, yet you call someone
> > > ELSE "paranoid"?
> >
> > If I said "afraid" of concealed weapons (and I don't think I did), then it
> > was purely a mistake. I *DON'T AGREE* with concealed weapons (guns to be
> > specific) not because I am afraid of them or they scare me--but because I
> > believe in open carry as the greatest deterrent to threat, the greatest
> > education on gun safety, and the greatest tool for desensitizing fearful
> > fools.
> >
> > **********
> > From: Kim W5TIT (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> > Subject: Re: ARRL Secret Elections Coming
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

> View: Complete Thread (432 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2000/02/18
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
> >
> > >However, is it the opinion of some that one must be a
> > licensed amateur to have opinions on the hobby, the laws governing the
> hobby,
> > the very nature of the hobby? I would really find that kind of
> > anti-democratic, if so...<
> >
> [I SNIPPED THIS ONE DUE TO LENGTH]
> > The Twerp in question is a hate-mongerer. He has nothing
> constructive to
> > offer this NG other than to be a muck-raker.
> >
>
> Well, I actually considered changing my thoughts above when I read this
> (I never "read ahead" when I respond to these things--my mistake,
> huh?). BUT, I left it so that you could *maybe* see how, out here, it
> looks like you yourself are "hating" as much as you claim someone else
> is.
>
> **********
> From: W5TIT - Kim (seventythree@eightyeight.net)
> Subject: Re: ??? for Mr DX
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (45 articles) | Original Format
> Date: 2002-01-26 18:04:59 PST
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020126200653.16072.00000572@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c52bc1e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Brian: You may prefer tuning through off-air methods. However, it is
not
> > >required and does break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier on-air.
> >
>
> I just noticed my severe mistake above. The last part of that sentence
> should read "and does n-o-t break any FCC R&R to tune with a carrier
> on-air."
>
> **********
> From: W5TIT, Kim Walker (kw5tit@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Re: R&O is out ... Major victory for NCI and ham radio in general
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> View: Complete Thread (395 articles) | Original Format

> Date: 2000/01/09
>
> Lenof21 wrote:
> >
> >
> > Whoops, sorry, not quite the right answer. One doesn't "learn" by
> > just "being on the air." Operate on the wrong frequencies or using
> > too much power than in regulations are all offenses...there is no
> > defense in "just learning." Memorizing the answers to test
> > questions won't handle everything after being licensed.
> >
> [I SNIPPED THIS ONE TOO]
> I will always be sure to be operating within regulations, either by
> having learned through repetition or by always being sure that I have
> resources nearby to "look up" things. So, to learn by being on the air
> is relative...and it was my mistake to generalize what I meant by that.
> If I suddenly decide right this minute that I want to go do some CW on
> any other band than 10M...I would have to look up my frequency
> priviledges.
>
> 73 Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>

2998. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 18:05:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a36nse$7qh$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32509

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c55e253_2@newsa.ev1.net...

> Well, in my opinion, this has been pretty silly exchange.
>
> Kim W5TIT

But at least you kept replying until you finally had the last word in the exchange. :-)

2999. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 18:29:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56E9EF.C209690A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32510

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cheezz..., what have we come to? More to the point, where are we going?

How can you go anywhere if all you do is rest on your rosey red laurels?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3000. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 18:39:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56EC6B.4B9A5364@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32511

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Hmm... I believe you're one who derided my statement a few years ago right here
> when I said that when/if aliens (earthlings, not extraterrestial) ever invade us
> they would do well to use CW for all their communications because by then no one
> will be able tell what it is, much less what they're saying. Changed your mind???

IMO, the US government military/intelligence folk will never not be able
to monitor and decode all known codes. Encrypted CW would be a logical
choice for terrorists having lots of bang for the bucks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3001. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 18:42:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C56ED23.DBB7572B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32512

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What a fool you continue to be..

What a fascist you continue to be. "Papers please. - Your papers are
not in order. You vill learn Morse code or you vill die."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3002. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:14:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c56f518_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32513

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a36hli$4qr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge
rather than
> it's leading edge? Your glass just half full?

Jim,

How does speaking of the "average" constitute "characterize(ing)
the ARS by its trailing edge"??? That's a contradiction spun by you
in an attempt to defuse the assertion of my opinion.

As far as the leading edge goes, my concern is that it is vanishingly
small, and with people like Dick ("don't need to know squat about
Shannon or any other BASIC principles of communcation theory")
Carroll posing as "mainstream" it's only likely to shrink ... that's
why
I oppose Dick's viewpoints so vehemently.

Since you're obiously an educated person, I have difficulty
understanding why/how you can be so comfortable in supporting
such backward thinking.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFb0oJe+N6+q84HiEQKe5QCfcVirVZaceZnMDn5Z4aD+yHQSwcAAn3T6
XQONdweL2+OxXL952IxvqqDj
=Nair
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3003. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:56:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129145621.11764.00000874@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 32515

In article <d22b54c3.0201290115.28f2128b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Hey Lenny you pore artifact - I long ago decided that picking the
>fuzzies out of my navel is a much more productive use of my time than
>is "debating" any more of your twisted old repetitive diatribes in
>this NG. Toodles & Happy Trolling.

Your decision is correct...can Kelly discuss, debate, or argue a subject successfully?

Hmmm...let's see, for "laffs," something about "26 patents" that turned out to be ONE...WW2 land vehicles having 28 VDC batteries. Just two for starters. :-)

Then there's the constant barrage of everyone MUST do things that a certain in-group of long-time OFs do or be labeled as deficient, un-real, or otherwise "bad" in a hobby activity. :-)

3004. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:56:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129145625.11764.00000875@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 32518

In article <20020129053736.19259.00000974@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>Moreover, when the statistical nature of "traffic offered" is
>>considered
>>via the Erlang equation, it can be easily shown that a VASTLY larger
>>number of users can be served with a much lower "blocking probability"
>>when a pool of channels is assigned dynamically than when the same
>>number of channels are assigned in a fixed, inflexible manner.
>>(classical trunking theory ... another communications principle that's
>>over 50 years old and still rejected by the majority of hams ...)
>
>Now, in fairness, Carl, most of today's ham radio operation is done using
>commercially available amateur equipment. If such features were available in
>modern ham gear, I think that hams would use them. In pointing out what is
>possible, I do not mean to blame hams for not using what is not available to
>them.
>
>As software-defined radio becomes more entrenched in modern radio, I think
>that we will see SDRs in use in the ham bands, too. Writing the code to make a
>universal radio a ham-band radio will be the easiest way for a manufacturer
>to produce ham gear.

This is just a side-note on Software-Defined Radio (SDR), Ed, but
anyone can go to the Harris website and examine the description
of their "Falcon II" radio systems. Frequency range 1.6 to 512 MHz,
just about any mode anyone can want. SDR all the way, including
secure stuff only for military use. www.harris.com

Harris recently got a Big contract to make them for the U.K.

>I am hoping that the programmability of the SDRs will be available, giving
>hams the ability to experiment with coding to improve the radios.

Please define the above. "Programmability" of present-day SDR,
including the 14-year operational U.S. SINCGARS military radio,
is rather embedded in firmware, stuck in micron-dimension silicon.

"Programmability" requires some reasonable approach to a
standard (or even common-use) "language" for anything to be
shared in a hobby activity. The closest I can see to that is the
industry's GPIB (IEEE 488) for test equipment.

>Come to think of
>it, the IEEE 802.11b devices are also quite programmable, although I believe
>that at this time, the programmability is a closely guarded trade secret. :-)

Oh, oh! Ed, you mentioned the word "secret" here! A whole buncha
folks will pick up on that and immediately initiate CONSPIRACY
commentary or other snarly stuff about SECRECY! :-)

Most folks haven't yet discovered that strength of coding, such as
for SS applications, is NOT in the direct, immediate hardware or
firmware but rather in the coding system itself. The coding system
can be devised to be as versatile as possible for an application; i.e.,
to allow most available "narrowband" modes now available to radio
amateurs plus expansion to other modes at a later time. The
problem with trying to devise such a programming system lies in
the present-day mindset of too many: Conditioned thinking based
solely on what has been done in the past with hardware. Some
hobbyists are fixated with the past and actually refuse to consider
any other way to do something even if it is demonstrated in front of
their eyes and ears. Trying to experiment in a closed-mind
community is a rather unproductive and frustrating exercise. :-)

A small example of system groundbreaking is G3PLX's PSK31
in which Peter fairly well reorganized character coding such
that, as a part of the whole and not solely by itself, it made the
resulting bandwidth very narrow. Those who could not educate
themselves beyond manufacturer's sales phrases refused to
believe it or tried to thrash the whole idea. Not unlike the
antipathy displayed against SSB voice v. DSB AM in the 1950s.

Another example which will become more prevalent in the future
is the DTV format in TV broadcasting...the ability to squeeze 18
MHz of video information into a 6 MHz RF bandwidth and ALSO
have room for multiple-channel audio, closed-captioning, and a
number of other features. All that while delivering a snow-free,
noise-free signal right down to threshold.

Now expect some deragatory commentary such as "TV
broadcasting is not done in ham radio!" or nasty remarks
about PSK31 by those who have a stubborn hold on the past.
They will not, indeed cannot, accept something new and have
great difficulty seeing beyond the labels to the system itself.
They cannot understand, nor will they understand that
general communications theory allows bandwidth compression
and elimination of redundant information without loss of the
basic information to be communicated. Bandwidth compression
exists In both examples I just cited...as it does in the data that
is transmitted and received over the Internet for this newsgroup.

The Standard Argument AGAINST will surface as "That's not
the way it is done in ham radio, you <explitives> !!!" :-)

3005. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:56:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129145627.11764.00000876@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 32516

In article <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201290006170.9767-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201272204000.7789-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>>> On Sun, 27 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201212105230.151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...

>>Thus, there is no "hop sequence" ...
>
>FHSS and DSSS have no meaning to those not familiar with spread spectrum.
>You should avoid using "industry insider" terms without defining them.

"Industry insider?" The terms "hop set" and "hop sequence" are in the TMs and training aids for U.S. military communications folks using the SINCGARS family. The family was put into operational use in 1989. Since SINCGARS is for small unit operations on land, it would be safe to say that a few ten thousands of radio operators in the military have become familiar with the terms.

Hop Sing is the character name of the cook on the old TV show "Bonanza." :-)

>Also, I
>couldn't care if it's a direct sequence or another pattern - because the
>actual pattern doesn't matter when one is considering on what frequencies it
>COULD go to.

That seems to be reducing the argument to absurdity (reducto ad absurdum). Almost any misused HF transceiver COULD be made to transmit well out of band, rather in excess of manufacturer's claims, ARRL lab reviews, or even FCC type acceptance. :-)

3006. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:56:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129145629.11764.00000877@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 32517

In article <bTA58.263$0J6.19211@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>If it makes you happy, Len, I drive a bus as well and I have TWO degrees
>including a Masters.

I'm sure you drive very well. My wife has three degrees and TWO are Masters but her driver's license is standard passenger auto rated and dislikes driving in traffic.

All of the degree certificates we have are in a box in storage in the northern house. In frames, of course. Should we have the four protected and mounted on plaques on the wall with little spotlights shining on them? :-)

>I did my cubical rat thing for 25 years and am about
>a year from collecting a nice retirement check and tapping a 6 figure
>IRA/401k.

Is that a "qualification" of any kind for what is essentially a hobby activity in radio?

>I drive because I want to: as Larry points out is it a useful,
>low-stress occupation that pays decently. And I have nothing to prove to
>you or anyone else.

No, I think that incorrect. It would appear that you DO have something to prove. That is evident in past remarks made in this (now) chat room. "I was BORN an Extra" is one of the memorable remarks in attempting to put down "lesser" hobbyists in here. Add to that some literary pretentiouness creeping in from time to time that is more suited to Sunday Supplement Book Review or Weekend Calendar sections.

I've spent most of my adult life IN radio and electronics yet a number of one-by-twos in here resent the hell out of that because I don't adhere to any "traditional" amateur radio party line phrasing of self-glorification in accomplishments.

>Years ago I ate at the Blackhawk Cafe in the Chicago Loop with a group
>that included a PhD garbage man. He got the biggest chuckle out of
>wondering what the yuppies at the next table would think about eating with
>a G-Man. He had nothing to prove either.

Name dropping about restaurants? :-) Having been born and raised 90 miles west of Chicago, I can name-drop "The Loop" (it is said that way to outsiders who've never been to Chicago)

and "The Outer Drive" with ease. Why? I don't care for the central area of Chicago. I don't care for the Center City area of Los Angeles either, but know it better. None of that has any bearing on anything, does it? :-)

I've WORKED with PhDs, some of which were fine folks who didn't mind getting their hands dirty in electronics hardware (rather than garbage). Some of them were pretentious assholes who wore their "I can sign 'doctor' in front of my name" as if they should be revered as gods. The unpretentious ones got the work done. The pretentious ones were too busy making themselves lofty to do much innovation. Great appearance, though. :-)

I HAVE a number of things to PROVE. The main one in here is to dispell a host of mythology that has grown and flourished in minds of amateur radio licensees and their insistence that their fantasies MUST be taken up by newcomers and propagated because THEY insist that "that's the way it is."

Now, if that is upsetting to the pretentious credentialists, TS. The pretentious credentialists HAVE EARNED THAT OPINION. Think about it.

3007. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 19:56:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129145630.11764.00000878@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 32514

In article <3C55EF78.48FEC9AA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> Despite Roll's bragging of "high academic honors" he now DRIVES
>> A BUS! :-)
>
>Most computers drive a bus.

Cecil, one more like this and you have to buy everyone a
round down at the bus bar... :-)

3008. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 20:03:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C57002C.F90CAEBF@uci.edu>
Source record: 32520

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:a36hli$4qr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge
> rather than
> > it's leading edge? Your glass just half full?
>
> Jim,
>
> How does speaking of the "average" constitute "characterize(ing)
> the ARS by its trailing edge"??? That's a contradiction spun by you
> in an attempt to defuse the assertion of my opinion.

Not at all. It is my opinion that you are characterizing the trailing edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your words. That is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You obviously need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.

> As far as the leading edge goes, my concern is that it is vanishingly
> small, and with people like Dick ("don't need to know squat about
> Shannon or any other BASIC principles of communcation theory")
> Carroll posing as "mainstream" it's only likely to shrink ... that's
> why
> I oppose Dick's viewpoints so vehemently.

I really only opposed your piss poor attitude about things - amateur radio in particular.

> Since you're obiously an educated person, I have difficulty
> understanding why/how you can be so comfortable in supporting
> such backward thinking.

What backward thinking do you contend that I support?

3009. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 20:05:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201292001200.11254-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32519

On 29 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>
>>Those
>>devices made it clear that there was a subset they could operate on. The
>>wireless lan stuff doesn't.
>
>The box on my Elecraft K2 doesn't make it clear that it does not operate on all
>of its specified frequenices either.
>
>I think that Amateur Radio is better off if the ham who only wants to receive
>information from the boxes of products he or she might use on ham radio does
>not do any experimentation.

Ok, but what is the "first line" of information regarding any product in general? Isn't it the PACKAGING? The second line would then be product reviews, ... , and lastly, the "standard" (although some standards are more standard than others) that it claims to follow.

My whole point here has been: One applies common sense to what one has available, and the packaging for the LAN stuff, without the detailed knowledge from secondary and other sources, brings one to the wrong conclusion about suitability for amateur operations.

3010. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 20:48:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C570AA8.AFBB89F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32521

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Cecil, one more like this and you have to buy everyone a
> round down at the bus bar... :-)

I can't do that, Len. Madison County, TX is legally "dry".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3011. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 22:21:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5720f0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32522

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C57002C.F90CAEBF@uci.edu...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a36hli$4qr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > > Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge
> > rather than
> > > it's leading edge? Your glass just half full?
> > >
> > Jim,
> >
> > How does speaking of the "average" constitute "characterize(ing)
> > the ARS by its trailing edge"??? That's a contradiction spun by
you
> > in an attempt to defuse the assertion of my opinion.
>
> Not at all. It is my opinion that you are characterizing the
trailing
> edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your words.
That
> is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You
obviously
> need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.

How so? I think it's fair to say that the average ham spends
most of his/her time either on CW or SSB ... SSB is over 50
years old ... not at all near commercial state of the art ... CW,
well that's pracatically got dinosaur dung on it it's so old,
technologically-speaking.

I think I've painted a reasonably accurate picture of the "average."

> > As far as the leading edge goes, my concern is that it is
vanishingly
> > small, and with people like Dick ("don't need to know squat about
> > Shannon or any other BASIC principles of communcation theory")
> > Carroll posing as "mainstream" it's only likely to shrink ...
that's
```

> > why
> > I oppose Dick's viewpoints so vehemently.
>
> I really only opposed your piss poor attitude about things - amateur
> radio in particular.

I don't have a bad attitude towards ham radio ... I like it and
value it ... that's why I'm so concerned about what I believe to
be a very negative trend in our "average" relative to the state
of commercial practice ... since the commercial folks would
LOVE to have a chance to bid at auction on quite a few of
our bands. (And I don't believe that our HF bands are totally
"safe" either.)

> > Since you're obiously an educated person, I have difficulty
> > understanding why/how you can be so comfortable in supporting
> > such backward thinking.
>
> What backward thinking do you contend that I support?

You seem to be sticking up for Dick in his attacks on my
assertions that we're dangerously behing the times ... if
Dick's views don't represent backward thinking, I don't
know what does ... (and I assure you I do know what does)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFcgVZe+N6+q84HiEQLM0ACfXLJxWLG3ri34LqVRnXV5R0tplUEAn1YY
T1Du+4yGEaLI3966ta1guYWn
=IOh/
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3012. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 22:56:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129175633.11385.00000128@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32523

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Ok, but what is the "first line" of information regarding any product in
>general? Isn't it the PACKAGING?

Yes, the packaging on a new Yaecomwood tells us that a unit is an HF
transceiver. But what tells us that it does not transmit simultaneously on all
of its frequencies.

If you feel that the package should contain all of the information you need to
know to operate something, I disagree.

> One applies common sense to what one has
>available, and the packaging for the LAN stuff, without the detailed
>knowledge
>from secondary and other sources, brings one to the wrong conclusion about
>suitability for amateur operations.

Yes, I agree; without common sense and knowledge, one can draw the wrong
conclusion from the marketing information that most companies put on the box of
their products. One should not buy a product unless he or she has at least
some common sense and knowledge about what that product is.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3013. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 22:58:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129175837.11385.00000131@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32524

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>The Standard Argument AGAINST will surface as "That's not
>the way it is done in ham radio, you <explitives> !!!" :-)

I have had some people say that to me, but almost all of them leave off the
name calling. Almost...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3014. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 23:03:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C572A59.460A238@uci.edu>
Source record: 32526

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C57002C.F90CAEBF@uci.edu...
> > It is my opinion that you are characterizing the
> trailing
> > edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your words.
> That
> > is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You
> obviously
> > need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.
>
> How so? I think it's fair to say that the average ham spends
> most of his/her time either on CW or SSB ... SSB is over 50
> years old ... not at all near commercial state of the art ... CW,
> well that's pracatically got dinosaur dung on it it's so old,
> technologically-speaking.

Do you ever use an electric light bulb, Carl? Think about how backward that makes you, by your logic, technologically speaking.

> I think I've painted a reasonably accurate picture of the "average."

You haven't, but I agree that you probably think you have.

> I don't have a bad attitude towards ham radio ...

You hide it very well.

> > What backward thinking do you contend that I support?

> You seem to be sticking up for Dick in his attacks on my
> assertions that we're dangerously behing the times

I've never once mentioned Dick, or his views in any of my responses to you.
So which of the views that I've expressed in my posts do you feel is backward?

3015. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 23:08:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129180831.11385.00000139@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32525

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>1) There are lots of 2-way electronic communication "hobbies"
> besides ham radio today. Back in the "Novice heyday" a teenager had
> very few other options

I am not sure I buy into that. Considering that over the course of the development of these lots more hobbies, the percentage of hams wrt the general population has grown, obviously more hams of some age are entering ham radio. Considering that all of us hams are big kids at heart, the factor you describe should apply as much to the 30 year old as the 13 year old.

>2) Antenna restrictions and RFI concerns make ham radio difficult or
> impossible for many young people.

Other than the factor that people <30 are probably more apt to rent an apartment, where antennas might be forbidden than people over 30, who are probably more apt to own their own home (CC&Rs notwithstanding), the 13-year old is not apt to have any more or less problems than the older ham. In fact, when you consider that the parents of most 13 year olds are over 30, the 13-year old will be like I was -- living at home and putting up an antenna at the folks' home.

As to RFI, interference to consumer equipment is under much better control than it was when I was hamming. With industry standards for immunity just now coming into play, the inherent shielding of cable TV (not perfect, but a whole sight better than over-the-air TV) and much better information about RFI than when I was a young ham, I don't think that RFI is a major impediment.

>Many 13 year olds today can't put up any kind
> of antenna, even if they have the yard and antenna.

The same restrictions apply to the 30 year old.

>3) Lack of publicity (relates to 1))

When I was 13, the ONLY way I learned about ham radio was from the old time ham who moved in next door. Today, I can find all sorts of information and publicity about it using any web search engine.

>4) Perceived high cost of getting started. (note "perceived")

I am not sure it is perceived. By whom? Most hams today realize that the cost of all electronics has decreased in real dollars. For $1000.00 I can buy capability that I never would have dreamed of in the 1960s.

>But let's fix what can be fixed. See the "S25.5 proposal proposal" thread
>for some ideas.

I have contributed my ideas. I think it is great that we are talking and thinking about it, because the day will come when Amateur Radio will ask the Commission to make a decision about change again.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3016. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 23:12:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129181213.11385.00000142@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32527

From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)

>Here is a 7-page tutorial on IEEE 802.11:
>
>http://www.wirelessethernet.org/downloads/IEEE_80211_Primer.pdf

And another:

http://www.chipcenter.com/wireless/news061.html

73,
Ed

3017. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-29 23:35:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c57336b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32528

```
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C55EEFC.E731277E@uci.edu...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C55A681.A6B19590@uci.edu...
> > >
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > SIight correction: "Carl is saying that, IMHO, and from comments
> > > > I've heard/seen from many, the subscription to QST is a SIGNIFICANT
> > > > reason that MANY people join ARRL." It is clearly not the ONLY
> > > > reason,
> > > > but, as I stated, IMHO, if the subscription to QST were separable
from
> > > > membership, many would opt for the subscription only option.
> > > >
> > > > BTW ... I would NOT be one of them.
> > >
> > > But don't you see the difference between saying it that way, and the
way
> > > you said it before? One is accurate, and the other is purely
> > > derogatory. You almost always opt for the derogatory. That's what
> > > makes a lot of what you say so irritating.
> >
> > Well, think about it. I don't subscribe to the "PCTA" and "NCTA"
labels;
> > however, for the sake of demonstration...
> >
> > When the two sides begin debate it doesn't matter which side it is,
*both*
> > get derogatory pretty damned quick. I mean, I often think that the
greatest
> > motivation isn't ham radio itself--or the pride of it, history of it, or
> > whatever of it. I wonder if most people in this newsgroup don't use it
as
> > an excuse to just act like assholes, myself included. Think I'd get
like I
> > do with someone on the air, or over the phone, or at work, or even at
play?
> > I'm pretty cocky here in this newsgroup, but I am not that way at all in
> > person. That's because *most* of us in person would also act a whole
lot
```

> > differently toward each other.
>
> Why not try it here too?

Jim, I can remember being truly shocked as a newbie on this newsgroup. I never expected that people on a newsgroup would act just as they go, generally, online with each other in a common chat room. So, been there-done that-threw away the t-shirt. When I began responding to the first posts I noticed here about the CW issue (remember, I found this newsgroup a few months before the Biennial Review process was over with), and was summarily sworn at, called dumb, etc., etc., I responded in kind. I would in real life, also, or I would just walk away for fear of dealing with a lunatic.

Kim W5TIT

3018. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 00:12:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c573c0a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32529

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:1%l58.114313$Ee7.7921173@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> Dick wrote in part ...
>
> "... That includes CW skill in this case. Since virtually every HF ham rig
> made includes the mode with no further additional overhead other than
> operator knowledge, it is sheer avoidance and
> irresponsibility for hams to fail to do so. I know that you know this, but
> prefer to continue on your jihad against the mode."
>
>
> Kim responded in part ...
>
> "How many languages do you speak, Dick? How much HAZMAT gear do you have,
> Dick? Have you got a mobile phone? Have you got some FRS radios? Have
you
> got a CB radio ready to be on the air? I could go on and on. To use your
> analogy (a piss-poor one, I'd add), then anyone who doesn't "arm"
themselves
> with extra language capability, extra contact capability, and so on, is
> *not* to have the maximum number of options."
>
>
> I think Dick makes a valid point here, Kim. The radio already has the
> ability "built -in". Why not take full advantage of it. Exchange a
> microphone for a key and the same amount of external equipment can give
you
> twice the capability. It's not like going out and purchasing or building
> additional equipment, merely a case of taking advantage of what's already
> there.
>

It is not Dick's point about CAW that I met with chagrin, Arnie. There's a
couple of things I take issue with that he said:

1) "It's a matter of being prepared for operation with the minimum level of
technical support.

My counterpoint to this is what least technical support is needed when the
most widely used form of communication (voice) is implemented on a net? I
understand that Dick is talking equipment support when he says "technical."
HOWEVER, equipment aside, the quickest most easily understood form of
communication is actually voice--very little technical support needed to
just plug in the mic and squeeze the PTT.

2) The best possible way to be prepared is to have the maximum number of options.

My observation on this is that if we are to use "the maximum number of options" as the basis for being prepared for an emergency, then my questions to Dick above stand as asked. It is impossible for someone to be "fully" prepared for an emergency or disaster. It is absolutely the best message that we can give that you should be as prepared as you can be in the area of your most passionate interest. It is up to the leaders in disaster communication to know his/her group's capabilities and plan for every capability they have. If I have nothing but voice operators in an emergency response group (and I should not have to ask, either, I should *KNOW* my team's capabilities), then I train never mentioning *any* other mode; and I prepare for methods that would work best using voice. If I have nothing but CW operators, then I, well...you know...train and prepare for methods that work best using CW. If I have both, and more mode capabilities, I do the same.

For the sake of argument, I respond below to your observations about what Dick C. said (then see my note at the very bottom).

While it may be that most rigs are equipped to handle CW--most people are not, for one. I don't know what the percentage is for people, who are capable and willing, to operate during an emergency or crisis and are also CW literate. But, I can tell you that most I know and deal with are not. So, to placate N2EY, I will make the statement that here in my *local* area, there are two things wrong with Dick C.'s voracity:

1) Most emergency nets in this area are conducted first on VHF/UHF, with some traffic handled on HF, via voice

2) Most every time I have ever heard of people talking about emergency responses, prior to my becoming a ham, there is no mention of CW nets or communication that were established, but plenty of discussion for voice nets

And, speaking in general terms:

3) Most CW capable rigs are also going to require power capabilities that are much harder to meet the more disastrous a situation is. With few exceptions, HF capability is going to entail far more power requirements than VHF/UHF will. At a minimum, to get operational on an HF net, a generator is going to be required for any length of time, right? (Correct me if I'm wrong--I am definitely *not* HF capability savvy).

4) Most people who don't care for the CW mode are also (ironically enough) involved in emergency communication of some sort

5) CW is a, generally, outmoded form of communication--with other just as easily established digital modes taking over (PSK, etc.) If I understand, for instance, PSK31 correctly, it is just as easily "hooked up."

> One analogy I can think of would be using a vacuum cleaner. We could lift
> up the vacuum to clean the drapes -- or -- take advantage of the built-in
> attachments to do the job. Simply a matter of learning how to use them.

>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>

Plus, Arnie, while Dick C.'s platform facilitates friendly discussion between others (such as you and I are capable of), Dick generally approaches this topic with a demeaning attitude toward others. It sets the stage for "competitive response" right off.

Kim W5TIT

3019. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 00:18:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c573d7a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32530

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c5611ed_1@news7.fast.net...
>
> Ed,
>
> I think you have my "theory" sort of "inside out" ... I was expressing
> the view that, if membership and the QST subsctiption were
> separable, that quite a few would subscribe to QST and not be
> members ... you turned it around ...
>
> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse
>

Not this member. I'd just as well not get QST. But, after a few years of resisting because of local ARRL stuff, I am now proud to support the national HQ. I just hope one day that more local ARRL stuff will happen/be corrected around here--it would no doubt add to the membership levels.

Kim W5TIT

3020. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 00:36:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5741b6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32531

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020129071313.16072.00000635@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c5418af_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Oh, gosh, sorry
>
> You are forgivenm, my child. ;-)
>

Thanks, I think.

> >
> >My point is that three people discussing the ways of
> >tuning on RRAP are not a good "poll" Jim.
>
> Wasn't meant to be. It's a discussion that involves both technical and
> operating matters. I say tuning up on-air is OK IFF it's done
considerately.
>

I see.

> >
> >I haven't read the text in all
> >the posts on tuning, as I don't care how you or Brian, or Joe Schmoe
tunes.
>
> So your attitude is that you don't want to learn new things, or even
discuss
> them.
> Interesting.
>

Didn't say that. My point in this discussion was that a) tuning on the air
is "OK", and b) the newsgroup probably isn't a good source for ascertaining
percentages of the way people do it. The rest of the matter was so far
above my head, I couldn't get interested if I tried. :)

> >
> >I'll tune with a carrier.
>
> What rigs do you have that require being tuned up in the first place?
> >

Just a Yaesu 890FT/AT, which actually tricks the antenna; however it still transmits as it "tunes." I used to have a Kenwood 520-S, and tried three times to tune it, traded it for a Radio Shack 440 HT. Before ya get all "well, you don't know the value, blah, blah, blah," I bought the Kenwood for $150.00. I *needed* a 440 rig, I didn't *like* the Kenwood. And so on. The rig, I think is still on the air with KY9Y.

> >
> >
> >Point is, there's nothing illegal about it.
>
> Actually, unnecessary tuning IS illegal. So is causing avoidable interference
> to
> other amateurs.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Once again you pop in with some qualifier that I missed. There's nothing illegal about tuning on the air, Jim. It's a given that one should do it within legal limitations.

By the way, a giggle for you (can you giggle?). See a post later from Jim Kelley (at the thread ???for Mr DX). I tell you that the exchange was pretty silly. He actually posts and says "But at least you kept replying until you finally had the last word in the exchange. :-)" The irony is that, no, *HE* actually had the last word...ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

3021. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 01:08:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020129200859.07935.00000615@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 32532

In article <3C52EEE6.A2B8089B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >Actually, I am asking how I could have tuned my AZ station, which included
>> >an HW-201, without putting a carrier on the air. The pi-net in the HW-201
>> >had to be tuned for the existing conditions which was not 50 ohms.
>>
>> Now I know you're not serious, Cecil. What's an HW-201?
>
>Do I have the part number wrong?

Previously explained and acknowledged, tnx. HW-100/SB-201 was a decent
setup for the money. You build 'em or buy 'em built?

>I had a Heathkit KW amp but I sold it.

The SB-200 and SB-201 were rated 1 kW CW and 1200 W PEP SSB. Which is
the max ratings of a pair of 572Bs. The introductory price of the SB-200 was
$200, which meant a lot more hams could run high power 'phone.

Its pi-net was only rated for 2:1 SWR, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3022. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 01:23:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C574B04.6FE0A7F8@uci.edu>
Source record: 32533

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C55EEFC.E731277E@uci.edu...
> > Why not try it here too?
>
> Jim, I can remember being truly shocked as a newbie on this newsgroup. I
> never expected that people on a newsgroup would act just as they go,
> generally, online with each other in a common chat room. So, been
> there-done that-threw away the t-shirt. When I began responding to the
> first posts I noticed here about the CW issue (remember, I found this
> newsgroup a few months before the Biennial Review process was over with),
> and was summarily sworn at, called dumb, etc., etc., I responded in kind. I
> would in real life, also, or I would just walk away for fear of dealing with
> a lunatic.

Ok. Sounds reasonable. :-)

3023. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 02:44:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a37mpc$jt9$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32534

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C580E87.5330E52@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >WHY must there be a "serious" number of new hams that learn
> > morse code anyway? No one has shown any reason for there
> > to be any large number of hams engaged in morse knowledge/use
> > anymore than anyone showing there are large (serious) numbers
> > of hams engaged in public service, homebrewing, etc.
>
> Well, Slick, if you haven't seen the light by now there's no help for you
and
> you're doomed to al ifetime of cluelessness. Poor fella.

Translation: "There is no reason."

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3024. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 03:34:55 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5eqevn86f4277@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32535

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> In article <3c5427e2_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

> >If you re-read my original post, I believe you'll find I said "If NCI
> >encouraged every no-code/slow-code amateur who's not an ARRL member
> >to join ... " etc.
>
> Sure. That's what you wrote, but not what I wrote. You ASSUME that all
> no-codetest/slowcodetest amateur would side with you. That's not a
> valid assumption at all.

I'm one of those "slowcode" people with a grandfathered tech+ who doesn't want to join NCI. If anything, I'm entertaining the idea that there should be MORE mode-specific testing, and possibly break the licenses out into specific mode priviliges, perhaps based on bandwidth usage.

have a base license class covering RF safety, then add on modules for voice, CW, RTTY/FSK modes, image... for each module added, add new questions relating to mode specific operations. and top it all off with some kind of "unlimited / experimenters" where you actually have to demonstrate that you understand time/frequency bandwidth relations.

DE KD7PNB
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3025. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 03:58:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C576F6D.E5F2377A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32536

N2EY wrote:
> You build 'em or buy 'em built?

I built the HW-100 and bought the SB-201 used.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3026. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:00:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C576FCE.C2F5F16D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32538

"Aaron J. Grier" wrote:
> I'm one of those "slowcode" people with a grandfathered tech+ who
> doesn't want to join NCI. If anything, I'm entertaining the idea that
> there should be MORE mode-specific testing, and possibly break the
> licenses out into specific mode priviliges, perhaps based on bandwidth
> usage.

The FCC prefers to simplify the amateur radio licensing program.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3027. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:02:35 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5es2rchtvuvfd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32537

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> Do you ever use an electric light bulb, Carl?

<SARCASM>
there's these neat glowing tubes called "flourescent" lights that are
very efficient. I hear they've even got them down really small now,
called "compact flourescent" that use a fraction of the power an
incandescent lightbulb uses, but fits into the same edison socket! and
then there's light-emitting diodes, and thin film transistors, and...
</SARCASM>

> Think about how backward that makes you, by your logic,
> technologically speaking.

I didn't get that from carl at all... he was stating that the modes
themselves are archaic -- no the people who use them.

incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
necessarily archaic too.

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > I think I've painted a reasonably accurate picture of the "average."
>
> You haven't, but I agree that you probably think you have.
>
> > I don't have a bad attitude towards ham radio ...
>
> You hide it very well.

it's attitude towards stodgy status quo, towards "CW and SSB forever"
types.

it is hypocritical to claim that the ARS is advancing the state of the
technology when the primary technologies used haven't changed or been
updated in 50+ years, and not for lack of opportunity...

DE KD7PNB
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3028. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:21:15 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5et5rgqi25l84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32539

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:

> Ok, but what is the "first line" of information regarding any product
> in general? Isn't it the PACKAGING? The second line would then be
> product reviews, ... , and lastly, the "standard" (although some
> standards are more standard than others) that it claims to follow.

"this product uses 802.11b spread-spectrum signalling, and can be
configured to use one of eleven overlapping 22Mhz channels in a 83.5 MHz
range, from 2400 to 2483.5MHz."

but simply stating "802.11b" on the box implies the above. sorry if you
couldn't research the terms you were unfamiliar with.

> My whole point here has been: One applies common sense to what one
> has available, and the packaging for the LAN stuff, without the
> detailed knowledge from secondary and other sources, brings one to the
> wrong conclusion about suitability for amateur operations.

that's why you've got a brain to recognize the terms you don't
understand, and then ask about them.

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3029. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:30:39 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5etnftkc2gd5d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32540

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
> On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> >With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD use
> >(spread over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier in
> >the middle and using a chipping rate that would spread it that wide,
> >but then there would be only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if the
> >data rate was low enough, one might get enough processing gain to be
> >able to do CDMA overlay and have multiple users, but not at the data
> >rates that today's LANs need to carry.
>
> I assume wrong? By the fact that you just confirmed that it could
> spread over the entire band, you just VALIDATED my assumption, not
> contradicted it.

a DSSS system COULD do the above. but a DSSS system labeled as
"802.11b" DOES NOT.

> Generally, these items simply say "SS" and don't tell us how or which
> particular algorithm it uses internally. Now, you are correct that I
> can be confused over which method a particular device uses, especially
> if the BOX/packaging DOESN'T SAY (or say something that leads to
> method identification). That's my point. It doesn't say.

did it say "802.11b" or "WiFi" on the box?

if it did not, then your assumption could have been correct.

> Again, one only has access to the manual AFTER purchase.

depends on the selling venue.

> How can one make an informed decision beforehand? Circular reasoning.

it's called doing your homework and asking questions about the product
after you've found out about it, and then before purchasing it. there's
nothing circular about it unless you keep asking the same questions and
forgetting about the same product. :)

kind of like this thread? ;)

DE KD7PNB
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3030. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:32:45 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5etrd62k6808f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32541

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

> "Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote:

> > maybe the "b" in 802.11b should be capitalized?
>
> Nope ... lower case is correct.

capitalized so mr. stussy could see it better... ;)

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3031. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 04:48:43 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5eupbp5jrl0e0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32542

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote:
> On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 02:31:12 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion of it, but I'd certainly
> >like to see strong encryption allowed for certain things, like
> >control links, for example.
>
> And woth strong encryption how is the FCC going to discharge their
> obligatory functions of identifying the station and verifying compliance
> with the rules on permissible and proscribed content? Are we going
> to get mired in the key escrow swamp ??

I was only arguing for authentication. the content of the messages
themselves would still be in the clear, similar to carl's usenet posts.
anyone can still see the content, but more importantly, anyone can
verify that the contents are from who they claim they are. for
authentication you need strong encryption OF THE SIGNATURE ONLY. not
the entire content.

there would be no need for key escrows... the station could transmit its
public key periodically with its callsign, perhaps.

DE KD7PNB
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3032. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:00:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C58C180.68029789@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32543

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cheezz..., what have we come to? More to the point, where are we going?
>
> How can you go anywhere if all you do is rest on your rosey red laurels?

I do wonder why you worry so much about me. Could it be because
I got to Extra class 32 years before you? Oh, I know the story, you really
didn't want one....

3033. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:03:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C58C233.17F01F5C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32544

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What a fool you continue to be..
>
> What a fascist you continue to be. "Papers please. - Your papers are
> not in order. You vill learn Morse code or you vill die."

As I said, what a fool.....

3034. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:08:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130000830.02067.00000908@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32545

In article <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
<spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:

>Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I spent
>3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid me
>for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
>nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.

Thank you, "Jay".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3035. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:08:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130000830.02067.00000909@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32546

In article <3C52ED07.F5C1981@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > There is no external transmatch. The pi-net tuner is built into the amp.
>> >
>> With that piece of idiocy you just got yerself unanimously elected sysop
>for rrat.
>
>I'm serious, Brian. My HW-201 was like that. I assume most of the
>Ameritron amps are like that today. Why would anyone spring for
>a $400 external tuner when the pi-net tuner is built in?

Bunch of reasons:

1) Lowpass filters doesn't like much SWR
2) Although an amp may be rated for "2:1 SWR", some loads may stress the
output network a bit more than desirable.
3) It may not be possible to get the load impedance to a point where the pinet
can match it
4) The amp may not be used all the time, in which case a tuner is needed for
the
exciter. If the exciter doesn't have an ATU, why not buy one tuner and be done
with it?
>
>Of course, I don't have that problem since the impedance seen by
>my SGC-500 amp is always between 25 ohms and 100 ohms.

Sure - your "tuner" takes the form of linear rather than lumped elements. Which
has advantages and disadvantages.

A wide range, low loss, balanced tuner can be easily made from just a pair of
coils (roller or tapped/switched) and a single variable capacitor. For a balun,
just wind coax on a piece of
PVC pipe (space the turns and secure with tie-wraps). Simple.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3036. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:08:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130000832.02067.00000910@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32547

In article <20020129180831.11385.00000139@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>1) There are lots of 2-way electronic communication "hobbies"
>> besides ham radio today. Back in the "Novice heyday" a teenager had
>> very few other options
>
>I am not sure I buy into that.

What other 2 way electronic communication "hobbies" existed for the teenager of 1962?
Back then there was the telephone (usually shared with the entire family), various unlicensed
short-range devices like phono oscillators and 100 mw walkie-talkies, and ham radio. 27 Mc.
CB was just getting started and required a license not available to a 13 year old.

No computers, no internet, no cell phones. Heck, most people didn't even have color TV.

>Considering that over the course of the
>development of these lots more hobbies, the percentage of hams wrt the
>general
>population has grown, obviously more hams of some age are entering ham radio.

The question is about 13 year olds getting into ham radio today vs. back in "the heyday of the
Novice license" - whenever that was. Dig out yer old QSTs or my article on US licensing history,
and you'll see that from the end of WW2 to 1962, the number of US hams grew steadily from
~60,000 to ~240,000. That's a quadrupling in 16 years, or almost double-digit growth EVERY
year for a decade and a half. Then in 1963 the growth suddenly stopped and the numbers stagnated
at around a quarter million for almost a decade. How come?
>
>Considering that all of us hams are big kids at heart, the factor you
>describe
>should apply as much to the 30 year old as the 13 year old.

Not really. Most 30 year olds today remember a time before a computer on every desk and a cellphone

on every belt. Most 13 year olds do not.
>
>>2) Antenna restrictions and RFI concerns make ham radio difficult or
>> impossible for many young people.
>
>Other than the factor that people <30 are probably more apt to rent an
>apartment, where antennas might be forbidden than people over 30, who are
>probably more apt to own their own home (CC&Rs notwithstanding), the 13-year
>old is not apt to have any more or less problems than the older ham. In
>fact,
>when you consider that the parents of most 13 year olds are over 30, the
>13-year old will be like I was -- living at home and putting up an antenna at
>the folks' home.

The percentage of the 13 year old population living in antenna-unfriendly
situations is MUCH
higher today than in the '60s. They are much more likely to be told that they
cannot have
an antenna, period. The 30 year old may decide to operate mobile, or move - the
13 year
old doesn't have those options.

>As to RFI, interference to consumer equipment is under much better control
>than
>it was when I was hamming. With industry standards for immunity just now
>coming into play, the inherent shielding of cable TV (not perfect, but a
>whole
>sight better than over-the-air TV) and much better information about RFI than
>when I was a young ham, I don't think that RFI is a major impediment.

Not everyone has cable, and TVI is not the only RFI. Plus it works both ways.
>
>>Many 13 year olds today can't put up any kind
>> of antenna, even if they have the yard and antenna.
>
>The same restrictions apply to the 30 year old.

The 30 year old can usually operate mobile, or decide to move. The 13 year old
can't.
>
>>3) Lack of publicity (relates to 1))
>
>When I was 13, the ONLY way I learned about ham radio was from the old time
>ham
>who moved in next door. Today, I can find all sorts of information and
>publicity about it using any web search engine.

The old time ham next door probably had a very visible antenna, too.

I discovered ham radio because I found an old ARRL Handbook that
somebody had given my dad for some forgotten reason. Tube info for
his hi-fi, I think. The library had more books and the local radio store had

more.

The Handbook that I found showed how to build simple, inexpensive radio sets and use them on the air. That's what hooked me. Couple of EE degrees later and I still have the old book.
>
>>4) Perceived high cost of getting started. (note "perceived")
>
>I am not sure it is perceived. By whom? Most hams today realize that the
>cost
>of all electronics has decreased in real dollars. For $1000.00 I can buy
>capability that I never would have dreamed of in the 1960s.

Sure. But most 13 year olds aren't going to spend $1000 just to get started.
>
>>But let's fix what can be fixed. See the "S25.5 proposal proposal" thread
>>for some ideas.
>
>I have contributed my ideas.

That's good.

>I think it is great that we are talking and
>thinking about it, because the day will come when Amateur Radio will ask the
>Commission to make a decision about change again.

That's the wrong way to go about it. We should develop a coherent plan, build a consensus and present it to the FCC. Be proactive, not reactive, and all those '90s
buzzphrases. In short, give the FCC a workable plan on a platter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3037. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:18:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C58C5A8.315820@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32548

W1RFI wrote:

> From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>
> >Here is a 7-page tutorial on IEEE 802.11:
> >
> >http://www.wirelessethernet.org/downloads/IEEE_80211_Primer.pdf
>
> And another:
>
> http://www.chipcenter.com/wireless/news061.html
>

I like the one in Feb 2002 QST by a real expert, Doug Smith
who is KF6DX. He's also a real nice guy who makes our own
Krusty Karl look like, well, what he really is.....

3038. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:20:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C58C632.7B68DBB8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32549

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C580E87.5330E52@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >WHY must there be a "serious" number of new hams that learn
> > > morse code anyway? No one has shown any reason for there
> > > to be any large number of hams engaged in morse knowledge/use
> > > anymore than anyone showing there are large (serious) numbers
> > > of hams engaged in public service, homebrewing, etc.
> >
> > Well, Slick, if you haven't seen the light by now there's no help for you
> and
> > you're doomed to al ifetime of cluelessness. Poor fella.
>
> Translation: "There is no reason."

For sure none that you will ever begin to understand. But we already knew that.

3039. Re: ??? for Mr DX

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:44:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C578832.DC8E7B32@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32550

N2EY wrote:
> A wide range, low loss, balanced tuner can be easily made from just a pair of
> coils (roller or tapped/switched) and a single variable capacitor.

I gathered and still have all the parts for one but with my present
matching method, I just don't need a tuner.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3040. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 05:46:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5788D0.8B3DB446@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32551

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Cheezz..., what have we come to? More to the point, where are we going?
> >
> > How can you go anywhere if all you do is rest on your rosey red laurels?
>
> I do wonder why you worry so much about me. Could it be because
> I got to Extra class 32 years before you? Oh, I know the story, you really
> didn't want one....

What kind of ham license did you have in 1951, Dick, when I had *ALL*
operating privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3041. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 06:48:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C57973F.89BDB80D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 32552

Yeah, bring back the all-code license......

KC8PMX wrote:

> Forget that...... Forget NCI or KCI too. Look out for ACI ALL CODE INTL.
> A group proposing a minimum mandatory 5wpm capability in morse code for ALL
> radio services.

3042. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 10:28:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130052853.04169.00000122@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32553

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

> (And I don't believe that our HF bands are totally
>"safe" either.)

They are probably safe from additional formal allocations, at least for the most part. Part 15 devices and uses already can occupy our HF spectrum. The biggest HF threat will continue to come from power-line noise, digital devices and increasingly, from various high-speed networking devices, similar to VDSL, HomePhone Networking and HomePlug devices.

So far, we have been lucky. The above-mentioned industries have been made aware of the interference potential from their devices and have included some protection for the ham bands in their standards and specifications. The unknown at this point is "access PLC" -- a technology that seeks to use utility-owned power lines to provide ISP services to residences and businesses. They lack the umbrella organizations such as the TIA, Home Phone Networking Alliance and HomePlug, so Amateur Radio has not been able to make the inroads with them that I have made with the other groups and organizations.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3043. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 10:34:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130053456.04169.00000123@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32554

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>What other 2 way electronic communication "hobbies" existed for the teenager
>of
>1962?

>CB was just getting started and required a license not available to a 13 year
>old.

That was the heyday of CB. I don't know the rules, but I knew of several 13/14 year olds that were active on CB, using their FCC-issued call letters. That call may have been issued to older family members, but apparently, that was not all that uncommon.

It is clear that the effects of multiple 2-way electronic communication hobbies are not affecting growth of Amateur Radio, so obviously, people of some age are joining our ranks in spite of those effects. Why do you believe that they are reducing the ranks of teenagers entering ham radio, but not affecting the ranks of older people?

> Then in 1963 the growth suddenly stopped and the
>numbers stagnated
>at around a quarter million for almost a decade. How come?

Some will say that incentive licensing was a failure. :-)

>The old time ham next door probably had a very visible antenna, too.

It was a windom up about 20 feet. He asked me to put it up.

>Sure. But most 13 year olds aren't going to spend $1000 just to get started.

I spent $200.00 in 1963 money to get started.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3044. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 10:37:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130053739.04169.00000124@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32555

From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)

>I'm entertaining the idea that
>there should be MORE mode-specific testing, and possibly break the
>licenses out into specific mode priviliges, perhaps based on bandwidth
>usage.

One of the values of having broad-based testing is that the applicant can then decide to use and experiment with any available mode at any time. If we had mode-specific testing required before a ham could use a new mode, I think that would tend to discourage, rather than encourage, the use of new modes by hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3045. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 13:52:24 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <sUS58.298$fc.178253@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32556

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020129083641.11381.00000021@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net
>
> >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.
>
> This is incorrect. Technician Class operators can operate on all bands 6 M
and
> up. >have privileges of up to 1500 watts, I do not see why that level is
> >necessary. At a maximum of 200-300 watts should allow communications
with
> >another station just about anywhere in any state, on any of the bands
from
> >50Mhz on up as far as mobiles are concerned.

Thats what I said..... unless you consider 6 meters a HF allocation. In all
of the material I have, 6 is a VHF band. Guess it is a matter of semantics
eh?

>
> Unless you are working one of the super stations, 1500 watts is needed for
> conventional moonbounce. Some hams have recently been experimenting with
> long-term integration to accomplish moonbounce at QRP levels, though.
>
True, a good percentage of hams do not do moonbounce, but there are some
that do. Overall, anyone needing to perform communications on 6 meters
through the centimeter band ranges can sufficiently communicate a
"reasonable" distance with 200-300 watts as a max. As far as "working DX"
that is not concern, as most of the DX activity is not attributed to that
region of spectrum. Granted there is band openings but usually those bands
are more for "local" communication, whatever your definition of local may
be. I will, regardless of frequency usage, never use more that 200-300 if
that is what is necessary to establish communication. Also, the cost and
power sources necessary are major limiting factors even if I wanted to run a
full 1500w. 95% of my amateur radio activities are related to public
service activities, and the training for emergency comm's if the need arises
in the future. Fortunately we have be really luckly locally speaking. But
with plenty of training, and performing drills/excercises, hopefully we will
be ready. With local ARES groups being nothing more than an old fart chit
chat group, I am looking towards establishing something better. I have seen
some groups in other area's that would astound some ARES groups. Again, my
attention to ham radio is the component of public service/emergency related
activities, so how I view various things discussed here and elsewhere is
based on that type of slant.

> >I would support a entry level of licensure that would give a taste of 1
HF
> >band, say like 10m and say 2 meters.
>
> If you limit the entry level too much, no one will want to play.

That may be true, but overall it seems like it may present a happy medium. All the old farts (pro-code) bitching about "how things used to be" will have their way, and also the (con-code) people will have something to use until they find whatever they want to do with going further in the hobby. Sure, some will be lost due to lack of ambition, but that has happened over the past 20-30 years anyways. If I had a dollar for ever person who has admitted they didn't utilize their license much after testing, or just let it lapse, I would have enough to start a really decent station. (If I had a dollar for every person who sat around and bitched and moaned about the problems in ham radio, and DID NOT DO ANTHING for positive promotion or positive change, I would have the best station anywhere.)

Interesting side note there Ed, we have 2 new prospects for recruiting new hams in our area at least. Email me if you want more info. It is something that could be implemented in many more areas! :)

Cheers!

Ryan

3046. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 14:05:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130090519.12328.00000256@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32557

>Subject: Re: Be A Winner! 5001
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/29/2002 1:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020129145629.11764.00000877@mb-mo.aol.com>

>I'm sure you drive very well. My wife has three degrees and TWO are
>Masters but her driver's license is standard passenger auto
>rated and dislikes driving in traffic.

The LAST thing SoCal needs is another over-educated under-trained female driver on the roads anyway. Keep her at home.

>All of the degree certificates we have are in a box in storage in the
>northern house. In frames, of course. Should we have the four
>protected and mounted on plaques on the wall with little spotlights
>shining on them?

Only if it says FCC Form 660 on it and had your name on it.

By the way, Your Loserness, I checked the database again to see if you have made good on your promise.

The result was predictable. How silly of me.

However I notice the other "Leonard H. Anderson" has failed to renew his license. Perhaps you can pull an end-run, forge a renewal with address change and become the defacto licensee.

>>I did my cubical rat thing for 25 years and am about
>>a year from collecting a nice retirement check and tapping a 6 figure
>>IRA/401k.
>
>Is that a "qualification" of any kind for what is essentially a
>hobby activity in radio?

I guess it's foolish to point out the several posts YOU have made in which you have bragged on YOUR retirement and sequestered funds...

Of course, since you are NOT a ham, I guess it's moot...right?

>I've spent most of my adult life IN radio and electronics yet
>a number of one-by-twos in here resent the hell out of that
>because I don't adhere to any "traditional" amateur radio
>party line phrasing of self-glorification in accomplishments.

No one "resents" it, Your Lyingness. What we "resent" is the implication that YOU know something about AMATEUR radio that we do not.

No one, and again I stress "least of all me", doubts your competence inside the box. However you have REPEATEDLY demonstrated ignorance of daily Amateur PRACTICE.

You have gone on to other great acts of arrogance and antagonism against anyone who dares to question YOUR knowledge and skills, acts that you claim to disdain in others yet perform yourself with great regularity.

The only one who CAN"T see it, is you. Too bad.

>I've WORKED with PhDs, some of which were fine folks who
>didn't mind getting their hands dirty in electronics hardware
>(rather than garbage)

I know you have. One of them remembered you. His rememberences of YOU weren't as fond or glowing. YOU shouldn't name drop, Lennie.

>Some of them were pretentious assholes
>who wore their "I can sign 'doctor' in front of my name" as if they
>should be revered as gods

Kinda like pompous electronics technicians with 14 years of night school who feel they can harass members of an avocation in which they do not participate?

>The unpretentious ones got the
>work done. The pretentious ones were too busy making
>themselves lofty to do much innovation. Great appearance,
>though.

We know which one YOU were.

>I HAVE a number of things to PROVE. The main one in here is
>to dispell a host of mythology that has grown and flourished in
>minds of amateur radio licensees and their insistence that their
>fantasies MUST be taken up by newcomers and propagated
>because THEY insist that "that's the way it is."

Too bad you haven't paid attention to what's being said by almost eveyone (including me) in this and almost every other Amateur forum.

As usual, you are a day late, a dollar short, and completely and blissfully ignorant of current events.

I think it's a riot. You truly are the Costello of Radio.

>Now, if that is upsetting to the pretentious credentialists, TS.
>The pretentious credentialists HAVE EARNED THAT OPINION.
>Think about it

We have. And we decided that you HAVE earned it..Wear it. Enjoy it!

Naggingly yours,

Steve

3047. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 14:07:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130090759.12328.00000257@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32558

>Subject: Re: Hey Carl . . .
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/29/2002 12:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C56EC6B.4B9A5364@IEEE.org>

>IMO, the US government military/intelligence folk will never not be able
>to monitor and decode all known codes. Encrypted CW would be a logical
>choice for terrorists having lots of bang for the bucks.

I disagree. They may not be able to break it TODAY, but I have faith in
the NSA and other agencies (And Cray computers!) to take the veil off of any
encryption mode or code.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3048. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 14:33:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C58041C.2D714E39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32559

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> >IMO, the US government military/intelligence folk will never not be able
> >to monitor and decode all known codes. Encrypted CW would be a logical
> >choice for terrorists having lots of bang for the bucks.
>
> I disagree. They may not be able to break it TODAY, but I have faith in
> the NSA and other agencies (And Cray computers!) to take the veil off of any
> encryption mode or code.

What do you disagree with, Steve? You said essentially the same thing as I.
Did my "never not be able to" confuse you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3049. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 14:40:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5805EC.E2A46F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32560

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:

> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net
> > >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.
> >
> > This is incorrect. Technician Class operators can operate on all bands 6 M and
> > up.
>
> Thats what I said..... unless you consider 6 meters a HF allocation.

I believe what Ed is saying is that not only do techs have all VHF/UHF
privileges but they also have *ALL* EHF privileges. Your statement
is wrong because you didn't include frequencies above UHF.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3050. TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 16:47:26 UTC
From: Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol <Virus.Patrol@drsolomon.com>
Message-ID: <3c5823b9.fbf9b49f.ce015b.10.2@drsolomon.com>
Source record: 32561
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

```
WARNING! A trojan has been found in an article posted to
the following newsgroup(s):
rec.radio.amateur.policy, alt.config, rec.sport.billiard,
rec.sport.skating.ice.figure, rec.travel.usa-canada

Message header follows:

>Message-Id: <aee89c74.bd0a508d@news1.mntp1.il.home.com>
>From: "Adam H. Kerman" <ahk@chinet.com>
>Subject: Re: Damn! You're ugly!
>Date: 30 Jan 2002 06:45:43 GMT

Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan report follows:

Dr Solomon's FindVirus IN-HOUSE version. Copyright (c) 1999 Network Associates Inc.
Virus data file v9999 created Jan 28 2002
Scanning for 60207 viruses, trojans and variants.

[HTML part] ... Found the JS/Loop trojan !!!

You can download a free evaluation (yet fully functional) copy of
the latest released version of Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan from
the following locations:

WWW: http://www.nai.com/naicommon/buy-try/try/products-evals.asp
CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON or GO MCAFEE
AOL: SAFETYONLINE

--
Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol UK Support: support@drsolomon.com
NAI Anti-Virus Emergency Response Team US Support: support@nai.com
WWW: http://www.mcafeeb2b.com UK Tel: +44 (0) 1296 318700
CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON USA Tel: +1 408 988-3832
```

3051. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 17:11:56 UTC
From: Texas Willee <n5wrx@stx.rr.com>
Message-ID: <wPV58.61269$XZ1.3374712@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 32562
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

Just a litle late, dont ya think?

Texas Willee

"Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol" <Virus.Patrol@drsolomon.com> wrote in message
news:3c5823b9.fbf9b49f.ce015b.10.2@drsolomon.com...
> WARNING! A trojan has been found in an article posted to
> the following newsgroup(s):
> rec.radio.amateur.policy, alt.config, rec.sport.billiard,
> rec.sport.skating.ice.figure, rec.travel.usa-canada
>
> Message header follows:
>
> >Message-Id: <aee89c74.bd0a508d@news1.mntp1.il.home.com>
> >From: "Adam H. Kerman" <ahk@chinet.com>
> >Subject: Re: Damn! You're ugly!
> >Date: 30 Jan 2002 06:45:43 GMT
>
> Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan report follows:
>
> Dr Solomon's FindVirus IN-HOUSE version. Copyright (c) 1999 Network
Associates Inc.
> Virus data file v9999 created Jan 28 2002
> Scanning for 60207 viruses, trojans and variants.
>
> [HTML part] ... Found the JS/Loop trojan !!!
>
> You can download a free evaluation (yet fully functional) copy of
> the latest released version of Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan from
> the following locations:
>
> WWW: http://www.nai.com/naicommon/buy-try/try/products-evals.asp
> CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON or GO MCAFEE
> AOL: SAFETYONLINE
>
> --
> Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol UK Support: support@drsolomon.com
> NAI Anti-Virus Emergency Response Team US Support: support@nai.com
> WWW: http://www.mcafeeb2b.com UK Tel: +44 (0) 1296 318700
> CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON USA Tel: +1 408 988-3832

3052. Re: Be A Winner! 5001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 17:44:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C5830DF.F1288661@earthlink.net>
Source record: 32563

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <bTA58.263$0J6.19211@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> I've spent most of my adult life IN radio and electronics yet
> a number of one-by-twos in here resent the hell out of that
> because I don't adhere to any "traditional" amateur radio
> party line phrasing of self-glorification in accomplishments.

I don't think many radio amateurs resent you for your stated reasons at all. I think you are resented because you are a non-ham lacking in any amateur radio credentials but long on opinion. You don't have any "traditional" amateur radio party line because you aren't a radio amateur.

> I HAVE a number of things to PROVE. The main one in here is
> to dispell a host of mythology that has grown and flourished in
> minds of amateur radio licensees and their insistence that their
> fantasies MUST be taken up by newcomers and propagated
> because THEY insist that "that's the way it is."

Let us know when you finally achieve newcomer status. Until that time, all of amateur radio will remain a fantasy to you. We'll stick to doing what we want. You may do what you can (nuttin').

Dave K8MN

3053. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 17:48:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5831F7.F746CA8@uci.edu>
Source record: 32564

"Aaron J. Grier" wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > Think about how backward that makes you, by your logic,
> > technologically speaking.

> I didn't get that from carl at all... he was stating that the modes
> themselves are archaic -- no the people who use them.

Then you didn't get what he was saying. He was saying the ARS is 50
years behind the times and the modes people use as the proof of that.

> incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
> necessarily archaic too.

That's exactly my point.

3054. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 18:29:40 UTC
From: Bob Johnson <bobj@cris.com>
Message-ID: <a39e2k$2tm@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 32565
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

Symantec's web site shows no information for JS/Loop or JS/Loop trojan

--
Bob Johnson, Denver, Colorado
Home of the 1997/1998 World Champion Denver Broncos
Home of the 1996/2001 Stanley Cup Champion Avalanche
bobj@cris.com
"Texas Willee" <n5wrx@stx.rr.com> wrote in message
news:wPV58.61269$XZ1.3374712@typhoon.austin.rr.com...
> Just a litle late, dont ya think?
>
> Texas Willee
>
> "Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol" <Virus.Patrol@drsolomon.com> wrote in message
> news:3c5823b9.fbf9b49f.ce015b.10.2@drsolomon.com...
> > WARNING! A trojan has been found in an article posted to
> > the following newsgroup(s):
> > rec.radio.amateur.policy, alt.config, rec.sport.billiard,
> > rec.sport.skating.ice.figure, rec.travel.usa-canada
> >
> > Message header follows:
> >
> > >Message-Id: <aee89c74.bd0a508d@news1.mntp1.il.home.com>
> > >From: "Adam H. Kerman" <ahk@chinet.com>
> > >Subject: Re: Damn! You're ugly!
> > >Date: 30 Jan 2002 06:45:43 GMT
> >
> > Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan report follows:
> >
> > Dr Solomon's FindVirus IN-HOUSE version. Copyright (c) 1999 Network
> Associates Inc.
> > Virus data file v9999 created Jan 28 2002
> > Scanning for 60207 viruses, trojans and variants.
> >
> > [HTML part] ... Found the JS/Loop trojan !!!
> >
> > You can download a free evaluation (yet fully functional) copy of
> > the latest released version of Dr Solomon's FindVirus/VirusScan from
> > the following locations:
> >
> > WWW: http://www.nai.com/naicommon/buy-try/try/products-evals.asp
> > CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON or GO MCAFEE
> > AOL: SAFETYONLINE

> >
> > --
> > Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol UK Support:
support@drsolomon.com
> > NAI Anti-Virus Emergency Response Team US Support:
support@nai.com
> > WWW: http://www.mcafeeb2b.com UK Tel: +44 (0) 1296
318700
> > CompuServe: GO DRSOLOMON USA Tel: +1 408
988-3832
>
>

3055. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 18:38:37 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C583DAF.2FF120CC@psu.edu>
Source record: 32566

Agreed. To test for the specific mode would be difficult for the FCC,
and wouldn't it be a blast to have to fork over more money for another test!

Wanna do PSK? First go to ARRL or Radio Shack, and buy a copy of "Now
You're Typing!" Study the guide, and demonstrate how to hook up the
appliance interface between computer and rig.

Next demonstrate that you can type at least 5 words per minute with
less than 2 typos.

Purty strange.

The whole idea was to allow amateurs, after passing a minimum standard,
to go out and have fun and learn stuff at the same time. Best way to do
that is by doing it, not studying it.

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:

> One of the values of having broad-based testing is that the applicant can then
> decide to use and experiment with any available mode at any time. If we had
> mode-specific testing required before a ham could use a new mode, I think that
> would tend to discourage, rather than encourage, the use of new modes by hams.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3056. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 18:57:57 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a39fnl$2bad$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 32567

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>> What is wrong with that picture? Nowhere was Mr. Ham able to find
>>and learn
>>> about this 20Mhz window of operation feature that makes otherwise
>>[perceived]
>>> unusable equipment (due to out of band transmission) usable (and
>>wholly in
>>> band).
>>
>>RTFM
>
>But one can't "read the manual" until AFTER purchase. Your reasoning is
>circular.

Read the 2.4 GHz DSSS PHY section in 802.11 (it is 30 pages). The advantage
of standard hardware is that the standard fully defines what is supposed
to come out of the RF connector.

>>> As a person involved in manufacture, shouldn't you be telling your
>>potential
>>> [secondary target] market about this?
>>
>>Reality check ... it's up to hams to be knowledgeable enough to
>>be able apply gear that wasn't specifically designed for their use
>>if they wish to apply it to ham radio ... tons and tons of Motorola
>>commercial mobile radio gear has been converted to service in
>>the ham bands (often with some actual modifications required) ...
>>does Motorola provide directions on how to modify their gear for
>>use in the ham bands with every unit (let alone on the box)???
>>I don't think so ...
>
>Motorola does offer SERVICE MANUALS for their equipment which do contain
>schematics. This example is not comparable.

If you want schematics and full documentation, buy a reference design
eval board from Intersil or one of the other chip vendors. Or buy a
card from one of the dozen or more manufacturers using vendor silicon
and reverse-engineer the card using the chipset data sheets. Of course,
I doubt that even the service manual for a Motorola radio would help
if you didn't know what an FM radio was, which is sort of equivalent
to the state you're in if you won't take the time to learn what comes
out of the RF connector of an 802.11b transceiver.

I think the point still stands. If you are adapting equipment from
another service for ARS use then you can't expect to be able to treat
it like a plug-'n-play appliance. Your license lets you put all manner
of equipment on the air, but makes you (not the manufacturer) responsible
for ensuring the equipment complies with the regulations of your service.
If you aren't very clear on what is coming out of the RF connector
(this isn't a secret, the equipment implements a standard) then
manufacturer labelling which encourages you to leave the device on
the store shelf is probably a feature. You should leave it there
until some other amateur who takes the time to understand what it's
doing gives you cookbook instructions which keep you from doing bad
things.

>>> Personally, until this thread surfaced in this group, I was like the
>>fictitious
>>> Mr. Ham above - not knowing the difference between the .11 and .11b
>>standards.
>>> I admit that I have learned something.
>>
>>Glad to hear it ... have you checked out the link to the standards
>>on the IEEE website? The standard is the definitive source for
>>information.
>
>How many people have time to read 1,000 page documents? Only those who are
>retired or don't need to work even have the potential for such time.

The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed difference;
both have the same channels, 802.11b just adds a more exotic modulation.
The DSSS PHY section which defines what comes out the RF conector, is
30 pages in 802.11 and under 50 pages in 802.11b. Reading either one
will do. If you can't invest this much time to learn how it works then
you probably aren't the one to be adapting the device for use in the
Amateur Radio Service. Icom and Kenwood don't sell this kind of gear
so you'll probably need to wait for another amateur to help.

Dennis Ferguson

3057. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 20:56:54 UTC
From: nobody <nobody@quick-clean.com>
Message-ID: <q6Z58.905$Kx3.1021334@typhoon.jacksonville.mediaone.net>
Source record: 32569
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

"Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol" <Virus.Patrol@drsolomon.com> wrote in
message news:3c5823b9.fbf9b49f.ce015b.10.2@drsolomon.com...
> WARNING! A trojan has been found in an article posted to
> the following newsgroup(s):
> rec.radio.amateur.policy, alt.config, rec.sport.billiard,
> rec.sport.skating.ice.figure, rec.travel.usa-canada

I reported it to Giganews. They said:
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
Thanks for the heads-up. We have addressed
this with the downstream provider.

Tim Yaeger

Giganews Abuse
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Frank G
www.Quick-Clean.com

3058. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:13:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201301313.31946f6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32568

agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier) wrote in message
news:<u5es2rchtvuvfd@corp.supernews.com>...
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> > Do you ever use an electric light bulb, Carl?
>
> <SARCASM>
> there's these neat glowing tubes called "flourescent" lights that are
> very efficient. I hear they've even got them down really small now,
> called "compact flourescent" that use a fraction of the power an
> incandescent lightbulb uses, but fits into the same edison socket! and
> then there's light-emitting diodes, and thin film transistors, and...
> </SARCASM>
>
> > Think about how backward that makes you, by your logic,
> > technologically speaking.
>
> I didn't get that from carl at all... he was stating that the modes
> themselves are archaic -- no the people who use them.
>
> incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
> necessarily archaic too.
>
>
You need a course in remedial reading or reading comprehension son.
>
>
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > I think I've painted a reasonably accurate picture of the "average."
> >
> > You haven't, but I agree that you probably think you have.
> >
> > > I don't have a bad attitude towards ham radio ...
> >
> > You hide it very well.
>
> it's attitude towards stodgy status quo, towards "CW and SSB forever"
> types.
>
> it is hypocritical to claim that the ARS is advancing the state of the
> technology when the primary technologies used haven't changed or been
> updated in 50+ years, and not for lack of opportunity...
>

>
That "advancing the state of the art" crapolla died years ago. But
then again how long ago did 100% ham-developed PSK-31 first pop up in
the RF spectrum?
>
>
The only "new technologies" being tossed around here are campaction
schemes which are NOT new modes. With 90% +/- of the ham vhf/uhf bands
dead spectrum space who cares about "compacting" those comms into even
less spectrum space?? Are YOU gonna pay for the infrastructures
required to implement those schemes? I thought not.
>
>
CW, FM and ssb WORK given the realities of what ham radio is actually
all about. It was a bunch of old farts who brought ssb into the HF ham
bands which mode all but completely replaced strongly-entrenched AM
over a period of 8-10 years. They created a model which is still quite
applicable today as it relates to The Herd adopting a new mode, any
new mode. The basic general nature of hams and their value sets have
not changed one bit any more than has the basic general natures of the
population at large changed in the past half century. Or from the days
of Moses and before for that matter.
>
>
The switch from AM to ssb was due to the whole litany of advantages it
has over AM. Cost, effectiveness, all the usual primary parameters
hams care about. But it had to be demonstrated by the pioneers who did
put it on 75 & 20 and finally convinced the stodgies to jump on it.
And they sure as hell did huh? THAT's the model which worked then and
it's the *only* model which will work today.
>
>
So here we be in RRAP which is overloaded with far-end techos bitching
about hams in general not adopting any of the myriad of the brainfarts
they have in mind and looking down their noses about the "average ham"
as being a no-clue Luddite.
>
>
Wake me up when any of the "geniuses" around here gets off his
keyboard and his dead butt and actually puts his pet brainfart on the
air and exposes it to the ham market realities of acceptance or
rejection by The Herd. Until they put the requisite effort into doing
what the ssb advocates did back when they got NO bitch on ANYBODY in
ham radio for not buying into any of their "visions". Core stuff: Like
put up or shut up. Ask me if I'm holding my breath.
>
>
> DE KD7PNB
>
>

w3rv

3059. Re: Comment - why would one want to??? (was Re: Request for Comment - New TNC design)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:33:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302125030.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32570
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 30 Jan 2002, Bishop Bradley wrote:
>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote
>> I have to ask again "Why would one want to bother with designing
>> a new "TNC" for 4800 bps???" (for that matter, why would one
>> bother desiging a "TNC," as opposed to a true RF modem
>> and running the "stack" on the PC???)
>
>I don't like the term TNC. It doesn't mean anything anymore, or
>is synonymous with AX.25. Ham radio is done with that as an
>attraction.
>
>Let's call it a modem. Digital data in (I don't care how, TTL is
>fine), and audio out (audio that can be interfaced to a radio).
>
>4800 baud carries vocoder voice. 4800 baud has good coverage
>per repeater. 9600 baud repeaters are short range devices in
>comparison (using the g3ruh design), or requires a beam. Don't
>try to sell me different. g3ruh modems are terrible designs.
>
>4800 baud modem chips are available that do 4 level FSK and
>built-in FEC. Vocoder chips are available that also have FEC
>built-in, and would be fine for plain old FSK.
>
>4800 baud is fine for APRS combined with voice. Higher baud
>rates require more nodes, and have smaller coverage area.
>
>Part15 devices running 11 Mbps have no value to a Ham. It's
>an unlicensed commercial design, and operates outside of the
>Ham bands.

To address the discussion on another newsgroup (cross-posting added) and this above comment to Carl Stevenson about part15 on 12cm: Gee - I wonder how he came to that conclusion? He must have read the box! As I have said, there simply isn't enough information out there for the non-radio-engineer amateur operator to realize that this belief is technically wrong - because the fact of a 20MHz slice of the band isn't evident to those who don't take the extraordinary step of looking up the IEEE 802.11b specification.

I discount you because you are involved in the design and/or manufacture of such devices. I discount Ed Hare because he is involved in the survey and testing (for interference purposes) of all wireless devices. [However, both of you seem knowledgable on the subject, but you are EXPERTS.] I have been talking about the AVERAGE PERSON. Not every amateur operator is an electronics

engineer.

>Hams no longer want to duplicate the internet. Trying to interest
>a Ham in high speed megabit wireless is a no gain exercise.
>Hams don't want another internet. They want to use GPS and
>voice, or other low bandwidth information. They don't want to
>email or ftp.

3060. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:39:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302134540.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32571

On 29 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Ok, but what is the "first line" of information regarding any product in
>>general? Isn't it the PACKAGING?
>
>Yes, the packaging on a new Yaecomwood tells us that a unit is an HF
>transceiver. But what tells us that it does not transmit simultaneously on all
>of its frequencies.

True. HF doesn't allow SS. Now, if the packaging said that it was an HF SS transmitter (assume that such is allowable for this example), one COULD PROPERLY assume that it MAY transmit on every allowable frequency in the band(s) unless it said otherwise (or research to a secondary source was done - that turned up that such was not the case).

>If you feel that the package should contain all of the information you need to
>know to operate something, I disagree.
>
>> One applies common sense to what one has
>>available, and the packaging for the LAN stuff, without the detailed
>>knowledge
>>from secondary and other sources, brings one to the wrong conclusion about
>>suitability for amateur operations.
>
>Yes, I agree; without common sense and knowledge, one can draw the wrong
>conclusion from the marketing information that most companies put on the box of
>their products. One should not buy a product unless he or she has at least
>some common sense and knowledge about what that product is.

That's my point. There's been no effort by these manufacturers to let a non-trivial secondary market (the amateur community, which has been starving for high-speed access in a "land dominated by 1200 through 9600 baud devices") know of the suitability.

Also note - in another thread (now cross-posted here), someone else recently commented about 11Mbps 2.4 wireless lan stuff being "unsuitable for going out of band" for amateur use.

3061. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:43:24 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302141490.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32572

On Wed, 30 Jan 2002, Aaron J. Grier wrote:
>D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>> Ok, but what is the "first line" of information regarding any product
>> in general? Isn't it the PACKAGING? The second line would then be
>> product reviews, ... , and lastly, the "standard" (although some
>> standards are more standard than others) that it claims to follow.
>
>"this product uses 802.11b spread-spectrum signalling, and can be
>configured to use one of eleven overlapping 22Mhz channels in a 83.5 MHz
>range, from 2400 to 2483.5MHz."
>
>but simply stating "802.11b" on the box implies the above. sorry if you
>couldn't research the terms you were unfamiliar with.
>
>> My whole point here has been: One applies common sense to what one
>> has available, and the packaging for the LAN stuff, without the
>> detailed knowledge from secondary and other sources, brings one to the
>> wrong conclusion about suitability for amateur operations.
>
>that's why you've got a brain to recognize the terms you don't
>understand, and then ask about them.

Interesting. You seemed to find at least ONE product that DID say that it could be limited. I hadn't seen that one when I last looked at the wireless lan stuff in early 2000 when I wanted to attach my laptop to my in house network.

Had that been among the boxes I had picked up and read, we wouldn't be having this discussion. However, that product might be the exception, not the rule.

3062. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:45:12 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302144560.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32573

On Wed, 30 Jan 2002, Aaron J. Grier wrote:
>D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>> On Mon, 28 Jan 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >With all due respect, you assume wrong ... a DSSS system COULD use
>> >(spread over) the entire band by placing its (suppressed) carrier in
>> >the middle and using a chipping rate that would spread it that wide,
>> >but then there would be only 1 (RF) channel ... of course, if the
>> >data rate was low enough, one might get enough processing gain to be
>> >able to do CDMA overlay and have multiple users, but not at the data
>> >rates that today's LANs need to carry.
>>
>> I assume wrong? By the fact that you just confirmed that it could
>> spread over the entire band, you just VALIDATED my assumption, not
>> contradicted it.
>
>a DSSS system COULD do the above. but a DSSS system labeled as
>"802.11b" DOES NOT.
>
>> Generally, these items simply say "SS" and don't tell us how or which
>> particular algorithm it uses internally. Now, you are correct that I
>> can be confused over which method a particular device uses, especially
>> if the BOX/packaging DOESN'T SAY (or say something that leads to
>> method identification). That's my point. It doesn't say.
>
>did it say "802.11b" or "WiFi" on the box?
>
>if it did not, then your assumption could have been correct.
>
>> Again, one only has access to the manual AFTER purchase.
>
>depends on the selling venue.
>
>> How can one make an informed decision beforehand? Circular reasoning.
>
>it's called doing your homework and asking questions about the product
>after you've found out about it, and then before purchasing it. there's
>nothing circular about it unless you keep asking the same questions and
>forgetting about the same product. :)
>
>kind of like this thread? ;)

Yes, exactly. This started by someone saying that it was suitable, while the information I had at the beginning gave the opposite conclusion, and apparently, I'm not the only one who arrived at that conclusion.

3063. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 21:49:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302147580.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32574

On 30 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>...
>The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed difference;

From what I have learned in this thread, that is wrong. It is my understanding that the 802.11 version of the standard still occupied the ENTIRE band, while the 802.11b version only takes a [programmable] slice. Are you contradicting the other responses on this issue?

>both have the same channels, 802.11b just adds a more exotic modulation.
>The DSSS PHY section which defines what comes out the RF conector, is
>30 pages in 802.11 and under 50 pages in 802.11b. Reading either one
>will do. If you can't invest this much time to learn how it works then
>you probably aren't the one to be adapting the device for use in the
>Amateur Radio Service. Icom and Kenwood don't sell this kind of gear
>so you'll probably need to wait for another amateur to help.

3064. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 22:45:38 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <_z_58.903$Up4.55574@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32575

"CAM" wrote ...

> > >IMO, the US government military/intelligence folk will never not be
able
> > >to monitor and decode all known codes. Encrypted CW would be a logical
> > >choice for terrorists having lots of bang for the bucks.
> >
> What do you disagree with, Steve? You said essentially the same thing as
I.
> Did my "never not be able to" confuse you?

Writing a double negative can be confusing to the reader, Cecil. (Never not
= Always) Since we can read as fast (and sometimes faster) than we can
speak, it is quite easy to transpose or skip a word and lose the meaning.
Steve made an honest mistake if you ask me.
Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

3065. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:16:38 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <11%58.1084$Up4.76058@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32576

"KC8PMX" wrote in part ...

"... 95% of my amateur radio activities are related to public service activities, and the training for emergency comm's if the need arises in the future. Fortunately we have be really luckly locally speaking. But with plenty of training, and performing drills/excercises, hopefully we will be ready. With local ARES groups being nothing more than an old fart chit chat group, I am looking towards establishing something better. I have seen some groups in other area's that would astound some ARES groups. Again, my attention to ham radio is the component of public service/emergency related activities, so how I view various things discussed here and elsewhere is based on that type of slant."

My mileage varies quite a bit. Our local ARES group is very prepared and has performed well on each and every SET drill that I have been aware of. We don't do a lot of "Chit-chatting", but rather get down to business. (even with the apparent burden of having Old Farts aboard)

" That may be true, but overall it seems like it may present a happy medium. All the old farts (pro-code) bitching about "how things used to be" will have their way, and also the (con-code) people will have something to use until they find whatever they want to do with going further in the hobby."

So it is your opinion that Pro-Code Hams are the only ones capable of bitching about how things used to be? Hardly. Give a listen to HF SSB on any given night. Some of what the OF's on voice (and are NOT pro-code) have to say about No-Code techs would hurt your feelings.

I am always amazed at the attitude of those that think that *anyone* that likes CW must be some kind of a knuckle dragger incapable of entering the 21st century. I've worked emergency communications / public service from day one of my entry into the ARS. I've used VHF and HF voice/CW to that end. We have an excellent ARES group and EOC which includes operators of all license classes and ability. We don't look down our noses at the No-code techs, and they don't refer to us as Old Fart Pro-Coders. We work together as a team --- Get it?

Besides --- I'll bet that I have converted more Hams to add CW use to their ARS toolbox than you have converted CW capable hams to exclusive VHF use. Care to put a friendly wager on it?

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

3066. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:32:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130183214.28718.00000300@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32577

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

> Now, if the packaging said that it was an HF SS
>transmitter (assume that such is allowable for this example), one COULD
>PROPERLY assume that it MAY transmit on every allowable frequency in the
>band(s) unless it said otherwise (or research to a secondary source was done
>- that turned up that such was not the case).

Would you really assume that an HF transcevier that was capable of SS would
transmit on all HF frequencies at the same time? Even that it would transmit
SS on an entire band at the same time? Would you assume that it is not
programmable in any way? Would you really expect them to put all that
information on the box?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3067. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:35:21 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a39vvp$h95$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 32585

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>On 30 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>>...
>>The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed difference;
>>both have the same channels, 802.11b just adds a more exotic modulation.
>
>From what I have learned in this thread, that is wrong. It is my understanding
>that the 802.11 version of the standard still occupied the ENTIRE band, while
>the 802.11b version only takes a [programmable] slice. Are you contradicting
>the other responses on this issue?

The IEEE 802.x standards sort of divide stuff into two "layers", the
media access control (MAC) layer which generally deals with definitions
and processing of bits in packets that are sent, and the physical (PHY)
layer which generally deals with the physical medium, formats and coding
used to get the packets from one place to another.

The 802.11 standard defines 3 different, incompatible optional
PHY standards (I think; I'm working from memory) over which its MAC
layer can run:

- a 2.4 GHz DSSS PHY layer. This runs at 1 or 2 Mbps, spreads the
signal to a width of 20 MHz and has user-selectable channels.

- a 2.4 GHz FHSS PHY layer. This runs at 1 or 2 Mbps, and has
user-selectable hopping sequences. This hops over the full
available bandwidth (though how much bandwidth this is varies
from country to country).

- an IR PHY layer. I know of no products using this.

The 802.11a standard adds a PHY layer using OFDM coding running at
speeds up to 55 Mbps in several bands in the 5 GHz region.

The 802.11b standard adds a 2.4 GHz DSSS PHY layer running at 5.5
or 11 Mbps. It uses the same signal bandwidth and channels as
the original 802.11 DSSS PHY, and falls back to the original 802.11
behaviour at 1 or 2 Mbps when conditions prevent running at higher
speed.

The distinction is hence between the FHSS and DSSS PHYs, not between
802.11 and 802.11b. The 802.11 FHSS PHY hops all over 70 MHz in the US,
but 802.11 DSSS had the 20 MHz channels and 802.11b is just an upward
compatible speed upgrade for the original DSSS PHY standard. Note that
the DSSS option for 802.11 was always more popular than FHSS even prior

to 802.11b, so most 802.11 cards also had channels.

I don't remember anyone contradicting this. If there was some fixation on 802.11b it might only be because you didn't seem responsive to the significance of the distinction between 802.11 DSSS and FHSS. 802.11b is unambiguously DSSS, while 802.11 might be either.

Dennis Ferguson

3068. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:35:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130183559.28718.00000302@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32578

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>One should not buy a product unless he or she has at least
>>some common sense and knowledge about what that product is.

>That's my point. There's been no effort by these manufacturers to let a
>non-trivial secondary market (the amateur community, which has been starving
>for high-speed access in a "land dominated by 1200 through 9600 baud
>devices")
>know of the suitability.

They are going to sell these by the tens of millions. How many do you think they will sell to Amateurs? Again, one should not buy a product unless one is willing to find out what that product is. Doing so is very easy, although not quite as easy as having them print on the box the small subset of the standard that you don't want to have to read.

>Also note - in another thread (now cross-posted here), someone else recently
>commented about 11Mbps 2.4 wireless lan stuff being "unsuitable for going out
>of band" for amateur use.

Correct. If one selects one of the upper channels, at least part of the transmission will be out of the Amateur band. They didn't put that on the box, either.

73,
Ed Hare

3069. Re: Comment - why would one want to??? (was Re: Request for Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:39:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130183943.28718.00000303@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32579

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

> because the fact of
>a 20MHz slice of the band isn't evident to those who don't take the
>extraordinary step of looking up the IEEE 802.11b specification.

Or the much less extraordinary step of readihg one of the short tutorials on
the subject.

Has Amateur Radio really slipped that far down that hams feel that they should
be able to learn everything about modifying the use of a product for Amateur
use by reading the marketing information on the box? :-)

> [However, both of you seem knowledgable on the subject,
> but you are EXPERTS.]

Expert on IEEE 802.11b? Not me! I was a bit interested in the subject because
these devices operate on ham bands and I wanted to learn a bit about them for a
number of reasons. But I am far from an expert; I just read the short
tutorials. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3070. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:41:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130184121.28718.00000305@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32580

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
>> necessarily archaic too.
>
>That's exactly my point.

Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about other modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no more technology is needed be archaic?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3071. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:45:13 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a3a0i9ief1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 32584

Aaron J. Grier <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote:
>Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
>> Encryption can be turned on or off ... not an issue ... hams would,
>> obviously, because of the requirements of Part 97, run with the
>> encryption turned off.
>
>not that having encryption turned on is an insurmountable deterrent, in
>any case. the crypto used by 802.11b is weak and has been beaten by at
>least two independent academic teams. I would be surprised if there
>_wasn't_ a sniffer tool floating around now.

Trying typing "AirSnort" or "WEPCrack" into a search engine.

Dennis Ferguson

3072. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:46:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130184619.28718.00000306@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32581

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@tm.net

>> >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.

>> This is incorrect. Technician Class operators can operate on all bands 6 M
>> and up.

>Thats what I said..... unless you consider 6 meters a HF allocation.

Six meters is a VHF allocation. However, Technicians have access to frequencies higher than UHF, so your statement that they only have VHF/UHF privileges is incorrect.

>Guess it is a matter of semantics
>eh?

Or a matter of the correct use of techncial terms. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3073. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:47:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5885FD.1B19DDF8@uci.edu>
Source record: 32582

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
> >> necessarily archaic too.
> >
> >That's exactly my point.
>
> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about other
> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no more
> technology is needed be archaic?

Do you feel that is an accurate way characterize the Amateur Radio
Service?

3074. SoCal RACES Active In Local Government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-30 23:52:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130185225.12840.00000258@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32583

FYI "You Know Who"

QUOTE from ARRL Web Page

New RACES Amateur Radio station open house gets positive media buzz: The Glendale (CA) Emergency Amateur Radio Service (GEARS)--a RACES group--held an open house January 16 to celebrate its extensively remodeled WC6AAZ ham station in the Glendale City Hall's Emergency Operations Center (EOC). The event attracted attention from several news media outlets, including the Los Angeles Daily News, the Glendale News Press and KNBC-TV, channel 4. "We've also been interviewed by the City of Glendale's monthly newsletter, City Views," said ARRL PIO Michael Benner, N6IJR. A GEARS news release pointed out how the group's "monthly meetings, drills, and training sessions" at the EOC had prepared GEARS to assist when a construction accident left Glendale Memorial Hospital without telephones last March. Invitations to the GEARS open house also went to all amateurs in Glendale as well as to city officials. The GEARS news release quoted City Radio Officer Jim Olliff, KE6URZ: "You never know when or where regular communication may be interrupted for any number of reasons. Historically, ham radio volunteers have proven their ability to provide reliable back-up channels of communication in emergency situations." WC6AAZ works with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Disaster Communication Service (DCS) and the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES).

END QUOTE

3075. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 00:58:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gqrsxr1.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32586

On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 06:20:47 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>How does the FCC do it for non-ham services that allow encryption.
>Another posted said encryption IS allowed for private radio
>services?

Other radio services do not have the strict content restrictions
that the amateur radio service has.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3076. Electronic Interaction (Was: Re: NCI Board. . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 01:57:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c58a609_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32587

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C574B04.6FE0A7F8@uci.edu...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C55EEFC.E731277E@uci.edu...
> > > Why not try it here too?
> >
> > Jim, I can remember being truly shocked as a newbie on this newsgroup.
I
> > never expected that people on a newsgroup would act just as they go,
> > generally, online with each other in a common chat room. So, been
> > there-done that-threw away the t-shirt. When I began responding to the
> > first posts I noticed here about the CW issue (remember, I found this
> > newsgroup a few months before the Biennial Review process was over
with),
> > and was summarily sworn at, called dumb, etc., etc., I responded in
kind. I
> > would in real life, also, or I would just walk away for fear of dealing
with
> > a lunatic.
>
> Ok. Sounds reasonable. :-)

Well, I don't know how "reasonable" it is, but it's the best I can come up with. I remember an old friend and I discussing on many occasions the ways in which people deal with each other online. This was back when I first got online, and there was a chat program called PowWow. It's still around, from tribal.com, but it's become a money-making venture now and is no longer free. Anyway, back to the point. Her and I would go a "monitor" this chat room. People were territorial, bashed any newcomer into the chat room, had "private" parties (if anyone tried to start talking to someone at a party and they had not been invited, they'd get hit with something called Nuke; which would immediately knock them off the air). Leslie was far more prone to late night observing, and she noted that these people (the "regulars" as they called themselves) were online almost 24/7.

Her and I came to the conclusion that many were probably lower class or poor; handicapped; or had some other malady that inhibited them from interaction with "real" people in "real" life. However, we could never figure out the mentality that makes people, including ourselves (Leslie and I) act quite more aggressively online than normal.

Interestingly enough, I have observed that--while it happens less on the ham bands--the same behavior can be witnessed on radio interaction. For instance, and this does happen on CB quite frequently, there is onair arguing of almost a warring nature, and I have heard of people going and shooting the coax of other CBers, etc.

What do you think? I think it's fascinating.

Kim W5TIT

3077. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 02:00:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c58a6b9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32588

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020130000830.02067.00000908@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:
>
> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I spent
> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid me
> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
>
> Thank you, "Jay".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was there
any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting prizes?

Kim W5TIT

3078. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 02:38:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130213853.02772.00000063@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 32589

In article <20020130053456.04169.00000123@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>What other 2 way electronic communication "hobbies" existed for the teenager
>>of
>>1962?
>
>>CB was just getting started and required a license not available to a 13
>year
>>old.
>
>That was the heyday of CB.

1963 was the heyday? Maybe. One thing is certain: in 1963 the number of cb licenses on the FCC books exceeded the number of ham licenses.

>I don't know the rules, but I knew of several
>13/14
>year olds that were active on CB, using their FCC-issued call letters. That
>call may have been issued to older family members, but apparently, that was
>not
>all that uncommon.

As I recall, cb licenses had an age requirement of 18 years. Of course lots of kids used their parents' sets, but if a kid was interested and the parents weren't,
he could not get a license.

>It is clear that the effects of multiple 2-way electronic communication
>hobbies
>are not affecting growth of Amateur Radio,

WHOA! It's not clear at all! Compare the growth from, say, 1981 to 1991 with the growth from 1991 to 2001.

>so obviously, people of some age
>are
>joining our ranks in spite of those effects. Why do you believe that they are
>reducing the ranks of teenagers entering ham radio, but not affecting the
>ranks
>of older people?

I gave a list of reasons, Ed.
>
>> Then in 1963 the growth suddenly stopped and the

>>numbers stagnated
>>at around a quarter million for almost a decade. How come?
>
>Some will say that incentive licensing was a failure. :-)

They will be wrong. The growth stopped in 1963 but incentive licensing did not begin until very late in 1968. Using that logic, the lack of growth in the mid 1990s
could be blamed on the restructuring of 2000 ;-)

>>The old time ham next door probably had a very visible antenna, too.
>
>It was a windom up about 20 feet. He asked me to put it up.
>
There ya go.

>>Sure. But most 13 year olds aren't going to spend $1000 just to get started.
>
>I spent $200.00 in 1963 money to get started.

I spent about $20. But the point is what will most kids do today, not what did we
do 30-40 years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3079. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 02:38:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020130213854.02772.00000064@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 32590

In article <17x58.666$TS2.410670@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

(I previously wrote):

>> Let's presume for a moment that it's late 2003 and the FCC has simply
>> dumped Element 1, but made no other changes.
>>
>> Here's what's wrong:
>>
>> - New hams have to pass the 35 question Tech written - but to do so, they
>> are handed the "200 page book", as W1RFI so often mentions.
>
>Who was handing out the books? I had to buy mine!

GOOD POINT! Thanks!

Both the size and cost of the "entry level" study guides may dissuade some
prospective hams.

> What Techs
>> get for their effort is ALL VHF/UHF at 1.5 kW power, but extremely limited
>> HF/MF.
>
>Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.

Let me restate:

Technicians without a code test get all amateur privileges above 30 MHz but
nothing below 30 MHz. Add a 5 wpm code test and they get extremely limited
privs below 30 MHz. That's unbalanced.

> Although they may
>have privileges of up to 1500 watts, I do not see why that level is
>necessary. At a maximum of 200-300 watts should allow communications with
>another station just about anywhere in any state, on any of the bands from
>50Mhz on up as far as mobiles are concerned. And residential setups with a
>decent antenna system should definitely have better luck there.

All depends what one wants to do. The main problem I see with 1500 W for Techs
is what it does to the testing. Lots of RF safety questions, which of necessity
crowd out other stuff. Most beginners aren't going to run anyhting like that
power
anyway, and those who do want to use it won't be dissuaded by more written
testing.

>> Only tiny slices of four bands, and only two modes! I think the "entry
>level"
>> license
>> should allow more spectrum and modes but less power. Remember, RF safety
>was
>> not a concern back when the structure was created.
>
>I would support a entry level of licensure that would give a taste of 1 HF
>band, say like 10m and say 2 meters.

Why so limited? I say give 'em nice slices of all the bands and a bunch of
modes
to boot.

> Then have the General, Advanced and
>Extra Class licenses testing go back to what it was 15-30 years ago.

Not gonna happen. The VEC system saves the FCC tons of money and effort.
They get unpaid volunteer hams to do FREE what used to cost serious tax
money. Think the FCC wants to run ham tests again?

>What
>to do with all the various licensees during the changes of the past 20 years
>or so, I don't have the solution to that, but making them upgrade to General
>as a minimum seems like the only solution. Who knows.....

Simple:

Keep the license names and most of the privs. Shift around some subbands
and expand the Tech HF stuff.

The new power limits would go into effect on a certain date, coincident with
new
tests. Holders of existing licenses like Tech would not lose high power privs
but
would have to show proof that they had been licensed before changeover day.
(Just keep a copy of the old license as proof). Nobody loses.

Eventually the Novices and Advanceds will disappear through attrition and
upgrading. No hurry, though.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3080. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 03:35:22 UTC
From: ZX11D <w9jcm@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3c58b8b0_2@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 32591
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

2 meter hams???????????? LOL thats funny. That show how much you know pal.
Boy there is allot of 2M dx.!!
"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be
> put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband
> have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules.
> They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555.
> Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they
> should be stopped"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I
> don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to
> operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own
> little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies
> can be jealous"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none.
> Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3081. Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 03:57:16 UTC
From: snakyjake1@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <2fac8683.0201301957.261f8404@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32592

Wanted to ask a quick question since I'm interested in FRS/Amateur radio...can I use "Amateur Radio" to talk on FRS frequencies for non emergency use?

Thanks,

Jake

3082. "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 04:11:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020130231129.24163.00000034@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 32593

In article <3c57336b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

> When I began responding to the
>first posts I noticed here about the CW issue (remember, I found this
>newsgroup a few months before the Biennial Review process was over with),
>and was summarily sworn at, called dumb, etc., etc.,

Kim:

As usual, a typically inaccurate and illogical posting. I don't remember
anyone in this NG "swearing" at you, per se. To be sure, you were
called "dumb" in so many words, but when you show up with a call
sign proclaimed by a high FCC enforcement official as capable of
taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," what, pray tell,
did you expect? Congratulations on your clever choice of a Vanity
call? Never mind -- I'm sure that's what you *did* expect!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3083. Re: "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 04:27:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C58C7A3.93236CF0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32594

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> ... but when you show up with a call
> sign proclaimed by a high FCC enforcement official as capable of
> taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," what, pray tell,
> did you expect?

Every day takes all of us one step closer to extinction.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3084. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 04:31:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C58C8BE.4CFED53E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32595

Jake McCrary wrote:
> Wanted to ask a quick question since I'm interested in FRS/Amateur
> radio...can I use "Amateur Radio" to talk on FRS frequencies for non
> emergency use?

Not legally.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3085. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 05:35:59 UTC
From: johns <snaken@uidaho.edu>
Message-ID: <a3al29$s1k$1@kestrel.csrv.uidaho.edu>
Source record: 32596
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

This one doesn't sound too mean, but in the last few
weeks, I've lost my hard drive twice to malicious code
that renamed system files. I've found that PoPupStopper
which shuts off JavaScript has helped a lot, unless, like
I did, you go there on purpose to see what will happen.
It happened all right. Instant blue screen and the drive
was kaput.

johns

3086. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 06:04:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5A2219.AF2B547B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32597

Jim Kelley wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:a36hli$4qr$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > > Why do you choose to characterize the ARS by it's trailing edge
> > rather than
> > > it's leading edge? Your glass just half full?
> >
> > Jim,
> >
> > How does speaking of the "average" constitute "characterize(ing)
> > the ARS by its trailing edge"??? That's a contradiction spun by you
> > in an attempt to defuse the assertion of my opinion.
>
> Not at all. It is my opinion that you are characterizing the trailing
> edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your words. That
> is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You obviously
> need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.
>
> > As far as the leading edge goes, my concern is that it is vanishingly
> > small, and with people like Dick ("don't need to know squat about
> > Shannon or any other BASIC principles of communcation theory")
> > Carroll posing as "mainstream" it's only likely to shrink ... that's
> > why
> > I oppose Dick's viewpoints so vehemently.
>
> I really only opposed your piss poor attitude about things - amateur
> radio in particular.
>
> > Since you're obiously an educated person, I have difficulty
> > understanding why/how you can be so comfortable in supporting
> > such backward thinking.
>
> What backward thinking do you contend that I support?

Why waste your time with a lying dipshit, Jim? He knows I've done far
more than he ever did in ham radio. So far what I've done has
brought me zero income. He can't say any such thing, all his digi

geeking has been for pay, despite his lying diatribes. He still hasn't
told us about his (non) exploits on ham radio actually *using*using the
digital modes. I **KNOW** I've done far more actual on the air
with digital modes than he ever did, and he knows it. My first
ham radio computer was a Commodore Vic 20 (all of 20K ram)
and an AIR-1 RTTY interface, well before packet radio came around. And when
it did, the next aquaition was a Commodore 64 (yup, 64K) with the brand new
PK64 multimode interface for packet AND RTTY. Does anyone really believe
he's been on HF with PACTOR or CLOVER???
Well, *I HAVE**!!!!

Meanwhile Kandid Karl has not even been on the air with PSK31, rather has
spent his time slobbering all over his microphone in working DX on SSB.
That's fine by me, but he is much less than candid in his lying
descriptions of my attitude and position merely becasuse I happen to
believe that CW and the testing for it still has a valid place in the
scheme of things. With idiots like him "lading the charge to the future"
there will BE no future.

I'll take Doug Smith 10,000 to one over Squiggy as a leader of
hi tech. Squiggy is a fraud, and a horses ass to boot.

3087. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 06:07:16 UTC
From: Bob Johnson <bobj@cris.com>
Message-ID: <a3amuk$2u0@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 32598
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

I'm running Window XP Pro with IE 6.0 and I have it set to not automatically
run JavaScript, so that probably saved me some headaches. I also have NAV,
but this one isn't in their definitions.

--
Bob Johnson, Denver, Colorado
Home of the 1997/1998 World Champion Denver Broncos
Home of the 1996/2001 Stanley Cup Champion Avalanche
bobj@cris.com
"johns" <snaken@uidaho.edu> wrote in message
news:a3al29$s1k$1@kestrel.csrv.uidaho.edu...
> This one doesn't sound too mean, but in the last few
> weeks, I've lost my hard drive twice to malicious code
> that renamed system files. I've found that PoPupStopper
> which shuts off JavaScript has helped a lot, unless, like
> I did, you go there on purpose to see what will happen.
> It happened all right. Instant blue screen and the drive
> was kaput.
>
> johns
>
>

3088. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 06:13:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5A2437.CC3DB936@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32599

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Cheezz..., what have we come to? More to the point, where are we going?
> > >
> > > How can you go anywhere if all you do is rest on your rosey red laurels?
> >
> > I do wonder why you worry so much about me. Could it be because
> > I got to Extra class 32 years before you? Oh, I know the story, you really
> > didn't want one....
>
> What kind of ham license did you have in 1951, Dick, when I had *ALL*
> operating privileges.

You gotta admit it's a bit curious that you didn't come up with an
Extra class ticket until the Grate Dumdown....

3089. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 06:35:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5A2951.92473D7A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32600

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> > (And I don't believe that our HF bands are totally
> >"safe" either.)
>
> They are probably safe from additional formal allocations, at least for the
> most part. Part 15 devices and uses already can occupy our HF spectrum. The
> biggest HF threat will continue to come from power-line noise, digital devices
> and increasingly, from various high-speed networking devices, similar to VDSL,
> HomePhone Networking and HomePlug devices.
>
> So far, we have been lucky. The above-mentioned industries have been made
> aware of the interference potential from their devices and have included some
> protection for the ham bands in their standards and specifications. The
> unknown at this point is "access PLC" -- a technology that seeks to use
> utility-owned power lines to provide ISP services to residences and businesses.
> They lack the umbrella organizations such as the TIA, Home Phone Networking
> Alliance and HomePlug, so Amateur Radio has not been able to make the inroads
> with them that I have made with the other groups and organizations.

If there's really anyone at FCC who truly understands all this, they
likely understand that eventually the only modes that will work
adequately in ham radio will be digital ones that have enough
noise and interference immunity. That may well take care of most
of the legacy modes.

3090. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 07:29:53 UTC
From: johns <snaken@uidaho.edu>
Message-ID: <a3arnq$2l5$1@kestrel.csrv.uidaho.edu>
Source record: 32601
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

> I'm running Window XP Pro with IE 6.0 and I have it set to not
automatically
> run JavaScript,

I'm using a test computer to see how bad some of this
stuff is. They are pounding us at UI all day long, so I
need to know. I'm amazed how nasty some of these
abandoned web sites are that have been taken over by
the hacker goons. Some of this Java code is not funny
at all, and you don't get a 2nd chance. Stay backed up.
MWave has the Plextor CDRWs on sale around $85
now, and that is the best security I have found. I can
be back up in about 30 minutes from scratch.

johns

3091. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 11:12:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131061244.13187.00000696@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32602

In article <3c56c9c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020129054226.19259.00000975@mb-mf.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >I was taking it as a given that, absent S25.5, the entry level
>> >class would have at least limited HF privileges (based on
>> >technical knowledge, rather than Morse proficiency).
>>
>> Even if the entry level were given HF priveleges similar to the
>current Tech+,
>
>I didn't mean THAT limited ...

Then be specific. Give some real numbers.
>
>> it makes little sense to have an "entry level" license that gives
>full
>> priveleges on VHF-daylight, including the right to use 1500 watts,
>and severely
>> limiting HF access and power. IMHO, it would make more sense to
>have an entry
>> class that is reasonably easy to obtain, but with power and
>frequency limits
>> evenly spread across the bands.

I agree 100%.

>Just as an example, perhaps
>voice/data/cw
>> priveleges on 75/80 M, 40 M, 15 M, 10 M, and operation on 2 meters,
>limited to
>> 100 watts would be a reasonable starting point. The 75/80 M and 2 M
>operation
>> would help the new ham be better connected to his or her locals, and
>the 40, 15
>> and 10 M would give the ham some interesting DX priveleges.

Why not go one step further and give slices of ALL bands?

The main reason to restrict power is that it reduces the need to test RF
safety/exposure
stuff.
>

>Power limits can be linked to (and justified on) the demonstrated
>level of technical proficiency ...

Only in the realm of RF safety. Does it take more "technical proficiency" to use a 500
watt 2 meter amplifier vs. a 50 watt model? Nope.

> frequency limits are more arbitrary
>and therefore more debatable. (What's the *real* difference between
>7220 and 7230, for example, in terms of the technical competence
>required?)

None. The same is true of power limits, except for RF safety. It's all about where
you set the incentives and what hoops you make folks jump through. Carl loves the "technical proficiency" hoop and the power incentive.
>
>> Just my personal view at this time. I am sure that my views will
>evolve as we
>> get closer to the point where the FCC has to consider what to do.
>
>Ditto ...
>
The time to develop a plan is now, rather than have the FCC develop one of their
own and then try to change their minds.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3092. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 12:15:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131071551.04188.00000341@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32603

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Why not go one step further and give slices of ALL bands?

It wouldn't bother me at all. Remember, though, that I am a fellow who was given all amateur priveleges for taking the General test. Of course, when I got relicensed in the 70s, I did have to take the Extra to get them back.

>The main reason to restrict power is that it reduces the need to test RF
>safety/exposure
>stuff.

The current rules require that stations who use more PEP to the antenna than the table in the rules need to evaluate their stations. On 40 meters, the limit is 500 W. On 10 meters, the limit is 50 W. Right now, we require Tech and General class operators to answer questions about RF safety.

>>Power limits can be linked to (and justified on) the demonstrated
>>level of technical proficiency ...

>Only in the realm of RF safety. Does it take more "technical proficiency" to
>use a 500 watt 2 meter amplifier vs. a 50 watt model? Nope.

EMC issues are also related to power levels.

>Carl loves the "technical proficiency" hoop and the power incentive.

"Love" may be a bit stronger word. Technical proficiency does satisfy one of the fundamental purposes of the Amateur Radio Service. I agree with you that the power incentive is primarily one of safety and knowledge to use high power responsibly. Of course, that beg the question about what percentage of today's hams of any license class use their linear amplifiers properly wrt the rule to use the minimum power necessary to carry out the desired communication. The old "I desire to be real loud" is pure justification, IMHO. :-)

>The time to develop a plan is now, rather than have the FCC develop one of
>their own and then try to change their minds.

If you want my guess, I think that the FCC would not develop a plan on its own. In the first place, NCI intends to be the first to file the petition for rulemaking after S25.5 is dropped. Although they probably have not set the full policy, as a minimum, that will contain a provision to drop all code tests. The logical step for the FCC would be to issue a Notice of Inquiry, to try to guage the spectrum of opinion on the subject.

And, in the final run, the FCC's determination about what is administratively best for the FCC will probably be a major factor. Any proposal that asks for a complicated licensing structure is, IMHO, doomed to fail.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3093. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 12:20:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131072043.04188.00000342@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32604

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> If there's really anyone at FCC who truly understands all this, they
>likely understand that eventually the only modes that will work
>adequately in ham radio will be digital ones that have enough
>noise and interference immunity. That may well take care of most
>of the legacy modes.

Digital radio is not a panacea for interference immunity. While one can gain about 10 dB (+-) over OOK CW in a 500 Hz bandwidth with some modulation methods and encoding, that will not be enough to overcome noise that is 30, 40 or 50 dB above the receiver noise figure. What nice things like FEC really do is to take a somewhat noisy and error-prone signal and make it much less noisy and error prone. But if the signal is very noisy and very error filled, FEC will fail and the signal will still be very noisy and have many errors.

It is kind of like the present-day DSP de-noise algorithms. The can clean up a partially noisy signal, but they do not help if a signal is buried in noise. Of course, as the DSP hardware gets faster, and innovations are made in the software, that will probably improve. This is an excellent opportunity for hams to experiment, but few seem interested.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3094. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 12:24:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131072446.04188.00000343@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32605

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Both the size and cost of the "entry level" study guides may dissuade some
>prospective hams.

In perspective, in 1963, the ARRL study guide for the Novice was 4 pages. The ARRL study guide for the General was 16 pages. That was all I studied to take my General exam, although as an active ham, I had read articles and parts of the ARRL Handbook at some point.

> Lots of RF safety questions, which of necessity
>crowd out other stuff.

Not necessarily. When the FCC mandated the RF safety questions (originally 5 on the Novice, Tech and General exams), they literally were added. The size of the test increased by 5 questions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3095. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 12:27:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131072730.04188.00000344@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 32606

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Jake McCrary wrote:

>> Wanted to ask a quick question since I'm interested in FRS/Amateur
>> radio...can I use "Amateur Radio" to talk on FRS frequencies for non
>> emergency use?

>Not legally.

FRS equipment must be FCC Certificated for that use. Amateur equipment is not so authorized. You can, however, modify FRS equipment to operate on the ham bands, if you wish.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3096. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 12:33:29 UTC
From: sheldoncue <sheldoncue@BITEMEhotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Xns91A72E8A6F166sittingduckcmhotmail@204.127.68.17>
Source record: 32607
Cross-posted to: alt.config,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

"Dr Solomon's Virus Patrol" <Virus.Patrol@drsolomon.com> wrote:

> WARNING! A trojan has been found in an article posted to
> the following newsgroup(s):
> rec.radio.amateur.policy, alt.config, rec.sport.billiard,
> rec.sport.skating.ice.figure, rec.travel.usa-canada
>
> Message header follows:
>

If you get a real newsreader or turn your html off in OE you will never be affected by this type of "virus". plain text is always best for mail and news.

3097. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 14:39:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131093906.17580.00000731@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32608

In article <rwH48.4133$Ab1.256552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Two rules if one is planning to use his encryption technique for long:
>never encrypt the same thing twice and never encrypt what the enemy
>already knows. The Japanese made both mistakes at Midway and it cost them
>their lunch.

Yup. The Germans made the same mistakes.

What it really comes down to is too much faith placed in a particular technology.
The Axis powers figured that their encryption would take so much time to break that any information gathered by the enemy would be "stale" by the time it was obtained. They never imagined the resources that would be used against them.

In at least one case the Bletchley Park codebreakers deciphered an Enigma-encoded message without knowing the decoder settings in advance in less time than Berlin took to decode it with an actual Enigma machine and the correct settings.

--

The big Japanese loss at Midway was not the four carriers or their airplanes, all of which could be replaced quickly at that time in the war. What really hurt
the IJN was the loss of their best pilots and technicians, with their valuable experience. Unlike the USN, the IJN did not rotate front-line personnel like air crews back to training commands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3098. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 14:39:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131093906.17580.00000730@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32609

In article <3c54301c_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020120001029.17580.00000459@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3c49f0e8_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >> Sure - but the problem is that the number of actual simultaneous
>> >users is
>> >> allegedly very small.
>> >
>> >But the "blocking probability" can still be "unacceptably
>> >high" in the eyes of those who want access to "their"
>> >channel right away at any time of day or night ...
>>
>> Ya missed the point, Carl. Snipped it right out.
>>
>> On the one hand, I read that there are areas where no repeater pairs
>are
>> available. On 2 meters, anyway. On the other hand, I read that the
>> assigned pairs sit idle 95% of the time.
>>
>> My question is, if there are so many repeaters on the air already
>that
>> are so quiet, why do we need more?
>
>I don't believe I was asserting that we necessarily need more
>repeaters (though coverage and reliability might be enhanced
>by having more, if they could share the spectrum effectively).

Then what, exactly, do you want?

>> >> THAT'S the problem that needs to be addressed.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >The problem is that "everyone (group)" wants to have his(its')
>> >own dedicated repeater pair so that they never have to deal
>> >with (wait for) other users on a shared frequency ...
>>
>> Maybe.
>>
>> Let's say it's true. What of it? Repeaters don't build themselves. A
>group

>> puts up money, time, and effort to get a repeater on the air and
>keep it
>> operating. Often a repeater is the work of a few dedicated
>individuals,
>> supported by a larger group who simply pay the dues. It's natural
>> for them to want control over their machine and its frequency pair.
>>
>> > this causes
>> >repeater pairs to lie idle much of the time, while others could
>> >be producively using them ...
>>
>> How does having a dedicated pair cause it to be idle?
>
>In the case of many metropolitan areas, at least, the pairs
>have been "gobbled up" and given coordination to a user
>group who may only infrequently actually USE the system,
>but keep it closed to "outsiders" and refuse to share the
>pair with another system.

That's what happens when the FCC allows "closed" repeaters. Any system that
allows dedicated
channels not accessible by all has the same problem.

>> The REAL problem, it seems to me, is that there are more repeaters
>> than hams who want to use them. I count 53 or so pairs from 146 to
>148,
>> plus simplex. If they were all busy, I could see a problem - but
>they're not.
>
>See above ...

Whcih tells me nothing. If you want to disallow closed repeaters, just say so.
>
>> > the "rub" is when someone else
>> >who shares the channel has to wait for someone else who was
>> >there first ...
>> >
>> How often does this happen?
>>
>> >The answer to that is in queuing theory ... the basis of the
>> >telephone system (where the number of trunk lines between
>> >COs is less than the number of subscriber lines connected
>> >to each CO) and mobile radio "trunking systems," and the
>> >"Erlang Equation" ... which when properly applied will show
>> >that a MUCH larger instantaneous traffic offered can be
>> >served with a VERY low "blocking probability" if each "QSO"
>> >is dynamically assigned to a channel from a "trunking pool"
>> >of multiple channels than in the situation where each user is
>> >"tied" to a dedicated channel ...
>>
>> I know all that. The trouble is that amateur radio is not the

>> phone company.
>
>No, but "the phone company" employed some of the brightest
>minds in the world, who over the years developed a great deal
>of insight into how to build ecomomical, effective, high capacity
>communications systems.

So? They also had to determine what the CUSTOMER wanted and
how to deliver it. They have tremendous resources and are not
spare-time volunteers.

>Much of that body of knowledge is
>directly applicable to improving ham radio's use of it spectrum,
>the availability of interference-free channels on demand, etc.
>(IF we are willing to accept something "new" ... that may have
>been invented and put into commercial practice many years
>ago ...)
>
Sure - just like our VHF/UHF FM repeater technology was lifted from the
commercial mobile radio services of the '50s and '60s. Nothing wrong
with that.

>> >In fact, in such a system, voice and data use could be
>> >integrated, promoting much higher usage of channels,
>> >while maintianing a level of service that would keep
>> >folks happy ... even though the traffic loading would be
>> >MUCH higher than the "dedicated repeater pair" system
>> >could ever handle.
>>
>> All depends on the demand distribution.
>
>No ...

Yes. If everybody wants to use it at the same time, the capacity becomes
more of an issue.

> what I'm contending is that a properly designed
>system where bandwidth is dynamically allocated on
>demand will outperform a system where channels lie
>fallow because their use is artificially "restricted" to
>certain uses (which may not be in demand at any given
>moment, while bandwidth for some other use IS in demand)
>
Sure. That's obvious - just look at what happens in parking lots.

The problems are two:

1) The CUSTOMER has to be convinced that the existing system needs to be
replaced. In
this case, the CUSTOMER is the "average ham" whom you describe in derogatory
terms
quite often. It's those same CUSTOMERS who have to PAY for all of it.

2) There has to be some sort of centralized control that assigns priority to
resource requests.

>> > The distinction between "voice channels"
>> >and "packet channels" (and all the wars that go with that)
>> >would disappear, because to the users, the system would
>> >be transparent and more available. (thus no reason for
>> >"turf wars")
>> >
>> You're missing the point. Again.
>>
>> It's clear that hams could build repeater systems that are much
>> more advanced than the current stand-alone, one-freq-in-
>> one-freq-out systems we have today - IF we wanted to. But
>> most hams don't want to because they don't see the need, nor the
>> possibilities.
>
>I personallly think that the REAL problem is that too few hams
>can see the possibilities (or

>flat out refuse to accept
>the possiblity that any change from "the way things have always
>been" could result in true benefits.)

I'm gonna give it to ya straight:

That's because those like you who want the changes have NOT made their case.
Instead of doing the show and tell thing, Carl, you lecture and insult people
and
deride their equipment and methods. You also don't give clear explanations of
what you are proposing and why it's better.

Then you wonder why other hams don't jump up and implement your ideas. The
problem is that you don't treat them as CUSTOMERS.

Would you talk to a CUSTOMER the way you have written in this newsgroup?

Look at how all new modes have come to ham radio - SSB replacing AM on HF, FM
replacing
AM on VHF/UHF, SSTV, PSK31, etc. In each case some hams set up their new system
and
then wrote about it, demonstrated it, did the show and tell circuit, and made
it easy to build/use.
They wrote books for the amateur market and conversion/construction articles
for the amateur
press. Eventually the manufacturers caught on and started making equipment.

PSK31 is a classic case. A British guy gets an idea, does the development work,
gets a group
of similarly minded hams in on the project. Has a clear vision and a good
selling pitch. Gives away
the software, too.

The concept becomes reality in a few years, others jump on, ham radio has a great new mode. Then
folks start making specialized low cost kits like the "Warbler". That's how it's done. No mention of
"dinosaur dung" or buggywhips, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3099. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 14:45:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C595878.226743CF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32610

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You gotta admit it's a bit curious that you didn't come up with an
> Extra class ticket until the Grate Dumdown....

What function could an extra perform that an advanced couldn't perform?
Whatever it was, I didn't need it. Unlike you, Dick, I don't consider
a piece of paper to be worth much of anything. IMO, the only value in
a ham license is the privileges granted. The only reason I upgraded
is that the advanced class license is now a lame duck.

If 5wpm Morse code dumbs someone down, wouldn't it be better if
that person didn't learn Morse code? If 5wpm Morse code dumbs
someone down, doesn't 20wpm Morse code dumb that person down
four times as much? With friends like you, Morse code doesn't
need any enemies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3100. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 14:54:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3blm702mju@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32614

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5A2437.CC3DB936@worldnet.att.net...

> You gotta admit it's a bit curious that you didn't come up with an
> Extra class ticket until the Grate Dumdown....

When computers moved from command line to GUI operating systems, it was to make things easier for someone to operate, and no one thought of it as dumbing down. When automobiles went from clutch to automatic, it was also to makes things easier to operate, yet still, no one thought of it as being dumbed down. Yet, when ham radio tries to move forward, the opposite is the norm.

3101. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 14:55:15 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <nVc68.381$fc.348658@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32611

Maybe we have a slight wording issue here Cecil..... I guess I was referring to 6 Meter and up -->meaning up in numerical frequency<----. I.e. 50Mhz-Ghz range, not the other way around.

> > > >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.
> > >
> > > This is incorrect. Technician Class operators can operate on all bands 6 M and
> > > up.
> >
> > Thats what I said..... unless you consider 6 meters a HF allocation.
>
> I believe what Ed is saying is that not only do techs have all VHF/UHF
> privileges but they also have *ALL* EHF privileges. Your statement
> is wrong because you didn't include frequencies above UHF.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3102. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 15:07:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C595D94.D241EEF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32612

KC8PMX wrote:
> Maybe we have a slight wording issue here Cecil..... I guess I was referring
> to 6 Meter and up -->meaning up in numerical frequency<----. I.e. 50Mhz-
> Ghz range, not the other way around.

UHF stops at 3GHz. To correct your statement would be:
"Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF/EHF privileges."
Your statement left out 27GHz of spectrum. :-)

> > > > >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3103. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 15:15:12 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <4cd68.3131$zT.213313@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32613

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

> >I was taking it as a given that, absent S25.5, the entry level
> >class would have at least limited HF privileges (based on
> >technical knowledge, rather than Morse proficiency).

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> Even if the entry level were given HF priveleges similar to the current
Tech+,
> it makes little sense to have an "entry level" license that gives full
> priveleges on VHF-daylight, including the right to use 1500 watts, and
severely
> limiting HF access and power.

Absolutely, way too much power for entry level.

> IMHO, it would make more sense to have an entry
> class that is reasonably easy to obtain, but with power and frequency
limits
> evenly spread across the bands. Just as an example, perhaps voice/data/cw
> priveleges on 75/80 M, 40 M, 15 M, 10 M, and operation on 2 meters,
limited to
> 100 watts would be a reasonable starting point. The 75/80 M and 2 M
operation
> would help the new ham be better connected to his or her locals, and the
40, 15
> and 10 M would give the ham some interesting DX priveleges.

Well, a couple of points...

When you say voice. The FCC doesn't define voice. Voice is audio frequencies
only... ;-)
Did you mean phone and if so that implies omitting image. Did you mean that.

When you say data/cw you are omitting RTTY. Did you mean that?

When you say 100 watts I think you should up that to 150 because there are
plenty of radios that do 100 watts easy and the newbies should not have to
worry about running up to the limit all the time. We don't need to set up an
obsticle course... ;-)

> Just my personal view at this time. I am sure that my views will evolve
as we
> get closer to the point where the FCC has to consider what to do.

That's fair, but I guess I'm saying, if you start limiting certain modes,
you should try to do so with real reasons in mind not just do so

arbitrarily. After all, as it is now, Technician Plus has CW on four HF bands but they cannot use the phone mode "MCW .. for providing telegraphy practice interspersed with speech". WHAT'S UP WITH THAT!!! ;-)

I'm willing to bet that was arrived at because of some compromise and no one was paying attention. They certainly weren't 'looking out' for the Novice or Technician Plus operators interests.

Rich

3104. Re: Electronic Interaction (Was: Re: NCI Board. . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 17:41:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5981DE.BF278480@uci.edu>
Source record: 32615

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Interestingly enough, I have observed that--while it happens less on the ham
> bands--the same behavior can be witnessed on radio interaction. For
> instance, and this does happen on CB quite frequently, there is onair
> arguing of almost a warring nature, and I have heard of people going and
> shooting the coax of other CBers, etc.

> What do you think? I think it's fascinating.

Well, I think it's kind of depressing, and I'm constantly resisting the urge to lash out more vehemently. I cancel a lot of newsgroup messages that I have written. I try to employ some degree of maturity, because no matter what somebody might say to me, everything I write reflects entirely on me rather than on the person I'm writing to. The people on the newsgroup are quite adept at picking out flaws in an argument, and so I try to write in anticipation of known counterarguments. Being unreasonable and beligerent usually gives people the greatest amount (or best quality) of ammo to use against you. But still, I can't always resist the opportunity to fling a good stinger now and then when a prime opportunity presents itself. ;-)

73 de ac6xg

3105. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 17:51:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c598637_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32616

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302134540.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> That's my point. There's been no effort by these manufacturers to
let a
> non-trivial secondary market (the amateur community, which has been
starving
> for high-speed access in a "land dominated by 1200 through 9600 baud
devices")
> know of the suitability.

I hate to be the one to tell you this, but, compared to the primary
markets, the amateur community would fall several notches BELOW
trivial ... and that's assuming that a very high percentage of hams
would
actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly sad to
say is
something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFmEMpe+N6+q84HiEQJCBwCgn4HVqpDGrgakP3KHZSg4zbLo8foAoIP4
s4MWVdx5dvSWdlJyD5osTqBP
=I136
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3106. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 17:56:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c598738_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32617

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C572A59.460A238@uci.edu...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C57002C.F90CAEBF@uci.edu...
> > > It is my opinion that you are characterizing the
> > trailing
> > > edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your
words.
> > That
> > > is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You
> > obviously
> > > need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.
> >
> > How so? I think it's fair to say that the average ham spends
> > most of his/her time either on CW or SSB ... SSB is over 50
> > years old ... not at all near commercial state of the art ... CW,
> > well that's pracatically got dinosaur dung on it it's so old,
> > technologically-speaking.
>
> Do you ever use an electric light bulb, Carl? Think about how
backward
> that makes you, by your logic, technologically speaking.

Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.

As far as the rest of this debate, I'm not going to play word
games for your amusement any more ... if you want to talk
substantive technical issues, fine ... otherwise, joust with
someone else.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFmFMpe+N6+q84HiEQJn7ACg0AhbU8Y971NwZXsu0cxN2zRDgcoAoMYD
hhq50glGtcFXNT4168iu0SGv
=yehk
```

```
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3107. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 18:08:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C59882F.FFE6C81B@uci.edu>
Source record: 32619

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> I hate to be the one to tell you this, but, compared to the primary
> markets, the amateur community would fall several notches BELOW
> trivial ... and that's assuming that a very high percentage of hams
> would
> actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly sad to
> say is
> something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.

Right. Due largely to the fact that WE AREN'T CONDUCTING BUSINESS on the ham bands. We're not selling something, promoting something, connecting to an enormous database, or user base for that matter. It's not what amateur radio is about, and to compare it with the business world is myopically, over-simplistically ignorant.

3108. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 18:11:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0201311011.34279c46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32618

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020131072446.04188.00000343@mb-df.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Both the size and cost of the "entry level" study guides may dissuade some
> >prospective hams.
>
> In perspective, in 1963, the ARRL study guide for the Novice was 4 pages. The
> ARRL study guide for the General was 16 pages.

That's kinda misleading, Ed. The ARRL did not sell "study guides" in 1963.

What the did sell was the License Manual for 50 cents. In that manual the
study questions for the Novice and General took up the space you describe.

In addition, the LMs contained all of the then-current regs for the ARS.
These needed to be studied as well because the study questions did not
cover much of the regs.

The old LMs simply reprinted the FCC's study questions, btw. Not only were
the questions not the same as on the real exam, but the study questions
were in essay form, not multiple choice.

> That was all I studied to take
> my General exam, although as an active ham, I had read articles and parts of
> the ARRL Handbook at some point.
>
Which means you had more information than was contained in an LM. An ARRL
Handbook of that era cost $3.50.

> > Lots of RF safety questions, which of necessity
> >crowd out other stuff.
>
> Not necessarily. When the FCC mandated the RF safety questions (originally 5 on
> the Novice, Tech and General exams), they literally were added. The size of the
> test increased by 5 questions.

Those were the OLD tests. Under those rules a new Tech had to take two
writtens totalling 65 questions (as I recall). Currently a new Tech requires
only a single 35 question test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3109. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 18:24:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C598BCD.D06A12D@uci.edu>
Source record: 32620

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C572A59.460A238@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C57002C.F90CAEBF@uci.edu...
> > > > It is my opinion that you are characterizing the
> > > trailing
> > > > edge rather than the average. "50 years behind" were your
> words.
> > > That
> > > > is an utterly ludicrous characterization of the 'mean'. You
> > > obviously
> > > > need considerably more data to reduce your standard deviation.
> > >
> > > How so? I think it's fair to say that the average ham spends
> > > most of his/her time either on CW or SSB ... SSB is over 50
> > > years old ... not at all near commercial state of the art ... CW,
> > > well that's pracatically got dinosaur dung on it it's so old,
> > > technologically-speaking.
> >
> > Do you ever use an electric light bulb, Carl? Think about how
> backward
> > that makes you, by your logic, technologically speaking.
>
> Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
> orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.

I don't think I made that claim. The point you weren't able to derive from the analogy is that one's technological level is not necessarily defined by or limited to the age of the technology one employs on a daily basis. The logic you use to arrive at your "50 years behind" assessment of amateur radio is flawed. You are an amateur radio operator, and you aren't 50 years behind. You stand as an exception to your own rule. Most technologies are defined by their leading edge, Carl. Why do you make an exception for amateur radio? The only reason I can think of is that you're a sourpuss.

> As far as the rest of this debate, I'm not going to play word
> games for your amusement any more ... if you want to talk
> substantive technical issues, fine ... otherwise, joust with
> someone else.

Word games that prove your logic is faulty. Yes, I don't blame you for not wanting to play. Please do continue to talk substantive techinical issues. Many times, the details are interesting. Other times I can't keep my eyes from glazing over. But when your "techincal issues" vere over to pointless derision of amateur radio, I reserve the option of debating your terms with you.

73 de ac6xg

3110. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 18:59:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131135922.03504.00000423@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 32621

>Subject: Re: Question re. NCI?
>From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 1/30/02 9:00 PM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c58a6b9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020130000830.02067.00000908@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
>> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:
>>
>> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I spent
>> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid me
>> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
>> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
>>
>> Thank you, "Jay".
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was there
>any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting prizes?

>Kim

Kim,

Where do you think Jay was, and what do
you think he was doing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3111. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 19:34:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131143407.11389.00000325@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 32622

>Subject: Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 1/31/2002 8:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C595878.226743CF@IEEE.org>

>What function could an extra perform that an advanced couldn't perform?
>Whatever it was, I didn't need it. Unlike you, Dick, I don't consider
>a piece of paper to be worth much of anything. IMO, the only value in
>a ham license is the privileges granted. The only reason I upgraded
>is that the advanced class license is now a lame duck.

Don't get me wrong, Cecil...I am glad you upgraded. However that last paragraph made absolutely NO sense.

WHAT priviledge do you have/use now that you didn't before the upgrade?

If you DO use the priviledges, then it is apparent the paper DOES make the difference, for without it, you'd NOT be using the priviledges.

If you DON'T use the extra (pardopn the pun) priviledges, then your "lame duck" Advanced Class license wasn't so lame afterall, now was it?

As a matter of fact, you had the distinct honor of having something no one else would ever be able to earn....AND...Everyone would KNOW, beyond a shadow of a doubt that you DID pass a code test "back when". Present day Extra's and Generals cannot make that claim.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3112. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 22:25:31 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3c59c2f8.2612562@news.cet.com>
Source record: 32623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 11:59:00 -0500 (EST), twistedhed@webtv.net
(Twistedhed) wrote:

>From: cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com (Train)
>Come on now Twistie.....Are you going to tell us that those "spectrum
>purity anal retentive assholes (read HAMS) could actually be the cause
>of such EMI and Sparky would try to dupe us into thinking the culprit
>would be CB Radio?
>Please note EXTREME sarcasm in above statement. Train
>-
>Or the fact that hammies compared to cbers have a much greater potential
>for harm when speaking of interference.

Are you saying that it was Hams that brought down those Blackhawk
helicoptors? Let's put this into perspective, twist. We were talking
about illegal operators, people that have no respect for the law,
other operators, or people's lives. Or didn't you read those
references I cited just a couple posts ago?

3113. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 23:07:51 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <b7k68.29051$B94.3768066@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 32624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3c59c2f8.2612562@news.cet.com...
> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 11:59:00 -0500 (EST), twistedhed@webtv.net
> (Twistedhed) wrote:
>
> >From: cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com (Train)
> >Come on now Twistie.....Are you going to tell us that those "spectrum
> >purity anal retentive assholes (read HAMS) could actually be the cause
> >of such EMI and Sparky would try to dupe us into thinking the culprit
> >would be CB Radio?
> >Please note EXTREME sarcasm in above statement. Train
> >-
> >Or the fact that hammies compared to cbers have a much greater potential
> >for harm when speaking of interference.
>
> Are you saying that it was Hams that brought down those Blackhawk
> helicoptors?

Why the hell not? An illogical assertion can logically be countered by the
same.

Let's put this into perspective, twist. We were talking
> about illegal operators, people that have no respect for the law,
> other operators, or people's lives.

No we're not asshole, we're talking about EMI (Elecrto Magnetic
Interference) and possible origins. You alledge it to be CB Radio and we can
alledge it to be Ham Operators. No proof of either has been shown!

Or didn't you read those
> references I cited just a couple posts ago?

Sure I did. Not a single fucking word of it said CB Radio in it anywhere!
Train

>

3114. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 23:14:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gqtdmy2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32625

On 31 Jan 2002 12:27:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>FRS equipment must be FCC Certificated for that use. Amateur equipment is not
>so authorized. You can, however, modify FRS equipment to operate on the ham
>bands, if you wish.

Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3115. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-01-31 23:14:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gqtdw73.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32626

On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 17:56:05 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
>orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.

My wife's subspecialty of power engineering is industrial lighting,
and she avers that there have been tremendous advances in lighting
technology and controls in the last decade or two.

In the residential arena, look at high-intensity halogen-excited
lights and the mini-compact low-consumption fluorescent bulbs which
are replacing Thomas the Tinkerer's 100-year old filament-in-a-vacuum
bulbs.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3116. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:06:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0201312330300.14908-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32627

On 30 Jan 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>> Now, if the packaging said that it was an HF SS
>>transmitter (assume that such is allowable for this example), one COULD
>>PROPERLY assume that it MAY transmit on every allowable frequency in the
>>band(s) unless it said otherwise (or research to a secondary source was done
>>- that turned up that such was not the case).
>
>Would you really assume that an HF transcevier that was capable of SS would
>transmit on all HF frequencies at the same time? Even that it would transmit
>SS on an entire band at the same time? Would you assume that it is not
>programmable in any way? Would you really expect them to put all that
>information on the box?

I never said "at the same time." However, what I did say is correct in that I would assume that some part of its RF energy, given enough time, would fall on EVERY frequency in the band in the absence of information to the contrary, just because it is identified as SS. The problem is once it indicates that even one of these frequency slices is outside of the amateur allocation and there is no information that indicates that it could be contained completely inside the allocation, it becomes identified as an unsuitable device for amateur use that exceeds the part 15 limits.

So, if it lists a range where part of that range is outside the amateur allocation and says nothing more, one must assume that it is unsuitable without evidence to the contrary, at least in its stock condition. Of course, this leads to the question of modification possibility, but now, one is getting into the secondary source information, etc....

So, for this wireless lan stuff, if it says 2400-2483.5 and DOESN'T say anything about channels or subranges, an amateur, assuming intent to use in excess of part 15 allowances and going by the box information, is going to pass that item up and select one that DOES say that it can be limited.

The last time I looked (not recently - over a year ago), none of the devices I found mentioned channels or subranges.

3117. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:07:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C59DC55.AB904253@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32628

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> If you DON'T use the extra (pardopn the pun) priviledges, then your "lame
> duck" Advanced Class license wasn't so lame afterall, now was it?

I don't use the extra privileges. Do you know what a "lame duck" is? I don't want to be caught in a position where advanced's are forced to upgrade to extra or be demoted back to general when the FCC decides to eliminate the advanced class altogether.

> As a matter of fact, you had the distinct honor of having something no one
> else would ever be able to earn....AND...Everyone would KNOW, beyond a shadow
> of a doubt that you DID pass a code test "back when". Present day Extra's and
> Generals cannot make that claim.

Advanced cannot make that claim either. They might have gotten a waiver.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3118. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:09:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3cm9m02hlo@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32631

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gqtdw73.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 17:56:05 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
> >orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.
>
> My wife's subspecialty of power engineering is industrial lighting,
> and she avers that there have been tremendous advances in lighting
> technology and controls in the last decade or two.
>
> In the residential arena, look at high-intensity halogen-excited
> lights and the mini-compact low-consumption fluorescent bulbs which
> are replacing Thomas the Tinkerer's 100-year old filament-in-a-vacuum
> bulbs.

The EPA is already trying to ban the use of flourescent bulbs because of the miniscule amount mercury that is contained in them. Where I work, we were informed that we simply can't throw flourescent tubes in the trash anymore. They have to be discarded according to EPA regulations. The same goes for high-intensity discharge and sodium vapor lamps used in our warehouses and process facilities. Of course, this is just for industry, but don't be surprised if it's soon applied to everyone.

3119. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:16:23 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3c59dc33.413200@news.cet.com>
Source record: 32629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 23:07:51 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
wrote:

<snip lame attempt at damage control>

You can nitpick all you want, train. No matter how hard you try to
distance the issue from reality, the facts speak for themselves.

3120. Question for Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:20:30 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OFyOIYrqBHA.1192@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32630

K0CKB and I will be RV'ing in your state sometime soon. Probably dropping down out of OKC to San Antonio (bypassing DFW -- yuck!) then Del Rio and wandering westward into Big Bend and then to El Paso and into southern NM and AZ. Any recommendations for decent repeaters along that route?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3121. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 00:40:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <elLsOjrqBHA.1896@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32632

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> As a matter of fact, you had the distinct honor of having something
no one
> else would ever be able to earn....AND...Everyone would KNOW, beyond a
shadow
> of a doubt that you DID pass a code test "back when". Present day Extra's
and
> Generals cannot make that claim.

The hell we can't! (Whatever the "honor" is in that?) The morse test is a
requirement. We passed it. Now there's a different requirement. BFD.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3122. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 01:01:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c59ebbc_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32634

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302147580.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 30 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> >...
> >The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed
difference;
>
> From what I have learned in this thread, that is wrong. It is my
understanding
> that the 802.11 version of the standard still occupied the ENTIRE band,
while
> the 802.11b version only takes a [programmable] slice. Are you
contradicting
> the other responses on this issue?

The only thing that he's contradicting is your lack of understanding.

The original 802.11 DSSS PHY and the 802.11b PHY have the same
channels, as Dennis said ... and virtually the same spectrum mask.
As Dennis said, 802.11b just uses a more exotic modulation/coding
scheme to pack 11 Mbps into the same RF channel size.

> >both have the same channels, 802.11b just adds a more exotic modulation.
> >The DSSS PHY section which defines what comes out the RF conector, is
> >30 pages in 802.11 and under 50 pages in 802.11b. Reading either one
> >will do. If you can't invest this much time to learn how it works then
> >you probably aren't the one to be adapting the device for use in the
> >Amateur Radio Service. Icom and Kenwood don't sell this kind of gear
> >so you'll probably need to wait for another amateur to help.

Yes, if you don't even understand the basics and aren't willing to
read 50 pages to attempt to understand, you have no business
trying to adapt the device for use in the Amateur Radio Service.

Have you sought out a tutorial book on SS as I suggested?
(Or do you just want to bitch and troll for responses on how
"packaging is inadequate" ???)

Carl - wa6vse

3123. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 01:10:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131201033.12832.00000319@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32633

From: "Richard Plourde" rplourde@att.net

>Did you mean phone and if so that implies omitting image. Did you mean that.

I think that an amateur who is given access to spectrum should be given the
right to use all modes that are permitted on that spectrum.

>When you say data/cw you are omitting RTTY. Did you mean that?

I probably should have said digital/CW.

>When you say 100 watts I think you should up that to 150 because there are
>plenty of radios that do 100 watts easy and the newbies should not have to
>worry about running up to the limit all the time. We don't need to set up an
>obsticle course... ;-)

That works for me, on both counts.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3124. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 01:19:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0201311719.1c9a3558@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32635

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message news:<3C59882F.FFE6C81B@uci.edu>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > I hate to be the one to tell you this, but, compared to the primary
> > markets, the amateur community would fall several notches BELOW
> > trivial ... and that's assuming that a very high percentage of hams
> > would
> > actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly sad to
> > say is
> > something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.
>
> Right. Due largely to the fact that WE AREN'T CONDUCTING BUSINESS on
> the ham bands. We're not selling something, promoting something,
> connecting to an enormous database, or user base for that matter. It's
> not what amateur radio is about, and to compare it with the business
> world is myopically, over-simplistically ignorant.
>
>
Yahoo, somebody had to get it right and cut to the quick around here.
>
>
w3rv

3125. Re: Question for Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 01:26:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C59EEB4.2C620A79@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32636

K0HB wrote:
>
> K0CKB and I will be RV'ing in your state sometime soon. Probably dropping
> down out of OKC to San Antonio (bypassing DFW -- yuck!) then Del Rio and
> wandering westward into Big Bend and then to El Paso and into southern NM
> and AZ. Any recommendations for decent repeaters along that route?

Years ago, when I lived in AZ, I traveled I10 quite often and used the
ZIA linked network (West Texas to CA). But last I heard, it was falling
into disrepair. Are you going to be HF mobile?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3126. Re: Question for Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 01:42:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O7eruFsqBHA.924@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32637

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Are you going to be HF mobile?

I have 160 through 440 inclusive aboard the RV, but can't use it when moving (can't deploy antenna due to height restrictions).

While moving I have 2M and 440.

73, Hans

3127. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 02:39:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020131213954.05154.00001761@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 32638

In article <u59bn6fk47oc4c@corp.supernews.com>, agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier) writes:

>N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
>> They [the FCC] could just as easily say that while electronics theory
>> is good to know, there is no reason to TEST for it beyond the level
>> necessary for rules compliance and public safety considerations.
>
>indeed. I've held a license for over a decade now, but due to lack of
>available time and elmers once I got to college it lapsed, and I've only
>recently renewed it [1] at the jabbing requests of some friends.

Welcome back!

>I'm a
>little rusty on the specific rules and regs after all this time [2], but
>the one thing that seems to be lacking from the [3] test pool are
>questions involving operating protocol. I know what frequencies I can
>operate on, and with what modes, but truth be told I'm still a little
>shaky on protocol, never having owned a working HF rig. [4]

From what I see, the tests have never been meant as comprehensive exams on everything one needs to know to be a ham. Rather they are a mixed bag of stuff meant to meet several goals:

A - Address specific problem areas in the ARS. For example, back when hams' straying outside the bands was more common than today, the tests were full of questions about frequency meters, xtal tolerances and band edges.

B - Insuring the safety of the general public. That's why the RF exposure questions were added, and why there are questions aout house wiring and grounding.

C - Expose amateurs to current radio techniques and technology. Examples are the questions on spread spectrum.

D - Insure some knowledge of the regs

>
>the test seems to cover the physical layer and wire-level protocols of
>communication, so to speak, but doesn't really cover much in the way of
>actual communications protocol.

They figure that most hams will pick up most of it on the fly. Their main concern
is proper ID and interference mitigation.
>

>> Most of the other services wanted ham radio to go away - that's why we
>> got banished to "200 meters and down".
>
>and here I thought it was because the antennas get too big. ;)

HAW! That's a GOOD one!!;-)
>
>> The real question is this: Does multiple-level theory testing cause
>> today's ham radio to be more modern technologically than it would be
>> without such testing?
>
>or is such the point of modern amateur radio anymore?

I think it's one of the points of modern amateur radio, but not the only one.

> or has the art
>advanced as far as it can by amateur means?

That depends what is meant by "advancing the art". Obviously very few big revolutions in technology will come from the basement workshops of hams. But what does come from those shops are ways of doing things more simply, less expensively, and/or with adapted technology.

For example, I was on RTTY back in my college days when ham RTTY meant 60 wpm Baudot, usually using machines like the Model 19 teleprinter and a big heavy expensive homemade TU (TT/L-2, as I recall). Today we have PSK31 which requires a PC with soundcard, some cables and some free software. And no oil smell, messy ribbons, noise or rolls of paper (sigh).

Did PSK31 advance the state of the art? I think so.

>[1] ex-KC6PVE, now KD7PNB.

cool!!

>[2] of course I'm reviewing... a lot has apparently changed while I was
> away. 5WPM to get a general? I must be going crazy.

5 wpm to get an EXTRA. Believe it.

>[3] c. 1994 general pool

Hasn't changed that much. You can download the entire current Q&A pools from various websites. You can also take practice tests online. They are just like the real thing only they don't count, of course.

>[4] I have a sick heath HW-101 I've been lugging around since 1992,
> hoping to fix one of these days. it's become a quest. ;)

What is wrong with it? I have a couple hangar queens around somewhere for parts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3128. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 02:46:58 UTC
From: Another user <at@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32639
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a2h93c$mte$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> >
> > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> >
> > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you intend
on
> looking at this link,
> > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
"graphic"
> pics.
> >
> > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > cya, Im off to bed now
> > zzz
>
> Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
stamps.
>
>
>
>
>
```

3129. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 02:56:36 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <Etn68.30047$B94.4488052@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 32640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3c59dc33.413200@news.cet.com...
> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 23:07:51 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
> wrote:
>
> <snip lame attempt at damage control>
>
> You can nitpick all you want, train. No matter how hard you try to
> distance the issue from reality, the facts speak for themselves.

THE FACT is you made an illogical assertion. I countered it with the same.
Note to Mopar.....He was never better at this, he just had nobody with
any clue paying ANY attention to his diatribes.
Times up Sparky! Go find your flat little rock and crawl back under it for a
while until you find some other shitpile of useless government issued bile.
While I'm on the topic of bile, if this was anything but troll shit why
would you have it crossposted to all the buttfuck...err ham NG's?
You are such a lame-ass pile of shit. You knew after my second post you have
this argument lost and tried to go off on some different bullshit tangent.
As usual, you lose motherfucker!
Train

3130. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 03:36:50 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202010318540.15146-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32642

On Fri, 1 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302147580.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On 30 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>> >...
>> >The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed
>difference;
>>
>> From what I have learned in this thread, that is wrong. It is my
>understanding
>> that the 802.11 version of the standard still occupied the ENTIRE band,
>while
>> the 802.11b version only takes a [programmable] slice. Are you
>contradicting
>> the other responses on this issue?
>
>The only thing that he's contradicting is your lack of understanding.

Which means that you claimed experts did not explain it clearly. I noted carefully that when you guys referred only to the 20Mhz channel spacing, you also referred only to the .11b spec, but clearly also avoided the original .11 spec.

>The original 802.11 DSSS PHY and the 802.11b PHY have the same
>channels, as Dennis said ... and virtually the same spectrum mask.
>As Dennis said, 802.11b just uses a more exotic modulation/coding
>scheme to pack 11 Mbps into the same RF channel size.
>
>
>> >both have the same channels, 802.11b just adds a more exotic modulation.
>> >The DSSS PHY section which defines what comes out the RF conector, is
>> >30 pages in 802.11 and under 50 pages in 802.11b. Reading either one
>> >will do. If you can't invest this much time to learn how it works then
>> >you probably aren't the one to be adapting the device for use in the
>> >Amateur Radio Service. Icom and Kenwood don't sell this kind of gear
>> >so you'll probably need to wait for another amateur to help.
>
>Yes, if you don't even understand the basics and aren't willing to
>read 50 pages to attempt to understand, you have no business
>trying to adapt the device for use in the Amateur Radio Service.

Nor have I tried, because prior to this, such a device was considered unsuitable for use in the service. If I choose to, I will do the research, but first I have to know that the device is in fact suitable (which is what I

learned via this thread). What you seem to miss is what I originally said: On its surface, the device will be considered unsuitable before one even goes further to inquire because there is nothing that leads the average person (the non-engineer, who doesn't memorize obscure standards) to believe that it could even be modifiable without a PhD in electrical engineering, considering that most electronics are complex LSI.

To Carl: As both a manufacturer and an amateur, shouldn't you be pushing the information that it is suitable more so than you have in this discussion (like on your company's products)?

This all started as: You said it could go there; I heard it couldn't. You showed why? I now accept your explanation, although incoherent. I note that someone else recently indicated that they heard it can't. This tells me that you have to do more to get the word out.

>Have you sought out a tutorial book on SS as I suggested?
>(Or do you just want to bitch and troll for responses on how
>"packaging is inadequate" ???)

I don't need a tutorial. However, when I learned about SS, only the frequency hopping kind had been in use - direct sequence hadn't entered the picture yet. However, I don't really care how it does it at this point.

3131. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 03:36:52 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3c5a0cf3.337623@news.cet.com>
Source record: 32641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 02:56:36 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
wrote:

>
>"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
>news:3c59dc33.413200@news.cet.com...
>> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 23:07:51 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> <snip lame attempt at damage control>
>>
>> You can nitpick all you want, train. No matter how hard you try to
>> distance the issue from reality, the facts speak for themselves.
>
>THE FACT is you made an illogical assertion. I countered it with the same.
>Note to Mopar.....He was never better at this, he just had nobody with
>any clue paying ANY attention to his diatribes.
>Times up Sparky! Go find your flat little rock and crawl back under it for a
>while until you find some other shitpile of useless government issued bile.
>While I'm on the topic of bile, if this was anything but troll shit why
>would you have it crossposted to all the buttfuck...err ham NG's?
>You are such a lame-ass pile of shit. You knew after my second post you have
>this argument lost and tried to go off on some different bullshit tangent.
>As usual, you lose motherfucker!
>Train

If the post was so insignificant, then why are you putting up such a
big stink about it, train? Especially when the post was directed at
twistie? My god, the way you're whining it sounds like I stepped on
your pacifier!

3132. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 04:50:35 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net>
Message-ID: <v8p68.5804$NP5.3305809069@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 32644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Boy Frank has gone out on
a limb on this one. Do I understand the quote right?
He's saying that illegal cb brought down a Blackhawk
helicopter? I must have missed that one on CNN, you
would think it would've made Headline news too.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20020131180111.694$RE@newsreader.com...
> sparky@cet.com (Sparky) wrote:
> > >
> > Are you saying that it was Hams that brought down those Blackhawk
> > helicoptors? Let's put this into perspective, twist. We were talking
> > about illegal operators, people that have no respect for the law,
> > other operators, or people's lives. Or didn't you read those
> > references I cited just a couple posts ago?
> >
> I read them too,where did they mention CBer's? Check the group you're
> posting in,before you spout off.
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

3133. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 04:51:40 UTC
From: Kuay Lin <KL@junoperelec.org>
Message-ID: <a3d6o3arh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 32643

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >
> Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

And your point is?

Kuay

3134. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:17:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5B768C.301C3A0D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32645

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

that's assuming that a very high percentage of hams

> would
> actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly sad to
> say is
> something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.

So Mr Superior, go ahead and enumerate those benefits. Keep in
mind that ham radio is a totally voluntary avocation in which all
participants engage in pursuits of interest to them personally, with
no renumeration and entirely at their own expense. You are further
reminded that there is almost never any reason whatever for hams to
utilize high-rate data throughput nor for extreme efficiency where weak
signals must be extracted from far below the noise floor.
Most of the modes and methods you describe are in the realm of the
experimental, and unless you're been to selfabsorbed to notice, there is a
LOT of that going on by lots of hams.

3135. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:24:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5B781F.5CA90E54@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32646

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 17:56:05 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
> >orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.
>
> My wife's subspecialty of power engineering is industrial lighting,
> and she avers that there have been tremendous advances in lighting
> technology and controls in the last decade or two.
>
> In the residential arena, look at high-intensity halogen-excited
> lights and the mini-compact low-consumption fluorescent bulbs which
> are replacing Thomas the Tinkerer's 100-year old filament-in-a-vacuum
> bulbs.

And yet Carl Stevenson, like most of us, still uses Tom the Tinker's
ancient invention... :-)

3136. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:34:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5B7A76.68B03C31@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32647

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5A2437.CC3DB936@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > You gotta admit it's a bit curious that you didn't come up with an
> > Extra class ticket until the Grate Dumdown....
>
> When computers moved from command line to GUI operating systems, it was to
> make things easier for someone to operate, and no one thought of it as
> dumbing down. When automobiles went from clutch to automatic, it was also to
> makes things easier to operate, yet still, no one thought of it as being
> dumbed down. Yet, when ham radio tries to move forward, the opposite is the
> norm.

Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when they
are simply easier?

3137. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:36:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5B7B17.F0DB4FC9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32648

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
> >> necessarily archaic too.
> >
> >That's exactly my point.
>
> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about other
> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no more
> technology is needed be archaic?

Where have you seen anyone doing that?

3138. Re: MOAN, CBers, moan!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:37:41 UTC
From: kc7maw@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201013741.23621.00000462@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 32649

I think I'll log off the computer and get back on the air now. What a waste of my time. UNSUBSCRIBE PLEASE

3139. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 06:44:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5B7CF2.7561025@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32650

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > If there's really anyone at FCC who truly understands all this, they
> >likely understand that eventually the only modes that will work
> >adequately in ham radio will be digital ones that have enough
> >noise and interference immunity. That may well take care of most
> >of the legacy modes.
>
> Digital radio is not a panacea for interference immunity. While one can gain
> about 10 dB (+-) over OOK CW in a 500 Hz bandwidth with some modulation methods
> and encoding, that will not be enough to overcome noise that is 30, 40 or 50 dB
> above the receiver noise figure. What nice things like FEC really do is to
> take a somewhat noisy and error-prone signal and make it much less noisy and
> error prone. But if the signal is very noisy and very error filled, FEC will
> fail and the signal will still be very noisy and have many errors.
>
> It is kind of like the present-day DSP de-noise algorithms. The can clean up a
> partially noisy signal, but they do not help if a signal is buried in noise. Of
> course, as the DSP hardware gets faster, and innovations are made in the
> software, that will probably improve. This is an excellent opportunity for
> hams to experiment, but few seem interested.

Looks like you have leaped onto Carll Stevenson's bandwagon, complete with all
it's flat notes and equally flat tires.

How you can say few seem interested if beyond reality. What few here are
interested in is the continuous selfindulgant puffery offered by Stevenson and his
few minions. Those of us who love this hobby do what we do because we want to do
it. I "experiment" with new technologies. No, I don't invent them, I don't write
software, and don't plan to attempt to learn how at this stage of life. If I was
somewhat younger, I'm rather sure I'd have a different viewpoint, but that sure
doesn't mean I'm uninterested in experimenting with new technologies, nor that I in
any way reject their introduction to ham radio, as Stevenson insists. He simply
lies, or is too dense to recognize facts.
I hereby state that I am certain beyond doubt that I have operated, on the air on
HF ham radio, far more time with new technologies that he has or likely ever will.
The man is a blowhard, pure and simple.

3140. NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 08:30:31 UTC
From: bruce@perens.com
Message-ID: <59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32651

*
NO-CODE INTERNATIONAL
Candidates statement, and
CALL FOR ADDITIONAL CANDIDATES.

Please pass this message on to other Radio Amateurs, especially NCI members.

NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

You may know me: I'm Bruce Perens K6BP. I'm the founder of No-Code International. Outside of Amateur Radio, I'm probably best known as one of the founders of the Open Source movement in computer software, and an early Linux developer. You can read my bio at http://perens.com/ .

When I started NCI in 1997, I never dreamed that we'd achieve our goals so quickly - but we are most of the way there. Last year, the International Amateur Radio Union, composed of national radio societies from all over the world, voted to ask for the removal of the international treaty provision requiring Morse Code testing for Radio Amateurs. Even ARRL voted in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio Regulations. There is no remaining credible opposition to NCI's cause on the international level. It's certain that code requirements will be removed during a future World Radio Conference, hopefully the one in 2003.

The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204 national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight. National Amateur Radio societies that lobbied to preserve code testing would likely be opposed by their own governments and citizens. The U.S. FCC has already stated that their only reason for 5 WPM code testing is to satisfy the international treaty requirement. As its demographics change, the worldwide Amateur population becomes progressively less enamored of code requirements. Even pro-code organizations like FISTS have wisely concentrated on promoting the use of Morse on the air, rather than on the test. Thus, I don't see it as a winning strategy for any radio society, even ARRL, to continue to drag its feet on code testing once the international requirement ends. We won't fall asleep at the switch: NCI will persevere until the day that code requirements have been eliminated in every nation. But the end-game calls for a very different NCI from the one we've had up to now.

NCI has always been an adversary, and now it's time for us to be a partner. Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to reconcile with them. If we don't do so, we could snatch defeat from the jaws of victory by motivating new opposition in the no-code battle. But I am not confident that some of the present NCI directors are ready for the challenge of cooperation with their old enemies. A number of them

cling to a rabid and vindictive ARRL-phobia in a time when little more than watchfulness is appropriate. Thus, I am calling for the formation of a slate of candidates to bring NCI into the future, as a partner in the rehabilitation of Amateur Radio.

The CW requirements battle, carried on since the 1950's, has been a crippling one for Amateur Radio. In a time when we should have been moving the Amateur Service into the future, many of us dug our heels in to the past, diverting our collective energy from the healthy growth of our service and the defense of our radio spectrum allocation. We Radio Amateurs, through our own short-sightedness, took a vital Service and transformed it into technology's endangered species. But the Amateur Radio Service remains critically important as an educational tool. Amateur Radio is still the only practical means of maintaining a worldwide corps sufficient to improvise effective communications in any emergency, no matter how large. The social benefits of the Amateur Service, and the many good attributes of the Amateur Radio hobby, must be preserved. All Amateurs must unite to achieve that goal.

For NCI to take its appropriate role in the end-game of the no-code battle means cooperation with national societies like ARRL, and with IARU on the international front. Although I was bitterly opposed to ARRL's long-standing policy in favor of high-speed code testing, my goal has always been to get them to change their minds, not to defeat them. I've maintained my ARRL membership during the entire existence of NCI, and was lucky enough to be able to donate $1000 to ARRL's frequency defense fund last year. Every U.S. Amateur should donate whatever they can to that fund - go to https://www.arrl.org/forms/fdefense/fdefense.html to do so, or read about the fund at http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/01/14/2?nc=1

It's time to re-build NCI's leadership. Any person who was an NCI member on December 31, 2001 can be a candidate for director, and can vote in the election to be held no later than April 30. NCI directors can volunteer to attend government and radio society meetings on behalf of the organization, but most of them do little more than discuss the organization's policy and vote their directions via email. Thus, the load of being an NCI director is a manageable one for a busy person. We need new blood, and we need to question our existing leadership about how they will bring our organization into the future, if they are to continue in their positions at all.

Please write to me and tell me how you feel about this, especially if you are willing to serve as a candidate.

Many Thanks

Bruce Perens K6BP
Incumbent NCI Director

3141. list of all the irlp nodes connected to repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 09:30:37 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3c5a5f23.4854864@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32652

IRLP Network
Total Nodes Active Idle In Calls Down Offline
330 330 243 31 45 11

IRLP Node codes and locations:
This page will reload automatically in 300 seconds
Sorted by: Number
Node ID Callsign City Prov./St. Local Time Status
100 VE7RHS Vancouver BC 00:46 AM IDLE
101 VE7URG Vancouver BC 00:46 AM DOWN
102 VE7RNA Chemainus BC 00:46 AM VK2RAG
103 VE7VIC Victoria BC 00:46 AM IDLE
104 VE7RMT Victoria BC 00:46 AM IDLE
105 VE7RVN Vernon BC 00:46 AM IDLE
106 VA7OKN Vernon BC 00:46 AM DOWN
107 VE7MFS Coquitlam BC 00:46 AM DOWN
108 VE7TSI Kamloops BC 00:46 AM IDLE
109 VA7MAR Mackenzie BC 00:46 AM IDLE
110 VE7RGF Grand Forks BC 00:46 AM IDLE
111 VE7BHI Port Alberni BC 00:46 AM DOWN
112 VE7KU Port Alberni BC 00:46 AM IDLE
113 VA7LPG Nanoose Bay BC 00:46 AM IDLE
114 VA7HAM Penticton BC 00:46 AM DOWN
115 VE7REE Penticton BC 00:46 AM IDLE
116 VE7RAP Comox BC 00:46 AM IDLE
117 VE7RIA Victoria BC 00:46 AM REF2
118 VE7PQD Parksville BC 00:46 AM IDLE
119 VE7UHF Richmond BC 00:46 AM IDLE
120 VE6RPT Calgary AB 01:46 AM IDLE
121 VE7DQC Prince Rupert BC 00:46 AM IDLE
122 VE6TE Red Deer AB 01:46 AM IDLE
123 VE6ZV Calgary AB 01:46 AM IDLE
124 VE6SBR Edmonton AB 01:46 AM IDLE
125 VE7FFF Prince George BC 00:46 AM IDLE
126 SARA Province Wide AB 00:46 AM IDLE
127 VA6IRL Lethbridge AB 01:46 AM IDLE
128 VE6MPR Banff AB 01:46 AM IDLE
129 VE6WRT Calgary AB 01:46 AM REF931
130 VE6TRC Ft. McMurray AB 01:46 AM DOWN
131 VE6RJZ Canmore AB 01:46 AM IDLE
133 VE5CMR Saskatoon SK 02:46 AM IDLE
134 VE5RAD North Battleford SK 02:46 AM IDLE
135 VE5SKN Saskatoon SK 02:46 AM REF2
136 VE5CC Saskatoon SK 02:46 AM IDLE

137 VE5IOU Prince Albert SK 02:46 AM IDLE
138 VE5MLR Meadow Lake SK 02:46 AM IDLE
139 VE7RJZ Invermere BC 01:46 AM IDLE
140 VA7RDX Vanderhoof BC 00:46 AM IDLE
141 VE7RTS Kamloops BC 00:46 AM IDLE
142 VE7RAM Tappen BC 00:46 AM IDLE
145 VE6PRR Peace River AB 01:46 AM IDLE
146 VE6LGL Grande Prairie AB 01:46 AM REF2
150 VY1RW Whitehorse YT 00:46 AM IDLE
151 VY1RHJ Haines Junction YT 00:46 AM IDLE
155 VE5WM Regina SK 02:46 AM IDLE
157 VE5SCR Swift Current SK 02:46 AM IDLE
160 VE8YK Yellowknife NWT 01:46 AM IDLE
162 VE8NWT Yellowknife NWT 01:46 AM REF4
165 VE4UMR Winnipeg MB 02:46 AM IDLE
166 VE7CAP Cranbrook BC 01:46 AM DOWN
170 VE4SRR Swan River MB 02:46 AM IDLE
175 VE4FFR Flin Flon MB 02:46 AM IDLE
180 VE6MHU Medicine Hat AB 01:46 AM IDLE
185 VE6COM Lethbridge AB 01:46 AM IDLE
186 VE6KJM Airdrie AB 01:46 AM IDLE
190 VE6LT Red Deer AB 01:46 AM IDLE
191 VE7RMR Maple Ridge BC 00:46 AM IDLE
200 VA3LU Thunder Bay ON 03:46 AM IDLE
201 VE9ARZ Fredericton NB 04:46 AM DOWN
202 VE3ULR Toronto ON 03:46 AM IDLE
203 VE1CRA Charlottetown PEI 04:46 AM IDLE
204 VE2CRA Ottawa ON 03:46 AM DOWN
205 VE1NSG Halifax NS 04:46 AM IDLE
206 VE1WRC Amherst NS 04:46 AM IDLE
207 VE1KK New Glasgow NS 04:46 AM IDLE
208 VE1WN Greenwood NS 04:46 AM IDLE
209 VE3BIP Belleville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
210 VE3ADT Toronto (Milton) ON 03:46 AM IDLE
211 VE1WY Lindsay ON 03:46 AM IDLE
213 VE3YYS Ottawa ON 03:46 AM IDLE
214 VE3XTX Owen Sound ON 03:46 AM IDLE
215 VE1BAS Orleans ON 03:46 AM IDLE
216 VE3IRL Toronto ON 03:46 AM IDLE
217 VA3BBB Windsor ON 03:46 AM IDLE
218 VA3EWC Barrie ON 03:46 AM IDLE
219 VE3OAK Oakville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
221 VE3TST Stittsville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
222 VE3KNA Franktown ON 03:46 AM IDLE
223 VA3CTR Markham ON 03:46 AM IDLE
224 VA3BJD Oakville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
225 VE9ACP Fredericton NB 04:46 AM DOWN
226 VE3OVQ Guelph ON 03:46 AM REF2
227 VE3MOT Toronto (downtown) ON 03:46 AM IDLE
228 VE3SEX Almonte ON 03:46 AM IDLE

229 VE3PNO Toronto ON 03:46 AM DOWN
230 VO1KEN St. Johns NF 05:16 AM IDLE
232 VO1BWP Corner Brook NF 05:16 AM IDLE
233 VE3KD Sault Ste. Marie ON 03:46 AM IDLE
235 VO1HHR Grand Falls-Windsor NF 05:16 AM IDLE
236 VO1AAA New Harbour NF 08:46 AM IDLE
240 VE3SUE London ON 03:46 AM IDLE
241 VE3RBM Kitchener ON 03:46 AM IDLE
242 VE3SY Petersburg ON 03:46 AM IDLE
243 VE3WFM Waterloo ON 03:46 AM IDLE
245 VE3RAK Toronto ON 03:46 AM IDLE
246 VE3MUS Huntsville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
247 VE3RPT Toronto ON 03:46 AM IDLE
250 VE3DPL Norwich / Delhi ON 03:46 AM REF2
255 VE2BRR Montreal QC 03:46 AM REF4
256 VE2TPE Baie-Comeau QC 03:46 AM IDLE
257 VE2RJS Montreal QC 03:46 AM DOWN
258 VA2RLP Baie-Comeau QC 04:46 AM IDLE
260 VE3PGC Cornwall ON 03:46 AM REF2
261 VE3EI Cornwall ON 03:46 AM REF1
262 VE3NUU Monkland(Tmp) ON 03:46 AM IDLE
265 VA3MME Omemee ON 03:46 AM IDLE
268 VE3DJD Burlington ON 03:46 AM IDLE
270 VE3ORX Orangeville ON 03:46 AM IDLE
275 VE3KAR Kingston ON 03:46 AM IDLE
277 VE3RWN Bethany ON 03:46 AM IDLE
280 VA3SCR Innisfil ON 03:46 AM IDLE
281 VA3SCR Innisfil ON 03:46 AM DOWN
283 VA3SCR Innisfil ON 03:46 AM DOWN
290 VA3RVU Brampton ON 03:46 AM REF2
300 AH6LE Mt. Angel OR 00:46 AM IDLE
301 WA6SUP Sacramento CA 00:46 AM IDLE
302 WA6LCN Marinwood CA 00:46 AM IDLE
303 KB6THO Pasadena CA 00:46 AM IDLE
304 WA6JFK Los Angeles CA 00:46 AM IDLE
305 KB5DBR Ponca City OK 02:46 AM DOWN
306 AC7DE Helena MT 01:46 AM IDLE
307 WA6TWF Santiago Peak - Orange Cty CA 00:46 AM IDLE
308 WR6AVM Honolulu HI 22:46 PM IDLE
309 KB6JAG Hemet CA 00:46 AM IDLE
310 N6KNW Santa Clarita CA 00:46 AM IDLE
311 K6IOK Auburn CA 00:46 AM IDLE
312 KD6YYJ San Jose CA 00:46 AM IDLE
313 K7OJI Fruitland ID 01:46 AM IDLE
315 WA6RQD Oceanside CA 00:46 AM OFFLINE
316 WA6RQD Oceanside CA 00:46 AM IDLE
317 WD6AWP Huntington Beach CA 00:46 AM OFFLINE
318 W0GFQ Palm Springs CA 00:46 AM IDLE
319 WD8CIK Hollywood CA 00:46 AM IDLE
320 AH6CP Honolulu HI 22:46 PM IDLE

321 W7AOR Las Vegas NV 00:46 AM REF925
322 KH6GMP Kailua Kona HI 22:46 PM IDLE
323 KB7LVC Boise ID 01:46 AM IDLE
324 KB7RSI Las Vegas NV 00:46 AM IDLE
325 N7BFS Spokane WA 00:46 AM IDLE
326 KH7R Henderson NV 00:46 AM IDLE
327 K7SDC Castle Dale UT 01:46 AM IDLE
328 WX7Y Castle Dale UT 01:46 AM REF925
329 W7AOR Las Vegas NV 00:46 AM IDLE
330 N7CK San Manuel AZ 01:46 AM IDLE
331 KA7STK St. George UT 01:46 AM OFFLINE
332 N7GZT Columbia SC 03:46 AM IDLE
333 NV7RM Reno NV 01:46 AM IDLE
334 WR6JPL Pasadena CA 00:46 AM IDLE
335 N0PSR Denver CO 01:46 AM IDLE
337 AB7TJ Minden NV 00:46 AM IDLE
339 WB2BQW New Windsor NY 03:46 AM IDLE
340 KB8JXX Anchorage AK 23:46 PM IDLE
341 KD6GDB Santa Monica CA 00:46 AM IDLE
342 KD6LVP Beaverton OR 00:46 AM IDLE
343 KE6WUK Sunset Ridge / Los Angeles CA 00:46 AM IDLE
344 AH6GR Maui HI 22:46 PM REF4
345 N0SZ Boulder CO 01:46 AM IDLE
346 WA6LA Rancho Palos Verdes CA 00:46 AM DOWN
347 N6ICW Sacramento CA 00:46 AM IDLE
348 WA6LA Rancho Palos Verdes CA 00:46 AM IDLE
349 K6JSI San Diego CA 00:46 AM IDLE
350 K6JSI San Diego CA 00:46 AM DOWN
351 WB6EGR Santa Clarita CA 00:46 AM WB6EGR
352 WB6EGR Burbank CA 00:46 AM WB6EGR
353 K6JXY San Marcos CA 00:46 AM IDLE
354 W6DXX Palm Springs CA 00:46 AM OFFLINE
355 VE6RGP San Diego CA 00:46 AM OFFLINE
356 WB6HII Eureka CA 00:46 AM IDLE
357 N7HQZ Ferndale CA 00:46 AM DOWN
358 WU7Q Sacramento CA 00:46 AM IDLE
361 K6UB Saratoga CA 00:46 AM IDLE
362 KU6V Fremont CA 00:46 AM IDLE
363 KG6EVO Tahoe City CA 00:46 AM IDLE
364 WA6VPL Lompoc CA 00:46 AM IDLE
365 KE6PCV Los Angeles CA 00:46 AM IDLE
366 KD7EFG Murray UT 01:46 AM IDLE
367 N6JVH North Hills CA 00:46 AM DOWN
368 N7LZM Kennewick WA 00:46 AM DOWN
369 N6SEX Sacramento CA 00:46 AM IDLE
371 WA4HND Grand Junction CO 01:46 AM IDLE
372 KH6FV Honolulu HI 22:46 PM DOWN
373 NH6HF Lihue HI 22:46 PM IDLE
374 WB3EHB Camden NJ 03:46 AM IDLE
375 W0KU Golden CO 01:46 AM IDLE

376 N6JVH Los Angeles CA 00:46 AM IDLE
378 WR6HMB Half Moon Bay CA 00:46 AM IDLE
380 AH6JA Hilo HI 22:46 PM IDLE
381 KG6EAO Kapaa HI 22:46 PM DOWN
382 KC7GHT Phoenix AZ 01:46 AM IDLE
383 WB5EKU Los Angeles CA 00:46 AM IDLE
384 K6IXA Atwater CA 00:46 AM IDLE
385 W7FDF Tucson AZ 01:46 AM DOWN
386 WA7SPY Sacramento CA 00:46 AM IDLE
387 K6KCP Sacramento CA 00:46 AM DOWN
389 KG4OKL Huntsville AL 02:46 AM IDLE
394 WA6WDC Sun Valley AZ 01:46 AM DOWN
395 WB6ARE Cedar Park TX 02:46 AM IDLE
396 N6SEX N/A N/A 08:46 AM DOWN
399 WY0X Centennial CO 01:46 AM IDLE
400 WA3KOK Washington DC 03:46 AM IDLE
402 KA2JZO Bordentown NJ 03:46 AM IDLE
403 N2LKV Stony Point NY 03:46 AM IDLE
404 N2CKH Lakewood NJ 03:46 AM REF925
405 N2BJ New Lenox IL 02:46 AM IDLE
406 W1IMD Portland ME 03:46 AM IDLE
408 W2CNY Syracuse NY 03:46 AM IDLE
409 KB2FAF Cortland NY 03:46 AM REF925
410 KF3DY Wellsboro PA 03:46 AM IDLE
411 K0PCG Des Moines IA 02:46 AM IDLE
412 KF6SWL Omaha NE 02:46 AM IDLE
413 WA2ZPX Middletown NY 03:46 AM IDLE
414 WJ2W Terre Haute IN 02:46 AM IDLE
415 N5IUF Dallas/Ft.Worth TX 02:46 AM REF2
416 WB5TUF Houston TX 02:46 AM DOWN
417 WB7RES Caldwell ID 01:46 AM IDLE
418 N4MSE Dallas TX 01:46 AM DOWN
419 N4XQM Atlanta GA 03:46 AM DOWN
420 N4GLB Upstate SC 03:46 AM IDLE
421 W2ISB Liverpool NY 03:46 AM IDLE
423 NJ2FM Hopatcong NJ 03:46 AM IDLE
424 N5CWH Gilbert SC 03:46 AM IDLE
425 WR2ROC Rochester NY 03:46 AM IDLE
426 KD4RAA Raleigh NC 03:46 AM OFFLINE
427 KD4RAA Raleigh NC 03:46 AM IDLE
428 W9ADS Champaign-Urbana IL 02:46 AM IDLE
429 N4HAJ Kinston NC 03:46 AM IDLE
430 N3APP Erie PA 03:46 AM IDLE
431 N3RJC Lansdowne PA 03:46 AM IDLE
432 W1QWT Scituate MA 03:46 AM IDLE
433 K9WZ Plymouth IN 03:46 AM IDLE
435 W9DXN Dixon IL 02:46 AM REF2
436 W1CDO Seattle WA 00:46 AM DOWN
437 W8HDU Lima OH 03:46 AM IDLE
438 W9BCC Wausau WI 02:46 AM REF2

439 KC7ZWG Seattle-Tacoma WA 00:46 AM OFFLINE
440 KC8NCE Grand Haven MI 03:46 AM IDLE
441 N9OIG Union Grove WI 02:46 AM DOWN
442 W9SH Fishers IN 03:46 AM IDLE
444 KB3HF St. Peters MO 02:46 AM IDLE
445 N8DNX Stutsmanville MI 03:46 AM IDLE
446 WB8NXP Southfield MI 03:46 AM IDLE
448 K1IMD Eastern Long Island NY 03:46 AM IDLE
450 N4NEQ Atlanta GA 03:46 AM IDLE
451 KD4Z Orlando FL 03:46 AM REF2
453 K4KSA Tampa Bay FL 03:46 AM IDLE
455 W4DOC Atlanta GA 03:46 AM IDLE
456 NE1H Atlanta GA 03:46 AM OFFLINE
457 WB2WPA Naples FL 03:46 AM IDLE
459 WA1ZVZ Branford CT 03:46 AM IDLE
460 KD4BBM Miami FL 03:46 AM OFFLINE
461 WA1NVC Framingham MA 03:46 AM OFFLINE
463 N9EP Barrington IL 02:46 AM DOWN
464 N5LEZ Electra TX 02:46 AM IDLE
465 KA1UAG West Lebanon NH 03:46 AM IDLE
466 W4RPT Nashville TN 02:46 AM IDLE
467 N9UWE Danville IL 02:46 AM IDLE
468 K1DF Albany NY 03:46 AM IDLE
470 N8OJ Marietta OH 03:46 AM IDLE
471 WB8CXO Akron OH 03:46 AM DOWN
472 W8JL Marietta OH 03:46 AM IDLE
473 K9IP Indianapolis IN 03:46 AM IDLE
474 N2MH West Orange NJ 03:46 AM OFFLINE
475 N8BC Painesville OH 03:46 AM IDLE
476 N3IO Philadelphia PA 03:46 AM IDLE
477 KA3KCJ Downingtown / Mt. Joy PA 03:46 AM IDLE
478 KA3VMA Drexel Hill PA 03:46 AM IDLE
479 K3TAT Media PA 03:46 AM IDLE
482 WA3UMY Lexington Park MD 03:46 AM IDLE
483 N4IRS Stuart FL 03:46 AM REF921
484 N3IO Malvern PA 03:46 AM IDLE
485 W9CEQ Aurora IL 02:46 AM IDLE
486 KE4EUE Chesterfield VA 03:46 AM IDLE
487 K1IMD Riverhead NY 03:46 AM DOWN
488 KG4QAC Tampa FL 03:46 AM IDLE
490 AF4TZ Nashville TN 02:46 AM IDLE
493 W1ET Hanover NH 03:46 AM IDLE
494 N9TSW Des Plaines IL 02:46 AM DOWN
496 N9GPY Culver IN 03:46 AM IDLE
510 G4CUI Sheffield SY 08:46 AM DOWN
512 M1ERS Sheffield SY 08:46 AM IDLE
513 G4BVV Maltby SY 08:46 AM DOWN
514 G0FUO Mexborough SY 08:46 AM DOWN
515 GB3US Sheffield SY 08:46 AM IDLE
520 G4NJI Rotherham SY 08:46 AM IDLE

521 G8UVE Burnley LA 08:46 AM DOWN
522 G4EID Southport MER 08:46 AM IDLE
540 G0XEL Manchester -- 08:46 AM DOWN
600 VK2RBM Sydney NSW 19:46 PM IDLE
601 VK2RMP Wollongong NSW 19:46 PM REF5
603 VK2RMR Mt. Riverview NSW 19:46 PM REF5
604 VK2RTZ Newcastle NSW 19:46 PM IDLE
605 VK2RCZ Sydney NSW 19:46 PM REF5
606 VK2RAG Gosford NSW 19:46 PM VE7RNA
610 VK6RNC Perth W.A. 16:46 PM IDLE
620 VK6RFM Fremantle W.A. 16:46 PM IDLE
621 VK2TTA Wahroonga NSW 19:46 PM IDLE
622 VK2RIC Lismore NSW 19:46 PM IDLE
626 VK2WAG Wagga Wagga NSW 19:46 PM DOWN
630 VK3RGL Melbourne VIC 19:46 PM IDLE
631 VK3HEG Ballarat VIC 19:46 PM IDLE
632 VK3WRM Merbein VIC 19:46 PM IDLE
633 VK3RPU Arthur's Seat VIC 19:46 PM IDLE
635 VK3RMH Melbourne VIC 19:46 PM REF5
639 VK3JED IRLP-Experimental VIC 19:46 PM REF5
640 VK4BAB Ipswich QLD 18:46 PM IDLE
648 VK4RCA Cairns QLD 18:46 PM IDLE
650 VK5UJ Adelaide SA 18:16 PM DOWN
660 VK6AMS Karratha W.A. 16:46 PM IDLE
661 VK6RAL Albany W.A. 16:46 PM REF5
670 VK7AX Ulverstone TAS 19:46 PM IDLE
680 VK8RTE Darwin NT 18:16 PM IDLE
690 ZL3TMB Christchurch NZ 21:46 PM DOWN
691 ZL2LD Masterton NZ 21:46 PM IDLE
700 J73D Roseau Dominica 04:46 AM DOWN
710 J73CS Roseau Dominica 04:46 AM DOWN
712 9Z4CG San Fernando Trinidad 04:46 AM IDLE
750 9Y4AT Valsayn Trinidad 04:46 AM IDLE
760 9Y4SRR San Fernando Trinidad 08:46 AM DOWN
888 KC4USV McMurdo Station -- 21:46 PM IDLE
900 REF900 Vancouver BC 00:46 AM IDLE
910 REF1 Toronto Reflector ON 03:46 AM IDLE
920 REF2 Denver Reflector CO 01:46 AM IDLE
921 REF921 Raleigh NC 03:46 AM IDLE
925 REF925 Las Vegas NV 00:46 AM IDLE
930 REF930 Saskatoon Reflector SK 02:46 AM IDLE
931 REF931 Fredericton NB 04:46 AM IDLE
940 REF4 Yellowknife NWT 01:46 AM IDLE
950 REF5 Sydney NSW 19:46 PM IDLE

This page last modified: Tuesday, December 11 2001 00:25:56 Pacific Time

This page has been hit times since midnight December 11th, 2001
Please help this site stay listed in NetCraft! Click on the link below

This page created by Richard Whittaker (VY1RW) Using PHP, MySQL and Apache

Please send requests for updates/corrections/additions to IRLP Database Admin or database@irlp.net.

3142. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:10:53 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a3e316taf1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 32661
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night

LOL!!!!!! Only on verticals........LOL!!!!!!!!!

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a2h93cmte0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > >
> > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > >
> > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
intend
> on
> > looking at this link,
> > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> "graphic"
> > pics.
> > >
> > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > zzz
> >
> > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> stamps.

3143. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:27:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020201062754.28292.00000003@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 32653

In article <a3d6o3arh0@pita.alt.net>, "Kuay Lin" <KL@junoperelec.org> writes:

>
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >
>> Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> And your point is?
>
> Kuay

___king Idiot:

His point was that if you modify an FRS radio for use on the amateur
UHF band, it is no longer legal to use that unit on FRS, since the
modification violates they type acceptance requirements. Are you
always this ___king stupid?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3144. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:34:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201063458.11117.00000496@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32654

From: bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens)

>Even ARRL voted
>in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio
>Regulations.

A minor clarification; ARRL voted not to oppose removing code requirements from the international radio regulations.

> A number of <the present NCI Directors> cling to a rabid and
> vindictive ARRL-phobia in a time when little more
>than watchfulness is appropriate.

I do not know all of the NCI Board family, Bruce, but most of the ones I have spoken with here have, as a result of a sometimes-arduous dialogue, developed a balanced view, not a rabid and vindictive view, of ARRL and its policies (and potential policies).

I would suggest, however, that those that would like to influence or change ARRL's policies in this, or any, area, not adopt "watchfulness" as a strategy. The ARRL Board has a standing interest in hearing the views of its members, and potential members. I have done so, on numerous occasions. Tom Frenaye once told me that I am but one of a handful of members that regularly sends him opinion and thought. Like any Board, ARRL's has a wide range of personal opinion amongst its ranks. Even those that might feel that Morse code testing should be eliminated are not insensitive to the fact that membership views are central to their support of ARRL.

Those on both sides of opinion on this should make their views known to their ARRL Division Directors. See:

http://www.arrl.org/divisions

>NCI has always been an adversary, and now it's time for us to be a
>partner.

That has worked well for me in RFI damage control. ARRL never would have been able to help the Home Phone Networking Alliance, HomePlug and the VDSL committees include notches in the HF ham bands if it had taken an adversarial stance.

In my discussions here with many here, including some of NCI's leadership (personal opinion on both sides), I have always made the point that adversity is not necessary, or even helpful. Some have agreed; others have not.

>Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to
>reconcile with them.

It will be interesting to see what that reconciliation is. :-) The reason that I have never joined NCI, in spite of being a mostly no-code-test advocate, is that there has been no room for compromise in its position. I believe that such compromise is important to amateur radio, especially to our once-famous sense of community.
Just as a couple of examples, having some questions in the written exam on the text of a few minutes of sent Morse code, wrapped into the overall score, would be a reasonable thing to have. After all, testing or no, Morse code continues to be a viable and important part of amateur radio. I could also see cause to have even a pass/fail Morse code test, giving only access to the lower 25 kHz of 80, 40, 20, 15 and 10 meters. After all, by useage, that part of the band is 99% Morse code, so those not interested in the mode would not mind that much at all, but it would make a big difference to those that want to see some Morse code testing in amateur radio.

Just a few personal thoughts on this post, Bruce. Thank you for making it.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

3145. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:37:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201063741.11117.00000498@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32655

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Most of the modes and methods you describe are in the realm of the
>experimental, and unless you're been to selfabsorbed to notice, there is a
>LOT of that going on by lots of hams.

Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the modes and methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are telling us about.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3146. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:42:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201064243.11117.00000499@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32656

From: "Kuay Lin" KL@junoperelec.org

>> Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.

> And your point is?

It was an important point, Kuay. Phil wanted to make sure that those that modified equipment for use in the amateur bands knew that in doing so, they could no longer use the equipment in its original use.

I can modify a CB radio to transmit on 10 meters, but I can then no longer use it to transmit on CB. I can modify a car for off road use, but some of those modifications are such that it is no longer legal to use it on the road.

Why did you ask him what his point is? The point of his post was really pretty clear.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3147. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 11:44:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201064445.11117.00000500@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32657

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about other
>> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no more
>> technology is needed be archaic?

> Where have you seen anyone doing that?

With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3148. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 12:18:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201071810.13187.00000718@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32658

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gqrsxr1.pminews@news.earthlink.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Tue, 29 Jan 2002 06:20:47 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>How does the FCC do it for non-ham services that allow encryption.
>>Another posted said encryption IS allowed for private radio
>>services?
>
> Other radio services do not have the strict content restrictions
> that the amateur radio service has.
>
A few hams don't seem to know that the ARS has any content restrictions ;-)

--

Serious question:

Why would hams want to encrypt anything they transmit? I can understand the encryption of control links to avoid unauthorized access. Some emergency messages might be better sent by means other than unencrypted voice. But these are the rare exceptions.

Why would hams want normal everyday stuff encrypted?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3149. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Prop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 12:18:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201071811.13187.00000719@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32659

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gqtdw73.pminews@news.earthlink.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 17:56:05 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>>Are you claiming that lighting technology has advanced several
>>orders of magnitude in recent years? I think not.
>
> My wife's subspecialty of power engineering is industrial lighting,
> and she avers that there have been tremendous advances in lighting
> technology and controls in the last decade or two.
>
> In the residential arena, look at high-intensity halogen-excited
> lights and the mini-compact low-consumption fluorescent bulbs which
> are replacing Thomas the Tinkerer's 100-year old filament-in-a-vacuum
> bulbs.

Halogens are an improvement on the basic incandescent, but are still the same basic idea.

Compact flourescents are much more efficient but have some characterisitics that limit their use.

The basic garden-variety incandescent is about 125 year-old technology. The originals were carbon filament. The inert gas filled tungsten filament versions

have been around for almost 100 years. Yet they are still very widely used.

Old does not been bad, despite what some would foist upon us.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3150. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 12:45:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <B5w68.5$Lc2.20134@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 32660

> My mileage varies quite a bit. Our local ARES group is very prepared and
> has performed well on each and every SET drill that I have been aware of.
> We don't do a lot of "Chit-chatting", but rather get down to business.
> (even with the apparent burden of having Old Farts aboard)

Thats great. There are some groups here in Michigan that would impress ya alot, and there are some that are like I described in the earlier post. Kent County, MI (KCEST) is one prime example (of many) of where we would like our group to migrate to.

>
>

>
> So it is your opinion that Pro-Code Hams are the only ones capable of
> bitching about how things used to be? Hardly. Give a listen to HF SSB on
> any given night. Some of what the OF's on voice (and are NOT pro-code)
have
> to say about No-Code techs would hurt your feelings.

Nope. They just seem to go hand in hand it seems at least. Not pulling everyone under that particular blanket, but an overwhelming majority seem to be. I have packed away my Shortwave reciever. Not enthused about it anymore. Time right now is a huge factor for me. If I have that much time that I can sit and listen to any radio, I should be doing something else, like work or studying for my educational pursuits.

>
> I am always amazed at the attitude of those that think that *anyone* that
> likes CW must be some kind of a knuckle dragger incapable of entering the
> 21st century. I've worked emergency communications / public service from
> day one of my entry into the ARS. I've used VHF and HF voice/CW to that
> end. We have an excellent ARES group and EOC which includes operators of
> all license classes and ability. We don't look down our noses at the
> No-code techs, and they don't refer to us as Old Fart Pro-Coders. We work
> together as a team --- Get it?
>
> Besides --- I'll bet that I have converted more Hams to add CW use to
their
> ARS toolbox than you have converted CW capable hams to exclusive VHF use.
> Care to put a friendly wager on it?
>
I havent coverted anyone. The closest thing to that was encouraging some people (prior to licensing) to consider at least pursuing the entry level technicians license, and if it interested them further, to go further which by procedure requires morse code. 2 of them did, and 1 didn't.

I guess I am so sick and tired of the bitching, whining and moaning and not seeing the lack of positivity and support within our hobby, I guess I am becoming just like what I am complaining about right here. I guess if I am gonna get "slammed" at every turn, I am gonna give it right back, instead of "taking it" like a wuss..... And some times it is just "venting".

> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3151. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 13:15:00 UTC
From: Anonymous <Half_Wit_Wiseman@CurtainsBoyWogey.com>
Message-ID: <a3e483$254$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 32662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a3e316$taf$1@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
> news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> > Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night
>
> LOL!!!!!! Only on verticals........LOL!!!!!!!!!
>
>
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a2h93c$mte$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > > >
> > > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > > >
> > > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
> intend
> > on
> > > > looking at this link,
> > > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> > "graphic"
> > > > pics.
> > > >
> > > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > > zzz
> > >
> > > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> > stamps.
>
>
>

?
```

3152. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 13:21:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201082136.19893.00000545@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32663

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>This is an excellent opportunity for
>> hams to experiment, but few seem interested.

> Looks like you have leaped onto Carll Stevenson's bandwagon, complete with
>all it's flat notes and equally flat tires.

Are you disagreeing with me that this is an opportunity to experiment or do you disagree with me that few seem interested in doing such experiments? When you criticize a sentence that has two points to it, it is helpful if you identify which of those points you disagree with.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3153. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 13:25:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32664

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Did PSK31 advance the state of the art? I think so.

Within the amateur service, I agree, although there is nothing new about PSK as a modulation method. The advance in the amateur service was in creating the varicode used to encode text, although even this is a variation on Morse code, which uses a similar variable-length encoding. I don't know for how many years it has been permissible for amateurs to use a publicized unspecified digital code, but it is nice to see it finally taking off.

How many other such advances in the state of the art can we find from the past 10 years? What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art outside of amateur radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3154. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 14:46:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201094659.23230.00001085@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 32665

NO-CODE: THE END-GAME
>
>You may know me: I'm Bruce Perens K6BP. I'm the founder of No-Code
>International. Outside of Amateur Radio, I'm probably best known as
>one of the founders of the Open Source movement in computer software,
>and an early Linux developer. You can read my bio at http://perens.com/ .
>
>When I started NCI in 1997, I never dreamed that we'd achieve our goals so
>quickly - but we are most of the way there. Last year, the International
>Amateur Radio Union, composed of national radio societies from all
>over the world, voted to ask for the removal of the international treaty
>provision requiring Morse Code testing for Radio Amateurs. Even ARRL voted
>in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio
>Regulations. There is no remaining credible opposition to NCI's cause
>on the international level. It's certain that code requirements will be
>removed during a future World Radio Conference, hopefully the one in 2003.
>
>The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
>national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight. National
>Amateur Radio societies that lobbied to preserve code testing would
>likely be opposed by their own governments and citizens. The U.S. FCC
>has already stated that their only reason for 5 WPM code testing is to
>satisfy the international treaty requirement. As its demographics change,
>the worldwide Amateur population becomes progressively less enamored of
>code requirements. Even pro-code organizations like FISTS have wisely
>concentrated on promoting the use of Morse on the air, rather than
>on the test. Thus, I don't see it as a winning strategy for any radio
>society, even ARRL, to continue to drag its feet on code testing once the
>international requirement ends. We won't fall asleep at the switch: NCI
>will persevere until the day that code requirements have been eliminated in
>every nation. But the end-game calls for a very different NCI from the one
>we've had up to now.
>
>NCI has always been an adversary, and now it's time for us to be a
>partner. Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to
>reconcile with them. If we don't do so, we could snatch defeat from the
>jaws of victory by motivating new opposition in the no-code battle. But
>I am not confident that some of the present NCI directors are ready for
>the challenge of cooperation with their old enemies. A number of them
>cling to a rabid and vindictive ARRL-phobia in a time when little more
>than watchfulness is appropriate. Thus, I am calling for the formation
>of a slate of candidates to bring NCI into the future, as a partner in
>the rehabilitation of Amateur Radio.
>

>The CW requirements battle, carried on since the 1950's, has been a
>crippling one for Amateur Radio. In a time when we should have been
>moving the Amateur Service into the future, many of us dug our heels in
>to the past, diverting our collective energy from the healthy growth of
>our service and the defense of our radio spectrum allocation. We Radio
>Amateurs, through our own short-sightedness, took a vital Service and
>transformed it into technology's endangered species. But the Amateur
>Radio Service remains critically important as an educational tool. Amateur
>Radio is still the only practical means of maintaining a worldwide corps
>sufficient to improvise effective communications in any emergency, no
>matter how large. The social benefits of the Amateur Service, and the
>many good attributes of the Amateur Radio hobby, must be preserved. All
>Amateurs must unite to achieve that goal.
>
>For NCI to take its appropriate role in the end-game of the no-code battle
>means cooperation with national societies like ARRL, and with IARU
>on the international front. Although I was bitterly opposed to ARRL's
>long-standing policy in favor of high-speed code testing, my goal has
>always been to get them to change their minds, not to defeat them.
>I've maintained my ARRL membership during the entire existence of
>NCI, and was lucky enough to be able to donate $1000 to ARRL's frequency
>defense fund last year. Every U.S. Amateur should donate whatever they can to
>that fund - go to https://www.arrl.org/forms/fdefense/fdefense.html to do so,
>or read about the fund at http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/01/14/2?nc=1
>
>It's time to re-build NCI's leadership. Any person who was an NCI
>member on December 31, 2001 can be a candidate for director, and can
>vote in the election to be held no later than April 30. NCI directors
>can volunteer to attend government and radio society meetings on behalf
>of the organization, but most of them do little more than discuss the
>organization's policy and vote their directions via email. Thus, the
>load of being an NCI director is a manageable one for a busy person. We
>need new blood, and we need to question our existing leadership about
>how they will bring our organization into the future, if they are to
>continue in their positions at all.
>
>Please write to me and tell me how you feel about this, especially if
>you are willing to serve as a candidate.
>
> Many Thanks
>
> Bruce Perens K6BP
> Incumbent NCI Director
>

What a Bunch of BS. NCI was 1 of the reasons this service has fallin into the
mess its in, and now they want to be Buddies.
Bite me NCI, and take this Crap where it belongs, put this crap in rec.cb
where it belongs.

3155. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 15:03:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3eaj602qr@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32666

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5B7A76.68B03C31@worldnet.att.net...
> > When computers moved from command line to GUI operating systems, it was
to
> > make things easier for someone to operate, and no one thought of it as
> > dumbing down. When automobiles went from clutch to automatic, it was
also to
> > makes things easier to operate, yet still, no one thought of it as being
> > dumbed down. Yet, when ham radio tries to move forward, the opposite is
the
> > norm.
>
> Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when
they
> are simply easier?

If you think being stuck in the past is easier, feel free to stay there.
Just don't expect the rest of the world to stay there with you.

3156. Re: TROJAN ALERT! (JS/Loop)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 15:27:05 UTC
From: NinWanDon <nw300sales@aol.com>
Message-ID: <dty68.13332$By6.1483222@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

"tm" <tmoero@yahoo.invalid> wrote in message
news:tmoero-5ACB3B.16344431012002@newsflood.tokyo.att.ne.jp...
> In article <a39e2k$2tm@dispatch.concentric.net>,
> "Bob Johnson" <bobj@cris.com> wrote:
>
> > Symantec's web site shows no information for JS/Loop or JS/Loop trojan
>
> http://hq.mcafeeasap.com/dispTrojan.asp?virus_k=99220

CONFIRMED!
DO NOT GO THERE!

3157. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 16:09:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202010809.2df90a0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32668

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 31, 2002:

Novice - 40,009 (decrease of 9,320)
Tech - 235,351 (increase of 29,957)
Tech Plus - 84,180 (decrease of 44,680)
General - 138,784 (increase of 26,107)
Advanced - 86,422 (decrease of 13,360)
Extra - 98,382 (increase of 19,592)
Total - 683,128 (increase of 8,336)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3158. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 16:17:10 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <3c5abee7$0$2375$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 32669

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
news:20020201063458.11117.00000496@mb-dd.aol.com:

> From: bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens)
>
>>Even ARRL voted
>>in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio
>>Regulations.
>
> A minor clarification; ARRL voted not to oppose removing code
> requirements from the international radio regulations.
>

Same difference, the low-life scum.

kb7adl

3159. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 16:27:21 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net>
Message-ID: <Ilz68.10834$rV.44229@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 32670
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Roger,

Send me a reply...I have lost your email address.

73

Frank K3EKO

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a3e316taf1@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
> news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> > Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night
>
> LOL!!!!!! Only on verticals........LOL!!!!!!!!!
>
>
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a2h93cmte0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > > >
> > > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > > >
> > > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
> intend
> > on
> > > looking at this link,
> > > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> > "graphic"
> > > pics.
> > > >
> > > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > > zzz
> > >
> > > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> > stamps.
>
>

>

3160. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 16:38:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3eftg$8gq$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32671

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:

> This is an excellent opportunity for
> hams to experiment, but few seem interested.

Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I can't even read the stuff, Ed. Do you honestly think a lack of interest is the primary factor hindering DSP innovation in amateur radio?

3161. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 17:33:44 UTC
From: bruce@perens.com
Message-ID: <59348b59.0202010933.4540748d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32672

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020201063458.11117.00000496@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> A minor clarification; ARRL voted not to oppose removing code requirements
> from the international radio regulations.

Thanks for the nuance. As an organization attempting to transition its
own membership, I understand the reasons for ARRL's careful stance on
Morse requirements, especially why they aren't saying much about what
they will do after the international regulations change - it would
only inflame the membership without doing any other good.

> I do not know all of the NCI Board family, Bruce, but most of the ones I have
> spoken with here have, as a result of a sometimes-arduous dialogue, developed a
> balanced view, not a rabid and vindictive view, of ARRL and its policies (and
> potential policies).

I think you are mostly dealing with Carl, who has tempered himself
well after starting out some years before as a more inflamatory sort.

Behind closed doors, what I hear from at least two of the other folks
is really rather nasty, and should not continue. So, it's election
time.

Thanks

Bruce

3162. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 18:36:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201133644.16072.00000804@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32674

In article <59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>, bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens) writes:

>When I started NCI in 1997, I never dreamed that we'd achieve our goals so
>quickly - but we are most of the way there.

Most of the road had already been traveled. We've had code waivers since 1990 and
a ham license without a code test since 1991. FCC had been trying to push a nocodetest
ham license since 1975.

>Last year, the International
>Amateur Radio Union, composed of national radio societies from all
>over the world, voted to ask for the removal of the international treaty
>provision requiring Morse Code testing for Radio Amateurs.

That's no surprise.

> Even ARRL voted
>in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio
>Regulations.

No, they voted to not oppose it. Basically they washed their hands of the deal.

> There is no remaining credible opposition to NCI's cause
>on the international level. It's certain that code requirements will be
>removed during a future World Radio Conference, hopefully the one in 2003.
>
>The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
>national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight.

Why must it be a "fight", Bruce? Why use the words of violence? If it's
the "end game", why talk as if you want to kill off those who disagree with
you?

> National
>Amateur Radio societies that lobbied to preserve code testing would
>likely be opposed by their own governments and citizens.

Not really. The national societies have been moving away from support for
code tests for years.

>The U.S. FCC
>has already stated that their only reason for 5 WPM code testing is to
>satisfy the international treaty requirement.

They said essentially the same thing a decade ago.

>As its demographics change,
>the worldwide Amateur population becomes progressively less enamored of
>code requirements.

You mean as in TESTS?

>Even pro-code organizations like FISTS have wisely
>concentrated on promoting the use of Morse on the air, rather than
>on the test.

FISTS has ALWAYS been a group that promoted the USE and avoided any
stance on the TEST.

>Thus, I don't see it as a winning strategy for any radio
>society, even ARRL, to continue to drag its feet on code testing once the
>international requirement ends.

Even if that's what the membership wants? That's why the ARRL has kept its
stance for so long. Directors who ran on anti-code-test planks LOST.

The latest policy change came about because the ARRL BoD realized that
there was no point in supporting S25.5 when the other national societies were
against it.

>We won't fall asleep at the switch: NCI
>will persevere until the day that code requirements have been eliminated in
>every nation.

And then what? Will NCI simply disappear?

>But the end-game calls for a very different NCI from the one
>we've had up to now.
>
>NCI has always been an adversary, and now it's time for us to be a
>partner. Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to
>reconcile with them. If we don't do so, we could snatch defeat from the
>jaws of victory by motivating new opposition in the no-code battle.

Again, the words of violence. It's not a war, Bruce.

>But
>I am not confident that some of the present NCI directors are ready for
>the challenge of cooperation with their old enemies. A number of them
>cling to a rabid and vindictive ARRL-phobia in a time when little more
>than watchfulness is appropriate.

It was never justified in the first place.

>Thus, I am calling for the formation
>of a slate of candidates to bring NCI into the future, as a partner in
>the rehabilitation of Amateur Radio.
>
>The CW requirements battle, carried on since the 1950's, has been a
>crippling one for Amateur Radio.

How, exactly? Give us some PROOF, for once.

> In a time when we should have been
>moving the Amateur Service into the future, many of us dug our heels in
>to the past, diverting our collective energy from the healthy growth of
>our service and the defense of our radio spectrum allocation. We Radio
>Amateurs, through our own short-sightedness, took a vital Service and
>transformed it into technology's endangered species.

How, exactly?

The USA has had a nocodetest license since 1991. Eleven years. Has there
been a technologica revolution in the ARS because of it? Nope. Has there
been more growth than in the 1980s? Nope.

> But the Amateur
>Radio Service remains critically important as an educational tool. Amateur
>Radio is still the only practical means of maintaining a worldwide corps
>sufficient to improvise effective communications in any emergency, no
>matter how large. The social benefits of the Amateur Service, and the
>many good attributes of the Amateur Radio hobby, must be preserved. All
>Amateurs must unite to achieve that goal.

At last, something I can agree with.

--

It's pretty clear that FCC will drop Element ! like a hot potato as soon as
S25.5 permits.
They won't even need a petition or proposal because their statements in the R&O
for
98-143 make it clear that they want code testing to end. FCC would have
eliminated
all code testing in April of 2000 (if not before) except for S25.5.

So what is NCI's and Bruce Perens' vision of US amateur licensing after Element
1
is removed or waived? Will NCI even be needed after all code testing is gone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3163. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 18:36:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201133645.16072.00000805@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32673

In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Did PSK31 advance the state of the art? I think so.
>
>Within the amateur service, I agree, although there is nothing new about PSK
>as
>a modulation method.
>The advance in the amateur service was in creating the
>varicode used to encode text, although even this is a variation on Morse
>code,
>which uses a similar variable-length encoding.

gee whiz, what does a ham have to do to get some credit for doing a good thing? Seems like you want to minimize the contribution of PSK31.

Heck, Hedy Lamarr coinvented spread spectrum more than 50 years ago. It's OLD. Does it have dinosaur $%^& all over it yet?

>I don't know for how many
>years
>it has been permissible for amateurs to use a publicized unspecified digital
>code, but it is nice to see it finally taking off.

How far back do you think PSK31 goes? I heard about its development years
before
it hit QST.
>
>How many other such advances in the state of the art can we find from the
>past
>10 years?

All depends what you count as an advance.

> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
>outside of amateur radio?
>
Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance must have applicability outside amateur radio?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3164. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 18:46:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3ene5cej1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32675

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> How many other such advances in the state of the art can we find from the past
> 10 years? What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
> outside of amateur radio?

Raising the bar there a bit, aren't you Ed? Not only are amateurs expected to advance the state of the art in amateur radio, but also outside of amateur radio.
Well, in fact amateurs probably do advance the state of the art outside of amateur radio. We all work for a living, don't we? Some of us work in technical fields and develop non-radio related technology.

Just out of curiosity, what do you hope will be accomplished by engaging in this type of rhetoric? It's already a not-for-profit passtime. Are you trying to make it thankless as well?

3165. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 18:48:23 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a3eq3gaje0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 32677
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Frank Todd" <k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net> wrote in message
news:Ilz68.10834$rV.44229@rwcrnsc53...
> Roger,
>
> Send me a reply...I have lost your email address.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO

Ok, man!

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a3e316$taf$1@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
> > news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> > > Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night
> >
> > LOL!!!!!! Only on verticals........LOL!!!!!!!!!
> >
> >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:a2h93c$mte$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > > > >
> > > > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > > > >
> > > > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
> > intend
> > > > on
> > > > looking at this link,
> > > > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> > > "graphic"
> > > > pics.
> > > > >
> > > > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > > > zzz
```

> > > >
> > > > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > > > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> > > stamps.
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3166. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 19:14:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3ep2t$d7v$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32676

Bruce Perens <bruce@perens.com> wrote in message

> Behind closed doors, what I hear from at least two of the other folks
> is really rather nasty, and should not continue. So, it's election
> time.

I bet that guy from CQ isn't a big fan of the ARRL. Is the other guy named
Larry?

3167. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 19:40:28 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202011140.7f31f7ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32678

bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens) wrote in message
news:<59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>...

> When I started NCI in 1997, I never dreamed that we'd achieve our goals so
> quickly - but we are most of the way there.

Hello Bruce,

Speaking as a relative newbie and coming into amateur radio with a
pretty unbiased stance re. code vs. no-code, I'm not sure if the words
"achieve" and "goals" quite fit wrt what NCI has done. I was fortunate
enough to have had several "long distance" Elmers who conveyed the
meaning of setting a goal and enjoying the feeling of accomplishment
as a result of achieving that goal. I know some might argue that the
code itself is not the issue, but rather the requirement of having to
demonstrate a level of proficiency for HF access that's at hand. I
submit that if that were truly the case, there'd be no issue. I for
one never felt as if there was a threat to the mode of CW and
certainly never fely any resentment for having to "earn" HF
privileges. On the contrary, I feel a sense of "accomplishment" for
not only the physical/mental excercise of learning Morse, but also for
the sense of "achievement" that "came along for the ride." Like I
said, if you look at it from a relatively unbiased position with a set
of "fresh" eyes, I think what NCI stands for is anything but
"achievement."

> Last year, the International
> Amateur Radio Union, composed of national radio societies from all
> over the world, voted to ask for the removal of the international treaty
> provision requiring Morse Code testing for Radio Amateurs. Even ARRL voted
> in favor of removing code requirements from the (international) Radio
> Regulations.

This is not entirely accurate. "No comment" does NOT equal an
endorsement.

> There is no remaining credible opposition to NCI's cause
> on the international level. It's certain that code requirements will be
> removed during a future World Radio Conference, hopefully the one in 2003.

It's too bad that an internet based (With mail-in ballots too.) vote
encompassing all US licensed amateurs re. this is not fiscally viable.
(Yes, I made inquiries to the league.) I'd venture that your statement
above would prove inaccurate.

> NCI has always been an adversary

Is this not a telling statement, in and of itself.

> Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to
> reconcile with them.

It's sad that you appear to be referring to the majority of amateur radio operators as your "opposition." If the FCC stated that the reason they require code testing is because of the ITU requirement, who does that leave..."we the people?"

> If we don't do so, we could snatch defeat from the
> jaws of victory by motivating new opposition in the no-code battle.

It's very fitting that you take responsibilty for "igniting new opposition to the no-code battle." "Motivating?"...no, I don't think so. Elmers motivate. To fight such an arduous "battle" to remove a perceived "barrier" in such a underwhelming "rite of passage" smacks of underachievement.

> Please write to me and tell me how you feel about this, especially if
> you are willing to serve as a candidate.

Well, please consider this as written notice of one newbie's feelings. Yes, I'm willing to serve as a candidate...on any organization that will fight to preserve amateur radio's rich tradition. In my opinion, NCI's "goal" was already satisfied at it's inception. There is a no-code ticket. Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3168. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:09:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5AF5DC.D7584201@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32679

N2EY wrote:
> How far back do you think PSK31 goes? I heard about its development years
> before it hit QST.

It was originally ported to a DSP eval board, if I remember correctly.
It's popularity snowballed when it was ported to the PC platform.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3169. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:13:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5AF6FD.40F48F4A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32680

Bert Craig wrote:
> Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local
> country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the
> resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.

I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses. I don't
see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
in Part 97.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3170. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:20:06 UTC
From: 2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net
Message-ID: <3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
wrote:

>Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
>more political power.
>
>I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
>just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
>can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
>they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
>hams!
>My $.02
>Merry Christmas to all
>KA3DWW

Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.

Stacey, AA7YA

3171. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:34:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3eu0b01u2k@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32684

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a3ep2t$d7v$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Bruce Perens <bruce@perens.com> wrote in message
>
> > Behind closed doors, what I hear from at least two of the other folks
> > is really rather nasty, and should not continue. So, it's election
> > time.
>
> I bet that guy from CQ isn't a big fan of the ARRL. Is the other guy
named
> Larry?

I thought you were talking about Wayne - the guy from 73 magazine.

3172. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:42:09 UTC
From: Gary - KJ6Q <davison7@gte.net>
Message-ID: <B4D68.1084$lv1.707618@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 32682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

That's pretty contrary to what *I* hear up on the 10 meter band - it's just more of the same lousy
language and operating going on down on the REAL CB band - and *I personally* don't think we want OR
need them as hams... MORE isn't always "better"...

--
Gary - KJ6Q
****
Two things we'll never see:
1. Perpetual motion...
2. A liberal Democrat complaining
about "Too much government"
"S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message
news:3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
> >more political power.
> >
> >I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> >just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> >can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> >they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> >hams!
> >My $.02
> >Merry Christmas to all
> >KA3DWW
>
> Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
>

3173. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 20:51:38 UTC
From: George <tronic@boxfrog.com>
Message-ID: <a3ev4ppfa1@helle.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Is it the 11mtr band you mean, around the 27.555MHz usb.
these people have been using these frequencies for years, and no-one is going to stop them. most r-hams including myself started of on 27.555, this led to many of us becoming a r-ham.
have you got nothing better to do.

--
The Sorcerer
remove Spam for reply

"S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message news:3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
> >more political power.
> >
> >I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> >just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> >can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> >they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> >hams!
> >My $.02
> >Merry Christmas to all
> >KA3DWW
>
> Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.314 / Virus Database: 175 - Release Date: 11/01/02

3174. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 21:00:40 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <YID68.5463$I5.390638@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32685

Ed, my own personal concern is that there are way too many folk being exposed to the idea that hams can modify equipment and use it legally anywhere (other than the ham bands). There have been a lot of flames in rec.radio.cb, but to the unitinitiated it appears that a whole lot of modification is either legal or will 'enhance' the operation of their equipment. Increasing the deviation in an FM transmitter does, of course, something other than make it 'loud'. It has been mentioned in posts on other boards that you 'can't overmodulate an amp on SSB'. Of course, overdriving an amp has its' own problems. Thanks for pointing out that there was in important point to the post. It certainly, in my opinion, was not meant to flame anyone.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020201064243.11117.00000499@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Kuay Lin" KL@junoperelec.org
>
> >> Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.
>
> > And your point is?
>
> It was an important point, Kuay. Phil wanted to make sure that those that
> modified equipment for use in the amateur bands knew that in doing so,
they
> could no longer use the equipment in its original use.
>
> I can modify a CB radio to transmit on 10 meters, but I can then no longer
use
> it to transmit on CB. I can modify a car for off road use, but some of
those
> modifications are such that it is no longer legal to use it on the road.
>
> Why did you ask him what his point is? The point of his post was really
pretty
> clear.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

3175. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 21:20:26 UTC
From: 2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net
Message-ID: <3c5b0619.19767484@isp-west.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32686
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Fri, 1 Feb 2002 20:51:38 +0000 (UTC), "George" <tronic@boxfrog.com>
wrote:

>Is it the 11mtr band you mean, around the 27.555MHz usb.
>these people have been using these frequencies for years, and no-one is
>going to stop them. most r-hams including myself started of on 27.555, this
>led to many of us becoming a r-ham.
>have you got nothing better to do.
>
>

Actually, I was referring to the 10, 15, 20, 40 and 80 meter bands.
Give your radio a listen sometime.

AA7YA

3176. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 21:32:36 UTC
From: 2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net
Message-ID: <3c5b0707.20005495@isp-west.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 20:42:09 GMT, "Gary - KJ6Q" <davison7@gte.net>
wrote:

>That's pretty contrary to what *I* hear up on the 10 meter band - it's just more of the
same lousy
>language and operating going on down on the REAL CB band - and *I personally* don't think
we want OR
>need them as hams... MORE isn't always "better"...
>

Agreed. 10 years ago when I became a ham, 10 meters wasn't as
cluttered with lids who don't know the meaning of "operating split"
when it comes to chasing DX. As an ARRL member, I think it was a
shame the ARRL took the stance on the license restructuring. I've
seen posts on the DX Packetclusters from foreign stations saying "Boy
I bet the ARRL really must be proud of themselves". 10 meters used to
be a really fun band to be on, it still can be, but with lids who
don't know simple procedures and operating practices, radio
manufacturers might as well toss the license paperwork in the box
along with the rig. All in all, the ARRL is a good organization, but
any organization will make mistakes, big or small.

AA7YA

3177. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 21:44:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3f1ss$i41$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32688

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5AF6FD.40F48F4A@IEEE.org...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local
> > country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the
> > resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.

> I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses.

We know you were forced, so you must not have gone the distance.
(W = f * d) :-)

> I don't
> see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
> in Part 97.

Yeah. But then again, it doesn't say anything about force either. ;-)

3178. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 22:35:10 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.01.17.35.10.148793.12485@arrl.org>
Source record: 32689

On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 08:25:54 -0500, W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Did PSK31 advance the state of the art? I think so.
>
> Within the amateur service, I agree, although there is nothing new about
> PSK as a modulation method. The advance in the amateur service was in
> creating the varicode used to encode text, although even this is a
> variation on Morse code, which uses a similar variable-length encoding.
> I don't know for how many years it has been permissible for amateurs to
> use a publicized unspecified digital code, but it is nice to see it
> finally taking off.

I don't think advancing the state of the art necessarily equates to developing new fundamental principles. "State of the art" refers to the technology that's in actual use, not the bleeding edge. The way amateurs have historically contributed to the state of the art is at the application end, devising techniques and designs to better use the existing technology. PSK31 is a good example of that.

> How many other such advances in the state of the art can we find from
> the past 10 years? What is their applicability to advancing the state
> of the art outside of amateur radio?

If you're looking for wholesale transfer of amateur technology to the commercial field, you can find a bit. E.g., http://www.marinenet.net/Radio%20Modems.htm

But most of the crossovers between Amateur Radio and the commercial world are probablty from individual hams who are also employed in the industry. For example, suppose a ham who devised a clever means to reduce the power consumption of his homebrew QRP transceiver reused the technique in his work. You would never know it happened, much less be able to document it. That doesn't mean such things don't happen, though. And I'd say that has always been the principal way hams have contributed to the state of the art.

Jon

3179. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 22:40:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>
Source record: 32690

On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI) writes:
>
>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
>>outside of amateur radio?
>>
> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance must
> have applicability outside amateur radio?

When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you really think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its application within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term "radio art"? Why didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of his own art"?

Jon

3180. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 22:42:04 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.01.17.42.03.916764.12485@arrl.org>
Source record: 32691

On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:44 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> In article <59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>,
> bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens) writes:
>
>>The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
>>national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight.
>
> Why must it be a "fight", Bruce? Why use the words of violence? If it's
> the "end game", why talk as if you want to kill off those who disagree
> with you?

It's a metaphor, Jim. Geez!

Jon

3181. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 22:44:18 UTC
From: n7ws@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c5b17ba.77753079@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 32692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 1 Feb 2002 20:51:38 +0000 (UTC), "George" <tronic@boxfrog.com> wrote:

|Is it the 11mtr band you mean, around the 27.555MHz usb.
|these people have been using these frequencies for years, and no-one is
|going to stop them. most r-hams including myself started of on 27.555, this
|led to many of us becoming a r-ham.
|have you got nothing better to do.
|

I'm not sure if "r-ham" means "licensed radio amateur" but if it does, no, most hams DID NOT start on 27.555. A few old-timers maybe.... that used to be a ham band.

3182. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:01:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201180119.26577.00000004@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32693

From: "JAMES HAMPTON" j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net

> Thanks for pointing out that
>there was in important point to the post.

And thanks to you for adding that not every modification made to radio equipment will necessarily be legal or good operating practice if used within the Amateur Radio Service. Hams are permitted to do such mods because they have demonstrated some competence about the effect of those mods and the applicable rules within the service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3183. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:21:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201182124.26577.00000009@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32694

From: bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens)

>As an organization attempting to transition its
>own membership, I understand the reasons for ARRL's careful stance on
>Morse requirements, especially why they aren't saying much about what
>they will do after the international regulations change - it would
>only inflame the membership without doing any other good.

I am not at all sure this is accurate, Bruce. They are not saying what they will do after the international regulations change because they have not reached a decision about what they intend to do. I think that for ARRL, any such decision would be premature. The ARRL Board has not made any decision to "transition" its membership. .

Let's assume that WRC-2003 makes a change to the international requirement. It will not be an official change until the treaty is ratified. How much time will that take? From there, although NCI will almost certainly be among the first to petition the FCC for a rules change, it is likely that this will be a longer than usual process. This could all be at least 3 or more years away. Do you think that the overall membership of ARRL right now till be the same as it will be 3 years from now? Do you think the views of those members will be the same as they are today? I do not. Also, in that time frame, there could well be changes in the membership of the ARRL Board of Directors. I think that an ARRL Board that made a decision now that would appear to be binding to a future Board will not be making an appropriate choice.

I gave this a bit of thought on my drive home today. If you were serious about an NCI/opponent compromise, what could that compromise be? I am just curious? I am having trouble envisioning what sort of code testing NCI could support to reach a compromise with those that feel code testing should remain an important part of testing.

When it comes to ARRL, I believe that your statement that NCI seeks to persuade ARRL and others groups to have a position in line with NCI goals is the best course of organization an organization could take in this area. (This includes those organizations, or indidividuals, whose views are to keep code testing.) Some of the things I have seen some of NCI's leadership say, IMHO, very much get in the way of that goal.

At this point, I do not see that the ARRL Board has made any decision, other than its decision not to expend ARRL resources trying to oppose any reduction or elimination of code testing at the international level. If this gives them more resources to try to deal with the 40 meter issues, I am all for it. If there was a strong feeling among the ARRL Board members that now was the time to reach a decision, they would have hammered one out. If there was a strong feeling on the Board that everyone is certain what ARRL should do at this time,

they would have done it. Clearly, the Board wants to see just what changes are on the plate before it decides what to do and equally clearly, IMHO, they want to learn more about what ARRL members want and how, or if, those wants will be different when the decision needs to be made than they might be right now.

>Behind closed doors, what I hear from at least two of the other folks
>is really rather nasty, and should not continue. So, it's election
>time.

What is said behind closed doors is probably a valuable function of any Board. What counts, IMHO, is what is said in front of those doors. From my conversations here, some of the NCI Board see appear to see ARRL as the sworn enemy, others see ARRL in a more balanced light. I personally lean toward the latter.

Speaking of personally, when I offer my speculation about the ARRL Board, I am not speaking with any inside knowledge about what they intend to do, other than my knowing some of the Board on a personal level and knowing the standing interest the Board has in hearing from its members. Just to put that into perspective.

Good luck in your election.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3184. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:25:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201182509.26577.00000010@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32695

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>I bet that guy from CQ isn't a big fan of the ARRL. Is the other guy named
>Larry?

ARRL has a very friendly relationship with CQ magazine. Rich Moseson served as an ARRL Section Manager while he was a CQ employee. He has also served on a few ARRL committees, making positive contributions to the work he is involved in.

CQ is a magazine; ARRL is a membership services organization. I do not see any conflict. If someone on CQ staff contacted me for technical help on an article, or one of their authors did, I would gladly extend them help. In fact, I have done so, with W5YI when he wrote some of the CQ material on RF safety a few years ago, just to wrap it all together. Fred, too, is an ARRL member and I will offer him technical help to the work he does for Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3185. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:30:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201183058.26577.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32696

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>The CW requirements battle, carried on since the 1950's, has been a
>>crippling one for Amateur Radio.

>How, exactly? Give us some PROOF, for once.

In one form or another, we have had code testing since day 1 in Amateur Radio. Hey, wasn't the first code test at 5 wpm? :-) Over all of these years Amateur Radio has supposedly been crippled, it has grown and flourished. The only "leading indicator" is that the growth picked up with the no-code tests and appears to be picking up with the 5 wpm change.

In my personal opinion, though I have one on code testing, it is not that big of a deal one way or the other. It is a major leap to go from a belief that it is time to replace Morse testing with something else to it is "crippling Amateur Radio."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3186. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:34:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020201183431.26577.00000012@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 32697

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>> I don't
>> see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
>> in Part 97.

>Yeah. But then again, it doesn't say anything about force either. ;-)

It is all a question of accomplishments and the ham who had to work real hard to meet the requirements is not given more priveleges than the ham who easily met those same requirements.

Amateur Radio exists to meet the needs of the public interest and our regulators will determine what rules facilitate it meeting those needs. If they feel that the public interest requires an Amateur Radio Service with Morse code skills, they will continue to test them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3187. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:37:32 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020201183732.13177.00000558@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32698

>That's pretty contrary to what *I* hear up on the 10 meter band - it's just
>more of the same lousy
>language and operating going on down on the REAL CB band

Hi Gary,

Your statement is quite accurate. What you'll find on the so called "freeband" is very different than the truckers who buy cheap "export" 10/11-meter rigs at the local truckstop. Yeah, there IS an 11-meter "hobby" band but the serious folks are indeed migrating to amateur radio. You'll very rarely, if ever, find these folks bootlegging on 10-meters. The trucker, however, has no problem with parking on that "clear channel" he found on ch. 19 "two-up." I'm certainly not defending either, both are operating illegally. I'm merely pointing out the difference...and yes, one adapts quite well to ham radio while the other has no interest in hobby radio.

>*I personally* don't think we want OR
>need them as hams... MORE isn't always "better"...

Quite true. Take it easy. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3188. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:41:27 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020201184127.13177.00000559@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32699

>
>I'm not sure if "r-ham" means "licensed radio amateur"

Perhaps the 'r' stands for "recreational," (& licensed) I dunno?

>but if it does, no, most
>hams DID NOT start on 27.555. A few old-timers maybe.... that used to be a
>ham
>band.

Certainly NOT most, but more than "a few."

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3189. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-01 23:43:54 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020201184354.13177.00000560@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32700

>> Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local
>> country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the
>> resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.
>
>I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses. I don't
>see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
>in Part 97.

In the sense that it requires some discipline and effort,sure it can be termed
"work." Pleasant work for some, but work nonetheless. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3190. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:32:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B3394.1841FE7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32701

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The man is a blowhard, pure and simple.

Dick, do you have any idea how dumbed down you appear when instead of mounting a rational argument, you resort to ad hominem attacks? With friends like you, the ARS doesn't need any enemies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3191. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:36:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B3490.D886671C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32702

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:
>
> > This is an excellent opportunity for
> > hams to experiment, but few seem interested.
>
> Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
> books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I can't
> even read the stuff, Ed.

Try reverse engineering. If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio frequency.
As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light dawned.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3192. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:40:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B3576.7645D559@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32704

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when they
> are simply easier?

The answer lies in a question. What do the Amish, the Taliban, and
the PCTA have in common? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3193. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:41:15 UTC
From: Stahr <w6nyc@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <LAG68.100$Hb6.14339@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32703
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Do we really have to go through all this CRAP again????????

Can't there be at least a month between these stupid posts?

Dennis

"S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message
news:3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
> >more political power.
> >
> >I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> >just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> >can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> >they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> >hams!
> >My $.02
> >Merry Christmas to all
> >KA3DWW
>
> Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
>
>

3194. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:47:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B3738.DCD81B66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32705

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses.
>
> We know you were forced, ...

Nope, I am one of the fortunate few who wasn't forced. I already
knew Morse code before I learned about amateur radio. I learned
Morse code in Cub Scouts and hardly practiced at all for the
Novice code exam.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3195. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 00:49:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B37AB.6E372CD9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32706

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local
> >> country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the
> >> resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.
> > >
> > >I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses. I don't
> > >see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
> > >in Part 97.
> >
> > In the sense that it requires some discipline and effort,sure it can be termed
> > "work." Pleasant work for some, but work nonetheless. :-)

Not for me. I learned Morse code in the Cub Scouts long before I ever
heard of amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3196. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 01:27:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5b452f_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32707

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0201311719.1c9a3558@posting.google.com...
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:<3C59882F.FFE6C81B@uci.edu>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > I hate to be the one to tell you this, but, compared to the
primary
> > > markets, the amateur community would fall several notches BELOW
> > > trivial ... and that's assuming that a very high percentage of
hams
> > > would
> > > actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly
sad to
> > > say is
> > > something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.
> >
> > Right. Due largely to the fact that WE AREN'T CONDUCTING BUSINESS
on
> > the ham bands. We're not selling something, promoting something,
> > connecting to an enormous database, or user base for that matter.
It's
> > not what amateur radio is about, and to compare it with the
business
> > world is myopically, over-simplistically ignorant.
> >
> >
> Yahoo, somebody had to get it right and cut to the quick around
here.
> >
> >
> w3rv

I guess you guys might be related? You don't seem to grasp
the idea that you don't HAVE to be conducting business on
the ham bands to find high speed data useful ... higher speeds
also allow more people to share a channel in a way that's
rather transparent to each other by sending the data they have
to send quickly, then allowing the channel to be used by others.

There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either don't
recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is
```

irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFtAaJe+N6+q84HiEQIrOACghHwKOJ5vb7/DBCcldc1be+F5F08AoIA8
n5AhcXHdDikM3xgMfGy59XDv
=k3Pq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3197. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 01:46:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5b49ae_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32710

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202010318540.15146-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Fri, 1 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0201302147580.13001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On 30 Jan 2002, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> >> >...
> >> >The only difference between 802.11 DSSS and 802.11b is a speed
> >difference;
> >>
> >> From what I have learned in this thread, that is wrong. It is my
> >understanding
> >> that the 802.11 version of the standard still occupied the ENTIRE
band,
> >while
> >> the 802.11b version only takes a [programmable] slice. Are you
> >contradicting
> >> the other responses on this issue?
> >
> >The only thing that he's contradicting is your lack of
understanding.
>
> Which means that you claimed experts did not explain it clearly. I
noted
> carefully that when you guys referred only to the 20Mhz channel
spacing, you
> also referred only to the .11b spec, but clearly also avoided the
original .11
> spec.

I guess that's because nobody builds product that just does
the original .11 spec any more because the market's moved
to .11b because of the large increase in data rate, and you
couldn't sell a product that *just* did the original .11 modulation
any more ...

[snip for brevity]

> To Carl: As both a manufacturer and an amateur, shouldn't you be
pushing the
```

> information that it is suitable more so than you have in this
discussion (like
> on your company's products)?

I have tried to offer information to correct your missunderstanding
of the capabilities of 802.11b products. However, I don't view this
forum as an advertising medium for the company I work for and I
don't want to be accused of commercialism, as I have seen some
be attacked for that in the past.

> This all started as: You said it could go there; I heard it
couldn't. You
> showed why? I now accept your explanation, although incoherent. I
note that
> someone else recently indicated that they heard it can't. This
tells me that
> you have to do more to get the word out.

"It" can ... honest. However, you seem to think that my employer
has "an obligation" to include information on its' packaging that
will inform the most un/ill-informed amateur that he/she could
potentially use the product in amateur radio ... as I've pointed
out (and Ed has also stated), there isn't enough space on the box
for such "extraneous" information and the potential market to
amateurs is so small that it's not worth pursuing (for any large-scale
manufacturer, not just the one I work for ...)
>
> >Have you sought out a tutorial book on SS as I suggested?
> >(Or do you just want to bitch and troll for responses on how
> >"packaging is inadequate" ???)
>
> I don't need a tutorial. However, when I learned about SS, only the
frequency
> hopping kind had been in use - direct sequence hadn't entered the
picture yet.
> However, I don't really care how it does it at this point.

FHSS and DSSS have both been around for many years in both
professional and amateur literature ... your argument doesn't seem
to hold water ... with all respect, I still think you could benefit
from
a tutorial.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPFtE2Je+N6+q84HiEQJ/bwCgzKD3ccQ+bYK+IUNo3rLshHlEWmsAoPXl
OC+yH0nKGh/AqW7KLK8lAguy
=tumQ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3198. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 01:50:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3fgro$2mv$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32708

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5B768C.301C3A0D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> that's assuming that a very high percentage of hams
>
> > would
> > actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly sad to
> > say is
> > something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.
>
> So Mr Superior, go ahead and enumerate those benefits. Keep in
> mind that ham radio is a totally voluntary avocation in which all
> participants engage in pursuits of interest to them personally, with
> no renumeration and entirely at their own expense.

Actually, not "all" hams have it "entirely at their own expense". Many
emergency preparedness groups (RACES, etc.) have equipment
that is bought for the hams' use.

Just a minor point.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3199. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 01:58:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3fhh6$sh4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32709

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:YlD68.5463$I5.390638@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Ed, my own personal concern is that there are way too many folk being
> exposed to the idea that hams can modify equipment and use it legally
> anywhere (other than the ham bands).

Where is that "exposed to" happening?

> There have been a lot of flames in
> rec.radio.cb, but to the unitinitiated it appears that a whole lot of
> modification is either legal or will 'enhance' the operation of their
> equipment. Increasing the deviation in an FM transmitter does, of course,
> something other than make it 'loud'. It has been mentioned in posts on
> other boards that you 'can't overmodulate an amp on SSB'. Of course,
> overdriving an amp has its' own problems. Thanks for pointing out that
> there was in important point to the post. It certainly, in my opinion,
was
> not meant to flame anyone.

Is the rec.radio.cb the only place such misguided information that mods are
legal for non-ham services is being stated?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3200. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 02:06:08 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <LOH68.21701$E4.1122124@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32711

"CAM" Wrote ...
>
> The answer lies in a question. What do the Amish, the Taliban, and
> the PCTA have in common? :-)

Not funny in the least ... I expect better of you, Cecil. The smiley didn't save you on this one.

Arnie -

3201. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 02:15:13 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <RYH68.5752$zT.430537@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32712

> KC8PMX wrote:

> > > > > >Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF privileges.

> > Maybe we have a slight wording issue here Cecil..... I guess I was
referring
> > to 6 Meter and up -->meaning up in numerical frequency<----. I.e.
50Mhz-
> > Ghz range, not the other way around.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> UHF stops at 3GHz. To correct your statement would be:
> "Last I checked, techs now only have VHF/UHF/EHF privileges."
> Your statement left out 27GHz of spectrum. :-)

Wrong, Cecil... To correct your statement would be:
"Last I checked Tech now only have VHF/UHF/SHF/EHF privileges."
His statement left out much more than 27Ghz of spectrum.
Your statement left out 27GHz of spectrum. :-)

Rich

3202. Re: "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 02:28:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5b4ea9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32713

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C58C7A3.93236CF0@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > ... but when you show up with a call
> > sign proclaimed by a high FCC enforcement official as capable of
> > taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," what, pray tell,
> > did you expect?
>
> Every day takes all of us one step closer to extinction.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Whew. I discussed this so much with the last round (the one I thought would live until around March), that it's gotten second-hat and boring... Larry must not be able to see past the nose on his face.

Kim W5TIT

3203. Re: Electronic Interaction (Was: Re: NCI Board. . .)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 02:41:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5b51b8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32714

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C5981DE.BF278480@uci.edu...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Interestingly enough, I have observed that--while it happens less on the
ham
> > bands--the same behavior can be witnessed on radio interaction. For
> > instance, and this does happen on CB quite frequently, there is onair
> > arguing of almost a warring nature, and I have heard of people going and
> > shooting the coax of other CBers, etc.
>
> > What do you think? I think it's fascinating.
>
> Well, I think it's kind of depressing, and I'm constantly resisting the
> urge to lash out more vehemently. I cancel a lot of newsgroup messages
> that I have written. I try to employ some degree of maturity, because
> no matter what somebody might say to me, everything I write reflects
> entirely on me rather than on the person I'm writing to. The people on
> the newsgroup are quite adept at picking out flaws in an argument, and
> so I try to write in anticipation of known counterarguments. Being
> unreasonable and beligerent usually gives people the greatest amount (or
> best quality) of ammo to use against you. But still, I can't always
> resist the opportunity to fling a good stinger now and then when a prime
> opportunity presents itself. ;-)
>
> 73 de ac6xg

Interesting. I don't hold back when I'm online, while I'm more prone to in
real life. The other thing about the "online" experience is, as we talk
face-to-face we can tell by others' expressions what impact our point is
making and modify the delivery based on what we are trying to communicate.
Often, written comments are taken far more literally than they should be.
For instance, N2EY would respond to this very message with, "Kim, we have
never talked face-to-face..." :) He'd say that because I used the word
'we' in the communication that he was confused because he thought I was
talking about he and I.

At any rate, reflecting upon myself is something that I don't mind in
anything I've said. I am way too reality based and have been told that many
times, as criticisms from bosses, friends, my darlin' hubby, etc. But, I
cut to the chase. I don't like wasting time on beating around the bush.
That's even rougher in the written word.

Thing I always realize here, and one of the reasons why nothing said gets
under my skin, is that the people who say the really mean things are people
I envision having a huge chip on their shoulder, and they just don't like

life in general. Why should I allow myself, or them, the time? ;)

Kim W5TIT

3204. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 02:46:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5b52d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32715

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020131135922.03504.00000423@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Question re. NCI?
> >From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 1/30/02 9:00 PM Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c58a6b9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020130000830.02067.00000908@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> In article <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> >> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
spent
> >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid
me
> >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
> >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
> >>
> >> Thank you, "Jay".
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was
there
> >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
prizes?
>
> >Kim
>
> Kim,
>
> Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> you think he was doing?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Don't know. I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got that he forgot to mention it. Doubt wherever it was would change my impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off, has a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.

Kim W5TIT

3205. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:03:17 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <VFI68.6025$I5.437598@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32716

> From: "Richard Plourde" rplourde@att.net

> >Did you mean phone and if so that implies omitting image. Did you mean
that.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> I think that an amateur who is given access to spectrum should be given
the
> right to use all modes that are permitted on that spectrum.

Do you mean that for the Novice/Technician Plus CW only and CW/SSB
subands???
There're plenty of modes that they're arbitrarily prohibited from using.
In my book, only the power limitations are justifiable.

> >When you say data/cw you are omitting RTTY. Did you mean that?

> I probably should have said digital/CW.

Wrong, you should have said CW/RTTY/data... ;-)
Using the word 'digital' is a wrong as using the word 'voice' the FCC Part
97 defines neither. OTOH, the ARRL FFC Rule Book does mention 'digital
voice' and the sidebar says in part...

...emmision designator might be J1E. Transmission of such signals would be
in the phone bands...

They, also, say 'digitized voice' also called 'quantized phone' is not
data... hmmmm... We ARE talking government here... ;-)

The other thing to mention here is that CW AND 'digital' can be used on all
frequencies in HF. Another reason not to use the word 'digital'. heh heh

Not TOO confusing is it???

Rich

3206. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:22:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5C9F2A.891C61DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32717

W1RFI wrote:

> From: bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens)
>
> >As an organization attempting to transition its
> >own membership, I understand the reasons for ARRL's careful stance on
> >Morse requirements, especially why they aren't saying much about what
> >they will do after the international regulations change - it would
> >only inflame the membership without doing any other good.
>
> I am not at all sure this is accurate, Bruce. They are not saying what they
> will do after the international regulations change because they have not
> reached a decision about what they intend to do. I think that for ARRL, any
> such decision would be premature. The ARRL Board has not made any decision to
> "transition" its membership. .

Well, you know how it is with those NCI folks, Ed. They have a lock on "how it's supposed to be" and nothing anyone else has to say means anything at all.

3207. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:27:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA02A.AFFA53D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32718

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:44 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> > In article <59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>,
> > bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens) writes:
> >
> >>The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
> >>national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight.
> >
> > Why must it be a "fight", Bruce? Why use the words of violence? If it's
> > the "end game", why talk as if you want to kill off those who disagree
> > with you?
>
> It's a metaphor, Jim. Geez!

CArl Stevenson has never sounded much like a metaphor.

3208. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:33:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA1A3.D32E868F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32719

CAM wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >> Everybody'd like to enjoy the pleasures of the local
> > >> country club, but nobody want to put in the required work to earn the
> > >> resources to afford it. It's be kinda amusing if it weren't so sad.
> > >
> > >I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses. I don't
> > >see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
> > >in Part 97.
> >
> > In the sense that it requires some discipline and effort,sure it can be termed
> > "work." Pleasant work for some, but work nonetheless. :-)
>
> Not for me. I learned Morse code in the Cub Scouts long before I ever
> heard of amateur radio.

So what? That only means you did the work earlier.

3209. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:38:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA2DF.6C3E976D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32720

N2EY wrote:

> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of January 31, 2002:
>
> Novice - 40,009 (decrease of 9,320)
> Tech - 235,351 (increase of 29,957)
> Tech Plus - 84,180 (decrease of 44,680)
> General - 138,784 (increase of 26,107)
> Advanced - 86,422 (decrease of 13,360)
> Extra - 98,382 (increase of 19,592)
> Total - 683,128 (increase of 8,336)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
licenses of only 8,336.

Looks like basically a bargain basement
"gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to upgrade
without it.

3210. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:46:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA49E.47D4A031@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32721

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5B7A76.68B03C31@worldnet.att.net...
> > > When computers moved from command line to GUI operating systems, it was
> to
> > > make things easier for someone to operate, and no one thought of it as
> > > dumbing down. When automobiles went from clutch to automatic, it was
> also to
> > > makes things easier to operate, yet still, no one thought of it as being
> > > dumbed down. Yet, when ham radio tries to move forward, the opposite is
> the
> > > norm.
> >
> > Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when
> they
> > are simply easier?
>
> If you think being stuck in the past is easier, feel free to stay there.

So you have no answer other than to regurgitate more standard meaningless NCI dogma. Just as we thought.

3211. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:52:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA621.521D766C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32722

Jim Kelley wrote:

> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:
>
> > This is an excellent opportunity for
> > hams to experiment, but few seem interested.
>
> Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
> books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I can't
> even read the stuff, Ed. Do you honestly think a lack of interest is the
> primary factor hindering DSP innovation in amateur radio?

Really, Jim, it could make you wonder if he is that familiar with what is
really going on in ham radio.

I "experiment" with new modes often, sometimes continuously for
days, during my hobby activities. I know nothning about designing
new whizzy modes, so I'm completely satisfied to experiment with
the results offered by those who do. Does that make me and the many thousands
like me "retro" and "doesn't seem interested"? If so, there has been a gigantic
shift in what is expected from hams, for there has never been any serious
percentage of ham radio ops involved in
the development of new modes nor equipment to use them. And nearly all of those
hams who were also were employed doing exactly that as their life's vocation.
Darn few "ordinary" hams have ever stumbled onto major advancements on their
own.
I fear Ed has been hoodwinked by the likes of Carl Stevenson.

3212. Re: Since Sparky can't prove what he says....ever.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 03:59:51 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0202011959.21821c46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

sparky@cet.com (Sparky) wrote in message news:<3c5a0cf3.337623@news.cet.com>...
> On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 02:56:36 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
> >news:3c59dc33.413200@news.cet.com...
> >> On Thu, 31 Jan 2002 23:07:51 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> <snip lame attempt at damage control>
> >>
> >> You can nitpick all you want, train. No matter how hard you try to
> >> distance the issue from reality, the facts speak for themselves.
> >>
> >THE FACT is you made an illogical assertion. I countered it with the same.
> >Note to Mopar.....He was never better at this, he just had nobody with
> >any clue paying ANY attention to his diatribes.
> >Times up Sparky! Go find your flat little rock and crawl back under it for a
> >while until you find some other shitpile of useless government issued bile.
> >While I'm on the topic of bile, if this was anything but troll shit why
> >would you have it crossposted to all the buttfuck...err ham NG's?
> >You are such a lame-ass pile of shit. You knew after my second post you have
> >this argument lost and tried to go off on some different bullshit tangent.
> >As usual, you lose motherfucker!
> >Train
>
> If the post was so insignificant, then why are you putting up such a
> big stink about it, train? Especially when the post was directed at
> twistie?

Cuz BigRadios.Biz sales are at stake. If illegal CBers start seeing
proof that their overpowered outband rigs interfere with stuff then it
could affect Train's ability to sell his cb amps and crappy doctored
radios.

-Aaron-

3213. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:02:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA884.B05C403D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32724

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The man is a blowhard, pure and simple.
>
> Dick, do you have any idea how dumbed down you appear when instead of
> mounting a rational argument, you resort to ad hominem attacks?

Well, Cec OB, a spade is a spade is a spade.

> With
> friends like you, the ARS doesn't need any enemies.
> --

Comed to think on it, you're a bit of a blowhard yourself.

3214. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:06:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CA976.1A5B66AA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32725

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when they
> > are simply easier?
>
> The answer lies in a question. What do the Amish, the Taliban, and
> the PCTA have in common? :-)

Americns are dying in droves due to being overweight, out of shape with plugged arteries because "things are easier".
Did you have a point?

3215. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:11:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B66D6.9B13CB9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32726

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Did you have a point?

Some religions require their followers to live in the past. But that's
not a good way to function within a technical hobby.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3216. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:16:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CABA8.824BED40@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32727

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020131135922.03504.00000423@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Question re. NCI?
> > >From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > >Date: 1/30/02 9:00 PM Eastern Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <3c58a6b9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
> > >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20020130000830.02067.00000908@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > >> In article <MPG.16b988edca47d2f9896b0@news.earthlink.net>, Jay
> > >> <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
> spent
> > >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid
> me
> > >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
> > >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
> > >>
> > >> Thank you, "Jay".
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was
> there
> > >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
> prizes?
> >
> > >Kim
> >
> > Kim,
> >
> > Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> > you think he was doing?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Don't know.

We noticed. Many times.

> I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
> that he forgot to mention it. Doubt wherever it was would change my
> impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off, has
> a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.

She talk of someone else being impressed with himself???

3217. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:17:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5B6845.323087C2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32728

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Not for me. I learned Morse code in the Cub Scouts long before I ever
> > heard of amateur radio.
>
> So what? That only means you did the work earlier.

It wasn't work. There was absolutely no reward for learning Morse
code in Cub Scouts.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3218. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:23:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CAD4A.A9C887B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32729

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about other
> >> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no more
> >> technology is needed be archaic?
>
> > Where have you seen anyone doing that?
>
> With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?

Did you find your own question to be ambiguous? I didn't. So
I'll ask again: where have you seen anyone doing that?

3219. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:30:07 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <jXJ68.6268$I5.453469@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32730

> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:

> > > This is an excellent opportunity for
> > > hams to experiment, but few seem interested.

> Jim Kelley wrote:

> > Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
> > books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I
can't
> > even read the stuff, Ed.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5B3490.D886671C@IEEE.org...

> Try reverse engineering. If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
> how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio
frequency.
> As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light
dawned.

Cecil, What does that mean? The audio frequency is dependent on where you tuned it. you can tune it down to 20 Hz and that means 40 samples/second. What happens if you tune to 5 Hz? I would think that you'd want to shoot for something on the order of sampling 100 times the average beep rate... that would keep your sampling rate directly proportional to the character rate. At least you'd always be in the right order of magnitude... ;-)

Rich

3220. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 04:41:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB1BB.E7537B4A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32731

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Most of the modes and methods you describe are in the realm of the
> >experimental, and unless you're been to selfabsorbed to notice, there is a
> >LOT of that going on by lots of hams.
>
> Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the modes and
> methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are telling
> us about.

I imagined you read QST. Sorry.

3221. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 05:07:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB7A8.5A1D5EB3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32732

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Did you have a point?
>
> Some religions require their followers to live in the past

And some genuises insist on spouting nincompoopery. Are you having fun
yet?

3222. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 05:08:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB807.994E49B4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32733

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Not for me. I learned Morse code in the Cub Scouts long before I ever
> > > heard of amateur radio.
> >
> > So what? That only means you did the work earlier.
>
> It wasn't work. There was absolutely no reward for learning Morse
> code in Cub Scouts.

Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for no "reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?

3223. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:07:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202012207.5915c476@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32734

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C5B3394.1841FE7C@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The man is a blowhard, pure and simple.
>
> Dick, do you have any idea how dumbed down you appear when instead of
> mounting a rational argument, you resort to ad hominem attacks? With
> friends like you, the ARS doesn't need any enemies.
>
>
This is not ham radio, this is RRAP Cecil and Dick tells it like it
is. Yeah, he has a lotta company out here. "Rational arguments" be
damned, that's your hobby. When was the last time Squiggy actually did
anything about getting any of his brainfarts on the air vs. just
blowing hard into the RRAP server drive partition? Put it on the air
or SHADDUP. Welcome to ham radio.
>
>
w3rv

3224. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:31:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g0n7$5b8$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32735

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020201183431.26577.00000012@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> I don't
> >> see the necessity of work being performed as a requirement
> >> in Part 97.
>
> >Yeah. But then again, it doesn't say anything about force either. ;-)
>
> It is all a question of accomplishments and the ham who had to work real
hard
> to meet the requirements is not given more priveleges than the ham who
easily
> met those same requirements.

Are you trying to lay a guilt trip on me or somethin'? I already feel bad
enough about it, Ed.

> Amateur Radio exists to meet the needs of the public interest and our
> regulators will determine what rules facilitate it meeting those needs.
If
> they feel that the public interest requires an Amateur Radio Service with
Morse
> code skills, they will continue to test them.

Hey. I've got mine (such as they are). That's all that matters to me.

The code requirement, which it seems you want to discuss, will be gone
within a few years. That's just the way it is. But I just can't resist
poking some fun at some of the stupid excuses people come up with for
getting rid of it.

It was a joke, Ed. You know, work equals force times distance. Cecil
talked extensively about how the FCC applies force to it's applicants. In
his post, he said the work was equal to zero. If we assume the force the
FCC applied was not equal to zero, then distance he went must have been
zero. Get it? It's physics humor. Didn't you laugh?

73, ac6xg

3225. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:38:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g14k$5jm$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32737

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5B3738.DCD81B66@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > I never expended any work in getting my ham licenses.
> >
> > We know you were forced, ...
>
> Nope, I am one of the fortunate few who wasn't forced. I already
> knew Morse code before I learned about amateur radio. I learned
> Morse code in Cub Scouts and hardly practiced at all for the
> Novice code exam.

I can't believe you of all people would say that. I remember your gospels very well. (Better than you it seems.) You were forced by the power of the federal government, the rule of law to take that code test. We all were - unless we obtained our license illegally. How you learned code is completely irrelevant to that fact.

3226. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:40:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g18d$5k4$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32736

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020201182509.26577.00000010@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >I bet that guy from CQ isn't a big fan of the ARRL. Is the other guy
named
> >Larry?
>
> ARRL has a very friendly relationship with CQ magazine. Rich Moseson
served as
> an ARRL Section Manager while he was a CQ employee. He has also served on
a few
> ARRL committees, making positive contributions to the work he is involved
in.
>
> CQ is a magazine; ARRL is a membership services organization. I do not see
any
> conflict. If someone on CQ staff contacted me for technical help on an
article,
> or one of their authors did, I would gladly extend them help. In fact, I
have
> done so, with W5YI when he wrote some of the CQ material on RF safety a
few
> years ago, just to wrap it all together. Fred, too, is an ARRL member and
I
> will offer him technical help to the work he does for Amateur Radio.

Oh. So it couldn't be Fred who Bruce is talking about. I knew you would
know, Ed. Thanks for the help.

73, ac6xg

3227. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:41:48 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n2hcmlod8n10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32739

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> "Aaron J. Grier" wrote:
>
> > I didn't get that from carl at all... he was stating that the modes
> > themselves are archaic -- no the people who use them.
>
> Then you didn't get what he was saying. He was saying the ARS is 50
> years behind the times and the modes people use as the proof of that.

the amateur radio service itself, not the people...

I see your point though -- I don't think even Carl can reference a voice
mode that can replace SSB. (Carl?)

> > incandescent light bulbs are archaic, but one who uses them is not
> > necessarily archaic too.
>
> That's exactly my point.

then we are in agreement... and to avoid recursion, I'll stop there. ;)

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3228. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:46:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g1k5$5qs$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32738

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CA2DF.6C3E976D@worldnet.att.net...

> So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
> licenses of only 8,336.
>
> Looks like basically a bargain basement
> "gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to
upgrade
> without it.

The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?

3229. 3rd Party Traffic?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:50:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g1r5$5tq$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32740

==>PRESIDENT BUSH ADDRESSES FLORIDA ARES NET

President George W. Bush spoke January 31 via Amateur Radio to members of the Northern Florida Amateur Radio Emergency Service Net (NFAN). The president was in Florida to spotlight five volunteer groups for their value to the new Office of Homeland Security--among them the Volusia County Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES).

"I want to thank all the volunteers who help make sure that Florida is prepared for any kind of emergency," the president said in part, after checking in around 9:15 AM to a regular session of the 75-meter ARES net. "I want to thank you all for helping your communities be prepared."

Northern Florida ARRL Section Manager Rudy Hubbard, WA4PUP, said Bush spoke from a portable station set up at a Daytona Beach-area fire station. At the request of ARES Volusia County Emergency Coordinator Joette Barnett, KG4HPN, John Schmidt, AF4PU, and Clifford Fraser, KE4HIY, arranged to have the station ready as a demonstration of Amateur Radio's role in emergency preparedness and in the hope that Bush would be willing to address the 75-meter net. Hearing the president check into the net was a pleasant surprise, Hubbard said.

ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, said he was "extremely gratified" that President Bush recognized the valuable service Amateur Radio operators provide in times of emergencies. "I know that all hams in the United States stand ready to do their part in America's Homeland Security Program," Haynie commented. Haynie has said that defining Amateur Radio's role in homeland security would top his list of initiatives for his second term.

Hubbard said a copy of proposed expanded Amateur Radio antenna (PRB-1)legislation was given to the President and to the president's brother, Florida Gov Jeb Bush, for possible introduction in next year's Florida legislative session. "We Amateur Radio operators will volunteer however we're needed, and maybe it will be seen that we can greatly help the nation if we have the antennas we need," Hubbard commented. The proposed bill would seek to extend Florida's PRB-1 law to include private deed covenants, conditions and restrictions.

Bush's stop in Florida was part of a swing through the southeastern US, which also included stops in North Carolina and Georgia. The Daytona Beach event marked a rare appearance on ham radio by a sitting president. Former President Gerald Ford spoke via a ham radio satellite hookup in 1986.

3230. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 06:53:52 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n380ipcpave7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32741

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> You need a course in remedial reading or reading comprehension son.

perhaps, or maybe a little more whisky. ;)

> That "advancing the state of the art" crapolla died years ago. But
> then again how long ago did 100% ham-developed PSK-31 first pop up in
> the RF spectrum?

it's making sense now... Carl is looking at the trailing edge (what modes are the majority of hams using) and you are looking at the leading edge (what cutting edge things are hams doing).

> The only "new technologies" being tossed around here are campaction
> schemes which are NOT new modes. With 90% +/- of the ham vhf/uhf bands
> dead spectrum space who cares about "compacting" those comms into even
> less spectrum space?? Are YOU gonna pay for the infrastructures
> required to implement those schemes? I thought not.

hell no, I'm going to BUILD the new infrastructures. isn't that what being a ham is all about? ;)

> CW, FM and ssb WORK given the realities of what ham radio is actually
> all about. It was a bunch of old farts who brought ssb into the HF ham
> bands which mode all but completely replaced strongly-entrenched AM
> over a period of 8-10 years. They created a model which is still
> quite applicable today as it relates to The Herd adopting a new mode,
> any new mode. The basic general nature of hams and their value sets
> have not changed one bit any more than has the basic general natures
> of the population at large changed in the past half century. Or from
> the days of Moses and before for that matter.

probably due to the increasing mean age of hams... when I got my license at age 15 I felt like a young'un. not much has changed.

Carl -- can you point to any "cutting edge commercial technologies" which can replace SSB?

"the herd" seems to have skipped ham radio entirely and gone on to land-line connections running TCP/IP over a variety of media.

> So here we be in RRAP which is overloaded with far-end techos bitching
> about hams in general not adopting any of the myriad of the brainfarts
> they have in mind and looking down their noses about the "average ham"
> as being a no-clue Luddite.

what do you expect on usenet? ;) and for the record, I like CW
precisely because it IS a "luddite" mode.

> put up or shut up. Ask me if I'm holding my breath.

indeed. see you on 2.4GHz with my IPsec 802.11 packets.

KD7PNB

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3231. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:04:42 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n3sa425etg8f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32742

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> When was the last time Squiggy actually did anything about getting any
> of his brainfarts on the air vs. just blowing hard into the RRAP
> server drive partition?

he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works for a
company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham license and
a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty things.

> Put it on the air or SHADDUP. Welcome to ham radio.

exactly!

KD7PNB
--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3232. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:10:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CD498.59F08A1F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32743

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5CA2DF.6C3E976D@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
> > licenses of only 8,336.
> >
> > Looks like basically a bargain basement
> > "gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to
> upgrade
> > without it.
>
> The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
> enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?

But of course, James. And when they just won't stretch a little, we lower the carrot on the stick until they can get to it without too much strain on their psyches.

3233. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:22:13 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n4t54rmmpn7c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32744

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

> There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
> speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either don't
> recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is
> irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.

alright Carl, put your mouth where your money/job is and name some of
these applications for the curious.

straight TCP/IP networking over amateur-controlled endpoints is enough
to give me a woody, but I'm sure not everybody else is as geeky as me.

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3234. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:29:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3g44m$730$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32745

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5B3490.D886671C@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:
> >
> > > This is an excellent opportunity for
> > > hams to experiment, but few seem interested.
> >
> > Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
> > books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I
can't
> > even read the stuff, Ed.

> Try reverse engineering.

I always thought that was cheating. (But I'm not entirely adverse to
that.) ;-)

> If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
> how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio
frequency.
> As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light
dawned.

I know the feeling, but I have resigned myself to the fact that analog is
just more fun. Aren't you simply describing oversampling in an analog to
digital conversion? DSP is what you do with the signal after that. Math in
the digital domain gives me a headache. Reading a half page of integrals is
about as much as I can bear. I start to lose the gist of things after that.
I guess I'm just another one of these guys who proves Carl and Ed's point
about the worthlessness of amateur radio operators.

3235. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:37:30 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n5pqp65i9n87@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32746

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:

> Interesting. You seemed to find at least ONE product that DID say
> that it could be limited. I hadn't seen that one when I last looked
> at the wireless lan stuff in early 2000 when I wanted to attach my
> laptop to my in house network.

I guess my mileage varied significantly. my first exposure to 802.11
networking (the non-frequency hopping kind) came to me in the form of a
couple of AT&T/lucent wavelan cards. the outside of the box gives a
nebulous "features spread spectrum radio transmission in unlicensed
bands (915MHz or 2.4GHz depending on country regulations)" and cracking
open the manual reveals that the channels must be set manually.

> Had that been among the boxes I had picked up and read, we wouldn't be
> having this discussion. However, that product might be the exception,
> not the rule.

looking at the documentation that came with my original wavelan cards,
they don't even mention 802.11. but that was 1996. but I now see how
you came to your conclusion.

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3236. Re: encryption & authentication (was Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 07:49:06 UTC
From: agrier@poofygoof.com
Message-ID: <u5n6fi3efahf1f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 32747

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> Why would hams want to encrypt anything they transmit? I can
> understand the encryption of control links to avoid unauthorized
> access. Some emergency messages might be better sent by means other
> than unencrypted voice. But these are the rare exceptions.

when you start getting into fully automated networks, control links can become the rule -- not the exception. unattended automated mail delivery comes immediately to mind.

> Why would hams want normal everyday stuff encrypted?

for amateur radio, you basically trade-off privacy for privilige, so by definition, if it's a private communication, it's not for amateur radio. ;)

--
Aaron J. Grier | "Not your ordinary poofy goof." | agrier@poofygoof.com
"[...] I generally haven't found IDM guys to be very good
live acts, most of them just sit down at their laptop and
tweak reaktor." -- Brandon Daniel

3237. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 09:06:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <N_N68.6530$I5.487081@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32748

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a3fhh6$sh4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> Is the rec.radio.cb the only place such misguided information that mods
are
> legal for non-ham services is being stated?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

In my experience I don't think anyone is under that delusion even on
rec.radio.cb.

3238. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 09:07:57 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a3ga9d$9su$9@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 32749
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

In rec.radio.amateur.antenna S. Hanrahan <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote:

> Agreed. 10 years ago when I became a ham, 10 meters wasn't as
> cluttered with lids who don't know the meaning of "operating split"
> when it comes to chasing DX. As an ARRL member, I think it was a
> shame the ARRL took the stance on the license restructuring. I've
> seen posts on the DX Packetclusters from foreign stations saying "Boy
> I bet the ARRL really must be proud of themselves". 10 meters used to
> be a really fun band to be on, it still can be, but with lids who
> don't know simple procedures and operating practices, radio
> manufacturers might as well toss the license paperwork in the box
> along with the rig. All in all, the ARRL is a good organization, but
> any organization will make mistakes, big or small.

Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
the restructuring.

I personally believe that the restructuring that is being used is wrong.
Novice should be the entry level for HF, Tech for above 30 meters, with
Extra being the third class. Keep General if necessary, but there is no
real need for it.

I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
They are trivial to pass, right now.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

3239. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 10:01:26 UTC
From: Malcontent <Anon@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a3gdbs$sh0$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 32750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

> Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
> was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
> the restructuring.
>
> I personally believe that the restructuring that is being used is wrong.
> Novice should be the entry level for HF, Tech for above 30 meters, with
> Extra being the third class. Keep General if necessary, but there is no
> real need for it.
>
> I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
> They are trivial to pass, right now.
>
> --
> Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

Of course we all have our differing opinions. As a 13 wpm General I feel slighted that a 5 wpm tech is to be shoved into my slot without ever having to pound a key. I dislike it, but I will live with it. It is for this same reason that I hesitate taking the written test for Extra. It seems that the Extras resent those of us that test "up" to Extra....after all, they earned their ticket the hard way and they see us newbie Extras as interlopers. They feel that I should not be an Extra since my 13 wpm did not meet the criteria.
Me? Heck. I don't care one way or the other.
You won't see me jumping forth to join the ARRL...I have better things to do with my time and money.
The old codgers who claim that it is the ARRL or nothing are fighting a losing battle. In light of the fact that only a third or less Ham Ops belong to the ARRL speaks volumes.
I like my hobby. I do NOT need the ARRL in any way, shape or form. They have done nothing for me and I doubt they will any time soon.

3240. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:05:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202080505.11085.00000732@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32751

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>Oh. So it couldn't be Fred who Bruce is talking about. I knew you would
>know, Ed. Thanks for the help.

Sure. And, for the record, I believe that ARRL has a good relationship with Fred, too, some differences of opinion notwithstanding. For whatever reason, Fred chose to become involved with the FCC on the RF-safety rulemaking matter, and he and I exchanged a fair amount of information. As I put some of my technical viewpoints before the Commission, I also put Fred's differing viewpoints on the table, at Fred's request. It saved everybody a fair amount of time.

Fred is in the commercial exams and study guide business. Although those study guides do compete with those of other publishers, that doesn't mean that all aspects of the ARRL/W5YI relationship are adversarial. Fred's ARRL membership is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support the good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need to be done better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3241. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:06:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202080619.11085.00000733@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32752

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about
>other
>> >> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no
>more
>> >> technology is needed be archaic?
>>
>> > Where have you seen anyone doing that?
>>
>> With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?
>
> Did you find your own question to be ambiguous? I didn't. So
>I'll ask again: where have you seen anyone doing that?

Nothing ambiguous about the question at all, Dick, but if it is too hard for
you, I will let you pass.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3242. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:07:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202080745.11085.00000736@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32753

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
>licenses of only 8,336.

> Looks like basically a bargain basement
>"gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to upgrade
>without it.

Is that how you characterize an increase int he number of hams of about 10% per year? How odd!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3243. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:08:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202080819.11085.00000737@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32754

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
>enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?

It is beginning to appear that Dick doesn't. That is pretty odd, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3244. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:13:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202081301.11085.00000738@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32756

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the modes
>and
>> methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are
>telling
>> us about.

> I imagined you read QST. Sorry.

That is a pretty odd thing to say, Dick. Do you really think I don't read QST?
Sorry.

I recall some really cool experimentation being featured in QST, but not
"lots." Can you elaborate a bit more and explain how many makes a "lots" to
you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3245. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:18:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202081831.11085.00000739@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32755

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for no
>"reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
>

To quote the gist of some of your past posts, those that don't know the answer would never understand the explanation.

I bet that most hams know the answer...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3246. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:20:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202082025.11085.00000740@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32757

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Try reverse engineering. If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
>how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio frequency.
>As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light dawned.

How would it handle chirp? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3247. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:21:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202082137.11085.00000741@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32758

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>I guess I'm just another one of these guys who proves Carl and Ed's point
>about the worthlessness of amateur radio operators.

If that is what you think the point is, you missed it. Do you really mean that?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3248. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 13:23:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202082316.11085.00000742@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 32759

From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)

>he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works for a
>company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham license and
>a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty things.

You could add that they do so on Amateur frequencies. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3249. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:01:36 UTC
From: George <tronic@boxfrog.com>
Message-ID: <a3grg0$1tk$1@paris.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Well that is hardly *just above the CB band* is it??
and you are supposed to be a licensed Ham.

--
The Sorcerer
remove Spam for reply

"S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message
news:3c5b0619.19767484@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> On Fri, 1 Feb 2002 20:51:38 +0000 (UTC), "George" <tronic@boxfrog.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Is it the 11mtr band you mean, around the 27.555MHz usb.
> >these people have been using these frequencies for years, and no-one is
> >going to stop them. most r-hams including myself started of on 27.555,
this
> >led to many of us becoming a r-ham.
> >have you got nothing better to do.
> >
> >
>
> Actually, I was referring to the 10, 15, 20, 40 and 80 meter bands.
> Give your radio a listen sometime.
>
> AA7YA
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.314 / Virus Database: 175 - Release Date: 11/01/02

3250. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:05:35 UTC
From: George <tronic@boxfrog.com>
Message-ID: <a3grneidk1@knossos.btinternet.com>
Source record: 32761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Exactly, the more stupid pathetic people like this S Hanrahan keeps on whining and moaning the more the cb'rs are going to do it. Just to annoy the Pillock

--
The Sorcerer
remove Spam for reply

"Stahr" <w6nyc(remove this to email)@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:LAG68.100$Hb6.14339@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Do we really have to go through all this CRAP again????????
>
> Can't there be at least a month between these stupid posts?
>
> Dennis
>
>
> "S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message
> news:3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> > On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
> > >more political power.
> > >
> > >I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> > >just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> > >can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> > >they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> > >hams!
> > >My $.02
> > >Merry Christmas to all
> > >KA3DWW
> >
> > Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.
> >
> > Stacey, AA7YA
> >
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.314 / Virus Database: 175 - Release Date: 11/01/02

3251. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:26:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bf8d1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32762

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5C9F2A.891C61DE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >
> > I am not at all sure this is accurate, Bruce. They are not saying what
they
> > will do after the international regulations change because they have not
> > reached a decision about what they intend to do. I think that for ARRL,
any
> > such decision would be premature. The ARRL Board has not made any
decision to
> > "transition" its membership. .
>
> Well, you know how it is with those NCI folks, Ed. They have a lock on
"how it's
> supposed to be" and nothing anyone else has to say means anything at all.
>

ROFLMAO!! Sounds just like Dick. I had *no* idea Dick was one of "those
NCI folks!"

Kim W5TIT

3252. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:29:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bf972_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32763

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CA2DF.6C3E976D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
> licenses of only 8,336.
>
> Looks like basically a bargain basement
> "gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to
upgrade
> without it.
>

Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid to deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was wrong. He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the numbers as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).

Kim W5TIT

3253. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:30:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bf9af_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32764

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CA49E.47D4A031@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> So you have no answer other than to regurgitate more standard
meaningless NCI
> dogma. Just as we thought.
>

You led the way, Dick. Ya just forgot the flashlight.

Kim W5TIT

3254. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:37:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bfb2f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32765

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CA621.521D766C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in regard to DSP:
> >
> > > This is an excellent opportunity for
> > > hams to experiment, but few seem interested.
> >
> > Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
> > books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I
can't
> > even read the stuff, Ed. Do you honestly think a lack of interest is
the
> > primary factor hindering DSP innovation in amateur radio?
>
> Really, Jim, it could make you wonder if he is that familiar with what is
> really going on in ham radio.
>
> I "experiment" with new modes often, sometimes continuously for
> days, during my hobby activities. I know nothning about designing
> new whizzy modes, so I'm completely satisfied to experiment with
> the results offered by those who do.
>

Here, let me do some of that puking...er, regurgitating that you speak of so
often, Dickie: you mean *you* just don't want to learn anything new? *You*
don't want to apply yourself to your avocation of electronics? Shame.
Shame.

>
> Does that make me and the many thousands
> like me "retro" and "doesn't seem interested"? If so, there has been a
gigantic
> shift in what is expected from hams,
>

My first question would be: Who is doing the expecting? My puke...er,
regurgitation would be that it sure does make you (I'll leave out your
probable fictitious "thousands") "retro" and "uninterested." Isn't that
what you like to say of others? Yeah, this regurgitation game works *TWO*
ways, eh?

>
> for there has never been any serious
> percentage of ham radio ops involved in
> the development of new modes nor equipment to use them.
>

W-H-A-T????!!!! And you say *YOU'RE* smart? Eeegads, Dickie.

>
> And nearly all of those
> hams who were also were employed doing exactly that as their life's
vocation.
> Darn few "ordinary" hams have ever stumbled onto major advancements on
their
> own.
> I fear Ed has been hoodwinked by the likes of Carl Stevenson.
>

Hooooboy. Man, Jim's/N2EY, "Fear Factor(TM)" thing works well. Yeah
buddy....ROFLMAO....

Kim W5TIT

3255. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:45:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bfd46_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32766

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CABA8.824BED40@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020131135922.03504.00000423@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > >
> > > Kim,
> > >
> > > Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> > > you think he was doing?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > Don't know.
>
> We noticed. Many times.
>
>
> > I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
> > that he forgot to mention it. Doubt wherever it was would change my
> > impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off,
has
> > a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.
>
> She talk of someone else being impressed with himself???
>

GASP You responded directly to a post from *me* Dickie. Does this
mean...? Could this mean...? Ya mean ya aren't *cough* i-g-n-o-r-i-n-g me
anymore?! Note to self: mark this point, Dick's backed up on nearly every
post I've read this morning; he'll back up on this one, too.

Back to Dickie: after the posts I've seen this morning from you, if I were
you I wouldn't even be *pretending* to argue yourself into being smarter
than someone else. Or impressed, for that matter. Could ya perhaps 'splain
how you got that I was talking about someone being impressed with theirself
from the comments above? I'd really like to see the explanation you have
for that one. Go ahead, it's OK. I have all day.

(Psssst, hint: I said Jay is impressed with the goodies he got. I have no
idea if he's impressed with himself. *Try* to keep up, would you?).

Kim W5TIT

3256. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:49:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bfe1a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32767

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CB1BB.E7537B4A@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Most of the modes and methods you describe are in the realm of the
> > >experimental, and unless you're been to selfabsorbed to notice, there
is a
> > >LOT of that going on by lots of hams.
> >
> > Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the
modes and
> > methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are
telling
> > us about.
>
> I imagined you read QST. Sorry.
>

Yeah, Ed, c'mon! ;). 'Smatta wid you? Didn't you know that all those QST magazines delivered = the number of people who do the projects? Sheeesh!

(It's the same intellect he used when he read one book about Islam and decided that each and *every* Muslim thinks exactly as described by the author of that book).

Kim W5TIT

3257. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 14:51:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5bfe81_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32768

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CB807.994E49B4@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Not for me. I learned Morse code in the Cub Scouts long before I
ever
> > > > heard of amateur radio.
> > >
> > > So what? That only means you did the work earlier.
> >
> > It wasn't work. There was absolutely no reward for learning Morse
> > code in Cub Scouts.
>
> Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for
no
> "reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
>

So, you never felt the reward of facilitating an environment for new amateur
radio operators. Uh, you speak volumes. Hope you're out of the VE game
now. Maybe Jay has something for you to do. He gets lots of rewards!

Kim W5TIT

3258. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:01:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5BFF5E.4411E4FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32769

Richard Plourde wrote:
> Cecil, What does that mean? The audio frequency is dependent on where you
> tuned it. you can tune it down to 20 Hz and that means 40 samples/second.
> What happens if you tune to 5 Hz? I would think that you'd want to shoot for
> something on the order of sampling 100 times the average beep rate... that
> would keep your sampling rate directly proportional to the character rate.
> At least you'd always be in the right order of magnitude... ;-)

The audio frequency depends on the filter and is usually in the
neighborhood of 600Hz-800Hz. If you make the sample rate double
the audio frequency, all the coefficients are either zero, one,
or minus one - no multiplication needed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3259. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:02:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5c0110_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32772

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202081301.11085.00000738@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the
modes
> >and
> >> methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are
> >telling
> >> us about.
>
> > I imagined you read QST. Sorry.
>
> That is a pretty odd thing to say, Dick. Do you really think I don't read
QST?
> Sorry.
>
> I recall some really cool experimentation being featured in QST, but not
> "lots." Can you elaborate a bit more and explain how many makes a "lots"
to
> you?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

More to the point, how does Dick come to the conclusion that just because there are XXXnumber of QST magazines distributed that it would equal the number of hams who do experimentation?

I'm waiting for the answer on that one...LOL

Kim W5TIT

3260. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:03:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5BFFBF.19AE7242@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32770

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Math in the digital domain gives me a headache.

Still using a slide rule, I suppose?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3261. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:04:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C0000.90D77518@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32771

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Try reverse engineering. If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
> >how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio frequency.
> >As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light dawned.
>
> How would it handle chirp? :-)

No self-respecting ham would have chirp, would he, Ed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3262. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:11:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C0188.E66E034F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32773

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
> >enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?
>
> It is beginning to appear that Dick doesn't. That is pretty odd, too.

Dick crawled uphill both ways on his hands and knees naked in the snow
to take his ham exams and resents anyone who doesn't do the same.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3263. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:19:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C037F.B82EBD93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32774

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You were forced by the power of the
> federal government, the rule of law to take that code test. We all were -
> unless we obtained our license illegally. How you learned code is
> completely irrelevant to that fact.

Yes, I was forced to take the code test but I wasn't forced to prepare
for the code test. I was already prepared.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3264. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:23:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C047C.7A0DC165@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32775

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for no
> "reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?

If you weren't rewarded with good feelings about it, why did you do it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3265. 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:32:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5c0838_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32778

I've posted the below article from The ARRL Letter, Vol. 21, No. 5, February 1, 2002. I'd like to see the 70cm preserved without interference from such sources as noted in the article. However, I do wonder how populated the 70cm band is in other places than my own. The reason I ask is to formulate some comments that I'll write myself to the FCC regarding the topic below.

Here in the Dallas area, as often as I've listened or been on 70cm (which, granted has been a small percentage of time), I have not heard a lot of activity. Others in this area have made the same observation. This, however, was prior to the widening use of technologies such as IRLP. I wonder what the band-use is in other areas of the country. Are there technologies on the horizon that will call for an even greater appeal to the 70cm band?

While not a valid "argument" to defend 70cm, how would you go about making the band more appealing? By that I mean, usually, new hams first get the 2M handheld, then the 2M mobile, then we hear of them shopping around for a dual-band mobile. More times than I care to reveal, the typical response to them is: "Why do you want to spend the money on a dual-band--there's nothing on 440?" We can't, of course, say to the FCC, "we are going to be needing that space." 70cm often comes under threat and I think (due to my operating area) that it is because we don't use the band that much. It sure would be nice to see it become more active, thus making it maybe less desirable as a target.

I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and this area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of the 70cm band where you are? Anyone have any thoughts for other ideas on this matter to the FCC?

Kim W5TIT

==>ARRL GOING TO THE MAT ON 70-CM BAND THREAT

ARRL officials met recently with FCC staff members as part of the League's effort to stave off a band threat on 70 cm. ARRL General Counsel Chris Imlay, W3KD, and Technical Relations Manager Paul Rinaldo, W4RI, delivered an ex parte presentation to FCC Office of Engineering and Technology staffers on January 14. At issue was SAVI Technology's plan--already tentatively agreed to by the FCC--to deploy unlicensed transient RF identification devices between 425 and 435 MHz at much higher field strengths and duty cycles than Part 15 rules now permit for such devices. RFID tags are used to track and inventory parcel shipments.

"We told them that this was the worst possible choice of bands for these RFIDs," Imlay said. "Besides, there's no technical justification for that choice of frequencies." The request to use 70 cm has more to do with economics than technology, he said, because SAVI needs to bring down the cost of RFIDs in order to make a profit.

Imlay added that the ARRL would "do whatever it takes" to stave off the threat, including further direct appeals to FCC staff. The ARRL plans to file "strongly worded" comments on the SAVI petition by the February 12 comment deadline. Reply comments are due by March 12, 2002. Imlay said he was assured that SAVI's request "was not a done deal."

The FCC acted on the SAVI request last October in an FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making and Order (ET Docket 01-278). The ARRL argued in comments filed last March that the field strengths and duty cycles SAVI proposed for its RFID tags as Part 15 "periodic radiators" were unreasonable and "would undoubtedly seriously disrupt amateur communications in one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations," particularly for weak-signal enthusiasts.

The League also believes the FCC lacks the statutory authority to permit the RFID tags under its Part 15 rules in the configuration SAVI has requested. The ARRL argues that under the Communications Act of 1934, such devices with substantial interference potential must be licensed. The ARRL also has suggested that SAVI pick one of the Industrial, Scientific and Medical (ISM) bands instead of 425-435 MHz.

The ARRL's January 14 ex parte presentation was complemented by an interference study prepared by ARRL Lab Supervisor Ed Hare, W1RFI, and ARRL Senior Engineer Zack Lau, W1VT. A copy of the interference study and more information is available on the ARRL Web site "Band Threats" page <http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/rm-1005/SaviExParte.pdf>.

3266. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:34:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5c08c1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32779

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5C0188.E66E034F@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
> > >enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?
> >
> > It is beginning to appear that Dick doesn't. That is pretty odd, too.
>
> Dick crawled uphill both ways on his hands and knees naked in the snow
> to take his ham exams and resents anyone who doesn't do the same.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

UGH!!! Cecil!!! I was still on my first cup of coffee when you mentioned
Dickie being naked. Whew...

Can't wait to have a meal with you! Keep me posted!

Kim W5TIT

3267. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:38:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3h0p5keu1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32777

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5BFFBF.19AE7242@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Math in the digital domain gives me a headache.
>
> Still using a slide rule, I suppose?

I think it's been about 30 years since I used a slide rule. You'll have to
show me how you work differential equations on one.

3268. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:44:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3h14mkju1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32776

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5C037F.B82EBD93@IEEE.org...

> Yes, I was forced to take the code test but I wasn't forced to prepare
> for the code test. I was already prepared.

You were a real good boy, Cecil. Thanks for sharing.

3269. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:47:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3h19b$kn0$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32780

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202080505.11085.00000732@mb-dd.aol.com...
> Sure. And, for the record, I believe that ARRL has a good relationship
with
> Fred, too, some differences of opinion notwithstanding. For whatever
reason,
> Fred chose to become involved with the FCC on the RF-safety rulemaking
matter,
> and he and I exchanged a fair amount of information. As I put some of my
> technical viewpoints before the Commission, I also put Fred's differing
> viewpoints on the table, at Fred's request. It saved everybody a fair
amount of
> time.
>
> Fred is in the commercial exams and study guide business. Although those
study
> guides do compete with those of other publishers, that doesn't mean that
all
> aspects of the ARRL/W5YI relationship are adversarial. Fred's ARRL
membership
> is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support
the
> good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need
to
> be done better.

In other words, he'd never say a bad word to anybody about the ARRL. Thanks
Ed.

73, Jim

3270. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:49:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C0A7D.E796D6F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32781

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> How's the popularity of the 70cm band where you are?

To the best of my knowledge, the only 70cm ham signal on the
air in Madison County, TX is my remote control stuff.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3271. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:52:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C0B37.9E748F5B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32782

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Can't wait to have a meal with you! Keep me posted!

No news on the IC-746pro.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3272. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 15:59:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3h20skvh1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32784

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202081301.11085.00000738@mb-dd.aol.com...
> I recall some really cool experimentation being featured in QST, but not
> "lots." Can you elaborate a bit more and explain how many makes a "lots"
to
> you?

Actually Ed, since you're the one taking issue with Dick about "lots", you
need to explain how many "lots" and "some" are, in order to support your
point of contention about it.

3273. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 16:04:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3h2a6$l4o$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 32783

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5C0A7D.E796D6F0@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > How's the popularity of the 70cm band where you are?
>
> To the best of my knowledge, the only 70cm ham signal on the
> air in Madison County, TX is my remote control stuff.

Cool. I think my remote control stuff is in the 900-1200 nm band.

3274. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 17:20:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D6371.856072D7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32785

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about
> >other
> >> >> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no
> >more
> >> >> technology is needed be archaic?
> >>
> >> > Where have you seen anyone doing that?
> >>
> >> With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?
> >
> > Did you find your own question to be ambiguous? I didn't. So
> >I'll ask again: where have you seen anyone doing that?
>
> Nothing ambiguous about the question at all, Dick, but if it is too hard for
> you, I will let you pass.

Sorry, Ed I won't let you pass. :-) Where have you seen anyone who uses incandescent bulbs state that no more technology is needed? (your question)

3275. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 17:22:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D6400.93B42DC9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32786

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
> >licenses of only 8,336.
>
> > Looks like basically a bargain basement
> >"gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to upgrade
> >without it.
>
> Is that how you characterize an increase int he number of hams of about 10% per
> year? How odd!
>

Nope. The number of upgrades. Were have you ever seen such a surge of upgrades before? Never. It's the antithesis of Incentive Licensing, where the goal was to actually learn more radio. Here the goal was simply "get the numbers up".

3276. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 17:30:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D65C3.9F06E86@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32787

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >The other way of looking at it of course, is that 75,000 were motivated
> >enough to upgrade. We do want people to upgrade, right Dick?
>
> It is beginning to appear that Dick doesn't. That is pretty odd, too.

I'll say it again, it's clear the goal of the recent restructuring was to merely get the numbers up, both in new hams and upgrades, as opposed to that of Incentive Licensing which was to learn more radio and prove it by taking and passing difficult exams. No wonder so many longtime hams feel contempt for the currently trendy viewpoint.
Do I want people to upgrade? Just for the sake of them holding a higher class license for which they were required to do little or nothing significant? What's the point?

3277. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 17:48:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D6A0E.227320FE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32788

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in the modes
> >and
> >> methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that you are
> >telling
> >> us about.
>
> > I imagined you read QST. Sorry.
>
> That is a pretty odd thing to say, Dick. Do you really think I don't read QST?
> Sorry.
>
> I recall some really cool experimentation being featured in QST, but not
> "lots." Can you elaborate a bit more and explain how many makes a "lots" to
> you?

Evidently you take different information from what you read in QST than I. I get the idea that there *are* a lot of leading edge hams dlong interesting things with new technologies. Even me, one who doesn't write software nor design anything digital, a leftover from the analog age. I still do a lot of computing on ham radio, hey, I even recently bought a new 1.1 Ghz computer running Windows XP just to play ham radio with. Runs MIXwin really well, and I wasn't sure that XP would do that until I tried it. The hams who got MIXwin together were doing some neat things with technollogy. I get to benefit by being able to follow up and use the fruits of their work. Dots that leave me out of the list of "lots" of hams doing things with newer technologies? Gee, I hoped you would think that guys like might number in the "lots" right along with the geeks who design the stuff. There are clearly "lots" of them, out there, too, tho most of them clearly are employed in the field. Certainly nothing wrong with that. As a young fellow I did that with the things I learned as a ham, and spent a career doing. I applaud the guys who still do that, tho it is dissapointing that many of them seem to fail to realize what got them where they are,what went before, and have little or no regard for the rich history and traditions of ham radio.

What *really* shows their lack of understanding is how they act toward anyone who acknowledges the communications value of CW, even in the face of technology, to be a retro or Luddite, whatever else they're doing. Makes them look a bit dense, doesn't it?

BTW, I was disappointed to find that MIXwin works PACTOR on receive only. If it would transmit also that would be the complete digicomm program for hams. Any idea if they plan to upgrade it to PACTOR transmit also?

3278. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 17:52:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D6AFA.DA8084AC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32789

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for no
> >"reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
> >
>
> To quote the gist of some of your past posts, those that don't know the answer
> would never understand the explanation.
>
> I bet that most hams know the answer...

Well I know the answer. I got the satisfaction of returning something to a hobby that has provided so much to me. And I would imagine that Cecil got some satisfacttion from learning Morse code in Cub scouts, deny it as he will.

3279. ARNewsline 1277 - Feb 1 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 18:28:18 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202132818.28179.00001333@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32790

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1277 – February 1, 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1277 with a release date of Friday, February 1st, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

The President of the United States speaks to hams in Florida and is ham radio seeing a second Solar Max? These stoies are first on amateur Radio Newsline report number 1277 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

BREAKING NEWS: PRESIDENT BUSH COMES TO HAM RADIO

The President of the United States has come to ham radio. Bill Burnett, KT4SB, has the details:

--

President George W. Bush has taken to the ham radio airwaves. This, to thank the Florida Amateur Radio community for being ready to serve the public when it is needed.

The President’s comments were made during a stopover the morning of January 31st at the Volusia County Fire Services and Training Center near Daytona. Around 9:15 AM Eastern Time, President Bush checked in to the Northern Florida Amateur Radio Emergency Service Net on 3.950 MHz using a portable station set up John Schmidt, AF4PU. Then the President made these remarks to the 40 or so stations listening to the net:

--

President George W. Bush:

"I want to thank all the volunteers who help make sure that Florida is prepared for any kind of emergency. I also want to assure you that your Federal government is doing everything we can to make sure that there is not an emergency--starting with unleashing the mighty U.S. military overseas to bring evil ones to justice. But should there be a need for a response, I want to thank you all for helping our communities be prepared. And finally, I want to tell you--we are lucky to be Americans and may God continue to bless this great land of ours. Thank you very much."

--

Needless to say the net members were delighted to have the President of the United States address them. More important, hams nationwide can now be sure that President Bush knows that Amateur Radio operators are ready to serve whenever he, and the nation, needs to call on them for help.

In Miami, I’m Bill Burnett, KT4SB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

The complete story is on the web at
http://firstcoastcommunity.jacksonville.com/northfloridaamateurradiosocietynofars (Tnx NU4F, CQ Magazine)

**

HAM RADIO SCIENCE: TWO SOLAR MAXIMUMS THIS SEASON

In case you are wondering why the current solar cycle is still providing such amazing VHF and UHF DX, one researcher may have the answer. He says that the current cycle appears to be having a second peak and that this is really not very unusual. Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, looks at the scientist and his latest data.

--

The most recent and ongoing Solar Maximum -- or Solar Max -- theoretically crested in mid-2000. Sunspot counts were higher than they had been in 10 years, and solar activity was intense. One remarkable eruption on July 14, 2000 caused brilliant auroras as far south as Texas. But after that, sunspot counts slowly declined and the Sun was relatively quiet for month-long stretches. Most scientists said that the Solar Max was over. But was it?

Now, as 2002 unfolds, the National Aeronautics and Space Administrations solar foorecasters say that it looks as if the Solar Max is back with us again. The Sun is again peppered with spots, eruptions are frequent and hams notice that the VHF DX keeps rolling in.

Why is this happening? Well David Hathaway, a solar physicist at the NASA Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville Alabama has one theory. Hathaway says that the current solar cycle appears to be double-peaked, and the second peak has arrived.

--
Hathaway Audio Here
In-Q: We have seen other cycles...
Out-Q: ...define this maximum
--

Scientists track solar cycles by counting sunspots and Hathaway is an expert forecaster of sunspot numbers. He says that sunspot counts peaked in 2000 some months earlier than we expected. He says that the subsequent dip toward solar minimum seemed premature and before long, sunspot counts reversed course and began to climb toward a second maximum that now appears to be only a few percent smaller than the first.

--
Hathaway Audio Here
In-Q: Its a bigger than average...
Out-Q: ...smaler than 19, 21 and 22.
--

Hathaway notes that there is a widespread misconception that solar activity varies every eleven years like a pure sinusoidal wave. It isn't. He says that solar activity is chaotic and there can be more than one peak in any given period. Translated for ham radio: Enjoy the VHF DX while you can.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ.

--

Hathaway says that the Solar Max eleven years ago was much the same as this one. The first peak arrived in mid-1989 followed by a smaller maximum in early 1991. And if you are interested in hearing more about this interesting phenomena from David Hathaway its as easy as taking your web browser over to www.rainreport.com. Or you can call on the phone to area code 847-827-7246. (NASA, RAIN)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HF ANTENNA INSTALLED ON ISS

High Frequency ham radio operations from the International Space Station could be on the not to distant horizon. This, after a successful space walk on January 25th to install another antenna on the orbiting outpost. Amateur Radio Newsline's Roy Neal, K-6-D-U-E, has the details.

--

The spacewalkers have had another good day in space. On Friday the 25th of January, Cosmonaut Yuri Onufrienko, RK3DUO and Astronaut Dan Bursch, KD5PNU, successfully mounted a second ham radio antenna near a docking port amidships on the International Space Station. It is made of flexible tape and is similar to but longer than another antenna installed on January 14th. That one tunes both VHF and UHF frequencies. The new antenna will tune HF frequencies.

ARISS Board Chairman Fran Bauer, KA3HDO, says it definitely will work on ten meters and may even be made to work on 15 and 20 meters. BUT right now there is no gear on board to handle those frequencies. Experiments using the lower frequencies are on the list of futures for ARISS but no timetable has been assigned to design and build them.

Owen Garriott, W5LFL, the first man to operate ham equipment in space, once prophesied that a five watt transmitter in orbit might well be heard simultaneously world wide. The great number of hams with good stations on the lower frequencies also makes them enticing to ARISS. It's a safe bet that serious consideration now is being given to expedite such a project. Once a station is sent up, the antenna will be waiting.

The new antenna is the second of four to be installed on board the space station. No timetable has been announced for the final installation. All of

these amateur antennas were built by Italy, tested and qualified in the US, to fit ports built by Russia, as befits the international nature of the ISS.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Roy Neal, K6DUE

--

Installation of the 2.5-meter long flexible tape antenna involved not only the mechanical deployment but routing cables and establishing the R-F connection as well. (ARISS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: THAT ANNOYING SATELLITE IS OFF 2 METERS

An annoying mystery satellite transmitting AFSK, frequency modulated Morse on 144.100 MHz for several days has been identified. It turned out to be a signal from the MAROC-TUBSAT satellite. This is an Earth-sensing spacecraft owned by a Moroccan government agency called he Royal Center for Remote Sensing. It was placed into a polar orbit by a Russian launcher on December 10, 2001.

As soon as he learned of the interference to amateur operations, Professor Udo Renner of the Center had the 144.100 MHz transmitter turned off. He then notified AMSAT Germany that TUBSAT was no longer on two meters.

But TUBSAT also has a downlink at 436.075 MHz. This system is only busy over North Africa and Europe and only when the control stations in Rabat and Berlin are activated. It has not been heard elsewhere in the world. (AMSAT-NA)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Pentucket Radio Club repeater serving Groveland Massachusetts

(5 sec pause here)

**

SPECTRUM PRESERVATION: ARRL SAYS IT WILL FIGHT TO KEEP RFID OFF 70 CM

The ARRL says that it will go all the way to protect the 70 centimeter ham band from a threat brought by commercial interests. At issue is a plan from SAVI Technology and already tentatively agreed to by the FCC to deploy unlicensed transient R-F identification tag transmitters operating between 425 and 435 MHz. These tags run at much higher field strengths and duty cycles than Part 15 rules now permit.

According to a League bulletin issued on January 29th, ARRL officials have already met with members of the FCC staff as part of the League's effort to stave off a band threat. The bulletin says that General Counsel Chris Imlay, W3KD, and ARRL Technical Relations Manager Paul Rinaldo, W4RI, delivered an ex parte presentation to FCC Office of Engineering and Technology staffers January

14th outlining the opposition of the ham radio community. (ARRL)

**

FCC: CHAIRMAN POWELL HOME AFTER HOSPITAL TESTS

Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell was discharged from the hospital on Friday January 25th. This, after a two-night stay in the to undergo tests because of a lingering stomach bug.

Stomach discomfort caused him to cancel appearances at the Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas on January 8th and again at the annual conference of the National Association of Television Program Executives on Wednesday January 23rd. Doctors advised precautionary tests that required overnight stays at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in suburban Washington. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THAT SONG WAS NOT AS BAD AS WE THOUGHT

The Federal Communications Commission has dropped an indecency fine against a Colorado radio station. KKMG FM of Colorado Springs had been fined seven-thousand dollars for airing the edited version of Eminem's "The Real Slim Shady." This, after a listener wrote the regulatory agency to complain.

At the time the fine was issued federal regulators said the edited version still included some expletives and references to violence and graphic sex. But the FCC now says it has reconsidered. It now says that the lyrics in the edited version didn't violate its rules by being "patently offensive." (FCC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: BRAZIL RADIO OPERATORS HELP IN POWER OUTAGE CRISIS

A major electricity blackout hit at least five Brazilian states on January 21st, and it was hobby radio enthusiasts that let people know about it.

The blackout, which began at 1:30 p.m., hit hardest in the industrial southeast and the major cities of Sao Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Rio De Janeiro, Goiania, Vitoria and the capital, Brasilia.

According to news reports, Brazil’s National Energy Agency blamed the outage on transmission line failures. The same news report credited Brazilian hobby radio operators as informing authorities that subways in Rio De Janero and Sao Paulo were halted and that traffic lights were out snarling commuters in several areas.

The outage was caused by a failure at the Itaipu hydroelectric station in southwestern Brazil. A power-line failure caused thirteen of the dam's eighteen turbines to stop, cutting off nearly 20 percent of the country's energy. Power was restored about three hours later. The news story did not identify the radio operators as being hams. (Various shortwave news reports)

**

RESCUE RADIO: NEW INTER-JURISDICTION RADIO SYSTEMS BEING INTRODUCED

Santa Clara County California, police, fire and emergency medical personnel have never been able to communicate with one another at the scene of a major disaster. This is because each agency uses a separate radio system. That is expected to change this year.

Santa Clara County will be leading the nation in using new digital radio technology to solve the inter-agency communications problem. The new system will allow up to eighteen participating jurisdictions in any county to talk to one another instantly.

By way of example, once the system is up and running, officers involved in one of California's famed high-speed car chase will be able to talk directly to police in the neighboring jurisdiction as the suspect approaches that town. They won't have to switch channels or go through dispatch centers. This means less time wasted and the probability that lives will be saved.

While Santa Clara county is at the head of the pack in adopting this new digital communications technology, the same news reports say that and Washington, D-C is not far behind. (Cal-State Info.)

**

PUBLIC RELATIONS: A CHEAP SATELLITE

A Cheap Satellite is the name of an Associated Press item that highlighted the work of the faculty and students at the United States Naval Academy in the development and launch of the P C Sat ham radio satellite. The story tells how the twenty-five pound bird was built using off the shelf products including a tape measure for its antenna and rechargeable double A cell batteries for power.

The story was written by Tom Stuckey and moved on the wire on Wednesday January 23rd. It noted that PCSat, was the 44th amateur satellite put in orbit. It is one of more than a dozen built by university students around the world. (VHF Reflector)

**

CONVENTIONS & HAMFESTS: ORLANDO HAMCATION WEAK SIGNAL FORUM

The Orlando HamCation will host its first ever Weak Signal VHF and UHF forum. Beginning at 2 p.m. on Saturday Ferbruary 9th, the one hour session will be moderated by N2CEI, of Down East Microwave. Also, Tom Haddon, K5VH, will be on hand to motivate more Florida hams to become active on the Microwave bands.

If you are in the Orlando Florida area on February 8th to the 10th drop in on the Orlando Hamcation. For more details and or advance reservations, go to oarc.org/hamcat.html on the World Wide Web (W2BZY)

**

CONVENTIONS & HAMFESTS: DATE CHANGE FOR RADIOFEST 2002

Brian Broggie, W6FVI, asks that we pass along a date change for RadioFest 2002 sponsored by the Naval Post Graduate School Amateur Radio Club in Monterey California. The new date is February 23rd. More information is in cyberspace at k6ly.org/radiofest. (W6FVI)

**

BREAK 2

Here when you need us 52 weeks a year. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website at www .arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO SCHOLARSHIPS: THE DARA SCHOLARSHIPS

The Dayton Amateur Radio Association is one of three ham radio organizations seeking nominations for its scholarship program for the 2002-2003 academic year. According to DARA, applicants must be graduating high school seniors in 2002 and hold any class of an FCC issued mateur Radio license. The scholarship awards run up to $2000, as determined by the scholarship committee. Money must be used toward tuition at an institution of higher education.

To obtain an application, send a self-addressed, stamped envelope to the Dayton Amateur Radio Association Scholarship Program, 9873 Lower Valley Pike, Medway, Ohio 45341. You can also obtain an application by e-mail to n8emo1@msn.com. Completed applications must be postmarked no latter than June 1st to be eligible for this years scholarship program. (DARA)

**

HAM RADIO SCHOLARSHIPS: THE FOUNDATION FOR AMATEUR RADIO

Another organization offering scholarships to hams id the Foundation For Amateur Radio. The Washington, D.C. area group will administer sixty-two scholarships for the academic year running from 2002 through 2003. Licensed Radio Amateurs may compete for these awards if they plan to pursue a full-time course of studies beyond high school and are enrolled in or have been accepted for enrollment at an accredited university, college or technical school. The awards range from $500 to $2500 with preference given in some cases to residents of specified geographical areas or the pursuit of certain study programs. Additional information and an application form may be requested by letter or QSL card to the FAR Scholarships, Post Office Box 831, Riverdale, Maryland, 20738. (Foundation For Amateur Radio)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SOUTH AFRICA: SA RADIO AMATEURS OF THE YEAR NAMED

Turning to international news, South Africa is honoring two of its own as that nations Radio Amateurs of the Year. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, brings us the details:

--
The South African Amateur Radio Development Trust have announced the winners of the 2001 Siemens Radio Amateur of the Year Award. This award is made annually to a Radio Amateur who has made a major contribution to the Amateur Service either on a technical or development basis in ZS land.

The award has been bestowed jointly on Bradley Phillips, ZS5BP, and Garth Wilson, ZR6CY. ZS5BP for his work on the introduction of Iphone and the development of the Internet Radio Linked project. ZR6CY for his continuous efforts to develop communication skills amongst the youth. He has to date presented no less than 80 camps for Voortrekkers to learn the Morse code and basic communication skills.

For Q-News Australia, I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

This award is considered as South Africa's equivalent to the Dayton awards presented here in the United States. (SARL News, Q-News)

**
INTERNATIONAL - UK: KENWOOD TROPHY AWARDED TO G3XWH

Meantime, over in the U-K, Richard Horton, G3XWH, who chaired the RSGB's Future Licensing and Examination Forum has been awarded the Kenwood Trophy. This, for his significant contribution to training and development in amateur radio.

Horton recently retired from the Radio Society of Great Britain's Board where he was responsible for amateur radio development. His committee was responsible for much of the work that went into the creation of the new U-K Foundation Class license. (GB2RS)

**
DX

In DX, DJ4KW and DK9GG are currently active from Belize as V31YN and V31GW, respectively, through early February. Activity is on CW, RTTY and PSK 31. (RSGB)

And IN3QBR will be active from Vientiane as XW3QBR until the 31st of July. He will be joined, from the 20th of April until the 10th of May by IN3ZNR operating as XW3ZNR. (OPDX)

And R1ANF began operations as CE9 slash R1ANF on the 29th of December from a Chilean base in the South Shetland Islands. He is active on 10 to 28MHz with 100 watts to an R6000 vertical. For all three QSL as directed on the air. (RSGB)

**
THAT FINAL ITEM: CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ED CLEGG W2LOY

And finally this week, if you were on the VHF bands in the 50's, 60's and 70's then the name Clegg Labs touched your ham radio operations. And as we hear in

this report, the family of the man behind the gear is inviting you to help celebrate his life.

--

Even if you did not own any Clegg gear, the chances are that you talked to someone on the air who did. Whether it was the top of the line Interceptor receiver and Zeus transmitter or the entry level 99'er transceiver, it was easy to spot a Clegg signal by its almost overpowering modulation that seemed just right for the R-F carrier it was on.

Almost every product that carried the Clegg label was designed by the company's founder Edward T. Clegg, W2LOY. When he moved the company to Pennsylvania in the 1970's, Ed took the call W3LOY. Likewise, after retiring to Ohio he traded the 3 for an 8, but kept the famed L-O-Y suffix.

And regardless of the call area, Ed Clegg was first and foremost a communications designer well ahead of his time. Even more important, he was a positive influence on just about everyone with whom he came in contact.

Ed Clegg left us last September at age 80. Now, his wife Martie will be hosting a gathering in March near the Clegg home in Lancaster Ohio. The purpose is to celebrate the life of Edward T. Clegg. And they are asking you to help.

Martie, her daughter Linda and Linda's husband Rob MacGuffie, K2HZN, are asking anyone who knew Ed to share in the celebration. They know that most of you won't be able to be in Lancaster Ohio on March 30th. But some of you do have memories, stories, photos and other Ed Clegg memorabilia that would help to make this day even more unforgettable.

If you have something to share, please contact Linda and Rob before the end of February. Their address is 70 Province Road, Gilmanton New Hampshire with a zipcode of 03237. Rob's cyperspace address is K2HZN@yahooo.com.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Cathy Anno, KB0FDU.

--

By the way, a number of us here at the Amateur Radio Newsline began our ham radio careers using gear designed by Ed Clegg. In fact, our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, got to know Ed while Bill was still a teenager operating A-M on the 6 meter band. (Clegg family)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm _____
saying welcome to the year 2002, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur
Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

3280. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 19:27:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#CAdb9BrBHA.1060@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 32791

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> To the best of my knowledge, the only 70cm ham signal on the
> air in Madison County, TX is my remote control stuff.
>

Turn your beam over towards North Zulch. My directory lists
an "N5WRK/B" propagation beacon on 432.315MHz,
OMNI 2W ERP 42M HAAT.

3281. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 19:36:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5C3FD5.6502D18A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32792

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > To the best of my knowledge, the only 70cm ham signal on the
> > air in Madison County, TX is my remote control stuff.
>
> Turn your beam over towards North Zulch. My directory lists
> an "N5WRK/B" propagation beacon on 432.315MHz,
> OMNI 2W ERP 42M HAAT.

I can only do FM on 70cm.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3282. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 20:19:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202151950.16072.00000834@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32793

"Kim" wrote:

>> N2EY wrote

>> >> ."Jay" wrote:

>> >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
>spent
>> >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid
>me
>> >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
>> >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
>> >>
>> >> Thank you, "Jay".
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was
>there
>> >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
>prizes?

>> Where do you think Jay was, and what do
>> you think he was doing?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Don't know.

Think about it.

Here's a hint: He spent the last 2 weeks of September and the first three weeks

of October somewhere "downtown" with the Red Cross and Salvation Army. And
everyone there had to wear coveralls and use face masks.

> I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
>that he forgot to mention it.

What "trophies"?

>Doubt wherever it was would change my
>impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off, has
>a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.

Some people have very short memories.

Thanks again, "Jay".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3283. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 21:57:12 UTC
From: n3ab@fast.net
Message-ID: <3c5e5f76.14324900@news.fast.net>
Source record: 32794
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 05:01:26 -0500, "Malcontent" <Anon@Anon.com> wrote:

>
>

<SNIP>

>reason that I hesitate taking the written test for Extra. It seems that the
>Extras resent those of us that test "up" to Extra....after all, they earned
>their ticket the hard way and they see us newbie Extras as interlopers.
>They feel that I should not be an Extra since my 13 wpm did not meet the
>criteria.

I've been a ham since 1968 and had my Extra since '74, so using your terminology, I took the tests "the hard way". I resent no one who enters our hobby no matter how he or she took any tests. And I do not consider a "newbie Extra" (your terminology) as an "interloper". Please don't wrongly judge many of us who have been in the hobby most of our lives and are happy to see ham radio thrive. Your note indicates that you are the one who is biased. We all share a common hobby, but sometimes I wonder.....

John N3AB

3284. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:04:08 UTC
From: kb0pyo <kb0pyo@redred.com>
Message-ID: <3C5C6258.C30DB6C5@redred.com>
Source record: 32795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

rec.radio.swap deleted from reply, and this has what to do with buying
or selling radios?

George wrote:
>
> Exactly, the more stupid pathetic people like this S Hanrahan keeps on
> whining and moaning the more the cb'rs are going to do it. Just to annoy the
> Pillock
>
> --
> ***The Sorcerer***
> remove Spam for reply
>
> "Stahr" <w6nyc(remove this to email)@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:LAG68.100$Hb6.14339@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Do we really have to go through all this CRAP again????????
> >
> > Can't there be at least a month between these stupid posts?
> >
> > Dennis
> >
> >
> > "S. Hanrahan" <2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c5af818.16182201@isp-west.usenetserver.com...
> > > On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:52:04 -0500, OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
> > > >more political power.
> > > >
> > > >I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> > > >just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> > > >can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> > > >they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> > > >hams!
> > > >My $.02
> > > >Merry Christmas to all
> > > >KA3DWW
> > >
> > > Now easier than ever, thanks to the license class restructuring.
> > >
> > > Stacey, AA7YA
> > >

> > >
> >
> >
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.314 / Virus Database: 175 - Release Date: 11/01/02

3285. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:31:34 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16c678efcbc22a6a9896ba@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32796

In article <20020202151950.16072.00000834@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
says...
> "Kim" wrote:
>
> >> N2EY wrote
>
> >> >> ."Jay" wrote:
>
> >> >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
> >spent
> >> >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid
> >me
> >> >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
> >> >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
> >> >>
> >> >> Thank you, "Jay".
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was
> >there
> >> >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
> >prizes?
>
> >> Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> >> you think he was doing?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >Don't know.
>
> Think about it.
>
> Here's a hint: He spent the last 2 weeks of September and the first three weeks
>
> of October somewhere "downtown" with the Red Cross and Salvation Army. And
> everyone there had to wear coveralls and use face masks.
>
> > I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
> >that he forgot to mention it.
>
> What "trophies"?
>
> >Doubt wherever it was would change my

> >impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off, has
> >a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.
>
> Some people have very short memories.
>
> Thanks again, "Jay".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
Skiing wasn't that great. Besides being very warm one day, like in the mid 50's, that storm over the past two days dumped more ice than snow so I came home to find this stuff. All I can say is WOW (not WHIP em OUT WEDNESDAY!)

Anyway, thanks Jim, if thanks can be said. It was done out a sense of duty for lack of better words. Several of my neighbors here in Bronxville lost family and when the call went out for any WECA club members with EMT experience, neither my wife nor my children complained that I was playing "radio" again, although this time, it was little if any radio. Several of my club friends were in the pit helping dig. Fortunately I only was at "ground zero" for 2 days. In all my life I will never forget what I saw. Mainly I was a block away, most of the time doing moderate EMT care, cuts, scrapes, a lot of eyewashing and nasal lavage.

As to Kim, what can anyone say. She asks a question and I answered. If the answer is so far over her head, tuff shit. I forget that the further you get away from the city, the more surreal the whole thing gets. There are people I talk to on HF still have a hard enough time try to envision what happen and you expect some "slightly" overweight broad who is proud of the fact she buys designer clothes from Omar the Tentmaker to understand? You are asking way to much.

I'd gladly trade in my "trophies" if the whole thing could be considered a do-over. But I wouldn't expect her understanding on this, better yet, from what I've seen she shows a regular lack of any understanding on many issues. She's what they call a Yenta..someone who sticks their big fat nose into everything whether they need to or not.

And yes Kim, I was impressed. Impressed with the huge number of people who dropped everything and came to help. From the 5 star chefs who came and cooked food 24/7 for everyone free of charge to the Mayor who up until that time I thought was a pompous ass until I saw the man break down and cry at the site of what was once a wonder of the world.

And I mentioned being paid because IBM doesn't pay for off time like this. Yes they are paying for employees called up to active duty, but never for someone just taking off for 5 weeks. However due to the situation and because it involved only several dozen people, Corporate decided we'd get paid so that we could continue what we were doing and

not have to worry about our finances at home...amazing stuff indeed. I wouldn't expect someone like YOU o understand but then again I'm not asking you to understand because you never will. To you, it's all some TV type news program that you see on your 19" RCA couple of times per week.

I am sure you'll puff up larger than life, if that's possible, with the "I knew people who died" get all huffy and stomp your little size 13's on the ground, but that's OK You go girl

That's all I have to say on the subject. I am not asking for the understanding on why I did it, I can't really explain it, but Kim if you think I did it for trophies or to impress you or anybody, you're a BIGGER stupid broad than ever I give you credit for.

Pictures of WECA's involvement can be seen at:

http://www.weca.org/index.html

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

3286. CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:35:21 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0202021435.2a3ee7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I ran across the following story in a club newsletter.

At first glance it appears to be fuel for anti-ham/pro-illegal CB fires. But if you read closely, you can see that the ham in question has not only behaved responsibly, but he is actively being supported by both local and national ham organizations in dealing with the problem. Illegal CBers would never come forward to take responsibility, much less identify themselves.

Note the city council's reaction in paragraph 3. Anger and frustration. Can you blame them? The problem of high-powered CB outlaws running spectrally-dirty gear is epidemic throughout the USA. To the general public, a "radio operator" is one of these outlaw CB characters.

Most hams don't care what happens in the 11 meter band as long as it does not affect them. If they continue to maintain this policy they will face an increasing hostility in the eyes of the public who can't tell the difference between a licensed ham and a guy running 10 KW with an echo mike on channel 6.

-Aaron-

RFI COMPLAINTS, CITY COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT
FRUSTRATE MICHIGAN AMATEUR

Rob Underwood, W8YRB, says RFI complaints have him at his wit's end. The
Wyoming, Michigan, ARRL member says his efforts to resolve some neighbors'
complaints of stubborn interference are at an impasse. To add to his frustration, the Wyoming City Council now has asked the FCC to step in, and
the situation has erupted into a media spectacle that, he says, hasn't done
much for ham radio's image.

The FCC's position with respect to RFI to consumer devices is that the consumer device--telephone, stereo, TV or other appliance--most often is to
blame, and that consumers need to deal with appliance manufacturers. Underwood says he's gone the extra mile to resolve interference complaints,
but one neighbor a half block away has become especially intractable,

pinning blame for interference to her telephone and touch lamp squarely on
him. The woman ultimately complained to the city council, which met January
21 and unanimously agreed to contact the FCC.

****Underwood said city council members "threw their hands in the air, and most
of them said it was my station that needed to be 'filtered' and didn't want
to hear what my solutions were." ****

Twenty one amateurs reportedly attended the
council meeting on Underwood's behalf, and one Council member praised
Underwood's attempts to assist and to educate everyone.

Underwood said, however, that several other neighbors turned up at the
session with new RFI complaints he hadn't heard before. He's volunteered to
assist them. Underwood says media coverage has focused on the neighbors'
complaints rather than on his efforts to respond to them.

The neighbor's touch lamp seems especially susceptible to RFI and even
flickers when he keys his 100-W mobile transmitter while driving by her
house, Underwood said. Although he installed some ferrite chokes on the
lamp's power cord, the problem persisted. The neighbor has refused further
offers of help.

Underwood reports that his own home is essentially free of RFI problems,
with the exception of his cordless telephones when he runs his amplifier. He
said he installed RF chokes on telephone equipment for his immediate
neighbors who had complained of problems, and they have not reported any
interference since.

Underwood has the full support of ARRL Michigan Section Manager Dick Mondro,
W8FQT, who noted that the FCC Detroit Field Office was also aware of the
problem and has been cooperating in resolving the issue.

ARRL provides information and resources to deal with RFI problems on the
ARRL Web site's RFI pages .

3287. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:47:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32799

In article <20020201183058.26577.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>The CW requirements battle, carried on since the 1950's, has been a
>>>crippling one for Amateur Radio.
>
>>How, exactly? Give us some PROOF, for once.
>
>In one form or another, we have had code testing since day 1 in Amateur
>Radio.

Well, since 1912. Amateur radio existed before then, however.

>Hey, wasn't the first code test at 5 wpm? :-)

From 1912 to the 1917 shutdown for WW1. When hams were allowed back on the air in 1919, the test speed was 10 wpm.

>Over all of these years
>Amateur
>Radio has supposedly been crippled, it has grown and flourished.

Yup. Which disproves Bruce's claims.

> The only
>"leading indicator" is that the growth picked up with the no-code tests and
>appears to be picking up with the 5 wpm change.

Show us your numbers, Ed. What was the growth per year in the time periods before the Tech lost its code test in 1991, after that change, and before and after
the 2000 restructuring?
>
>In my personal opinion, though I have one on code testing, it is not that big
>of a deal one way or the other.

I think most hams feel the same way.

>It is a major leap to go from a belief that
>it
>is time to replace Morse testing with something else to it is "crippling
>Amateur Radio."
>
I'd go a step farther. Representing code tests as "crippling amateur radio" and "digging our heels in the past" does no good. In fact it does lots of damage by

diverting focus from the REAL problems confronting ham radio, like lack of publicity, RFI, antenna restrictions, band threats, etc.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3288. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:47:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020202174754.17580.00000784@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 32798

In article <20020202080745.11085.00000736@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> So we have about 75,000 upgrades and an increase on total numbers of
>>licenses of only 8,336.
>
>> Looks like basically a bargain basement
>>"gimmee" for all those already licensed who were too unmotivated to upgrade
>>without it.
>
>Is that how you characterize an increase int he number of hams of about 10%
>per
>year?

10% per year??? When did THAT happen, Ed?

--

Look at the increase since April 15 2000, then look at the increase for an identical period of time BEFORE that date.

http://www.ah0a.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3289. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-02 22:55:25 UTC
From: " .Your Friend Bill" <none@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C5C6E5D.680BBC71@coqui.net>
Source record: 32800
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

JRS wrote:
>
> On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 05:01:26 -0500, "Malcontent" <Anon@Anon.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
>
> <SNIP>
>
> >reason that I hesitate taking the written test for Extra. It seems that the
> >Extras resent those of us that test "up" to Extra....after all, they earned
> >their ticket the hard way and they see us newbie Extras as interlopers.
> >They feel that I should not be an Extra since my 13 wpm did not meet the
> >criteria.
>
> I've been a ham since 1968 and had my Extra since '74, so using your
> terminology, I took the tests "the hard way". I resent no one who
> enters our hobby no matter how he or she took any tests. And I do not
> consider a "newbie Extra" (your terminology) as an "interloper".
> Please don't wrongly judge many of us who have been in the hobby most
> of our lives and are happy to see ham radio thrive. Your note
> indicates that you are the one who is biased. We all share a common
> hobby, but sometimes I wonder.....
>
> John N3AB

John,
I'm about 2-3 years behind you in Novice and Extra. When I got my Extra
they were doing the multiple choice code test at a Hamfest instead of
solid-copy under the watchful eye of the FCC-marm in the Atlanta office,
a 5 hour drive away (or 5 days if you had to walk barefoot in the snow
carrying a load of firewood). The written test had been 'watered down'
to where it was easier than my Advanced. You'll probably recall that
that Extra was considered 'cheapened' at the time. And there was a time
when I wouldn't be caught dead with one of those newbie calls like I
have now.
Yes indeed, these little arguments fade with time. I don't think ham
radio is in danger of being overrun by people who aren't interested and
just get a license or upgrade because they are bored that day.

-Bill WX4A

3290. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 00:43:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202021643.2a195e07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32801

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5b452f_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>

> > >
> > Yahoo, somebody had to get it right and cut to the quick around
> here.
> > >
> > >
> > w3rv
>
> I guess you guys might be related?
>
>
Only in RRAP.
>
>
> You don't seem to grasp
> the idea that you don't HAVE to be conducting business on
> the ham bands to find high speed data useful ...
>
>
That one is between you and Jim.
>
>
> higher speeds
> also allow more people to share a channel in a way that's
> rather transparent to each other by sending the data they have
> to send quickly, then allowing the channel to be used by others.
>
>
Where? There isn't anywhere near the level of congestion in the
vhf/uhf ham bands to justify implementing schemes like that. And there
isn't enough bandwidth on the HF bands to provide "clear channel
comms" everywhere for everybody especially for complex data like
digitized voices, never mind full-blowm multimedia comms like we have
with the Internet.
>
>
> There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
> speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either don't
> recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is

> irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.
>
>
Nonsense. That's not where we're coming from at all, at least that's
not where I'm coming from. There is no doubt in my mind that there are
hams who would use high-speed data comms and I have no problem with
that at all. Nor do I have any problems with reasonable setasides for
operation of those modes *IF* they attract a significant user base
wash my mouf.
>
>
One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed digital
system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have yet
to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
>
>
Another rub being that, based on my observations and some discussions
the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close to
zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the dx
spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham radio
today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.
>
>
Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you attract.
But per previous, go for it, break out the soddering arn and put yer
techo-whizzies on the air and make idiots out of us retrograde noclue
J-38-pounding fossils who "don't understand the gifts you're
offering." Or shaddup.
>
>
You DO have a soddering arn dontcha Carl . . ?
>
>
Ah fuggit. We're all trollers around here.
>
>
Dit freakin' dit . . .
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

3291. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 01:20:56 UTC
From: 2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net
Message-ID: <3c5c900b.2538174@isp-west.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 14:01:36 +0000 (UTC), "George" <tronic@boxfrog.com>
wrote:

>Well that is hardly *just above the CB band* is it??

Right, it's within the ham bands, that's my point.

>and you are supposed to be a licensed Ham.

And you call yourself one too. Go figure.

AA7YA

3292. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 01:25:26 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202030125340.18370-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32803

On Sat, 2 Feb 2002, Aaron J. Grier wrote:
>D. Stussy <kd6lvw@att.net> wrote:
>> Interesting. You seemed to find at least ONE product that DID say
>> that it could be limited. I hadn't seen that one when I last looked
>> at the wireless lan stuff in early 2000 when I wanted to attach my
>> laptop to my in house network.
>
>I guess my mileage varied significantly. my first exposure to 802.11
>networking (the non-frequency hopping kind) came to me in the form of a
>couple of AT&T/lucent wavelan cards. the outside of the box gives a
>nebulous "features spread spectrum radio transmission in unlicensed
>bands (915MHz or 2.4GHz depending on country regulations)" and cracking
>open the manual reveals that the channels must be set manually.
>
>> Had that been among the boxes I had picked up and read, we wouldn't be
>> having this discussion. However, that product might be the exception,
>> not the rule.
>
>looking at the documentation that came with my original wavelan cards,
>they don't even mention 802.11. but that was 1996. but I now see how
>you came to your conclusion.

Thank you.

That was my whole point, summarized right there. :-)

3293. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 01:26:01 UTC
From: 2aa7ya@remove4spam.nemontel.net
Message-ID: <3c5c90ac.2699219@isp-west.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 09:07:57 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
<billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:

>Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
>was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
>the restructuring.

Put the blame where the blame fits. The ARRL is the lobbying force,
"the voice", if you will, of all those screaming hams, in Washington.

>
>I personally believe that the restructuring that is being used is wrong.
>Novice should be the entry level for HF, Tech for above 30 meters, with
>Extra being the third class. Keep General if necessary, but there is no
>real need for it.
>
>I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
>They are trivial to pass, right now.

Personally, I think they should leave the license classes as they are,
modernize the tests and yes, make them more rigorous again.

AA7YA

3294. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 01:27:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202030126520.18370-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32805

On 2 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)
>>he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works for a
>>company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham license and
>>a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty things.
>
>You could add that they do so on Amateur frequencies. :-)

Ah, but if they're not doing it AS AMATEURS, it's intrusion (even if it's
legal) and therefore a potential interference source.

3295. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 01:35:41 UTC
From: " .Your Friend Bill" <none@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C5C93ED.85364CBB@coqui.net>
Source record: 32806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>
> On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 09:07:57 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
> <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:
>
> >Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
> >was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
> >the restructuring.
>
> Put the blame where the blame fits. The ARRL is the lobbying force,
> "the voice", if you will, of all those screaming hams, in Washington.

Bzzzt. Although the ARRL is a lobbying force for hams, it is also a
lobbying force utilized by equip mfrs who would like to have a larger
market. The non-hams out there whittling toothpicks and cursing ham
radio because of the code requirement are not directly represented.
I don't think most of their members as licensed hams are screaming for a
reduction in standards.
Could be wrong. Follow the money...it says Icom/Yaesu/Kenwood/etc.
-Bill

3296. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 02:34:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ca37c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32808

Well, Jay, ya shoulda mentioned all that the first time 'round. That's all
I can say.

Kim W5TIT

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16c678efcbc22a6a9896ba@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <20020202151950.16072.00000834@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> says...
> > "Kim" wrote:
> >
> > >> N2EY wrote
> >
> > >> >> ."Jay" wrote:
> >
> > >> >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
> > >spent
> > >> >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even
paid
> > >me
> > >> >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to
keep the
> > >> >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Thank you, "Jay".
> > >> >>
> > >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >> >
> > >> >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay.
Was
> > >there
> > >> >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
> > >prizes?
> >
> > >> Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> > >> you think he was doing?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > >Don't know.
> >
> > Think about it.
> >
> > Here's a hint: He spent the last 2 weeks of September and the first
three weeks

> >
> > of October somewhere "downtown" with the Red Cross and Salvation Army.
And
> > everyone there had to wear coveralls and use face masks.
> >
> > > I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
> > >that he forgot to mention it.
> >
> > What "trophies"?
> >
> > >Doubt wherever it was would change my
> > >impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off,
has
> > >a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.
> >
> > Some people have very short memories.
> >
> > Thanks again, "Jay".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
> Skiing wasn't that great. Besides being very warm one day, like in the
> mid 50's, that storm over the past two days dumped more ice than snow so
> I came home to find this stuff. All I can say is WOW (not WHIP em OUT
> WEDNESDAY!)
>
> Anyway, thanks Jim, if thanks can be said. It was done out a sense of
> duty for lack of better words. Several of my neighbors here in
> Bronxville lost family and when the call went out for any WECA club
> members with EMT experience, neither my wife nor my children complained
> that I was playing "radio" again, although this time, it was little if
> any radio. Several of my club friends were in the pit helping dig.
> Fortunately I only was at "ground zero" for 2 days. In all my life I
> will never forget what I saw. Mainly I was a block away, most of the
> time doing moderate EMT care, cuts, scrapes, a lot of eyewashing and
> nasal lavage.
>
> As to Kim, what can anyone say. She asks a question and I answered. If
> the answer is so far over her head, tuff shit. I forget that the further
> you get away from the city, the more surreal the whole thing gets. There
> are people I talk to on HF still have a hard enough time try to envision
> what happen and you expect some "slightly" overweight broad who is proud
> of the fact she buys designer clothes from Omar the Tentmaker to
> understand? You are asking way to much.
>
>
> I'd gladly trade in my "trophies" if the whole thing could be
> considered a do-over. But I wouldn't expect her understanding on this,

> better yet, from what I've seen she shows a regular lack of any
> understanding on many issues. She's what they call a Yenta..someone who
> sticks their big fat nose into everything whether they need to or not.
>
>
> And yes Kim, I was impressed. Impressed with the huge number of people
> who dropped everything and came to help. From the 5 star chefs who came
> and cooked food 24/7 for everyone free of charge to the Mayor who up
> until that time I thought was a pompous ass until I saw the man break
> down and cry at the site of what was once a wonder of the world.
>
> And I mentioned being paid because IBM doesn't pay for off time like
> this. Yes they are paying for employees called up to active duty, but
> never for someone just taking off for 5 weeks. However due to the
> situation and because it involved only several dozen people, Corporate
> decided we'd get paid so that we could continue what we were doing and
> not have to worry about our finances at home...amazing stuff indeed. I
> wouldn't expect someone like YOU o understand but then again I'm not
> asking you to understand because you never will. To you, it's all some
> TV type news program that you see on your 19" RCA couple of times per
> week.
>
> I am sure you'll puff up larger than life, if that's possible, with the
> "I knew people who died" get all huffy and stomp your little size 13's
> on the ground, but that's OK You go girl
>
> That's all I have to say on the subject. I am not asking for the
> understanding on why I did it, I can't really explain it, but Kim if you
> think I did it for trophies or to impress you or anybody, you're a
> BIGGER stupid broad than ever I give you credit for.
>
> Pictures of WECA's involvement can be seen at:
>
> http://www.weca.org/index.html
>
>
>
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

3297. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 02:37:38 UTC
From: SideBand <ab8lr@csotbs.org>
Message-ID: <3C5CA272.5020607@csotbs.org>
Source record: 32807
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I fail to see where in the article anything is stated about illegal CB operations...

Did you make that up, or are you imagining things again?

-SSB

Aaron H. Voobner wrote:

> I ran across the following story in a club newsletter.
>
> At first glance it appears to be fuel for anti-ham/pro-illegal CB
> fires. But if you read closely, you can see that the ham in question
> has not only behaved responsibly, but he is actively being supported
> by both local and national ham organizations in dealing with the
> problem. Illegal CBers would never come forward to take
> responsibility, much less identify themselves.
>
> Note the city council's reaction in paragraph 3. Anger and
> frustration. Can you blame them? The problem of high-powered CB
> outlaws running spectrally-dirty gear is epidemic throughout the USA.
> To the general public, a "radio operator" is one of these outlaw CB
> characters.
>
> Most hams don't care what happens in the 11 meter band as long as it
> does not affect them. If they continue to maintain this policy they
> will face an increasing hostility in the eyes of the public who can't
> tell the difference between a licensed ham and a guy running 10 KW
> with an echo mike on channel 6.
>
> -Aaron-
>
> --
> RFI COMPLAINTS, CITY COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT
> FRUSTRATE MICHIGAN AMATEUR
>
> Rob Underwood, W8YRB, says RFI complaints have him at his wit's end.
> The
> Wyoming, Michigan, ARRL member says his efforts to resolve some
> neighbors'
> complaints of stubborn interference are at an impasse. To add to his
> frustration, the Wyoming City Council now has asked the FCC to step
> in, and
> the situation has erupted into a media spectacle that, he says, hasn't

> done
> much for ham radio's image.
>
> The FCC's position with respect to RFI to consumer devices is that the
> consumer device--telephone, stereo, TV or other appliance--most often
> is to
> blame, and that consumers need to deal with appliance manufacturers.
> Underwood says he's gone the extra mile to resolve interference
> complaints,
> but one neighbor a half block away has become especially intractable,
> pinning blame for interference to her telephone and touch lamp
> squarely on
> him. The woman ultimately complained to the city council, which met
> January
> 21 and unanimously agreed to contact the FCC.
>
> ****Underwood said city council members "threw their hands in the air,
> and most
> of them said it was my station that needed to be 'filtered' and didn't
> want
> to hear what my solutions were." ****
>
> Twenty one amateurs reportedly attended the
> council meeting on Underwood's behalf, and one Council member praised
> Underwood's attempts to assist and to educate everyone.
>
> Underwood said, however, that several other neighbors turned up at the
> session with new RFI complaints he hadn't heard before. He's
> volunteered to
> assist them. Underwood says media coverage has focused on the
> neighbors'
> complaints rather than on his efforts to respond to them.
>
> The neighbor's touch lamp seems especially susceptible to RFI and even
> flickers when he keys his 100-W mobile transmitter while driving by
> her
> house, Underwood said. Although he installed some ferrite chokes on
> the
> lamp's power cord, the problem persisted. The neighbor has refused
> further
> offers of help.
>
> Underwood reports that his own home is essentially free of RFI
> problems,
> with the exception of his cordless telephones when he runs his
> amplifier. He
> said he installed RF chokes on telephone equipment for his immediate
> neighbors who had complained of problems, and they have not reported
> any
> interference since.

>
> Underwood has the full support of ARRL Michigan Section Manager Dick
> Mondro,
> W8FQT, who noted that the FCC Detroit Field Office was also aware of
> the
> problem and has been cooperating in resolving the issue.
>
> ARRL provides information and resources to deal with RFI problems on
> the
> ARRL Web site's RFI pages .
>
> ---
>

--
73 de AB8LR, Chris

http://csotbs.shopiwon.com/ for great deals on computer products.

3298. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 02:55:26 UTC
From: Steven - KF2TI <kf2ti@mindsspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3i8ri$98l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32809

In article <3c5ca37c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> Well, Jay, ya shoulda mentioned all that the first time 'round. That's all
> I can say.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

sorry. I forget that this is seen differently from different parts of
the country. It's kind of like abbreviations. Everyone uses them and
expects everyone else to know there meaning.

Enjoy what's left of the weekend and remember.. Phil sez 6 more weeks of
winter...bad Phil..bad

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

3299. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:00:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3i90c025e8@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32812

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5C9F2A.891C61DE@worldnet.att.net...

> Well, you know how it is with those NCI folks, Ed. They have a lock on
"how it's
> supposed to be" and nothing anyone else has to say means anything at all.

If that's the way you see them, then you should join because you'd fit right
in.

3300. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:00:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ca972_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32811

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.16c678efcbc22a6a9896ba@news.earthlink.net...
>
> As to Kim, what can anyone say. She asks a question and I answered. If
> the answer is so far over her head, tuff shit. I forget that the further
> you get away from the city, the more surreal the whole thing gets.
>

I don't know that your point of view is accurate. Many here in Dallas were in utter shock for quite a few days after the WTC got hit. In fact, there are people who still get quite "on the edge" at the mere mention of further terrorist attacks. I can't say I was necessarily shocked, as the concept of someone doing that is quite equal to my idea of what mean people can really be like. And it doesn't surprise me at all to hear of people who *are* that mean to do such things.

>
> There
> are people I talk to on HF still have a hard enough time try to envision
> what happen and you expect some "slightly" overweight broad who is proud
> of the fact she buys designer clothes from Omar the Tentmaker to
> understand? You are asking way to much.
>

Wonder if you'd have helped people like myself, Jay? You sound like you were able to come through the whole thing with the same points of view and prejudices you have probably always had? Was it humbling at all to you? I really ask that with all sincerity. I saw a post from you wherein you mentioned not much other than the "trophies" (my term) you kept and, if you were saying that tongue-in-cheek it was not apparent to me. If you'd responded with some explanation of what you were talking about, I certainly didn't see it. I sounded mean, maybe. And you sound mean now, too, I might add.

>
> I'd gladly trade in my "trophies" if the whole thing could be
> considered a do-over. But I wouldn't expect her understanding on this,
> better yet, from what I've seen she shows a regular lack of any
> understanding on many issues. She's what they call a Yenta..someone who
> sticks their big fat nose into everything whether they need to or not.
>

At least you were able to maintain your prejudices against others and get back right away to normal life, right? By the way, isn't Yenta a mean term toward Jewish women? I'm not Jewish.

>
> And yes Kim, I was impressed. Impressed with the huge number of people
> who dropped everything and came to help. From the 5 star chefs who came
> and cooked food 24/7 for everyone free of charge to the Mayor who up
> until that time I thought was a pompous ass until I saw the man break
> down and cry at the site of what was once a wonder of the world.
>

Yeah, good 'ol Rudy. He surprised most who only knew him that way, eh?

>
> And I mentioned being paid because IBM doesn't pay for off time like
> this. Yes they are paying for employees called up to active duty, but
> never for someone just taking off for 5 weeks. However due to the
> situation and because it involved only several dozen people, Corporate
> decided we'd get paid so that we could continue what we were doing and
> not have to worry about our finances at home...amazing stuff indeed.
>

Yep, pretty amazing stuff.

>
> I
> wouldn't expect someone like YOU o understand but then again I'm not
> asking you to understand because you never will. To you, it's all some
> TV type news program that you see on your 19" RCA couple of times per
> week.
>

Uh, yeah sure. Yep, you sure did get back to normalcy real quick. I wonder how many people just like me were in that building. Would you feel the same way about them, still? I mean, you wanna get down to some really dirty pulls at the ego, let's just go for the jugular, OK?

>
> I am sure you'll puff up larger than life, if that's possible, with the
> "I knew people who died" get all huffy and stomp your little size 13's
> on the ground, but that's OK You go girl
>

Whew. Speaking of mean people! How mean *can* you get, Jay? Now you're getting warmed up. Nope, didn't know anyone. At least not that I know of. If you want something, though, my dad told me that he and my mom's best friend's son had some friends and their baby who were on the first plane that went into the building. That help ya out? How 'bout I get my dad to repeater over the repeater and I'll record it this time as his voice crackles? That make ya happy?

>
> That's all I have to say on the subject. I am not asking for the
> understanding on why I did it, I can't really explain it, but Kim if you
> think I did it for trophies or to impress you or anybody, you're a
> BIGGER stupid broad than ever I give you credit for.
>

Yep, sounds pretty mean to me. Well, no credit due here. And, like I said the text where you wrote that you got to keep this and that...well, gave me the impression that's all you really had been impressed with. However, now that you're back to normal and able to start slinging mud, I'm glad I was able to bring you back to your reality, eh?

> Pictures of WECA's involvement can be seen at:
>
> http://www.weca.org/index.html
>
>
>
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

I would say thanks, but it'd be rather perfunctory of me to do so at this point, don't ya think? Besides, I doubt your prejudiced mind would allow you to believe that maybe I'd mean it...so, we're even. Let's just not either of us go any further with our meanness--we've proven we can get pretty darned mean. But not *that* mean, right? I'll just say: "Welcome home, such as home is."

Kim W5TIT

3301. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:01:12 UTC
From: jbloom@arrl.org
Message-ID: <f8026928.0202021901.6cd08d1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32810

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> Show us your numbers, Ed. What was the growth per year in the time periods
> before the Tech lost its code test in 1991, after that change,

YEAR AMATEURS DELTA DELTA(%)
1980 393,000 --- ---
1990 467,000 74,000 19% (1980-1990)
2000 682,000 215,000 46% (2000-1990)

While we're at it, consider the number of licensees as a percentage of
the US population:

1980 0.17%
1990 0.19%
2000 0.25%

Clearly, growth spurted after the 1991 no-code license came into
effect. Do you really doubt that, Jim?

> and before and
> after
> the 2000 restructuring?

March 1999 674,719
March 2000 677,784 (1-yr growth: 3,065)
March 2001 684,359 (1-yr growth: 6,575)

After April 15, 2000 the numbers rose at a higher rate than in the
immediately preceding period until they reached their peak in March
2001. Since then they've declined some. That's probably no
coincidence: the decline began just as the first 1991 no-code licences
began to expire. The no-code rules caused a jump in the license
numbers, and it's not surprising to see a matching decline as those
licenses reach their expiration dates. Whether these expirations will
continue to offset growth remains to be seen. It's way too early to
tell for sure.

Caveat: All of this 1-year-term number crunching is pretty tenuous
stuff upon which to draw conclusions. After all we're talking about
sub-1% variations. Those are pretty small potatoes. In the last 12
months, from Jan '01 to Jan '02 the change in the count was zero.
(Yes, exactly zero, according to AH0A.) From Jul '97 to Jul '98
(pre-restructuring) we lost 5,331 licensees. What does that tell us
about the success of restructuring? Not a damn thing.

> I'd go a step farther. Representing code tests as "crippling amateur radio" and
> "digging our heels in the past" does no good. In fact it does lots of damage by

>
> diverting focus from the REAL problems confronting ham radio, like lack of
> publicity, RFI, antenna restrictions, band threats, etc.

Maybe, but I don't think the impact has been very significant. It's not as though those other areas aren't being worked on. And to the degree the no-code debate has diverted attention, aren't those on BOTH sides who allowed themselves to be diverted from more important issues equally to blame?

Jon

3302. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:13:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3i9o7026vk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32813

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5CA976.1A5B66AA@worldnet.att.net...

> Americns are dying in droves due to being overweight, out of shape with
plugged
> arteries because "things are easier".
> Did you have a point?

Wow! That's really a stretch - comparing progress with poor personal
choices. What are you going to do for your next trick?

3303. Re: "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:15:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3i9t60278v@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32814

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c5b4ea9_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Whew. I discussed this so much with the last round (the one I thought
would
> live until around March), that it's gotten second-hat and boring... Larry
> must not be able to see past the nose on his face.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'm sure he can, but his tunnel vision has blotted out the rest of the
picture.

3304. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:37:04 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB023.9042664A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32815

All Hail, the Darth Vader of Amateur Radio and his 21st
Century manifesto!

This chilling statement reminds me of another from recent
history:

"You may write over the German Army: "The end of the German
Army." For then, gentlemen, you must definitely become
political....You may then become hangmen of the regime and
political commissars, and if you do not behave your wife and
child will be put behind locked doors. And if you still do
not behave, you will be thrown out and perhaps stood up
against a wall ..."

Bruce Perens wrote:
>
>
>
> You may know me: I'm Bruce Perens K6BP. I'm the founder of No-Code
> International.

> The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
> national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight. National
> Amateur Radio societies that lobbied to preserve code testing would
> likely be opposed by their own governments and citizens.
>
> NCI has always been an adversary, and now it's time for us to be a
> partner. Our opposition has conceded enough that it's time for NCI to
> reconcile with them. If we don't do so, we could snatch defeat from the
> jaws of victory by motivating new opposition in the no-code battle.

3305. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 03:59:05 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB54C.9B49C2C2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32816

Hi Ed,

Let's see if I get it. The End-Game is that Amateur Radio
will be "transformed" into a technocrat society full of
Bruce Peren's, Carl Stevenson's, Gary Coffman's, Len of 21's
etc, interspersed with their band of followers and
apologists. The rest of us will forced to resign in shame
because we cannot keep up with the cutting edge of the next
digital protocol that IEEE cranks out. What a wonderful
world that will be!

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for no
> >"reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
> >
>
> To quote the gist of some of your past posts, those that don't know the answer
> would never understand the explanation.
>
> I bet that most hams know the answer...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3306. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 04:09:09 UTC
From: Mike <mdickman@bevcomm.net>
Message-ID: <3C5CB820.CE1B2DAD@bevcomm.net>
Source record: 32817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Malcontent wrote:

> > Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
> > was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
> > the restructuring.
> >
> > I personally believe that the restructuring that is being used is wrong.
> > Novice should be the entry level for HF, Tech for above 30 meters, with
> > Extra being the third class. Keep General if necessary, but there is no
> > real need for it.
> >
> > I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
> > They are trivial to pass, right now.
> >
> > --
> > Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>
> Of course we all have our differing opinions. As a 13 wpm General I feel
> slighted that a 5 wpm tech is to be shoved into my slot without ever having
> to pound a key.

I did not like CW shoved at me, as I could care less to "pound a key" Last time
I checked this was the "new" millenuim. If you want old modes, use them.
String and two paper cups work too, I do not see AT & T using them. At least
some of us will try something new and different.

--
Mike
KD4LLA

3307. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 04:13:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020202231350.09596.00000004@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32819

In article <20020202080505.11085.00000732@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Fred is in the commercial exams and study guide business. Although those
>study
>guides do compete with those of other publishers, that doesn't mean that all
>aspects of the ARRL/W5YI relationship are adversarial. Fred's ARRL
>membership
>is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support
>the
>good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need to
>be done better.

Yeah, like working to eliminate the requirement that hams learn
an important communications skill at a moderate (13-20 WPM) level.
IOW, dumb hams down so they can get a license and hopefully buy
whatever he's selling at the moment. Fred has his own best interests
at heart, to be sure -- but I don't know where the best interests of
the ARS come into play as far as he's concerned. Moreover, every
personal interaction I've had with him would have completely turned
me off to the hobby, had I not already been involved.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3308. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 04:13:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020202231351.09596.00000005@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32818

In article <20020202081831.11085.00000739@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work for
>no
>>"reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
>>
>
>To quote the gist of some of your past posts, those that don't know the
>answer
>would never understand the explanation.
>
>I bet that most hams know the answer...
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Actually, it would depend if any of those eight years of VE'ing occurred after April 15, 2000. After that date, all he would have to show for his VE efforts are a bunch of paperwork upgrades, and some lazy, technically-uninvolved CB'ers looking for more "lebensraum" on the amateur bands. I just hope he had a fresh roll of Bounty paper towels available to sop up the drool.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3309. Re: "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 04:24:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020202232407.09596.00000007@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32820

In article <a3i9t60278v@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Whew. I discussed this so much with the last round (the one I thought
>would
>> live until around March), that it's gotten second-hat and boring... Larry
>> must not be able to see past the nose on his face.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
>I'm sure he can, but his tunnel vision has blotted out the rest of the
>picture.

I can see past my nose a lot better than Kim can see her feet!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3310. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 04:24:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 32821

In article <3C5CB820.CE1B2DAD@bevcomm.net>, Mike <mdickman@bevcomm.net> writes:

>
>I did not like CW shoved at me, as I could care less to "pound a key" Last
>time
>I checked this was the "new" millenuim. If you want old modes, use them.
>String and two paper cups work too, I do not see AT & T using them. At least
>some of us will try something new and different.

Mike:

Glad to see you say that, and I fully agree. How about a sked
on 20-meter PSK-31?

BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,
and discovered that it is a very effective mode of communication,
with robust characteristics that I have not found in any other
mode. I started using it exclusively after my last experience
at being cussed out for not knowing my 10-10 number on 10-meter
SSB. Since then, I've been strictly CW and digital modes. Any
idiot can talk into a microphone, and most idiots do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3311. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 06:54:52 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <k7578.45479$E4.1814739@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32822
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Aaron H. Voobner" quoted in part ...

"The FCC's position with respect to RFI to consumer devices is that the consumer device-- telephone, stereo, TV or other appliance--most often is to blame, and that consumers need to deal with appliance manufacturers. Underwood says he's gone the extra mile to resolve interference complaints ... The neighbor's touch lamp seems especially susceptible to RFI and even flickers when he keys his 100-W mobile transmitter while driving by her house, Underwood said. Although he installed some ferrite chokes on the lamp's power cord, the problem persisted. The neighbor has refused further offers of help."

Wrong Mr. Underwood. We, as amateurs, should *never* install anything at anyone's home. Once we do that, we then accept responsibility for further interference (and further cost if it doesn't work). "That guy put something on my TV and now it doesn't work right" We can tell them where to buy ferrite chokes or high pass filters (for example), and can advise them that this might help with the problem, but that is as far as I believe we should go to "help" them. I also find it extremely hard to believe that 100 watts would cause interference to *any* modern appliance (especially mobile) A crock if you ask me. I typically run about 80 watts to a G5RV through a low pass filter and am yet to have *any* complaints from neighbors in the three plus years I have been running my amateur equipment adjacent to them.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st
Home of Walt's World on the web

3312. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 08:03:00 UTC
From: SideBand <ab8lr@csotbs.org>
Message-ID: <3C5CEEB4.9020002@csotbs.org>
Source record: 32823
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I run 100 watts to a G5RV in the apartment building, without a lowpass filter, and have yet to have an interference complaint as well. And yes, the neighbors know I'm a HAM, and they know that if they DO have an interference problem, to drop me a note so we can determine if it's me or something else.

-SSB

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Aaron H. Voobner" quoted in part ...
>
>
> "The FCC's position with respect to RFI to consumer devices is that the
> consumer device-- telephone, stereo, TV or other appliance--most often is to
> blame, and that consumers need to deal with appliance manufacturers.
> Underwood says he's gone the extra mile to resolve interference complaints
> ... The neighbor's touch lamp seems especially susceptible to RFI and even
> flickers when he keys his 100-W mobile transmitter while driving by her
> house, Underwood said. Although he installed some ferrite chokes on the
> lamp's power cord, the problem persisted. The neighbor has refused further
> offers of help."
>
> Wrong Mr. Underwood. We, as amateurs, should *never* install anything at
> anyone's home. Once we do that, we then accept responsibility for further
> interference (and further cost if it doesn't work). "That guy put something
> on my TV and now it doesn't work right" We can tell them where to buy
> ferrite chokes or high pass filters (for example), and can advise them that
> this might help with the problem, but that is as far as I believe we should
> go to "help" them. I also find it extremely hard to believe that 100 watts
> would cause interference to *any* modern appliance (especially mobile) A
> crock if you ask me. I typically run about 80 watts to a G5RV through a low
> pass filter and am yet to have *any* complaints from neighbors in the three
> plus years I have been running my amateur equipment adjacent to them.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
>

>
>

--
73 de AB8LR, Chris

http://csotbs.shopiwon.com/ for great deals on computer products.

3313. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 11:20:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <U1978.8264$zT.680462@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32824

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3C5CB820.CE1B2DAD@bevcomm.net>, Mike <mdickman@bevcomm.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >I did not like CW shoved at me, as I could care less to "pound a key"
Last
> >time
> >I checked this was the "new" millenuim. If you want old modes, use
them.
> >String and two paper cups work too, I do not see AT & T using them. At
least
> >some of us will try something new and different.
>
> Mike:
>
> Glad to see you say that, and I fully agree. How about a sked
> on 20-meter PSK-31?
>
> BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
> because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,
> and discovered that it is a very effective mode of communication,
> with robust characteristics that I have not found in any other
> mode. I started using it exclusively after my last experience
> at being cussed out for not knowing my 10-10 number on 10-meter
> SSB. Since then, I've been strictly CW and digital modes. Any
> idiot can talk into a microphone, and most idiots do.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, Larry 10-10 numbers are easy. Add your phone number, Social
Security number, drivers license number, a few credit cards together and
multiply by the barometric pressure in millibars. And try to keep a
straight face as you give it out.

3314. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 11:45:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sp978.8268$zT.682196@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32825
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> > "Aaron H. Voobner" quoted in part **and snipped by me > >
> >
> > Wrong Mr. Underwood. We, as amateurs, should *never* install anything
at
> > anyone's home. Once we do that, we then accept responsibility for
further
> > interference (and further cost if it doesn't work). "That guy put
something
> > on my TV and now it doesn't work right" We can tell them where to buy
> > ferrite chokes or high pass filters (for example), and can advise them
that
> > this might help with the problem, but that is as far as I believe we
should
> > go to "help" them. I also find it extremely hard to believe that 100
watts
> > would cause interference to *any* modern appliance (especially mobile)
A
> > crock if you ask me. I typically run about 80 watts to a G5RV through
a low
> > pass filter and am yet to have *any* complaints from neighbors in the
three
> > plus years I have been running my amateur equipment adjacent to them.
> >
> > Arnie -
> > KT4ST
> >
> > www.qsl.net/kt4st
> > Home of Walt's World on the web
> >
> > "SideBand" <ab8lr@csotbs.org> wrote in message
news:3C5CEEB4.9020002@csotbs.org...
> I run 100 watts to a G5RV in the apartment building, without a lowpass
> filter, and have yet to have an interference complaint as well. And yes,
> the neighbors know I'm a HAM, and they know that if they DO have an
> interference problem, to drop me a note so we can determine if it's me
or
> something else.
>
> -SSB
>

> --
> 73 de AB8LR, Chris
>

I run in an apartment complex as well up to 150 watts. Chris, touch lamps are notorious and do not make much of a case for much of anything. The only thing I have gotten into is a car stereo of all things; giving it the whumph with SSB or big volume swings with CW was almost fun. Truthfully, I think the owner would have liked to be able to do it himself much like the guy who blew a coupling cap in the amp and invented fuzz guitar.

Dick NBK

3315. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:08:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203070820.12312.00000888@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32826

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>here? There isn't anywhere near the level of congestion in the
>vhf/uhf ham bands to justify implementing schemes like that.

Then let us know what your local coordinating body says if you ask to put up a repeater on 2 meters.

If they say no, do you think that the fact that hams are told they cannot do what they want to do on VHF and UHF may be a factor in that lack of congestion.

When we build better roads, more people use them and there are benefits that might never have even been envisioned when the roads were being built.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3316. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:13:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203071329.12312.00000889@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32827

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
>comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed digital
>system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
>postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have yet
>to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.

No amateur operation is free from interference, and I think the best we can expect as new modes are introduced is that the QRM potential is mutually spread around. What percentage of the interference you have experienced on the ham bands has been from others using the same mode you are using, as compared to interference from other modes? And is the inter-mode interference a question of the inability of the modes to mutually exist on the same band, or the same factor that causes intra-mode interference -- inconsiderate operators or changing propagation conditions?

As it applies to spread spectrum, Carl does not need to address the issue of interference to narrow-band modes at all. The FCC took care of that absolutely when it mandated that if a spread spectrum system interferes with a narrow-band user, the obligation is on the spread-spectrum operator to correct the interference.

How much more protection do you think needs to exist than absolute?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3317. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:18:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203071831.12312.00000890@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32828

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>W1RFI wrote:

>> How would it handle chirp? :-)

>No self-respecting ham would have chirp, would he, Ed?

That's what I thought. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3318. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:21:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203072140.12312.00000891@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32829

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Let's see if I get it. The End-Game is that Amateur Radio
>will be "transformed" into a technocrat society full of
>Bruce Peren's, Carl Stevenson's, Gary Coffman's, Len of 21's
>etc, interspersed with their band of followers and
>apologists. The rest of us will forced to resign in shame
>because we cannot keep up with the cutting edge of the next
>digital protocol that IEEE cranks out. What a wonderful
>world that will be!

What an odd conclusion to draw from my statement that I believe Amateur Radio should contribute some technology to the society that has created it with technology as part of its stated purpose.

If you feel you have not contributed to the purpose of Amateur Radio, perhaps it would be better for you to make such contributions than to resign in shame. If you do not feel you can or want to do so in a techncial manner, there are many other important ways you can be of service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3319. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:22:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203072249.12312.00000892@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32830

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>I bet that most hams know the answer...

>Actually, it would depend if any of those eight years of VE'ing occurred
>after April 15, 2000. After that date, all he would have to show for his
>VE efforts are a bunch of paperwork upgrades, and some lazy,
>technically-uninvolved CB'ers looking for more "lebensraum" on the
>amateur bands. I just hope he had a fresh roll of Bounty paper towels
>available to sop up the drool.

As I said, Larry, "most" hams. I knew there would be some exceptions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3320. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:27:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203072735.12312.00000893@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32831

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I'll say it again, it's clear the goal of the recent restructuring was to
>merely get the numbers up, both in new hams and upgrades, as opposed to that
>of Incentive Licensing which was to learn more radio and prove it by taking
>and passing difficult exams.

I didn't see that goal in the FCC's Report and Order. Is this another one of
your "hidden agenda" things?

>Do I want people to upgrade? Just for the sake of them holding a
>higher class license for which they were required to do little or nothing
>significant? What's the point?

They are studying and learning and passing tests that are harder than the
General class exam I had to pass, Dick.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3321. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:29:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203072901.12312.00000894@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32832

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>10% per year??? When did THAT happen, Ed?

Opps... brain spasm. Try about 1% per year. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3322. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:31:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203073115.12312.00000895@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32833

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >> >> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about
>> >other
>> >> >> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no
>> >more
>> >> >> technology is needed be archaic?
>> >>
>> >> > Where have you seen anyone doing that?
>> >>
>> >> With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?
>> >
>> > Did you find your own question to be ambiguous? I didn't. So
>> >I'll ask again: where have you seen anyone doing that?
>>
>> Nothing ambiguous about the question at all, Dick, but if it is too hard
>for
>> you, I will let you pass.
>
> Sorry, Ed I won't let you pass. :-) Where have you seen anyone who uses
>incandescent bulbs state that no more technology is needed? (your question)

I have not seen this attitude wrt incandescent bulb users. However, the thread started with Amateur Radio, and the incandescent bulb was an analogy. I have seen people in ham radio say that the technology hams are using is adequate, so there is no need to develop more.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3323. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:32:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203073230.12312.00000896@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32834

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>Fred's ARRL
>membership
>> is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support
>the
>> good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need
>to
>> be done better.

>In other words, he'd never say a bad word to anybody about the ARRL. Thanks
>Ed.

That conclusion is ridulous on its face.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI>

3324. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 12:36:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203073656.12312.00000898@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 32835

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>Few seem interested....hmmm. I invested in a few hundred dollars in DSP
>books a few years ago. I also have some of the TI DSP data books. I can't
>even read the stuff, Ed. Do you honestly think a lack of interest is the
>primary factor hindering DSP innovation in amateur radio?

Yes, I do still believe that, although it is clear that in your case, the interest was there to at least learn about it. But you were interested in learning about other things, but probably took the step to set solder to soldering iron and translate that knowledge into hardware.

You did not choose to do that with DSP, although if you didn't understand the concepts, that would be understandable. Perhaps some of the tutorial articles on the ARRL Tech Info Svc DSP page would be useful.

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3325. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 13:23:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3jdg2012uv@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32837

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202231350.09596.00000004@mb-cu.aol.com...
> Yeah, like working to eliminate the requirement that hams learn
> an important communications skill at a moderate (13-20 WPM) level.

You spelled "worthless" wrong again.

3326. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 13:27:35 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3jdo2013dk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32838

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com...
> BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
> because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,

Translation: "I did it, so everyone else should have to do it."

3327. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 13:30:29 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5D3B3D.4829DA70@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32836

W1RFI wrote:

>
> What an odd conclusion to draw from my statement that I believe Amateur Radio
> should contribute some technology to the society that has created it with
> technology as part of its stated purpose.

Speaking of odd replies ;-)!

73,
Clay N4AOX

3328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 13:56:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5d434d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32839

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202232407.09596.00000007@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <a3i9t60278v@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Whew. I discussed this so much with the last round (the one I thought
> >would
> >> live until around March), that it's gotten second-hat and boring...
Larry
> >> must not be able to see past the nose on his face.
> >>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> >
> >I'm sure he can, but his tunnel vision has blotted out the rest of the
> >picture.
>
> I can see past my nose a lot better than Kim can see her feet!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, your twisted sense of perspective is raring up again.

Kim W5TIT

3329. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 13:58:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5d43a5$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32840

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3C5CB820.CE1B2DAD@bevcomm.net>, Mike <mdickman@bevcomm.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >I did not like CW shoved at me, as I could care less to "pound a key"
Last
> >time
> >I checked this was the "new" millenuim. If you want old modes, use them.
> >String and two paper cups work too, I do not see AT & T using them. At
least
> >some of us will try something new and different.
>
> Mike:
>
> Glad to see you say that, and I fully agree. How about a sked
> on 20-meter PSK-31?
>
> BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
> because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,
> and discovered that it is a very effective mode of communication,
> with robust characteristics that I have not found in any other
> mode. I started using it exclusively after my last experience
> at being cussed out for not knowing my 10-10 number on 10-meter
> SSB. Since then, I've been strictly CW and digital modes. Any
> idiot can talk into a microphone, and most idiots do.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, Larry's an all or nothing person, black or white. One person acts
like that on 10M and it's all over for Larry. Most idiots are affected like
that.

Kim W5TIT

3330. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 14:05:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5d453e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32841

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a3jdo2013dk@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com...
> > BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
> > because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,
>
> Translation: "I did it, so everyone else should have to do it."
>
>

Yep, you got it. Larry's attitude about hating CW and being extremely angry at having had to learn it to join the "higher class" (thought of by Larry in the wrong perspective, of course) is blatantly obvious is his meandering expression of opinions on the subject. I've mentioned that to him, but he's in a state of denial. ;)

Kim W5TIT

3331. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 14:59:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3jjbnhjm1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32842

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202231350.09596.00000004@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <20020202080505.11085.00000732@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >Fred is in the commercial exams and study guide business. Although those
> >study
> >guides do compete with those of other publishers, that doesn't mean that
all
> >aspects of the ARRL/W5YI relationship are adversarial. Fred's ARRL
> >membership
> >is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to
support
> >the
> >good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel
need to
> >be done better.
>
> Yeah, like working to eliminate the requirement that hams learn
> an important communications skill at a moderate (13-20 WPM) level.
> IOW,

Larry,

Where's the smily and the IMHO to your above statement?
In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
Your catagorization of morse as "an important communinication
skill" is simply one person's opinion...yours. Neither you nor
anyone else has been able to convince the FCC that morse IS
important enough to retain 13/20 wpm testing.

>...dumb hams down so they can get a license and hopefully buy
> whatever he's selling at the moment. Fred has his own best interests
> at heart, to be sure -- but I don't know where the best interests of
> the ARS come into play as far as he's concerned. Moreover, every
> personal interaction I've had with him would have completely turned
> me off to the hobby, had I not already been involved.

Sounds like a personal problem.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3332. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:04:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3jjjmbnl1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32843

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a3i90c025e8@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5C9F2A.891C61DE@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Well, you know how it is with those NCI folks, Ed. They have a lock on
> "how it's
> > supposed to be" and nothing anyone else has to say means anything at
all.
>
> If that's the way you see them, then you should join because you'd fit
right
> in.

Ed,
NCI, like any other group (e.g. ARRL) or individual is free to espouse and
push any position(s) they want. Last I checked, the first amendment
hadn't been repealed. Dick is free to comment, agree,
disagree to his heart's content just as we (NCI) are free
to voice our opinions, beliefs, etc. as well as to counter or ignore
opinions of others. It happens all the time. It's life in a democracy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3333. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:28:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3jl12$20g$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32844

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203072140.12312.00000891@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Let's see if I get it. The End-Game is that Amateur Radio
> >will be "transformed" into a technocrat society full of
> >Bruce Peren's, Carl Stevenson's, Gary Coffman's, Len of 21's
> >etc, interspersed with their band of followers and
> >apologists. The rest of us will forced to resign in shame
> >because we cannot keep up with the cutting edge of the next
> >digital protocol that IEEE cranks out. What a wonderful
> >world that will be!
>
> What an odd conclusion to draw from my statement that I believe Amateur
Radio
> should contribute some technology to the society that has created it with
> technology as part of its stated purpose.

Thanks Ed, I had the same opinion as to Clay's lack of logic in
opining his conclusion based on what has been said before by
anyone...be it you, Bruce P, Gary C, Carl....etc.

> If you feel you have not contributed to the purpose of Amateur Radio,
perhaps
> it would be better for you to make such contributions than to resign in
shame.
> If you do not feel you can or want to do so in a techncial manner, there
are
> many other important ways you can be of service.

Agree 100%.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3334. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:31:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203103128.06191.00000892@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 32845

>Sounds like a personal problem.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>

Sounds like 500,000 Hams Personel Problem

3335. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:32:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3jl8p$l68$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32847

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020202231351.09596.00000005@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <20020202081831.11085.00000739@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
> >> Well that tells us more about you. Most of us have done lots of work
> >> for no "reward". What do you think I got for 8 years of VE'ing?
> >>
> >
> >To quote the gist of some of your past posts, those that don't know
> >the answer would never understand the explanation.
> >
> >I bet that most hams know the answer...
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Actually, it would depend if any of those eight years of VE'ing occurred
> after April 15, 2000. After that date, all he would have to show for his
> VE efforts are a bunch of paperwork upgrades, and some lazy,
> technically-uninvolved CB'ers looking for more "lebensraum" on the
> amateur bands. I just hope he had a fresh roll of Bounty paper towels
> available to sop up the drool.
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,
You are so predictable in your opinions.
Do you believe for one second your comments
above serve to enlighten, lead or encourage anyone to
become a ham?

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3336. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:32:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203103259.06191.00000893@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 32846

>or ignore
>opinions of others.

This sounds more like NCI

3337. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 15:37:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3jlj1$320$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32848

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203072735.12312.00000893@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > I'll say it again, it's clear the goal of the recent restructuring was
to
> >merely get the numbers up, both in new hams and upgrades, as opposed to
that
> >of Incentive Licensing which was to learn more radio and prove it by
taking
> >and passing difficult exams.
>
> I didn't see that goal in the FCC's Report and Order. Is this another one
of
> your "hidden agenda" things?

Dick probably believes we (NCI), ARRL and the FCC have it
planned that way in some kind of grand conspiracy (IMHO of course :-).

> >Do I want people to upgrade? Just for the sake of them holding a
> >higher class license for which they were required to do little or nothing
> >significant? What's the point?
>
> They are studying and learning and passing tests that are harder than the
> General class exam I had to pass, Dick.

As I recall, the ONLY paper upgrades were for coded techs who
had been licensed prior to 1987 (i.e. they had taken and passed
the General theory test). In all other cases, anyone desiring
to upgrade required passing a new test or having a CSCE indicating
credit for the required test element having been taken already.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3338. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 16:15:58 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <2nd78.6680$rx3.4015557790@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 32849
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kind a throws our resident troll Aaron
on Rec.Radio.CB theory and troll post to hell
doesn't it.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> wrote in message
news:k7578.45479$E4.1814739@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> "Aaron H. Voobner" quoted in part ...
>
>
> "The FCC's position with respect to RFI to consumer devices is that the
> consumer device-- telephone, stereo, TV or other appliance--most often is
to
> blame, and that consumers need to deal with appliance manufacturers.
> Underwood says he's gone the extra mile to resolve interference complaints
> ... The neighbor's touch lamp seems especially susceptible to RFI and
even
> flickers when he keys his 100-W mobile transmitter while driving by her
> house, Underwood said. Although he installed some ferrite chokes on the
> lamp's power cord, the problem persisted. The neighbor has refused further
> offers of help."
>
> Wrong Mr. Underwood. We, as amateurs, should *never* install anything at
> anyone's home. Once we do that, we then accept responsibility for further
> interference (and further cost if it doesn't work). "That guy put
something
> on my TV and now it doesn't work right" We can tell them where to buy
> ferrite chokes or high pass filters (for example), and can advise them
that
> this might help with the problem, but that is as far as I believe we
should

> go to "help" them. I also find it extremely hard to believe that 100
watts
> would cause interference to *any* modern appliance (especially mobile) A
> crock if you ask me. I typically run about 80 watts to a G5RV through a
low
> pass filter and am yet to have *any* complaints from neighbors in the
three
> plus years I have been running my amateur equipment adjacent to them.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
> www.qsl.net/kt4st
> Home of Walt's World on the web
>
>
>
>
>

3339. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 16:35:05 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203113505.14072.00001159@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32850

>In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
>of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.

Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the FCC re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham but I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes too...and plenty of them. Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments made on the NG re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't consider..." What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?" And please don't tell me that it's "not about licensed amateurs," because it is. It's OUR hobby/service...both yours , mine, and the future newcomers. If you've convinced yourself that the will of those presently licensed doesn't matter re. this issue, that's fine. But don't expect me to buy that. Let's quit using the FCC as the "righteous" pillar here, they're only the enforcers.

>Your catagorization of morse as "an important communinication
>skill" is simply one person's opinion...yours.

I think you a few hundred thousand souls shy here.

>Neither you nor
>anyone else has been able to convince the FCC that morse IS
>important enough to retain 13/20 wpm testing.

This is entirely correct, but it doesn't say anything toward the validity or correctness of that decision.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3340. Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 17:55:08 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <a89ce4c4343213336081475b32335195.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 32851

RRAP Top 10 Users Jan 2002

[405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
[261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
[233] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 7.3%
[197] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 6.2%
[148] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.7%
[131] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.1%
[120] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 3.8%
[113] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.6%
[100] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.1%
[98] W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> 3.1%

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3341. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:02:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5EBEE3.92E06B46@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32852

W1RFI wrote:

> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >here? There isn't anywhere near the level of congestion in the
> >vhf/uhf ham bands to justify implementing schemes like that.
>
> Then let us know what your local coordinating body says if you ask to put up a
> repeater on 2 meters.
>
> If they say no, do you think that the fact that hams are told they cannot do
> what they want to do on VHF and UHF may be a factor in that lack of congestion.
>
> When we build better roads, more people use them and there are benefits that
> might never have even been envisioned when the roads were being built.

All that would be funny if it wasn't a bit pitiful.
All those coordinated repeaters out there, silently using up our spectrum.

3342. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:05:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5EBF90.3905577@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32853

W1RFI wrote:

> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
> >comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed digital
> >system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
> >postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have yet
> >to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
>
> No amateur operation is free from interference, and I think the best we can
> expect as new modes are introduced is that the QRM potential is mutually spread
> around. What percentage of the interference you have experienced on the ham
> bands has been from others using the same mode you are using, as compared to
> interference from other modes? And is the inter-mode interference a question
> of the inability of the modes to mutually exist on the same band, or the same
> factor that causes intra-mode interference -- inconsiderate operators or
> changing propagation conditions?
>
> As it applies to spread spectrum, Carl does not need to address the issue of
> interference to narrow-band modes at all. The FCC took care of that absolutely
> when it mandated that if a spread spectrum system interferes with a narrow-band
> user, the obligation is on the spread-spectrum operator to correct the
> interference.
>
> How much more protection do you think needs to exist than absolute?

The ability of the victim of the interference to actually do something about it
would help. Riley alone can't do it all.
Do I think that Carl Stevenson would be eager to resolve his SS interference to a
"legacy" mode? Do I really need to answer?

3343. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:11:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5EC10A.10966E5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32854

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >> >> Would someone who uses an incandescent bulb, but knows little about
> >> >other
> >> >> >> modern technology and stated that because incandescent bulbs work, no
> >> >more
> >> >> >> technology is needed be archaic?
> >> >>
> >> >> > Where have you seen anyone doing that?
> >> >>
> >> >> With incandescent bulbs, or with respect to modern radio technology?
> >> >
> >> > Did you find your own question to be ambiguous? I didn't. So
> >> >I'll ask again: where have you seen anyone doing that?
> >>
> >> Nothing ambiguous about the question at all, Dick, but if it is too hard
> >for
> >> you, I will let you pass.
> >
> > Sorry, Ed I won't let you pass. :-) Where have you seen anyone who uses
> >incandescent bulbs state that no more technology is needed? (your question)
>
> I have not seen this attitude wrt incandescent bulb users. However, the thread
> started with Amateur Radio, and the incandescent bulb was an analogy. I have
> seen people in ham radio say that the technology hams are using is adequate, so
> there is no need to develop more.

Then you clearly have misunderstood what was said. What was rejected is
Stevenson's demand that all hams rush to join the "abandon all the old, flush it
and adopt all the new, posthaste, else
the ARS is doomed" bandwagon.
I'll say it yet again, I KNOW that I have used far more non-legacy technology on
ham radio that he has done. That isn't likely to change, despite his belligerent
puffery. And despite my support and use of CW.

3344. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:12:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203131258.09871.00001716@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 32855

>What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?"

Theres NCI problem, they are not worried about what the Majority want, but only what they want.

3345. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:16:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5EC21C.98EAB741@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32856

Krell wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020202232407.09596.00000006@mb-cu.aol.com...
> > BTW -- I didn't like having CW shoved at me either. I learned it
> > because I wanted to be a ham. Once I learned it, I grew to love it,
>
> Translation: "I did it, so everyone else should have to do it."

Why do the anticoders always get it all so wrong?

The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
all hams to be taught the same".

3346. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:28:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5EC4FE.6C616806@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32857

Bert Craig wrote:

> >In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
> >of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
>
> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the FCC
> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham but
> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes too...and
> plenty of them. Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments made on the NG
> re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't consider..."
> What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?" And please don't
> tell me that it's "not about licensed amateurs," because it is. It's OUR
> hobby/service...both yours , mine, and the future newcomers. If you've
> convinced yourself that the will of those presently licensed doesn't matter re.
> this issue, that's fine. But don't expect me to buy that. Let's quit using the
> FCC as the "righteous" pillar here, they're only the enforcers.
>
> >Your catagorization of morse as "an important communinication
> >skill" is simply one person's opinion...yours.
>
> I think you a few hundred thousand souls shy here.
>
> >Neither you nor
> >anyone else has been able to convince the FCC that morse IS
> >important enough to retain 13/20 wpm testing.
>
> This is entirely correct, but it doesn't say anything toward the validity or
> correctness of that decision.

It's the anti-coder - NCI crutch, Bert. If FCC allows/says/does/doesn't do/ it, and it fits hand in glove with their wishes, it can't possibly be in error, whatever the underlying reason for FCC's action/inaction.

Any clear analysis of FCC over the past few decades will show a great many such moves that can easily be seen as wrong, but no matter. They make the rules, even if the rules are destructive rather than constructive. I suppose the total ignoring of CB for so long, and the results of that are the best clear evidence.
And that is not to say that FCC is able, in many cases, to do better, given budget constraints and other negative influences, such as political interference in what was intended to be an nonpolitical process.. Clearly they could do better in some cases, though.

3347. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 18:52:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202031052.f15a6fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32858

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020203070820.12312.00000888@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >here? There isn't anywhere near the level of congestion in the
> >vhf/uhf ham bands to justify implementing schemes like that.
>
> Then let us know what your local coordinating body says if you ask to put up a
> repeater on 2 meters.
>
>
I don't know if there are any 2m pairs open here or not but Philly
being a major metropolitan area I doubt it. Which is why a number of
224 machines have popped up recently. We better start using 222 before
we lose any more of it huh?
>
>
> If they say no, do you think that the fact that hams are told they cannot do
> what they want to do on VHF and UHF may be a factor in that lack of
> congestion.
>
>
Absolutely not. Do you actually think that there are enough ops out
there who won't get om 2m unless they have their own machines to
affect band utilization? There's a long list of things we can't do, I
can't run FM simplex on 144.050. You think I'm gonna turn my 2m rig
off and go pout and suck my thumb because I "can't do my thing" on
144.050? Ridiculous.
>
>
> When we build better roads, more people use them and there are benefits that
> might never have even been envisioned when the roads were being built.
>
>
100% conjecture with no supporting data at all one way or another
formal or informal.
>
>
Trunking has been kicked around in this thread and it would accomplish
the sorts of comms you feel are needed. It's an archaic technology and
tbere are a large number of hams who are intimately familiar with it
via their professional activities. I know several. So where's the
trunking from the pros in that game??
>

>
I just don't think there's a market for any of it, it's just a lotta
unrealistic gum-beating and ruminating. Of course I could be wrong . .
you gonna pull a 2m trunking or similar system together and test the
market? Din think so.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

3348. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 19:15:23 UTC
From: Moolie <mooli@aol.com>
Message-ID: <f%f78.23389$X64.7525583@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 32859

what does he win ??

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:a89ce4c4343213336081475b32335195.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
>
> RRAP Top 10 Users Jan 2002
>
> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
> [233] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 7.3%
> [197] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 6.2%
> [148] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.7%
> [131] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.1%
> [120] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 3.8%
> [113] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.6%
> [100] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.1%
> [98] W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> 3.1%
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3349. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 19:27:36 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203142736.29623.00000235@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32860

>It's the anti-coder - NCI crutch, Bert. If FCC allows/says/does/doesn't do/
>it,
>and it fits hand in glove with their wishes, it can't possibly be in error,
>whatever the underlying reason for FCC's action/inaction.

I agree Dick, but how much value would be placed in the FCC's thoughts on this matter if they were FOR the retention of the code. They appear to be the "big bully" of the schoolyard. Your feelings for the big bully varies depending on whether or not said bully's taking your lunch money of sharing the booty with you. While I respect "authority," I feel quite comfortable with calling any "democratic" authority that does NOT serve the wants/needs of the majority a "bully."

>Any clear analysis of FCC over the past few decades will show a great many
>such
>moves that can easily be seen as wrong, but no matter. They make the rules,
>even if
>the rules are destructive rather than constructive. I suppose the total
>ignoring of
>CB for so long, and the results of that are the best clear evidence.

Dick, since you know my history, (more or less.) you can surmise that this is a sore spot for me. I'd love to see licensing returned to CB as well as the removal of the unenforceable 155.3 mi limit. IMHO, the FCC bungled on both, but perhaps it's more a resource issue wrt enforcement. I've made my mistakes but I've tried my best to apply a cold steak to CB's black eye. This includes working CW on 27.1250 MHz. The majority of my Morse practice was accomplished on a 27 MHz Part 15 QRP device. "Barrier?"...no, not even to a CBer! ;-)

>And that is not to say that FCC is able, in many cases, to do better, given
>budget constraints and other negative influences, such as political
>interference in
>what was intended to be an nonpolitical process.. Clearly they could do
>better in
>some cases, though.

Agreed. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3350. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 19:29:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202031129.16274481@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32861

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020203071329.12312.00000889@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
> >comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed digital
> >system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
> >postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have yet
> >to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
>
> No amateur operation is free from interference, and I think the best we can
> expect as new modes are introduced is that the QRM potential is mutually spread
> around.
>
>
Baloney. In the case of vhf/uhf I have some huge number of normally
unused clear channels available which I can jump on and not have a bit
of QRM from anybody. Do you think for one minute that I'm about to
support giving up some significant number of those freqs just so that
the users of some wide mode are enjoying their excessive bandwidth?
When pigs fly.
>
>
> What percentage of the interference you have experienced on the ham
> bands has been from others using the same mode you are using, as compared to
> interference from other modes?
>
>
On HF 90% of it. On vhf/uhf 0%.
>
>
> And is the inter-mode interference a question
> of the inability of the modes to mutually exist on the same band, or the same
> factor that causes intra-mode interference -- inconsiderate operators or
> changing propagation conditions?
>
>
Gimmee a break, I've been mixing it up with the broadcasters and ssb
ops on 40 since the stone age and nobody is a lid. That's ham radio.
>
>
> As it applies to spread spectrum, Carl does not need to address the issue of
> interference to narrow-band modes at all. The FCC took care of that absolutely
> when it mandated that if a spread spectrum system interferes with a narrow-band

> user, the obligation is on the spread-spectrum operator to correct the
> interference.
>
>
Yeah, but he's obviously still obliquely at it.
>
>
> How much more protection do you think needs to exist than absolute?
>
>
There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
here.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

3351. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 19:42:37 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203144237.14096.00000913@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32862

>Your feelings for the big bully varies depending on
>whether or not said bully's taking your lunch money of sharing the booty with
>you.

CORRECTION: The 'of' should read 'or'

>Your feelings for the big bully varies depending on
>whether or not said bully's taking your lunch money OR sharing the booty with
>you.

Sorry.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3352. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 19:58:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3k4k801b4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32864

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:a89ce4c43432133360814 75b32335195.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
>
> RRAP Top 10 Users Jan 2002
>
> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
> [233] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 7.3%
> [197] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 6.2%
> [148] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.7%
> [131] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.1%
> [120] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 3.8%
> [113] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.6%
> [100] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.1%
> [98] W5TIT - Kim <none@none.net> 3.1%

Impressive, yet I'll bet you'd be surprised to find that even the busiest
users probably only spend about one hour a day, reading/posting to
newgroups.

3353. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:07:08 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3k55701bsf@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32865

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203113505.14072.00001159@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
> >of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
>
> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the
FCC
> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham
but
> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes
too...and
> plenty of them. Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments made on
the NG
> re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't
consider..."
> What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?" And please
don't

The FCC gave plenty of time and opportunity to respond to the rule changes
when they where being proposed. Anyone who sits back and bitches about it,
yet didn't say anything when they had the chance, has no excuse for
complaining now.

3354. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:10:15 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0202031210.672b088d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net. wrote:
> Kind a throws our resident troll Aaron
>on Rec.Radio.CB theory and troll post to hell
>doesn't it.

Allow me to introduce one of rec.radio.cb's more prominent resident cb
outlaws, Mr. "Landshark".

-Aaron-

--

> >From: The Landshark (lndshark@ix.netcom.com)
> >Subject: Re: CBers to be reigned in...
> >Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> >Date: 1999/10/13
> >
> ><snip>
> > I would think Mr. "liners are illegal" would love this shit.
> >You are always whining about how "Linears are illegal" and free
> >banders
> >should be caught and fined. WHAT A FUCKING HYPOCRITE!!!!!!!
> > Now that laws are being passed that could effect YOU, whether or
> >not you are doing anything wrong, you start whining. You come on
> >this newsgroup several months back PREACHING part 95. of the F.C.C.
> >and posting statements every time someone asked "About my linear"
> >or "how do I mod my 148" and your classic response "It's illegal
> >see part 95." or "It's against federal law to mod that, and big fines
> >and or jail" Now that they are going to pass laws that will screw you
> >too, you start this whining........ Go fuck yourself, you live
> >with what's been created, whether you like it or not, but stop
> >being such a hypocrite and whiner.
> > I hate dirt bags like you and your Butt brother Joe, I would
> >thoroughly enjoy just keep this going for a long time.........
> >
> > The Landshark

3355. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:11:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3k5d501ciq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32866

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a3jl8p$l68$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Larry,
> You are so predictable in your opinions.
> Do you believe for one second your comments
> above serve to enlighten, lead or encourage anyone to
> become a ham?
>
> No cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Some people, such as Dick, Larry, and Babbling Bruce, don't know how to encourage and build. They only know how to discourage and destroy.

3356. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:16:45 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3k5n801d7v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 32867

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5EC21C.98EAB741@worldnet.att.net...
> Why do the anticoders always get it all so wrong?
>
> The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
> Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
> the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
> all hams to be taught the same".

Personal enjoyment does not mean something has overall value. "One man's
junk..." as it were. So don't expect everyone else to appreciate your junk.

3357. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:37:41 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <23ba33ac8859c722ba7e22166555f543.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 32868

"Krell" wrote

> Impressive, yet I'll bet you'd be surprised to find that even the busiest
> users probably only spend about one hour a day, reading/posting to
> newgroups.

Anyone who spends more than 10 minutes a day in a newsgroup
(especially this one!) needs to go get a life!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3358. new relaise Qso Manager

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:37:42 UTC
From: Paolo Nossa <ik4clf@inwind.it>
Message-ID: <qch78.22810$om6.585272@news1.tin.it>
Source record: 32869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,relcom.radi

www.qsl.net/ik4clf
HF QSO/QSL/Award managment, ADIF Import/Export, full version free to everybody.
Requires Access 97 or Access 2000 (with JPEG and TIFF filter installed), screen resolution 800x600/1024x768.
Includes: over 9500 logged QSO's for easy/quick testing of performance and 5 maps (Italy, Usa, Usa-Cal, Usa-Fla, Svalbard Is).
Full mapping (382 maps) available at Downloads page or free on request (CD-ROM).

3359. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 20:58:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5da493_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32870

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203113505.14072.00001159@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
> >of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
>
> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or
just the FCC
> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a
licensed ham but
> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes
too...and
> plenty of them. Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments
made on the NG
> re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't
consider..."

Bert,

I believe that the record shows that Bill is correct. And, as the
regulatory agency charged with regulating the spectrum "in the
public interest, convenience, and necessity," the FCC acted on
the body of record in a public proceeding and made its own
determination.

> What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?" And
please don't
> tell me that it's "not about licensed amateurs," because it is. It's
OUR
> hobby/service...both yours , mine, and the future newcomers.

Actually, it's THE PUBLIC's service, and the point is that the
current set of inmates should not be the sole determiners
of how the assylum is run (if you'll excuse my metaphor ...)
The fox guarding the henhouse is virtually always a bad idea.

> If you've
> convinced yourself that the will of those presently licensed doesn't
matter re.
> this issue, that's fine. But don't expect me to buy that. Let's quit
using the
> FCC as the "righteous" pillar here, they're only the enforcers.

They (the FCC) considered the inputs they received from
presently licensed amateurs ... and various other legitimate
factors ... and arrived at a decision. The fact that you and
some others don't agree with the decision doesn't make it
inherently improper or incorrect.

> >Your catagorization of morse as "an important communinication
> >skill" is simply one person's opinion...yours.
>
> I think you a few hundred thousand souls shy here.

I think that the numbers would fall far on the side of
the decision the FCC made, if everyone "voted" ...
however, it still is a matter of establishing sound public
policy, and should NOT be a "popularity contest" thus
a "vote of the incumbent hams" would not be a proper
means of making the decision, even though I'm convinced
that such a vote would go the way I'd like to see it go.

> >Neither you nor
> >anyone else has been able to convince the FCC that morse IS
> >important enough to retain 13/20 wpm testing.
>
> This is entirely correct, but it doesn't say anything toward the
validity or
> correctness of that decision.

It certainly does ... the decision was made on the basis of
a public proceeding, according to the Aministrative Proceedures
Act. As such, as long as the rules were followed, and they were,
the decision is inherently valid.

The fast that you don't think it was the correct decision is
irrelevant to the fact that it was a valid decision, and your
opinion that wasn't the correct decision is just that ... your
opinion. Your opinion and something on the order of a
dollar (more or less, depending on where) will get you a
cup of coffee.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF2kcZe+N6+q84HiEQL6VACfQ/nmnNQsMhQYqfpvoVAWhxwiiVMAoIvk
e/q3xu3EtAgvCJ/Mwfmkua8G
=YP5y
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3360. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:07:15 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203160715.14096.00000946@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32871

>"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020203113505.14072.00001159@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
>> >In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
>> >of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
>>
>> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the
>FCC
>> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham
>but
>> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes
>too...and
>> plenty of them. Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments made on
>the NG
>> re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't
>consider..."
>> What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?" And please
>don't
>
>The FCC gave plenty of time and opportunity to respond to the rule changes
>when they where being proposed. Anyone who sits back and bitches about it,
>yet didn't say anything when they had the chance, has no excuse for
>complaining now.

Actually, I've been a licensed amateur for less that one year. At the time of said "bitching" time, I was part of the group that NCI portends to be acting in the best interests of. I was one of those who represent the future of amateur radio. I must've missed the "I won't do anything that requires discipline or work" classes when I decided to become part of the fraternity. When I made the decision, I researched the requirements, sought help when needed, and met said requirements. Odd, it never even occurred to me to ask for a "buy." (Is that how it's spelled? i.e. NCAA tournaments.) So there ya go.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

P.S. It's actually kinda amusing to be told that one's "bitching" and/or "complaining" by those who support the removal of a 5-wpm code test for some additional privileges. Amusing indeed. 8-D

3361. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:12:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5da7f4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32872

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <20020201183058.26577.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
> >In my personal opinion, though I have one on code testing, it is
not that big
> >of a deal one way or the other.
>
> I think most hams feel the same way.

It may not be "that big of a deal one way or the other" to
some hams who have already "jumped through the hoop"
and "have theirs" ... but it is a big deal to many prospective
hams ... thus, in terms of future growth (even replacing older
hams as they, unfortuantely, go SK ...) it IS a big deal.

> >It is a major leap to go from a belief thatit
> >is time to replace Morse testing with something else to it is
"crippling
> >Amateur Radio."

There's a lot of discussion here about "replacing Morse testing
with something else." Yet NOBODY has ever, that I have seen,
given a rational and compelling reason why something that is
no longer needed NEEDS TO BE (or should be) "replaced by
something else ...

I haven't seen a shred of evidence that the FCC feels that Morse
testing needs to be replaced by something else ... all I saw them
say was that they saw Morse as serving no legitimate regulatory
purpose (beyond the current need to meet the requirements of
the ITU Radio Regulations S25.5 ...).

I see no reason whatsoever that Morse testing needs to be
replaced with ANYTHING ... unless someone has an agenda
to erect additional, unnecessary barriers to entry.

> I'd go a step farther. Representing code tests as "crippling amateur
radio" and
> "digging our heels in the past" does no good. In fact it does lots
of damage by
> diverting focus from the REAL problems confronting ham radio, like

lack of
> publicity, RFI, antenna restrictions, band threats, etc.

I see artifical barriers to entry to otherwise qualified prospective hams as being a "real problem." And one that contributes to bad publicity (many images of ham radio in the media are one of an outdated, Morse-centric activity ...). Additionally, the unnecessary barrier contributes to a lack of numbers (which equal political influence) needed to overturn antenna restrictions, fend off band threats, etc.

That, along with the rift, contention, and class warfare in the amateur community that Morse testing has caused for at least as long as I've been licensed, is what I think Bruce was referring to when he spoke of the Morse issue "crippling amateur radio."

That's all easy to ignore if you keep your head in the sand and take the "it's our (the incumbents') hobby and we should be able to do with it as we please viewpoint.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ----------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ----------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF2nz5e+N6+q84HiEQLyigCgxaxSvLde/cfD4ZIRrWB/DRnILEsAn0Jp
vofu6fNTewiWkN+VjDCnEVKS
=7SlA
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3362. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:34:35 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5DACAF.56FCA93@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32873

Speaking of predictable responses....What does else does one
expect from another NCI suck-up?

73,
Clay N4AOX

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020203072140.12312.00000891@mb-mf.aol.com...
>
> > What an odd conclusion to draw from my statement that I believe Amateur
> Radio
> > should contribute some technology to the society that has created it with
> > technology as part of its stated purpose.
>
> Thanks Ed, I had the same opinion as to Clay's lack of logic in
> opining his conclusion based on what has been said before by
> anyone...be it you, Bruce P, Gary C, Carl....etc.
>
>
> Agree 100%.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3363. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:47:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5db008_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32874

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202030126520.18370-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 2 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)
> >>he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works for
a
> >>company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham
license and
> >>a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty
things.
> >
> >You could add that they do so on Amateur frequencies. :-)
>
> Ah, but if they're not doing it AS AMATEURS, it's intrusion (even if
it's
> legal) and therefore a potential interference source.

Huh??? How does an amateur, operating in a LICENSED service,
constitute an "intrusion?"

Also, all Part 15 devices have to accept any interference they
receive from licensed services and cannot cause harmful
interference to licensed services

That's something that all of the manufacturers of 802.11b devices
knew from the start, so the devices and the modulation, coding,
and protocols they use were designed to be robust as the standard
was developed.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF2v3pe+N6+q84HiEQIXowCfQvel40jPZdX0/nyJ3boBKMxyFIsAoJNZ
cWtnteGDxZAmgV1+VGr2rNkL
=NoSy
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3364. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:47:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203164753.28685.00001031@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32875

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>100% conjecture with no supporting data at all one way or another
>formal or informal.

Of course it is conjecture. The only supporting data is that when the world has built better roads, better tools, or better anything, doing so has significantly increased useage.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3365. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:49:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5db076_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32876

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202082137.11085.00000741@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >I guess I'm just another one of these guys who proves Carl and Ed's
point
> >about the worthlessness of amateur radio operators.
>
> If that is what you think the point is, you missed it. Do you really
mean that?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ditto ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF2wTpe+N6+q84HiEQIJ8gCgzT7QP8IfFlj0hu+7E45ZMbgJbGAAoOdH
jZ36f7HuUhgDW+Kc3a9Xa/JR
=LPSB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3366. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:49:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203164920.28685.00001032@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32877

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Do I think that Carl Stevenson would be eager to resolve his SS interference
>to a
>"legacy" mode? Do I really need to answer?

No, Carl does. I will ask him.

Carl, if you set up and operate an SS system and it causes interference to a narrowband user, are you going to do what the rules require to resolve that interference?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3367. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:50:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203165035.28685.00001033@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 32878

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
>wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
>notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
>here.

That would require a rules change.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3368. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:52:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5db13a$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32879

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202082025.11085.00000740@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Try reverse engineering. If you had to decode CW using DSP techniques,
> >how would you do it? Hint: Sample at double the Morse code audio
frequency.
> >As I was attempting to design a Morse code audio decoder, the light
dawned.
>
> How would it handle chirp? :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Are you suggesting that modern equipment should be
designed to tolerate, and thereby encourage the use
of, badly designed equipment that puts out poor quality
signals? :-)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

3369. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 21:59:11 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <eji78.58676$Up4.2643445@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 32880

In my area there are about 8 repeaters within my reach, and I hate to admit
that the usage of
any of them is rare. I often go up there just to check for any traffic. I
might find one or two
repeaters in use. Down on 2 meters, there can be as many as 8 repeaters in
use at the same
time. Sounds like we need to start using 70 cm much more.

Jerry
K4KWH

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c5c0838_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> I've posted the below article from The ARRL Letter, Vol. 21, No. 5,
February
> 1, 2002. I'd like to see the 70cm preserved without interference from
such
> sources as noted in the article. However, I do wonder how populated the
> 70cm band is in other places than my own. The reason I ask is to
formulate
> some comments that I'll write myself to the FCC regarding the topic below.
>
> Here in the Dallas area, as often as I've listened or been on 70cm (which,
> granted has been a small percentage of time), I have not heard a lot of
> activity. Others in this area have made the same observation. This,
> however, was prior to the widening use of technologies such as IRLP. I
> wonder what the band-use is in other areas of the country. Are there
> technologies on the horizon that will call for an even greater appeal to
the
> 70cm band?
>
> While not a valid "argument" to defend 70cm, how would you go about making
> the band more appealing? By that I mean, usually, new hams first get the
2M
> handheld, then the 2M mobile, then we hear of them shopping around for a
> dual-band mobile. More times than I care to reveal, the typical response
to
> them is: "Why do you want to spend the money on a dual-band--there's
nothing
> on 440?" We can't, of course, say to the FCC, "we are going to be needing
> that space." 70cm often comes under threat and I think (due to my
operating
> area) that it is because we don't use the band that much. It sure would
be
> nice to see it become more active, thus making it maybe less desirable as

a
> target.
>
> I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm
> being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and
this
> area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of the
> 70cm band where you are? Anyone have any thoughts for other ideas on this
> matter to the FCC?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> ==>ARRL GOING TO THE MAT ON 70-CM BAND THREAT
>
> ARRL officials met recently with FCC staff members as part of the League's
> effort to stave off a band threat on 70 cm. ARRL General Counsel Chris
> Imlay, W3KD, and Technical Relations Manager Paul Rinaldo, W4RI, delivered
> an ex parte presentation to FCC Office of Engineering and Technology
> staffers on January 14. At issue was SAVI Technology's plan--already
> tentatively agreed to by the FCC--to deploy unlicensed transient RF
> identification devices between 425 and 435 MHz at much higher field
> strengths and duty cycles than Part 15 rules now permit for such devices.
> RFID tags are used to track and inventory parcel shipments.
>
> "We told them that this was the worst possible choice of bands for these
> RFIDs," Imlay said. "Besides, there's no technical justification for that
> choice of frequencies." The request to use 70 cm has more to do with
> economics than technology, he said, because SAVI needs to bring down the
> cost of RFIDs in order to make a profit.
>
> Imlay added that the ARRL would "do whatever it takes" to stave off the
> threat, including further direct appeals to FCC staff. The ARRL plans to
> file "strongly worded" comments on the SAVI petition by the February 12
> comment deadline. Reply comments are due by March 12, 2002. Imlay said he
> was assured that SAVI's request "was not a done deal."
>
> The FCC acted on the SAVI request last October in an FCC Notice of
Proposed
> Rule Making and Order (ET Docket 01-278). The ARRL argued in comments
filed
> last March that the field strengths and duty cycles SAVI proposed for its
> RFID tags as Part 15 "periodic radiators" were unreasonable and "would
> undoubtedly seriously disrupt amateur communications in one of the most
> popular of the Amateur Service allocations," particularly for weak-signal
> enthusiasts.
>
> The League also believes the FCC lacks the statutory authority to permit
the
> RFID tags under its Part 15 rules in the configuration SAVI has requested.

> The ARRL argues that under the Communications Act of 1934, such devices
with
> substantial interference potential must be licensed. The ARRL also has
> suggested that SAVI pick one of the Industrial, Scientific and Medical
(ISM)
> bands instead of 425-435 MHz.
>
> The ARRL's January 14 ex parte presentation was complemented by an
> interference study prepared by ARRL Lab Supervisor Ed Hare, W1RFI, and
ARRL
> Senior Engineer Zack Lau, W1VT. A copy of the interference study and more
> information is available on the ARRL Web site "Band Threats" page
> <http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/rm-1005/SaviExParte.pdf>.
>
>
>

3370. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:08:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5db50d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32881

"Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote in message
news:u5n4t54rmmpn7c@corp.supernews.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
> > There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
> > speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either
don't
> > recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is
> > irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.
>
> alright Carl, put your mouth where your money/job is and name some
of
> these applications for the curious.
>
> straight TCP/IP networking over amateur-controlled endpoints is
enough
> to give me a woody, but I'm sure not everybody else is as geeky as
me.

While I am not interested in the details of your "woody" or what
gives you one, and would appreciate it if you'd leave it out of
future correspondence :-), I would submit that once you have
the abiltity to run TCP/IP at sufficient speeds over amateur-
controlled endpoints, you have a platform that's ability to support
applications is virtually limited only by your imagination ...
exchange of files, e-mail, keyboard to keyboard, voice, fax,
web-pages, MPEG-encoded video, access to data, and on
and on and on ...

People say "I don't want to duplicate" the internet ... I would
ask:

1) Why not? ... it's pretty cool ... and to be able to do it without
being tied to wired infrastructure makes it even cooler and
move valuable. Talk about something that would provide
REAL value to the EMS folks ... imagine being able to provide
a decent bridge around outages in internet connectivity for them
during emergencies? Maybe "duplicate it" is a bit strong ...
how about *supplement* it? It's a crying shame that the block
of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
used ...

2) Why limit your imagination to what's available on the internet
now?

Carl - wa6vse

3371. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:09:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DB51C.E7FEF65E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32883

Bert Craig wrote:
> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the FCC
> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham but
> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope.

The law is the law. What you "hold" doesn't make any difference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3372. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:11:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DB57D.43E314A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32884

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?"
>
> Theres NCI problem, they are not worried about what the Majority want, but only
> what they want.

What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3373. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:11:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5db5c6$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32882

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020202081301.11085.00000738@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Can you give me some pointers to those doing such experiments in
the modes
> >and
> >> methods? I know of some, but I do not know of the "lots" that
you are
> >telling
> >> us about.
>
> > I imagined you read QST. Sorry.
>
> That is a pretty odd thing to say, Dick. Do you really think I
don't read QST?
> Sorry.
>
> I recall some really cool experimentation being featured in QST, but
not
> "lots." Can you elaborate a bit more and explain how many makes a
"lots" to
> you?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I imagined that Dick was refering to the (seemingly endlessly)
recurring articles on "build a super-regenerative receiver" ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF21kZe+N6+q84HiEQIA2wCfbZrCDtRp1JUA8yGlgRWZa1cHj18AoPex
w86UCAYfhfRoWjdjBwWAdFkf
=GAO3
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3374. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:16:22 UTC
From: WRC <solocase@sport.rr.com>
Message-ID: <3C5DBA48.4D50B1F6@sport.rr.com>
Source record: 32885
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank YOU So much...i thought it was only me that met them...malt liqour included. my aliens supplied the brew......

Twistedhed wrote:

> "A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt Liquor and not my
> usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite dizzy and hit
> my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to get on my
> illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a man who
> identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It sounded very real
> to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an authentic encounter.
> My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt liquor?"
>
> "Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate anti-spam
> guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy and put a .
> after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"
>
> Thank You,
>
> Twistedhed
> Oldsmar, FLA

3375. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:23:59 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203172359.29623.00000276@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32886

>What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?

Democracy!

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3376. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:24:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DB89F.D1F7BE27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32887

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Any clear analysis of FCC over the past few decades will show a great many such
> moves that can easily be seen as wrong, but no matter.

You're right, Dick, it doesn't matter. The law is the law. You ragged
on me for not being pleased with the law so why don't you just take
your own advice?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3377. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:28:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DB99A.56662CF9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32888

Bert Craig wrote:
> While I respect "authority," I feel quite comfortable with calling any
> "democratic" authority that does NOT serve the wants/needs of the majority a
> "bully."

What you don't seem to realize is that the "majority" are the citizens
of the United States, not the members of the ARS. The members of the ARS
are less than one percent of voters in the United States. Sounds like
you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3378. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:30:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBA12.C6ABA677@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32889

Bert Craig wrote:
> I must've missed the "I won't do anything that requires discipline or
> work" classes when I decided to become part of the fraternity.

Funny, I don't see "discipline" or "work" mentioned in Part 97.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3379. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:33:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBACD.1E643019@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32890

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> The fast that you don't think it was the correct decision is
> irrelevant to the fact that it was a valid decision, and your
> opinion that wasn't the correct decision is just that ... your
> opinion. Your opinion and something on the order of a
> dollar (more or less, depending on where) will get you a
> cup of coffee.

I find it interesting that someone who has been licensed a year
wants to have as much say as someone who has been licensed 50
years, yet, he wants someone licensed zero years not to have
any say at all. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3380. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:35:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBB4E.BBE05240@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32896

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> There's a lot of discussion here about "replacing Morse testing
> with something else." Yet NOBODY has ever, that I have seen,
> given a rational and compelling reason why something that is
> no longer needed NEEDS TO BE (or should be) "replaced by
> something else ...

Somebody once suggested that the Morse code test be replaced by
a typing test. I can do 65 wpm. How about you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3381. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:37:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203173706.02067.00001065@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32891

In article <3c5ca37c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Well, Jay, ya shoulda mentioned all that the first time 'round. That's all
>I can say.

I see. You missed what he was doing, but it's his fault, not yours.

I understood what he was saying the first time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3382. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:37:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203173707.02067.00001066@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32892

In article <a89ce4c4343213336081475b32335195.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> writes:

> RRAP Top 10 Users Jan 2002
>
>[405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
>[261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
>[233] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 7.3%
>[197] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 6.2%
>[148] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.7%
>[131] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.1%
>[120] Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 3.8%
>[113] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.6%
>[100] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.1%
> [98] Kim <none@none.net> 3.1%
>
One of those listed appears twice. Add the two different antispam email addresses used and you get 218, good for fourth place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3383. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:37:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203173707.02067.00001067@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32893

In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>> (W1RFI) writes:
>>
>>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
>>>outside of amateur radio?
>>>
>> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance must
>> have applicability outside amateur radio?
>
>When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
>ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you really
>think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its application
>within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term "radio art"? Why
>didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
>ability to contribute to the advancement of his own art"?
>
I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio. Ed seems to make that
separation, by such phrases as "real radio" and by asking about applicability
outside amateur radio.

As I see it, amateur radio is just as much "real radio" as any other authorized

radio service. What hams do is part of the "radio art".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3384. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:37:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203173709.02067.00001069@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 32894

In article <f8026928.0202021901.6cd08d1e@posting.google.com>, jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> Show us your numbers, Ed. What was the growth per year in the time periods
>> before the Tech lost its code test in 1991, after that change,
>
>YEAR AMATEURS DELTA DELTA(%)
>1980 393,000 --- ---
>1990 467,000 74,000 19% (1980-1990)
>2000 682,000 215,000 46% (2000-1990)

Not to be argumentative, but where do your numbers come from, Jon?

I have a a 1984-85 edition of the ARRL Call Directory. Printed early 1984. It says 453,000
total US hams.

Also have a 1993 "winged horse" Callbook. Printed late 1992. Says 575,000 US hams.
>
>While we're at it, consider the number of licensees as a percentage of
>the US population:
>
>1980 0.17%
>1990 0.19%
>2000 0.25%

Sure - but what numbers are you using and what is their source?

How do you compensate for the change from 5 to 10 year licenses, btw? The change occurred in 1984, which means that from 1989 to 1994 there were NO US ham license expirations. Conveniently, most of that falls into the 1990-2000 time frame.
>
>Clearly, growth spurted after the 1991 no-code license came into
>effect. Do you really doubt that, Jim?

Whenever the "price" of something is lowered, there is usually a spurt of "sales". The important question is whether it's a transient effect or a long term change.

I doubt that the 1991 or 2000 changes have/will result in longterm growth changes.
>
>> and before and

>> after
>> the 2000 restructuring?
>
>March 1999 674,719
>March 2000 677,784 (1-yr growth: 3,065)
>March 2001 684,359 (1-yr growth: 6,575)

Based on whose numbers?
>
>After April 15, 2000 the numbers rose at a higher rate than in the
>immediately preceding period until they reached their peak in March
>2001. Since then they've declined some.

Sure - a surge of new folks right after the "price" was lowered. Then
stability.

> That's probably no
>coincidence: the decline began just as the first 1991 no-code licences
>began to expire.

Which means what?

>The no-code rules caused a jump in the license
>numbers, and it's not surprising to see a matching decline as those
>licenses reach their expiration dates. Whether these expirations will
>continue to offset growth remains to be seen. It's way too early to
>tell for sure.

But you hold up the 1 year growth as proof.
>
>Caveat: All of this 1-year-term number crunching is pretty tenuous
>stuff upon which to draw conclusions. After all we're talking about
>sub-1% variations. Those are pretty small potatoes. In the last 12
>months, from Jan '01 to Jan '02 the change in the count was zero.
>(Yes, exactly zero, according to AH0A.) From Jul '97 to Jul '98
>(pre-restructuring) we lost 5,331 licensees. What does that tell us
>about the success of restructuring? Not a damn thing.

Exactly. But we are to believe without challenge claims that code testing
is/was "crippling" amateur radio. Sorry, I don't buy it.

Let's look at some more numbers from AH0A (end-of-month totals):

Total licenses March 00 (eve of restructuring): 677,784
Total licenses January 02 (most recent): 682,602

Increase: 4,918 in 22 months since restructuring

Total licenses May 98 (22 months before March 00): 673,973

Increase: 4,011 in 22 months before restructuring

Not exactly a big difference (917).

How about these (from AH0A):

Total new licenses from March 00 to Dec 01 (sum of all months from
April 00 to Dec 01): 33,856

Total new licenses from July 98 to March 00 (sum of all months for
period of same length before April 00): 27,935

Difference: 5,921 in 21 months
>
>> I'd go a step farther. Representing code tests as "crippling amateur radio"
>and
>> "digging our heels in the past" does no good. In fact it does lots of
>damage by
>>
>> diverting focus from the REAL problems confronting ham radio, like lack of
>> publicity, RFI, antenna restrictions, band threats, etc.
>
>Maybe, but I don't think the impact has been very significant. It's
>not as though those other areas aren't being worked on.

True to a point.

> And to the
>degree the no-code debate has diverted attention, aren't those on BOTH
>sides who allowed themselves to be diverted from more important issues
>equally to blame?

Not as I see it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3385. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:37:32 UTC
From: Macguyver <mac@guyver.com>
Message-ID: <3C5DBBAD.BB86E301@guyver.com>
Source record: 32895
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WRC wrote:
>
> Thank YOU So much...i thought it was only me that met them...malt liqour
> included. my aliens supplied the brew......

Howdy. You just replied to an old forged post. Also, you may
want to check the spelling in your headers. <;

"Organization:
orginization?...crappy at best."
^ (must have been the beer)

3386. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:42:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBCBA.4AEB3D91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32897

Clay N4AOX wrote:
> Speaking of predictable responses....What does else does one
> expect from another NCI suck-up?

Seems to me the FCC and NCI are essentially in agreement. Why
don't y'all PCTA folk just secede and form a society more to
y'all's liking? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3387. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:43:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBD21.9542F66F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32899

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
> Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
> the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
> all hams to be taught the same".

BOHICA!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3388. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:46:41 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203174641.14084.00000817@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32898

>Bert Craig wrote:
>> I must've missed the "I won't do anything that requires discipline or
>> work" classes when I decided to become part of the fraternity.
>
>Funny, I don't see "discipline" or "work" mentioned in Part 97.

Cecil,

I respect your views and generally hold your words in high esteem...but do you really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up hating the code, I like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of love," hence work.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3389. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:48:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DBE21.96DBA522@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32900

K0HB wrote:
> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%

I'll bet Jim posted more than twice as many words as I.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3390. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 22:57:18 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203175718.14084.00000819@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32901

>Bert Craig wrote:
>> While I respect "authority," I feel quite comfortable with calling any
>> "democratic" authority that does NOT serve the wants/needs of the majority
>a
>> "bully."
>
>What you don't seem to realize is that the "majority" are the citizens
>of the United States, not the members of the ARS. The members of the ARS
>are less than one percent of voters in the United States. Sounds like
>you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
>--
>cheers, CAM

Cecil, que paso? This about a policy re. licensed US amateurs. Do you think the members of the "Racoon Lodge" would appreciate it if members of the "Water Buffalo Lodge" voted on their referendums. My fictional example concerns Ralph and Fred, but it illustrates a point nonetheless. Amateur radio is open to all those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others need not apply. So the "majority" is rightly those who are licensed of interested in becoming licensed. C'mon Cecil, what gives with the off-the-wall logic tonight. This is really not an altogether complex issue.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3391. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:01:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32902

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202021643.2a195e07@posting.google.com...
> >
> One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
> comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed
digital
> system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
> postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have
yet
> to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.

Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
frequency.
That's what the rules say.

However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
the channel is occupied by another user.

However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.

> Another rub being that, based on my observations and some
discussions
> the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close
to
> zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
> 286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
> eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
> comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the
dx
> spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham
radio
> today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.

No ... I think that the lesson in reality is that amateur packet
didn't
keep up with the level of "service" (data transfer rates, and other
preformance metrics) that the internet provided, thus it became

VERY boring by comparison ... had hams kept their technology
competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
have been such an exodus as there was ...

> Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
> demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
> attract.

Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3BTJe+N6+q84HiEQKRqgCfe33xv1riU9XykY5tQZcQD9w5SvUAoIdO
u1384j5cVMgbGRbXA1Wi+1Ay
=scwX
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3392. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:02:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DC173.6B39EB64@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32903

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?
>
> Democracy!

Uhhhhh Bert, we don't live in a democracy. We live in a republic.
Otherwise, you might be drinking hemlock.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3393. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:05:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dc26a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32904

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5EBEE3.92E06B46@worldnet.att.net...
> All that would be funny if it wasn't a bit pitiful.
> All those coordinated repeaters out there, silently using up our
spectrum.

Whoa ... this is REALLY SCARY ... Dick actually appears
to have saidvsomething I agree with ...

Maybe I'm misunderstanding what he intended??? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3CLJe+N6+q84HiEQJFTQCg8ujFhWpeyNDlpC4U78rxyn50Ee4An0lX
/lE6Wftg5ymBKehmsGoi2VQi
=WCVc
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3394. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:10:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DC35C.35D7BA02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32906

Bert Craig wrote:
> Amateur radio is open to all
> those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others need not
> apply.

What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham does.
It would be unconstitutional to allow members of the ARS to run the ARS.
Responses to the R&O are open to all citizens.

That's why the FCC runs the ARS. They have the other 99.5% of the voters
to consider in their decisions. They are supposed to run the ARS based
on what is *good for the country*, not upon what is good for individual
members of the ARS. The FCC has decided that a 5wpm Morse code exam is
presently *good for the country*.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3395. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:12:03 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203181203.14084.00000822@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32905

>I find it interesting that someone who has been licensed a year
>wants to have as much say as someone who has been licensed 50
>years, yet, he wants someone licensed zero years not to have
>any say at all. :-)
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Now this is actually an interesting question. Perhaps we can play a little game (For amusement only.) since you seem to be in a "semantic" mood this evening.

Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that John was born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?

None of us are born amateur radio operators, we all had to put forth some effort to get from the street to the starting line. (Remember, there is no finish line.) Those before us set the standard, for better or worse. The only thing that was really "required" of us was to want it enough to "meet the current requirements." In doing so, we became part of the faculty who gets to set the standard for the next "freshman class." I was lucky enough to hook-up with some folks who set me on the right path. They made it plain and I brought the work-ethic. I told them what I wanted, I was in-turn advised of what I needed to do, and I did it. Overall, a very satisfying and rewarding experience. The anti-code folks might have a point if they needed 20-wpm for HF privies, but 5-wpm? C'mon Cecil.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3396. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:18:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dc578_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32907

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote in message
news:u5n2hcmlod8n10@corp.supernews.com...
>
> I see your point though -- I don't think even Carl can reference a
voice
> mode that can replace SSB. (Carl?)

I can envision several ... depending on exactly what your
goals are ...

There are coding schemes available that are
"near toll quality" at data rates as low as 2400 bps ...
lets say we use QPSK ... pretty narrow bandwidth and
good Eb/No performance ... you could even add some
redundancy for FEC and still have something that's
comparable in bandwidth to SSB ... with some interleaving
over FEC codewords, it could work pretty well.

Another approach is to use a multitone modem and lower
symbol rates ... with some parallelism in the data being
sent on subcarriers dispersed enough in frequency to
provide some protection against selective fading.
Again, FEC and interleaving, properly applied could
provide benefits as well.

There are other possiblitilies as well, but two examples
ought to be enough to make a point.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3FOZe+N6+q84HiEQJOzwCgomUIyu+1Z9wozuEDOA9PbiuIFTwAoKYl
6yCC/LEwndHlg3fi0P6fe1ef
=5o1p
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3397. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:21:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DC5E3.81589F1D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32908

Bert Craig wrote:
> I respect your views and generally hold your words in high esteem...but do you
> really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up hating the code, I
> like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of love,"
> hence work.

The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
The test is about qualifications, not about love. The FCC has decided
that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
radio operator is qualified without Morse code.

As an illustration: If a military special forces person who already
can do 40wpm Morse code decides to get his General ham license, he
must pass the 5wpm exam. A "labor of love" would have him passing
a 50wpm exam. "Labors of love" should be reserved for things like
frat initiations, not governmental requirements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3398. RE: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:29:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dc82e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32909

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Forwarded from e-mail, since I answered it there first
in reply to Ed ...

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Carl R. Stevenson [mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net]
> Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2002 5:53 PM
> To: 'W1RFI'
> Cc: 'dickc58@worldnet.att.net'
> Subject: RE: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o
S25.5
> Proposal
>
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: W1RFI [mailto:w1rfi@aol.com]
> > Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2002 4:49 PM
> > To: wa6vse@fast.net
> > Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re:
> ARS w/o S25.5
> > Proposal
> > >
> > >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > >Do I think that Carl Stevenson would be eager to
> > > resolve his SS interference to a "legacy" mode?
> > > Do I really need to answer?
> > >
> > No, Carl does. I will ask him.
> > >
> > Carl, if you set up and operate an SS system and it causes
> > interference to a
> > narrowband user, are you going to do what the rules require
> > to resolve that interference?
> > >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed,
>
> Absolutely ... I would take any steps necessary to resolve any
> harmful interference as required by the rules ... I always make
```

> every effort possible to comply with all of the FCC's rules. I
think
> you know that's how I would operate.
>
> Note that if I put up an FHSS system and it caused a carrier
> squelch system to "burp" (break squelch) once in a while, I'm
> not convinced that that in and of itself would constitute "harmful
> interference" ... what would your interpretation of the rules be in
> that case, Ed? Would it be reasonable to suggest that the operator
> of the carrier squelch system install CTCSS to prevent occasional
> squelch openings, assuming that the occasional squelch "burps"
> were the only noticable effect on the other system and that its
> normal use were not impaired in any meaningful manner?
>
> (I'll also answer this on r.r.a.p if it appears there, and I've
pasted
> Dick's e-mail address into the cc: field from the message above
> so he can see the answer firsthand.)
>
> 73,
> Carl
>
>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3H35e+N6+q84HiEQKk5gCcCRUhm0NmsmDOn/2MLkluv5VUjgAAoNRh
n/A4TRGyL25Wew8Q4kexkqzB
=lSp7
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3399. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:35:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DC935.A1AA32A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32912

Bert Craig wrote:
> Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that John was
> born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?

Should Juan's vote and John's vote count any less than yours? The FCC
must consider what is best for the country, not what is best for the
members of the ARS.

> The anti-code folks might have a point if they needed 20-wpm for HF
> privies, but 5-wpm? C'mon Cecil.

I'm perfectly satisfied with the present requirements, Bert. My
satisfaction and two bucks will get me a decent cup of coffee.
The question is: Will the FCC be satisfied with the present
requirements when and if S25.5 is repealed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3400. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:36:04 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203183604.14084.00000825@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32910

>The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
>The test is about qualifications, not about love. The FCC has decided
>that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
>If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
>radio operator is qualified without Morse code.

So that's all it's about, "governmental requirements?" If I believed that, I'd be really disappointed...but I don't so I'm not. :-)

There's a deep tradition and fraternal spirit in amateur radio. While it may become frayed and somewhat tattered, it's yet to be torn. Morse proficiency, howebver minimal, is but one thread of that spirit. You probably believe that it's only about the radio. Maybe that fresh "1-year" perspective is needed more that first thought.

>As an illustration: If a military special forces person who already
>can do 40wpm Morse code decides to get his General ham license, he
>must pass the 5wpm exam. A "labor of love" would have him passing
>a 50wpm exam. "Labors of love" should be reserved for things like
>frat initiations, not governmental requirements.

Reread this, Cecil. I repeat...que paso?

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3401. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:37:31 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203183731.14084.00000826@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32911

>Bert Craig wrote:
>>
>> >What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?
>>
>> Democracy!
>
>Uhhhhh Bert, we don't live in a democracy. We live in a republic.
>Otherwise, you might be drinking hemlock.
>--
>cheers, CAM

What's hemlock? I'm always in "learn" mode. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3402. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:49:55 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203184955.14084.00000827@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32913

>Bert Craig wrote:
>> Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that John
>was
>> born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?
>
>Should Juan's vote and John's vote count any less than yours?

Sorry, I should've pointed out that I meant for local, state, and presidential elections. "My bad." ;-)

>The FCC
>must consider what is best for the country, not what is best for the
>members of the ARS.

Hmm, I don't quite agree...but I'll be damned if I can come up with a good reason why. You ever had one of those? :-)

>I'm perfectly satisfied with the present requirements, Bert. My
>satisfaction and two bucks will get me a decent cup of coffee.

Me too. Funny thing is that with all the Starbucks, Chock Full O'Nuts, Dunkin Donuts, etc. around here...the best cup of coffee comes from the local Exxon gas station where they market the Begal Traders brand. You have to understand, I truly believe that on the 8th day, God made coffee. :-)

>The question is: Will the FCC be satisfied with the present
>requirements when and if S25.5 is repealed?

I sincerely hope so. I'll be more than happy to help any interested soul meet those requirements...the same way I was generously helped along.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3403. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-03 23:50:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DCCB7.6DC9D20F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32914

Bert Craig wrote:

> >Uhhhhh Bert, we don't live in a democracy. We live in a republic.
> >Otherwise, you might be drinking hemlock.
>
> What's hemlock? I'm always in "learn" mode. :-)

Socrates is considered the father of democracy. He promoted democracy
above all other systems. It is somewhat of a myth that the democracy
voted for him to drink hemlock, a deadly poison from the hemlock plant.
Thus his "democracy" was responsible for his death. (He was accused of not
properly promoting the Morse Code Creed of the time and sentenced to death. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3404. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:00:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DCF38.F68FBD30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32916

Bert Craig wrote:
> There's a deep tradition and fraternal spirit in amateur radio.

That's true, but the FCC doesn't care a whit about tradition or fraternal spirit and that is as it should be. It is up to the members of the ARS to promote the traditions and fraternal spirit. CW will survive because it has merit, not because the FCC should be dedicated to preserving an outdated mode. There is room in the ARS for both the old and the new. The choice of embracing the old or the new or both should lie with the individual ham who should not be hamstrung by governmental requirements. An individual just cannot be forced to like something. Hams are no exception.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3405. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:01:45 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203190145.14096.00000970@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 32915

>> >Uhhhhh Bert, we don't live in a democracy. We live in a republic.
>> >Otherwise, you might be drinking hemlock.
>>
>> What's hemlock? I'm always in "learn" mode. :-)
>
>Socrates is considered the father of democracy. He promoted democracy
>above all other systems. It is somewhat of a myth that the democracy
>voted for him to drink hemlock, a deadly poison from the hemlock plant.
>Thus his "democracy" was responsible for his death. (He was accused of not
>properly promoting the Morse Code Creed of the time and sentenced to death.
>:-)
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

ROTF, thanks Cecil. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3406. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:04:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203190440.15908.00001705@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32917

>What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?
>--
>cheers, CAM

What does that have to do with NCI wanting there way or no way. Are you suggesting NCIs Members are a Bunch of Inmates in an Institution?

3407. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:07:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203190701.15908.00001706@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32918

>Sounds like
>you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
>--
>cheers, CAM

Thats Exactly what NCI wants

3408. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:10:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203191003.15908.00001707@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32919

>The FCC has decided that a 5wpm Morse code exam is
>presently *good for the country*.
>--
>cheers, CAM

BS, they decide that the 5WPM would make there life easier because of the
Handicap problem.

3409. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:21:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DD3ED.9CC0EA3B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32920

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >What institution allows the inmates to run the institution?
>
> What does that have to do with NCI wanting there way or no way. Are you
> suggesting NCIs Members are a Bunch of Inmates in an Institution?

Seems to me that NCI simply agrees with the FCC. If the inmates agree
with the management of the institution, they certainly are happier.
Don't you want to be happy, Bruce? Shirley, you don't want a prefrontal
lobotomy ala "One Flew Over the Cookoo's (sp?) Nest".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3410. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:22:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DD42A.B26D4AA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32921

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >The FCC has decided that a 5wpm Morse code exam is
> >presently *good for the country*.
>
> BS, they decide that the 5WPM would make there life easier because of the
> Handicap problem.

That's good for the country, Bruce.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3411. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:23:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DD481.7C35BC64@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32922

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Sounds like
> >you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
>
> Thats Exactly what NCI wants

As long as that negligible minority is the FCC, what are you
going to do about it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3412. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:31:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5DD64D.8115D3FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32923

Bert Craig wrote:

> >The FCC
> >must consider what is best for the country, not what is best for the
> >members of the ARS.
>
> Hmm, I don't quite agree...but I'll be damned if I can come up with a good
> reason why. You ever had one of those? :-)

It's the broad picture. The members of the ARS don't own the ham bands.
The citizens of the USA own the public property that is the ham bands.
The FCC is supposed to act in a manner that is good for *all* citizens,
not just members of the ARS. The ARS is open to all *qualified* citizens.
The FCC gets to decide what "qualified" really means. Does CW skill
make a better ham? Of course it does. But should minimum requirements
include Morse code skill? The jury is still out.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3413. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:36:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3kl56hg1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32924

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203113505.14072.00001159@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >In case you missed it, the FCC doesn't consider morse skill
> >of sufficient importance to still require any 13-20 wpm testing.
>
> Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just the
FCC
> re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed ham
but
> I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope. They make mistakes
too...and
> plenty of them.

In the sphere of influence that the FCC rides heard over,
the FCC is above the Pope. Like it or not, it is the FCC
and only the FCC that gets to make the rules we amateurs
live by in the USA. The issue of value, importance, etc of
any one mode as to the role any skill in that mode should
be a requirement absolutely IS the FCC's to decide.

> Your answer to many (Yes, MANY!) of the comments made on the NG
> re. the removal of the code is often prefaced by "The FCC doesn't
consider..."

PLEASE tell me what is inaccurate in that statement.

> What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?"

The opinions of the majority, minority of licensed amateurs
is simply that...their opinions. Those opinions and considerations
are free to be shared or otherwise submitted to the FCC at any time.
Indeed, the FCC expressly offers everyone, both ham and non-ham alike,
the opportunity to submit their thoughts, opinions, suggestions
on FCC rules every time they (FCC) open an NPRM.

> And please don't
> tell me that it's "not about licensed amateurs," because it is. It's OUR
> hobby/service...both yours , mine, and the future newcomers. If you've
> convinced yourself that the will of those presently licensed doesn't
matter re.

The "will" of those presently licensed is, as stated
before, only subject to consideration by the FCC at the discretion
of the FCC.

> this issue, that's fine. But don't expect me to buy that. Let's quit using
the

> FCC as the "righteous" pillar here, they're only the enforcers.

Who then, if not the FCC gets to make the rules that you claim
"they're only the enforcers" of?

> >Your catagorization of morse as "an important communinication
> >skill" is simply one person's opinion...yours.
>
> I think you a few hundred thousand souls shy here.

Isn't it odd that there weren't anywhere near "a few hundred
thousand souls" that submitted comments/opinions/or otherwise to
the FCC when the FCC specifically asked for any such input?

> >Neither you nor
> >anyone else has been able to convince the FCC that morse IS
> >important enough to retain 13/20 wpm testing.
>
> This is entirely correct, but it doesn't say anything toward the validity
or
> correctness of that decision.

It absolutely does in the only context that makes any difference.
IF the FCC doesn't accept the validity of a particular argument,
it becomes immaterial as to who else outside the FCC might
think otherwise.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3414. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:41:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3klelqpo1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32925

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203131258.09871.00001716@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >What about what the majority of licensed amateurs "consider?"
>
> Theres NCI problem, they are not worried about what the Majority want, but
only
> what they want.

The FCC doesn't consider rules changes for ANY service based
on any majority. That is the reality of the regulations authority
expressly given to the FCC in the US government.

As to the opinions of a majority of hams, that isn't even known,
nor could it likly be established in any case.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3415. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:48:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3klr0bag1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32926

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203175718.14084.00000819@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >Bert Craig wrote:
> >> While I respect "authority," I feel quite comfortable with calling any
> >> "democratic" authority that does NOT serve the wants/needs of the
majority
> >a
> >> "bully."
> >
> >What you don't seem to realize is that the "majority" are the citizens
> >of the United States, not the members of the ARS. The members of the ARS
> >are less than one percent of voters in the United States. Sounds like
> >you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM
>
> Cecil, que paso? This about a policy re. licensed US amateurs. Do you
think the
> members of the "Racoon Lodge" would appreciate it if members of the "Water
> Buffalo Lodge" voted on their referendums. My fictional example concerns
Ralph
> and Fred, but it illustrates a point nonetheless. Amateur radio is open to
all
> those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others need
not
> apply. So the "majority" is rightly those who are licensed of interested
in
> becoming licensed. C'mon Cecil, what gives with the off-the-wall logic
tonight.
> This is really not an altogether complex issue.

In the area of government rules/regs, it is not a subset of the public
that gets to serve as a "majority." Does the driving public (i.e.
licensed drivers) have exclusive control, input, opinion regarding
the rules that apply to driving a motor vehicle?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3416. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:49:04 UTC
From: Roger Conroy <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a3klsr$i7t$1@ctb-nnrp2.saix.net>
Source record: 32927
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

will it increase the power rating as well? and what about the SWR?

"Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night
>
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a2h93cmte0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > >
> > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > >
> > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
intend
> on
> > looking at this link,
> > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> "graphic"
> > pics.
> > >
> > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > zzz
> >
> > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> stamps.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3417. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 00:53:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3km5e$f0e$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32928

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203190701.15908.00001706@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >Sounds like
> >you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM
>
> Thats Exactly what NCI wants

Absolutly FALSE unless you consider the FCC to be that
"negligible minority." The fact remains that the FCC does
get to make all the rules and we (NCI) simply recognize it is
primarily the FCC that we (NCI) must convince as to any
rules changes we might want.

On a parrallel note, it is my understanding that a majority
of motorcyclists would just as soon do away with mandatory
helmeit laws....yet that majority doesn't hold sway with the
legislative bodies in most states to end such helmit laws.

In many cases, rules that are not popular with a majority
of people impacted are brought about by small, dedicated groups
of people.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3418. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:03:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3kmrodlj1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32929

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203183604.14084.00000825@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
> >The test is about qualifications, not about love. The FCC has decided
> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
> >If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
> >radio operator is qualified without Morse code.
>
> So that's all it's about, "governmental requirements?" If I believed that,
I'd
> be really disappointed...but I don't so I'm not. :-)

Bert,
The role of government requirements, set by the FCC, absolutely
is ALL it's about as to code testing as a requirement. Issues and opinions
regarding effort, work, "love", etc. are not and should not be any
aspect of governmental licensing.

> There's a deep tradition and fraternal spirit in amateur radio. While it
may
> become frayed and somewhat tattered, it's yet to be torn.

And nothing in the rules, regs or requirements can or should be
a requirement as a consideration of such tradition or fraternal spirit.

> Morse proficiency,
> howebver minimal, is but one thread of that spirit.

Once again, tradition and spirit are NOT appropriate aspects
of government requirements for licensing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3419. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:15:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3kndo$nq8$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32930

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203181203.14084.00000822@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >I find it interesting that someone who has been licensed a year
> >wants to have as much say as someone who has been licensed 50
> >years, yet, he wants someone licensed zero years not to have
> >any say at all. :-)
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Now this is actually an interesting question. Perhaps we can play a little
game
> (For amusement only.) since you seem to be in a "semantic" mood this
evening.
>
> Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that John
was
> born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?
>
> None of us are born amateur radio operators, we all had to put forth some
> effort to get from the street to the starting line. (Remember, there is no
> finish line.)

Agreed.

> Those before us set the standard, for better or worse.

What standard? If you mean the test requirements, they have been
set by the FCC for over 50 years...not by licensed amateurs.

> The only
> thing that was really "required" of us was to want it enough to "meet the
> current requirements."

Agreed.

> In doing so, we became part of the faculty who gets to
> set the standard for the next "freshman class."

I'm still missing what that standard is...where is it identified?
If it is the overall attitude, perspective and commitment that
hams make towards various aspects of the service, then I'd suggest
that any "standard" is anything BUT a standard as ham radio
has always embraced a wide spectrum of acceptable behavior,
participation and/or commitment from licensed hams.

> I was lucky enough to hook-up
> with some folks who set me on the right path. They made it plain and I

brought
> the work-ethic. I told them what I wanted, I was in-turn advised of what I
> needed to do, and I did it.

If by "what was required" you refer to specific test requirements, I
absolutely agree.

> Overall, a very satisfying and rewarding experience.

Good, glad you enjoyed it.

> The anti-code folks might have a point if they needed 20-wpm for HF
> privies, but 5-wpm? C'mon Cecil.

The issue is NOT the degree of effort needed, it is the merit
of the requirement itself. THAT is the issue. If you are saying
the 5 wpm should be retained because it isn't (in your oopinion)
a significant effort for most people, then I disagree and have stated
such at many times in this forum as well as in my filed comments
with the FCC some three years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3420. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:19:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3knma$j6s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32931

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5DB51C.E7FEF65E@IEEE.org...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > Geez, Bill. Are you this placid with ALL forms of authority. (Or just
the FCC
> > re. this issue since it suits NCI's "goals"...for now.) I'm a licensed
ham but
> > I do NOT hold the FCC up there next to the Pope.
>
> The law is the law. What you "hold" doesn't make any difference.

Additionally, I learned a long time ago to work within the system
rather than confront it head on. Those that take the "headon"
approach usually end up getting the shaft ialong the way. Reminds
me of many in the military service who thought they could take on
the "system" and paid for it in the end...rather than simply accepting
the system and working it as best theycould until their enlistment or
2 years draft service was up.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3421. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:26:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5de3aa_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32932

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203175718.14084.00000819@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >Bert Craig wrote:
> >> While I respect "authority," I feel quite comfortable with
calling any
> >> "democratic" authority that does NOT serve the wants/needs of the
majority
> >a
> >> "bully."
> >
> >What you don't seem to realize is that the "majority" are the
citizens
> >of the United States, not the members of the ARS. The members of
the ARS
> >are less than one percent of voters in the United States. Sounds
like
> >you want a negligible minority of voters to be setting policy.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM
>
> Cecil, que paso? This about a policy re. licensed US amateurs. Do
you think the
> members of the "Racoon Lodge" would appreciate it if members of the
"Water
> Buffalo Lodge" voted on their referendums. My fictional example
concerns Ralph
> and Fred, but it illustrates a point nonetheless. Amateur radio is
open to all
> those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others
need not
> apply. So the "majority" is rightly those who are licensed of
interested in
> becoming licensed. C'mon Cecil, what gives with the off-the-wall
logic tonight.
> This is really not an altogether complex issue.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Bert,

Apparenty it's too complex an issue for YOU to fathom ...

The Amateur Radio Service and its use of spectrum (which belongs
to all of the population ... not to hams ... we're just allowed to USE
part of it ... we don't own it ... READ YOUR LICENSE) is NOT
the "Racoon Lodge." It is NOT a private fraternity that is largely
free, within some limits, to set its own rules.

The whole issue is about the legitimate requirements to GET
a license. That is not a matter to be decided by a popularity
contest amongst incumbent licensees. The fox may NOT
guard the henhouse ...

Yes, amateur radio is open to all who meet the requirements
set forth ... but YOU don't get to determine those requirements.
THAT's the FCC's job ...

Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
is a stinking pile of crap.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3jKZe+N6+q84HiEQLtyQCg6ejGfXE3G6dvcN/tvkMuD9C8u5UAoIta
/XaJ4q2m0fXrlDUoXuulvt9f
=SoJf
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3422. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:36:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F294C.E316F9D7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32933

Krell wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a3jl8p$l68$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Larry,
> > You are so predictable in your opinions.
> > Do you believe for one second your comments
> > above serve to enlighten, lead or encourage anyone to
> > become a ham?
> >
> > No cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Some people, such as Dick, Larry, and Babbling Bruce, don't know how to
> encourage and build. They only know how to discourage and destroy.

And you base that view entirely on the fact that we support a code test for hams. So all that means anything according to you anticoders is the sole factor of Morse code. That clearly shows your mentality, and it is disgusting.

3423. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:42:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5de780$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32934

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5DBA12.C6ABA677@IEEE.org...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > I must've missed the "I won't do anything that requires discipline
or
> > work" classes when I decided to become part of the fraternity.
>
> Funny, I don't see "discipline" or "work" mentioned in Part 97.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Funny ... I also don't see "fraternity" in there anywhere,
either.

Nor have I been able to find the section where it says,
"The current brothers of the fraternity shall determine
the nature and extend of hazing rituals which must be
endured by pledges wishing to become members of
the fraternity."

That's what Bert is asking for ... he has the ARS
confused with some stupid college fraternity and
thinks that he and "the brothers" ought to get to
set whatever arbitrary hazing rituals suit their whim.

That's REALLY a pile ... Bert, and quite a few
others here who obviously feel the same way,
just don't seem to have a clue as to how sound
public policy is formulated or how the rights of
individuals are protected from the tyrany of
some self-appointed "ruling class."

Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
governs least governs best." Don't take my
word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
able to read it.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPF3nBpe+N6+q84HiEQJP7ACgqbpgxR8CKPXBdU2dNyUJ13g4ZqcAoPDc
cF3rJcFbtWHiaXpq2MkYe+/N
=A3KX
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3424. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:48:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203204826.16072.00000862@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 32935

In article <3c5da7f4_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <20020201183058.26577.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>,
>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>> writes:
>> >In my personal opinion, though I have one on code testing, it is
>not that big
>> >of a deal one way or the other.
>>
>> I think most hams feel the same way.
>
>It may not be "that big of a deal one way or the other" to
>some hams who have already "jumped through the hoop"
>and "have theirs" ... but it is a big deal to many prospective
>hams ... thus, in terms of future growth (even replacing older
>hams as they, unfortuantely, go SK ...) it IS a big deal.

Who are all these alleged prospective hams to whom it is a big deal?
Where are their comments to the FCC on 98-143? Only a very few
individuals who are not hams bothered to comment to the FCC on
that NPRM.
>
>> >It is a major leap to go from a belief thatit
>> >is time to replace Morse testing with something else to it is
>"crippling
>> >Amateur Radio."
>
>There's a lot of discussion here about "replacing Morse testing
>with something else." Yet NOBODY has ever, that I have seen,
>given a rational and compelling reason why something that is
>no longer needed NEEDS TO BE (or should be) "replaced by
>something else ...
>
>I haven't seen a shred of evidence that the FCC feels that Morse
>testing needs to be replaced by something else ... all I saw them
>say was that they saw Morse as serving no legitimate regulatory
>purpose (beyond the current need to meet the requirements of
>the ITU Radio Regulations S25.5 ...).

Sure - which means it's a done deal as soon as S25.5 goes away.
>
>I see no reason whatsoever that Morse testing needs to be

>replaced with ANYTHING ... unless someone has an agenda
>to erect additional, unnecessary barriers to entry.

So the written testing and associated privileges are 100% perfect,
in your opinion.
>
>> I'd go a step farther. Representing code tests as "crippling amateur
>radio" and
>> "digging our heels in the past" does no good. In fact it does lots
>of damage by
>> diverting focus from the REAL problems confronting ham radio, like
>lack of
>> publicity, RFI, antenna restrictions, band threats, etc.
>
>I see artifical barriers to entry to otherwise qualified prospective
>hams as being a "real problem." And one that contributes to bad
>publicity (many images of ham radio in the media are one of an
>outdated, Morse-centric activity ...). Additionally, the unnecessary
>barrier contributes to a lack of numbers (which equal political
>influence) needed to overturn antenna restrictions, fend off band
>threats, etc.

The same is true of the multiple written exams. Why are THEY needed?
>
>That, along with the rift, contention, and class warfare in the
>amateur community that Morse testing has caused for at least
>as long as I've been licensed, is what I think Bruce was referring
>to when he spoke of the Morse issue "crippling amateur radio."

You see what isn't really there, Carl.

There has been a US nocodetest ham license that gives ALL amateur
radio privileges above 30 MHz for over a decade now. Has it resulted
in new technologies? Unprecedented growth? Nope.
>
>That's all easy to ignore if you keep your head in the sand and
>take the "it's our (the incumbents') hobby and we should be able
>to do with it as we please viewpoint.
>
If folks are unhappy with the requirements they could comment to
FCC NPRMs. The vast majority of those who do so are hams,
not nonhams.

Sounds to me like you would rather have amateur radio's future
decided by a small group that happens to agree with you rather
than by the majority of those in the amateur radio community.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3425. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:51:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F2CC0.D8627198@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32936

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
> > Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
> > the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
> > all hams to be taught the same".
>
> BOHICA!

So you're accustomed to bending over?

3426. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:54:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32937

CAM wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
> > Amateur radio is open to all
> > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others need not
> > apply.
>
> What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
> just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham does.

And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.

3427. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 01:59:26 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5DEABE.B40DE8A8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32938

Hi Cecil,

Trouble is, those carpet baggers from Newington have convinced everyone that they are the representative national organization, "of, by, and for the radio amateur". Also, they are striving to emass a large lobbying war chest (even though their by-laws prohibit such). And we all know that we have the best congress critters money can buy!

If dealing with those NCI butt-boys wasn't bad enough, we have to face an FCC that is enamoured with every crackpot claim of the digital mode de jour crowd that comes down the pike, and whose idea of good spectrum management is selling it off to the highest bidder. Do you ever wonder about the parade of digital wireless service companies headed toward or just about to enter bankruptcy as of late, eg. Motorola, Lucent, ATT Wireless, Global Crossings, etc.? I figure the FCC is just about as competent with recognizing and promoting good technology as the FAA has been in recognizing and promoting good airport security.

73,
Clay N4AOX

CAM wrote:
>

>
> Seems to me the FCC and NCI are essentially in agreement. Why
> don't y'all PCTA folk just secede and form a society more to
> y'all's liking? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3428. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:01:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a3kr0l$1tm$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 32944
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Roger Conroy" <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a3klsr$i7t$1@ctb-nnrp2.saix.net...
> will it increase the power rating as well? and what about the SWR?

LOL!!!!!!!!

> "Another user" <at@btinternet.com> wrote in message
> news:a3cvj2$p36$1@paris.btinternet.com...
> > Will it work on my dipole hi from 40 to 80 over night
> >
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a2h93c$mte$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > <xphbtf@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:8UU28.5126$2V3.17109@news.uswest.net...
> > > > I found this interesting article on penis development:
> > > >
> > > > " Amazing excersise system to improve your sex life, increase your
> > > > penis size, and help to reduce the risk of prostate cancer"
> > > >
> > > > The cost is less than $40.00 and seems good value, please if you
> intend
> > on
> > > looking at this link,
> > > > I will let you know that it is non-porn, however there are a few
> > "graphic"
> > > pics.
> > > >
> > > > go to http://zlap.to/pd11
> > > > cya, Im off to bed now
> > > > zzz
> > >
> > > Hey Stagger Lee and Arf arf!, there's hope for you two to save your
> > > marriages yet, and you can afford to cash in $40 worth of your food
> > stamps.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
```

>
>

3429. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:05:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F302F.1771F781@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32939

Bill Sohl wrote:

> The FCC doesn't consider rules changes for ANY service based
> on any majority.

SO why you choose to just ignore what the FCC says when it suits you, and other times swear the are always right? FCC has repetedly stated that they want hams to form a "concensus" of what we want
done in the area of regulations. Of course, when some special interest group such as you and NCI gets to certain key personnel, and gains sympathy for their point, they can change their own procedures at will.

3430. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:08:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dedb4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32941

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203181203.14084.00000822@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >I find it interesting that someone who has been licensed a year
> >wants to have as much say as someone who has been licensed 50
> >years, yet, he wants someone licensed zero years not to have
> >any say at all. :-)
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Now this is actually an interesting question. Perhaps we can play a
little game
> (For amusement only.) since you seem to be in a "semantic" mood this
evening.
>
> Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that
John was
> born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?

Of course not ... but this is really not a good analogy. We're not
talking about voting rights ... it's more like the right of free
speech.
Even non-citizens have a right of free speech.

Of maybe "freedom of religion" ... no religious group has the
power to dictate the religious beliefs and practices of any
other in this country ... try to view modes as analogous to
religious practices (sometimes I think some Morse practitioners
DO view it as a true religion ... and think it should be the State
Religion, despite the fact that the Constitution prohibits that.)

> None of us are born amateur radio operators, we all had to put forth
some
> effort to get from the street to the starting line. (Remember, there
is no
> finish line.) Those before us set the standard, for better or worse.

"Those (licensed operators) before" you did NOT set the
standard for your entry into ham radio ... its the government
in the form of the FCC that sets the standards for ham licensing..
(When are you going to get that through your head?)

>The only
> thing that was really "required" of us was to want it enough to

"meet the
> current requirements."

That's true ... but the requirements have changed to fit the times.
Learn to live with it.

> In doing so, we became part of the faculty who gets to
> set the standard for the next "freshman class."

You're joking, of course .. a 1 year ham is a member of
"the faculty that gets to set the standard" for those to come?
I think you're suffering from delusions of grandeur or
something ...

> I was lucky enough to hook-up
> with some folks who set me on the right path.

Translation: "I (Bert) was brainwashed by some old farts."

ROTFLMAO at your cluelessness.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3s9Je+N6+q84HiEQKtFwCfY053zIuP1X0oaFt5l73vwM8jeTkAoOOh
Q6k/0v7cfSuIpsm8ksMqDaLs
=2jl9
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3431. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:09:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F30F2.5A18461D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32940

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020203183604.14084.00000825@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> > >The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
> > >The test is about qualifications, not about love. The FCC has decided
> > >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
> > >If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
> > >radio operator is qualified without Morse code.
> >
> > So that's all it's about, "governmental requirements?" If I believed that,
> I'd
> > be really disappointed...but I don't so I'm not. :-)
>
> Bert,
> The role of government requirements, set by the FCC, absolutely
> is ALL it's about as to code testing as a requirement. Issues and opinions
> regarding effort, work, "love", etc. are not and should not be any
> aspect of governmental licensing.
>
> > There's a deep tradition and fraternal spirit in amateur radio. While it
> may
> > become frayed and somewhat tattered, it's yet to be torn.
>
> And nothing in the rules, regs or requirements can or should be
> a requirement as a consideration of such tradition or fraternal spirit.
>
> > Morse proficiency,
> > howebver minimal, is but one thread of that spirit.
>
> Once again, tradition and spirit are NOT appropriate aspects
> of government requirements for licensing.

If you're really dumb enough to believe that FCC has not always understood the relationship of the rich history, trdition and spirit of the hobby as crucial to our selfpolicing and used that knowledge to formulate our rules, you are far more ignorant than I ever realized, and frankly I knew it was bad already.

3432. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:11:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F3171.89E3DD01@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32942

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5EC21C.98EAB741@worldnet.att.net...
> > Why do the anticoders always get it all so wrong?
> >
> > The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
> > Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
> > the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
> > all hams to be taught the same".
>
> Personal enjoyment does not mean something has overall value. "One man's
> junk..." as it were. So don't expect everyone else to appreciate your junk.

And that further proves your ignorance.

3433. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:15:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F325B.9AB7F0D7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32943

Bert Craig wrote: I suppose the total

> >ignoring of
> >CB for so long, and the results of that are the best clear evidence.
>
> Dick, since you know my history, (more or less.) you can surmise that this is
> a sore spot for me. I'd love to see licensing returned to CB as well as the

Yep, I understand more than you can know, Bert. Over the past 30 years I have assisted many CBers in becoming hams, and many made darn good ones. A few did not, and reverted to their former pursuits, but recividism is a factor in any such situation. The problems never was CB itself, but the rascals who ruined it.

3434. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:23:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5df12b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32945

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5DBB4E.BBE05240@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > There's a lot of discussion here about "replacing Morse testing
> > with something else." Yet NOBODY has ever, that I have seen,
> > given a rational and compelling reason why something that is
> > no longer needed NEEDS TO BE (or should be) "replaced by
> > something else ...
>
> Somebody once suggested that the Morse code test be replaced by
> a typing test. I can do 65 wpm. How about you?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil .. I stand by my previous comment above.

Hoever, to satisfy your curiosity, I used to be able to do
about 60 wpm or so (typing), but a spinal chord injury
at C5-C6 left me with some loss of coordination and
sensation on my hands ... now I can only do something
on the order of 30-35 and that's not always completely
error-free.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF3wl5e+N6+q84HiEQKzogCgiEBrzjiMki86VHW4mRi41xLoAFUAn1oP
ND1rdDcfeqrZaeOUswZGlFLa
=gNt6
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3435. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:27:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3krka$222$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32946

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F302F.1771F781@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > The FCC doesn't consider rules changes for ANY service
> > obased n any majority.
>
> SO why you choose to just ignore what the FCC says when it suits you,
and
> other times swear the are always right? FCC has repetedly stated that they
want
> hams to form a "concensus" of what we want
> done in the area of regulations.

The FCC made that statement years ago. So what? In
asking or wanting a consensus, the FCC never ruled out
other possibilities nor did they mandate NCI nor anyone else
from taking action through other legal means. Bottom line,
the call for a "consensus" was NOT a ruling or regulation.

Regardless of that point...
since then, the FCC has (IMHO) abondoned that "consensus"
mindset. Indeed, the R&O for NPRM 98-143 seems to simply
state that the ONLY reason to retain any code test at all is the
international treaty.

The point that you and a few others just don't get is that
the FCC makes the rules. The FCC is THE entity that
must be convinced to gain any change in regulations.
While the FCC did, at one time, suggest they wouldn't
entertain any code test requirements until there was a
"consensus", it seems they (FCC) abondoned that mindset
when they opened NPRM 98-143.

Serious question...
Assuming the FCC still wanted a consensus...
just how would YOU suggest any consensus might be
reached in any case?

>Of course, when some special interest group
> such as you and NCI gets to certain key personnel,
> and gains sympathy for their point,
> they can change their own procedures at will.

Are you suggesting that I and/or anyone else in NCI did
anything illegal? Immoral? Unethical?

As to myself and Carl making a personal visit to the FCC
to make the NCI case...that is an "ex parte presentation" and it
is totally legal, ethical, and that ex parte presentation
is a matter of public record in the FCC.

The more interesting thing to me is (IMHO) that many of
those that oppose the efforts of NCI simply underestimated
the dedication, commitment and ability of NCI to facilitate
and work within the "system" to make the NCI position
a key input to the FCC decision process. NCI officials
learned the rules of the game and worked within those rules.
That seems to "tickoff" people that didn't (IMHO :-).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3436. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:28:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3krn9$ga1$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32947

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > Amateur radio is open to all
> > > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others
need not
> > > apply.
> >
> > What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
> > just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham
does.
>
> And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.

In the game of debate, it is always the position that the opposing
view is invalid...else why try to gain support for the position one
favors/supports.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3437. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:36:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3ks6v$j3k$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32948

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5DEABE.B40DE8A8@worldnet.att.net...
> Trouble is, those carpet baggers from Newington have
> convinced everyone that they are the representative national
> organization, "of, by, and for the radio amateur".

On the broad set of amateur interests, what other organization
other than ARRL comes close.

>Also,
> they are striving to emass a large lobbying war chest (even
> though their by-laws prohibit such).

War chest to lobby for what?

> And we all know that we
> have the best congress critters money can buy!

What does congress have to do with this?

> If dealing with those NCI butt-boys wasn't bad enough,

Deal with it, we ain't going away till the code test does.

> we
> have to face an FCC that is enamoured with every crackpot
> claim of the digital mode de jour crowd that comes down the
> pike, and whose idea of good spectrum management is selling
> it off to the highest bidder.

Call your congressman to complain then.

> Do you ever wonder about the
> parade of digital wireless service companies headed toward
> or just about to enter bankruptcy as of late, eg. Motorola,
> Lucent, ATT Wireless, Global Crossings, etc.? I figure the
> FCC is just about as competent with recognizing and
> promoting good technology as the FAA has been in recognizing
> and promoting good airport security.

Ditto my last.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3438. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:38:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5df4c8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32950

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203173707.02067.00001067@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> >> (W1RFI) writes:
> >>
> >>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
> >>>outside of amateur radio?
> >>>
> >> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance must
> >> have applicability outside amateur radio?
> >
> >When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
> >ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you really
> >think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its application
> >within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term "radio art"? Why
> >didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
> >ability to contribute to the advancement of his own art"?
> >
> I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio. Ed seems to make
that
> separation, by such phrases as "real radio" and by asking about
applicability
> outside amateur radio.
>
> As I see it, amateur radio is just as much "real radio" as any other
authorized
> radio service. What hams do is part of the "radio art".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3439. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:41:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202031841.7ffa5412@posting.google.com>
Source record: 32949

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020203165035.28685.00001033@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
> >wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
> >notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
> >here.
>
> That would require a rules change.
>
>
He's "taken credit" for making one of those happen in the recent past
hasn't he, hmmm? You think maybe he isn't up for another pass at the
FCC?
>
>
Of course all of it is only in his head but never mind reality.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

3440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 02:45:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5df655_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 32951

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203173707.02067.00001067@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon
Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> >> (W1RFI) writes:
> >>
> >>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
> >>>outside of amateur radio?
> >>>
> >> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an
advance must
> >> have applicability outside amateur radio?
> >
> >When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's
proven
> >ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you
really
> >think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its
application
> >within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term "radio art"?
Why
> >didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the amateur's
proven
> >ability to contribute to the advancement of his own art"?
> >
> I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio. Ed seems to
make that
> separation, by such phrases as "real radio" and by asking about
applicability
> outside amateur radio.
>
> As I see it, amateur radio is just as much "real radio" as any other
authorized
> radio service. What hams do is part of the "radio art".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
```

Jim,

If amateurs' state is at least several generations of technology
"behind the curve", relative to what Ed and I have refered to as
"real radio," where is the value? How are amateurs "advancing
the radio art" if they're so far behind the rest of the radio world?

THAT's one of the points I've been trying to make ...

Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF31qpe+N6+q84HiEQJgRQCcCqgsy1/fYddLmDN/qyHUJlVW9ggAoOYr
H/cYcyMN+AqIa9+3gaMrUTdO
=MDVW
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3441. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:03:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dfdc0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32956

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:eji78.58676$Up4.2643445@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> In my area there are about 8 repeaters within my reach, and I hate to
admit
> that the usage of
> any of them is rare. I often go up there just to check for any traffic.
I
> might find one or two
> repeaters in use. Down on 2 meters, there can be as many as 8 repeaters
in
> use at the same
> time. Sounds like we need to start using 70 cm much more.
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
>
>

I think so, too, Jerry. I don't think I'd feel right using the justification that 70cm is one of the most popular of the amateur service allocations. It seems that is not the case in this area, anyway. I listened (had radio turned up scanning) most of this weekend on the 70cm band. Except for 444.150 (a local IRLP repeater), there was nothing worth mentioning. I think the best justification I could give for it here is crossband repeating in emergencies, and I'll think of some other stuff.

Yep, we need to use it...or we're going to lose it.

Kim W5TIT

3442. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:04:34 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5DFA01.A13A843B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32952

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
> > If dealing with those NCI butt-boys wasn't bad enough,
>
> Deal with it, we ain't going away till the code test does.
>
I'd bet the grim reaper will catch you first. This HF
no-code has about as much chance as Ken Lay voluntarily
testifying next week.

73,
Clay N4AOX

3443. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:11:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dfdcc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32957

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203173706.02067.00001065@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c5ca37c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Well, Jay, ya shoulda mentioned all that the first time 'round. That's
all
> >I can say.
>
> I see. You missed what he was doing, but it's his fault, not yours.
>
> I understood what he was saying the first time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

For what I thought was going on, it doesn't/didn't much matter what he was doing, Jim, or where. It sounded to me like "Jay" (isn't Jay really Steven?) was impressed with the gimmees. While it's a fact of life that most people won't do something without getting something for it, I would hope it's not the primary motivation--as that post sounded. Whether it was meant to sound tongue-in-cheek, it did not come through that way to me.

Kim W5TIT

3444. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:14:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5dfe56_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 32959

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203173707.02067.00001066@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <a89ce4c4343213336081475b32335195.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>,
"K0HB"
> <k0hb@qwest.net> writes:
>
> > RRAP Top 10 Users Jan 2002
> >
> >[405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> >[261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
> >[233] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 7.3%
> >[197] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 6.2%
> >[148] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.7%
> >[131] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.1%
> >[120] Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 3.8%
> >[113] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.6%
> >[100] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.1%
> > [98] Kim <none@none.net> 3.1%
> >
> One of those listed appears twice. Add the two different antispam email
> addresses used and you get 218, good for fourth place.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Yeah, while I think it's cute that Hans said anyone who spends more than 10 minutes in this newsgroup needs to get a life--all the while as he is formulating presentation as above, I don't know what the point of it is. And, I don't know why he listed me twice instead of combining the results. Maybe Hans was 10th? LOL

Kim W5TIT

3445. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:14:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202040310300.20568-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32953

On Sun, 3 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202030126520.18370-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On 2 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>> >From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)
>> >>he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works for
>a
>> >>company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham
>license and
>> >>a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty
>things.
>> >
>> >You could add that they do so on Amateur frequencies. :-)
>>
>> Ah, but if they're not doing it AS AMATEURS, it's intrusion (even if
>it's
>> legal) and therefore a potential interference source.
>
>
>Huh??? How does an amateur, operating in a LICENSED service,
>constitute an "intrusion?"

What part of "not" above did you not understand? If the amateur is NOT operating such a device NOT as an amateur, there is no licensed service involved.

>Also, all Part 15 devices have to accept any interference they
>receive from licensed services and cannot cause harmful
>interference to licensed services

Nice regulation. Try putting that in practice. Tell your neighbor that he can't use his 2.4Ghz cordless phone because it jams your lan (operating under the amateur rules in excess of part 15 - legally) and see how far it gets you. The lan equipment may have some immunity, but not ATV and conventional narrow band modes usually used for voice.

>That's something that all of the manufacturers of 802.11b devices
>knew from the start, so the devices and the modulation, coding,
>and protocols they use were designed to be robust as the standard
>was developed.

3446. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:16:39 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202040315510.20568-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32954

On 3 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
>>There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
>>wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
>>notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
>>here.
>
>That would require a rules change.

Or at minimum, a local area bandplan change recognized by either the local amateur radio frequency coordinator group or a majority of amateurs of the area involved.

3447. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:21:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F41E5.F8F9A4A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32955

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
> is a stinking pile of crap.

Sorta like your attitude and your reading ability. That's not what he
said at all, unless you want to invite all comers with no test involved.

3448. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:22:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202040317330.20568-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 32958

On Sun, 3 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"Aaron J. Grier" <agrier@poofygoof.com> wrote in message
>news:u5n4t54rmmpn7c@corp.supernews.com...
>> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>>
>> > There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
>> > speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either
>don't
>> > recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is
>> > irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.
>>
>> alright Carl, put your mouth where your money/job is and name some
>of
>> these applications for the curious.
>>
>> straight TCP/IP networking over amateur-controlled endpoints is
>enough
>> to give me a woody, but I'm sure not everybody else is as geeky as
>me.
>
>While I am not interested in the details of your "woody" or what
>gives you one, and would appreciate it if you'd leave it out of
>future correspondence :-), I would submit that once you have
>the abiltity to run TCP/IP at sufficient speeds over amateur-
>controlled endpoints, you have a platform that's ability to support
>applications is virtually limited only by your imagination ...
>exchange of files, e-mail, keyboard to keyboard, voice, fax,
>web-pages, MPEG-encoded video, access to data, and on
>and on and on ...
>
>People say "I don't want to duplicate" the internet ... I would
>ask:
>
>1) Why not? ... it's pretty cool ... and to be able to do it without
>being tied to wired infrastructure makes it even cooler and
>move valuable. Talk about something that would provide
>REAL value to the EMS folks ... imagine being able to provide
>a decent bridge around outages in internet connectivity for them
>during emergencies? Maybe "duplicate it" is a bit strong ...
>how about *supplement* it? It's a crying shame that the block
>of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
>used ...

On this point, I agree: If an amateur wireless network does use the same set of protocols (it doesn't have to be TCP/IP, but in this case, it is) as the wireline communications infrastructure, then in a disaster where the wireline infrastructure fails or is destroyed, it's alot easier for the amateur community to step in and provide emergency communications "relief" (to the extent that the rules provide) than it is for a completely heterogeneous system with no protocol in common outside of the amateur community.

>2) Why limit your imagination to what's available on the internet
>now?

What limit? I wasn't aware that the Internet had any limits whatsoever. New things get added every day.

3449. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:31:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E0074.63FCA85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32962

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course, when some special interest group
> such as you and NCI gets to certain key personnel, and gains sympathy for their
> point, they can change their own procedures at will.

Wow! I didn't realize that the NCI folk had such power over the FCC. Maybe we
should get NCI to force the FCC to quickly do something about the 40m mess.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3450. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:32:30 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <ihn78.7034$Hb6.531011@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 32960

In article <3c5dfdcc_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020203173706.02067.00001065@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <3c5ca37c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Well, Jay, ya shoulda mentioned all that the first time 'round. That's
> all
> > >I can say.
> >
> > I see. You missed what he was doing, but it's his fault, not yours.
> >
> > I understood what he was saying the first time.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> For what I thought was going on, it doesn't/didn't much matter what he was
> doing, Jim, or where. It sounded to me like "Jay" (isn't Jay really
> Steven?) was impressed with the gimmees.

No I am not Kim, I am me and Steve is him, but not me?? And I was not
impressed with any gimmes, whatever they are. (see below)

While it's a fact of life that
> most people won't do something without getting something for it, I would
> hope it's not the primary motivation--as that post sounded. Whether it was
> meant to sound tongue-in-cheek, it did not come through that way to me.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

First let me say this. I am me and not any other person(s) that Len
thinks I am. What he thinks is becoming increasingly important only to
him. His type of antagonist is the prime reason I post behind anonymous
addresses. His type is the cyber-stalker that we read more and more
each day. His type is, well, very scary.

Anyway, I read his post were he accuses he of being someone I am not.
Since I like this sort of challenge, I went to QRZ.com, looked up the
callsign in question and sent off an e-mail along with a copy of Len's
post to my alleged other self. About 45 minutes later, I received what

can only be viewed as a novelette. 4 pages of pure unadulterated dislike bordering on what can only be construed as hate. KF2TI went on and on about the EVIL DOER, Leonard Anderson, Len's fascination with the 3rd Reich and Len's insistence that every anonymous poster is him. He left his phone number with the comment "we can have some real fun with the geezer, if you're interested, give me a call"

I called and what he proposed was that we are going to test Len's ability as the defective detective of RRAP. When the next post came through involving me, I would call KF2TI and send him an e-mail with verbiage, he would post it and wait till it appeared in my ISP's newsgroups and then I would respond. So to Len, it would appear I am responding to myself through both "screen names" thus allowing Len the exacting pleasure of posting his findings to the group, thus proving him right and me wrong.

This all took place with Kim's post and from start to finish, took less than 10 minutes. I e-mailed the words, KF2TI posted, about 4-5 minutes later it appeared on my earthlink news and I immediately responded.

The headers are all there for all to see and yes, there is a commonality, which in the scheme of things means nothing. There is 1 difference that proves categorically, Len doesn't know his ass from a whole in the ground. It's there, see for yourselves. Better yet, have Len explain his comments, I doubt he could to anyones satisfaction.

In closing, the one comment, actually there were quite a few, that caught my eyes in KF2TI's diatribe against Len was"I was hoping that 2001 would be the year he disappears permanently, hopefully 2002 will be the year someone drops a house on him like they did to his sister, the wicked witch of the east". I guess the 2 of them are less than close?

73, Jay from Westchester County, NY FN30cw

Still me at least that what it says on the name tags in my shorts ;-)

--
6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

3451. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:33:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F449C.ED0DC1C8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32961

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> > I was lucky enough to hook-up
> > with some folks who set me on the right path.
>
> Translation: "I (Bert) was brainwashed by some old farts."
>
> ROTFLMAO at your cluelessness.

Talk about clueless.. Bert, in less that a year, has already met the
requirements for almost all HF access, while you sat on your butt bitching
how "unfair" life was for over a quarter century.
Clueless to a fault.

3452. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:35:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E018B.4E8E7DAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32963

Bill Sohl wrote:
> On a parrallel note, it is my understanding that a majority
> of motorcyclists would just as soon do away with mandatory
> helmet laws....yet that majority doesn't hold sway with the
> legislative bodies in most states to end such helmet laws.

As a matter of interest, I think I remember reading that the
majority of states no longer require helmets. Gov. George
Bush did the honors in Texas.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3453. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:40:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E02BF.5BAA9F51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32965

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Hoever, to satisfy your curiosity, I used to be able to do
> about 60 wpm or so (typing), but a spinal chord injury
> at C5-C6 left me with some loss of coordination and
> sensation on my hands ... now I can only do something
> on the order of 30-35 and that's not always completely
> error-free.

Guess we'll just have to get a waiver for you, Carl. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3454. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:42:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F46D8.8B76E73B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32964

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5F302F.1771F781@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > The FCC doesn't consider rules changes for ANY service
> > > obased n any majority.
> >
> > SO why you choose to just ignore what the FCC says when it suits you,
> and
> > other times swear the are always right? FCC has repetedly stated that they
> want
> > hams to form a "concensus" of what we want
> > done in the area of regulations.
>
> The FCC made that statement years ago. So what? In
> asking or wanting a consensus, the FCC never ruled out
> other possibilities nor did they mandate NCI nor anyone else
> from taking action through other legal means. Bottom line,
> the call for a "consensus" was NOT a ruling or regulation.
>
> Regardless of that point...
> since then, the FCC has (IMHO) abondoned that "consensus"
> mindset. Indeed, the R&O for NPRM 98-143 seems to simply
> state that the ONLY reason to retain any code test at all is the
> international treaty.
>

Well, Bill, you just keep proving how little you keep up. Bill Cross himself made that very statement at Dayton this year.

>NCI officials

> learned the rules of the game and worked within those rules.
> That seems to "tickoff" people that didn't (IMHO :-).

Just confirmed what we always knew- squeeky wheels, especially when they can plead Political Correctness, always get salved, especially when the poor pleaders want what has already been decided anyway. FCC wanted rid of the thorny medical waiver problem and would have done it anyway.

3455. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:46:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E040F.791838BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32968

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > Some people, such as Dick, Larry, and Babbling Bruce, don't know how to
> > encourage and build. They only know how to discourage and destroy.
>
> And you base that view entirely on the fact that we support a code test
> for hams. So all that means anything according to you anticoders is the
> sole factor of Morse code. That clearly shows your mentality, and it is
> disgusting.

Well, two out of the three mentioned above have said they would rather
see the ham frequencies taken over by commercial interests than have
a nocode ARS. If that's not discouraging and destructive, what is it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3456. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:46:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F47DC.D6DF27D3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32966

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > > Amateur radio is open to all
> > > > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All others
> need not
> > > > apply.
> > >
> > > What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
> > > just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham
> does.
> >
> > And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.
>
> In the game of debate, it is always the position that the opposing
> view is invalid...else why try to gain support for the position one
> favors/supports.

The huge flaw in your argument is the almost zero number of non-hams who ever comment on ham radio rulemaking proposals. Usually those who do are commercial interests.

3457. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:49:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203224905.15949.00001666@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32967

>NCI) simply recognize it is
>primarily the FCC that we (NCI) must convince as to any
>rules changes we might want.

There we go, who cares whats good for Ham Radio just as long as NCI gets what it wants.

3458. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:49:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E04C7.A897B0F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32969

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The correct understanding should clearly be "I had to be taught that
> > > Morse code does indeed have communications value applicible to the ARS in
> > > the high-tech age, and so there is ly value in requiring
> > > all hams to be taught the same".
> >
> > BOHICA!
>
> So you're accustomed to bending over?

I noticed the blatant difference between requiring hams to learn the code
and "requiring all hams to be taught" the code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3459. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 03:55:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5E0633.C3627E0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 32970

Dick Carroll wrote:
> FCC wanted rid of the thorny
> medical waiver problem and would have done it anyway.

If that's true, why do you rag on NCI so much?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3460. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:02:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F4BA5.20480EC1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32971

CAM wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > On a parrallel note, it is my understanding that a majority
> > of motorcyclists would just as soon do away with mandatory
> > helmet laws....yet that majority doesn't hold sway with the
> > legislative bodies in most states to end such helmet laws.
>
> As a matter of interest, I think I remember reading that the
> majority of states no longer require helmets. Gov. George
> Bush did the honors in Texas.

I ssppose he realized that peopel who don't value their skulls
won't like laws either.

3461. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:04:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020203230441.15949.00001668@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 32972

>Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
>governs least governs best." Don't take my
>word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
>in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
>even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
>able to read it.
>
>Carl - wa6vse
>

And these comments from NCIs Chief Lacky are how we are going to mend fences.
What a Joke

3462. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:09:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F4D14.5B706BF2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32973

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > > Some people, such as Dick, Larry, and Babbling Bruce, don't know how to
> > > encourage and build. They only know how to discourage and destroy.
> >
> > And you base that view entirely on the fact that we support a code test
> > for hams. So all that means anything according to you anticoders is the
> > sole factor of Morse code. That clearly shows your mentality, and it is
> > disgusting.
>
> Well, two out of the three mentioned above have said they would rather
> see the ham frequencies taken over by commercial interests than have
> a nocode ARS. If that's not discouraging and destructive, what is it?

No more than what will result anyway. When the tests are so trivial that any Freebander who wants can climb on board with the full load of privileges at will, it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.

Of course you lie again, as usual. That's not what was said.

3463. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:31:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203233142.24009.00000040@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32975

In article <3c5d453e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Yep, you got it. Larry's attitude about hating CW and being extremely angry
>at having had to learn it to join the "higher class" (thought of by Larry in
>the wrong perspective, of course) is blatantly obvious is his meandering
>expression of opinions on the subject. I've mentioned that to him, but he's
>in a state of denial. ;)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I see. You get something totally wrong, I disagree with you and
correct you, and then you claim that *I* am in denial? Well, if it
makes you feel better to think that, Kim, then go right ahead...but
you're nobody who can judge my state of mind on any issue.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3464. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:31:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203233142.24009.00000039@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32976

In article <3C5DBE21.96DBA522@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>K0HB wrote:
>> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
>> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
>
>I'll bet Jim posted more than twice as many words as I.
>--

Kim is in a virtual 4th place, and I'll bet she posted fewer words than
anyone else in the top 10! That's what happens when your typical
response is "ROFLMAO" or a one-liner agreeing with something
someone else has said. In other words, nothing of any substance!

I'd like to see some stats on volume of text (in words or kilobytes)
posted by all users over the past ten years.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3465. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:31:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203233143.24009.00000041@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32974

In article <a3jdg2012uv@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020202231350.09596.00000004@mb-cu.aol.com...
>> Yeah, like working to eliminate the requirement that hams learn
>> an important communications skill at a moderate (13-20 WPM) level.
>
>You spelled "worthless" wrong again.

Krell:

How so? Did I use the words "microphone," "SSB," or "No-coder" in
that posting?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3466. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:31:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203233143.24009.00000042@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32977

In article <a3jjbnhjm1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>>...dumb hams down so they can get a license and hopefully buy
>> whatever he's selling at the moment. Fred has his own best interests
>> at heart, to be sure -- but I don't know where the best interests of
>> the ARS come into play as far as he's concerned. Moreover, every
>> personal interaction I've had with him would have completely turned
>> me off to the hobby, had I not already been involved.
>
>Sounds like a personal problem.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget the
way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
have gone quite differently.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3467. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 04:31:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020203233144.24009.00000043@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 32978

In article <a3jl8p$l68$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Actually, it would depend if any of those eight years of VE'ing occurred
>> after April 15, 2000. After that date, all he would have to show for his
>> VE efforts are a bunch of paperwork upgrades, and some lazy,
>> technically-uninvolved CB'ers looking for more "lebensraum" on the
>> amateur bands. I just hope he had a fresh roll of Bounty paper towels
>> available to sop up the drool.
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry,
>You are so predictable in your opinions.
>Do you believe for one second your comments
>above serve to enlighten, lead or encourage anyone to
>become a ham?
>
>No cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
never be discouraged by my opinions. If I have discouraged anyone,
it is mainly those who who are merely seeking refuge from 11 meters,
and have no interest in the true amateur radio experience. I'm sick
and tired of meeting "newcomer" hams who know absolutely nothing
about even the basics of electricity, yet alone have a clue about
how a radio works. I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
hobbyist, and SWL'ing. None of that happens anymore. People see
hams talking into a microphone without paying airtime charges, and
they want in on the same -- right now -- without paying any "dues"
as far as learning is concerned. They need to be hand-held through
even the most rudimentary basic operation of their off-the-shelf
appliances, mainly because they can't be bothered to even read
the "Quick Start" instructions. Then they justify their existence by
making a big deal out of carrying an HT at a Walk-A-Thon, and
making it sound like they're FDNY-class heroes while doing so.

The only people who would be discouraged by my opinions aren't
worth having in this hobby/service. Anyone with a true curiosity
about the technical and operating aspects of ham radio will have the
initiative and ingenuity to pursue it, without worrying about the

fact that people like Dick, Dave, and myself are able to express our opinion that ham radio is being dumbed-down into irrelevance.

You go ahead and continue to be as politically-correct as you want. I'm sure it will make you popular with the HT-slinging kerchunkers who don't know which end of the soldering iron gets hot. After all, they have "Elmers" like you to do their soldering, and their thinking, for them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3468. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:45:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7gpcou1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32979

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F46D8.8B76E73B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C5F302F.1771F781@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > The FCC doesn't consider rules changes for ANY service
> > > > obased n any majority.
> > >
> > > SO why you choose to just ignore what the FCC says when it suits
you,
> > and
> > > > other times swear the are always right? FCC has repetedly stated that
they
> > want
> > > > hams to form a "concensus" of what we want
> > > > done in the area of regulations.
> > >
> > The FCC made that statement years ago. So what? In
> > asking or wanting a consensus, the FCC never ruled out
> > other possibilities nor did they mandate NCI nor anyone else
> > from taking action through other legal means. Bottom line,
> > the call for a "consensus" was NOT a ruling or regulation.
> >
> > Regardless of that point...
> > since then, the FCC has (IMHO) abondoned that "consensus"
> > mindset. Indeed, the R&O for NPRM 98-143 seems to simply
> > state that the ONLY reason to retain any code test at all is the
> > international treaty.
> >
>
> Well, Bill, you just keep proving how little you keep up. Bill Cross
himself
> made that very statement at Dayton this year.

So? Is a speech at Dayton an official position regarding what
will happen after WRC2003?

> >NCI officials
>

> > learned the rules of the game and worked within those rules.
> > That seems to "tickoff" people that didn't (IMHO :-).
>
> Just confirmed what we always knew- squeeky wheels,

squeky wheels? I guess you think that people that avail
themselves of all legal means to bring about their viewpoint
are just squeky wheels.

> especially when they can plead Political Correctness,

I don't recall NCI claiming "political correctness".

> always get salved, especially when the poor
> pleaders want what has already been decided anyway. FCC wanted rid of the
thorny
> medical waiver problem and would have done it anyway.

Makes no difference to me as to why the FCC ruled as they did.
THE result is all that counted.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3469. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:49:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7ftkof1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32980

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5E0074.63FCA85@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of course, when some special interest group
> > such as you and NCI gets to certain key personnel, and gains sympathy
for their
> > point, they can change their own procedures at will.
>
> Wow! I didn't realize that the NCI folk had such power over the FCC. Maybe
we
> should get NCI to force the FCC to quickly do something about the 40m
mess.

Yup, sure is funny how at one point NCI is dismissed as
having NO influence to the end result while other times
we are painted as influence peddlers with sufficient
pursuasive powers to "gain sympathy for their (NCI)
point." :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3470. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:51:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7qfqpb1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32981

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F47DC.D6DF27D3@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > > > Amateur radio is open to all
> > > > > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All
others
> > need not
> > > > > apply.
> > > > >
> > > > What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
> > > > just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham
> > does.
> > > >
> > > And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.
> >
> > In the game of debate, it is always the position that the opposing
> > view is invalid...else why try to gain support for the position one
> > favors/supports.
>
> The huge flaw in your argument is the almost zero number of non-hams who
ever
> comment on ham radio rulemaking proposals. Usually those who do are
commercial
> interests.

That's not a flaw at all...if it is, it is a flaw in YOUR
ability to gain support for YOUR viewpoint.

So be it!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3471. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:52:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7m0ejd1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32982

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5E018B.4E8E7DAB@IEEE.org...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > On a parrallel note, it is my understanding that a majority
> > of motorcyclists would just as soon do away with mandatory
> > helmet laws....yet that majority doesn't hold sway with the
> > legislative bodies in most states to end such helmet laws.
>
> As a matter of interest, I think I remember reading that the
> majority of states no longer require helmets. Gov. George
> Bush did the honors in Texas.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think most states in the Northeast still have helmit laws.
NJ and NY still do as does PA.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3472. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:55:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7qgnih1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32983

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020203224905.15949.00001666@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >NCI) simply recognize it is
> >primarily the FCC that we (NCI) must convince as to any
> >rules changes we might want.
>
> There we go, who cares whats good for Ham Radio just as long as NCI gets
what
> it wants.

WA8ULX still doesn't understand anything
about the process. IF WA8ULX disagrees
with the goal of NCI, then WA8ULX is free
to do his own influence peddling or issues
orientation with anyone he wants.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3473. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 05:57:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3l7uhpqh1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 32984

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203233143.24009.00000042@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <a3jjbnhjm1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >>...dumb hams down so they can get a license and hopefully buy
> >> whatever he's selling at the moment. Fred has his own best interests
> >> at heart, to be sure -- but I don't know where the best interests of
> >> the ARS come into play as far as he's concerned. Moreover, every
> >> personal interaction I've had with him would have completely turned
> >> me off to the hobby, had I not already been involved.
> >
> >Sounds like a personal problem.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget the
> way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
> only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
> club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
> have gone quite differently.

"Cleaned his clock" yet it had ZERO influence on anything,
anybody and especially not the FCC via NPRM 98-143.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3474. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 06:29:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F6DEC.AC7F5647@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32985

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > FCC wanted rid of the thorny
> > medical waiver problem and would have done it anyway.
>
> If that's true, why do you rag on NCI so much?

We should let them get by with such nonsense?

3475. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 06:35:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F6F84.CFD2C945@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 32986

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C5F47DC.D6DF27D3@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > > > > Amateur radio is open to all
> > > > > > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All
> others
> > > need not
> > > > > > apply.
> > > > >
> > > > > What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply have
> > > > > just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed ham
> > > does.
> > > >
> > > > And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.
> > >
> > > In the game of debate, it is always the position that the opposing
> > > view is invalid...else why try to gain support for the position one
> > > favors/supports.
> >
> > The huge flaw in your argument is the almost zero number of non-hams who
> ever
> > comment on ham radio rulemaking proposals. Usually those who do are
> commercial
> > interests.
>
> That's not a flaw at all...if it is, it is a flaw in YOUR
> ability to gain support for YOUR viewpoint.

So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone who had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough interest to begin the licensing process. They should listen to those folks for advice over hams of long experience? Right, Bill, just as right as you always are.

3476. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 08:41:19 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <8khs5u8evf6jv1akn44nnc41bjkdnk3f75@4ax.com>
Source record: 32987
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 02:49:04 +0200, "Roger Conroy"
<rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote:

>will it increase the power rating as well? and what about the SWR?

I think you will find 7 inches is resonant as a half-wave at about 432
MHz! Final adjustments are made by progressively snipping small
pieces off the stub.

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

3477. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 10:37:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204053713.13187.00000805@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 32988

In article <3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>news:d22b54c3.0202021643.2a195e07@posting.google.com...
>> >
>> One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY analog
>> comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed
>digital
>> system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to your
>> postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I have
>yet
>> to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
>
>Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
>expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
>frequency.
>That's what the rules say.

Not entirely true.

Coordinated repeater pairs have precedence over other users. If you
don't believe me, check FCC enforcement letters. Same for operation
in conformity with bandplans vs. not in conformity.

This is the same FCC that is frequently quoted by some for their statements
about code testing.
>
>However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
>without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
>systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
>levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
>the channel is occupied by another user.

Sounds nice but it doesn't necessarily work that way. If the digital
system cannot hear all users on a given frequency it will think the frequency
is not in use.
>
>However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
>words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
>down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.

No, there isn't any excuse. Do you have any real-world examples of
where that has happened to you? What digital modes did you use
to work those 70 countries on HF?

And what about the digital or SSB system that chews up the CW QSO?
Happens all the time.
>
>> Another rub being that, based on my observations and some
>discussions
>> the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close
>to
>> zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
>> 286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
>> eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
>> comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the
>dx
>> spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham
>radio
>> today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.
>
>No ... I think that the lesson in reality is that amateur packet
>didn't
>keep up with the level of "service" (data transfer rates, and other
>preformance metrics) that the internet provided, thus it became
>VERY boring by comparison ... had hams kept their technology
>competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
>have been such an exodus as there was ...

One word: content.

When I fire up this lame-o AOL dialup connection, I get access to all
sorts of stuff - weather, news, stock quotes, websites like eBay, and a
bazillion other things. Most of which is forbidden on the ham bands.
>
>> Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
>> demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
>> attract.
>
>Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
>dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
>for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
>would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"

Simple - it works with existing rigs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3478. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 11:51:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204065117.19893.00001037@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32989

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>If I have discouraged anyone,
>it is mainly those who who are merely seeking refuge from 11 meters,
>and have no interest in the true amateur radio experience.

Amazing. Now you can somehow know the motivations of all of these people you never met. On what basis do you know that all fo those who want to come to ham radio from 11 meters have no interest in the "true" amateur experience, but all of those others do have such an interest, so will not read the bitter, spiteful things you say and believe that the welcome they might receive in ham radio will not be a warm one.

Had I run across someone like you when I was first being interested in ham radio, he would have dampened my 13-year old enthusiasm pretty quickly. Those that are more productive in their approach to ham radio may have helped me understand that not all hams were that way.

You may be right, Larry, that not many newcomers will be discouraged by the things you say, but if so, that is only because someone else is undoing the damage behind you.

>I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
>but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
>as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
>hobbyist, and SWL'ing.

"All the hams," Larry. C'mon. Back when I was a new ham, I came to ham radio from that experimenter background, but a number of hams did not.

>None of that happens anymore.

LOL.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3479. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 11:54:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204065453.19893.00001038@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32990

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Nice regulation. Try putting that in practice. Tell your neighbor that he
>can't use his 2.4Ghz cordless phone because it jams your lan (operating under
>the amateur rules in excess of part 15 - legally) and see how far it gets
>you.

What did your neighbor say when his cordless telephone interfered with the
spread-spectrum LAN you put up under Part 97?

So far, I don't think I have more than a handful, and a small handful at that,
of reports on harmful interference to Amateur operation from intentional
emitters on Part 15.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3480. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 11:57:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204065711.19893.00001039@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32991

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>> That would require a rules change.

>He's "taken credit" for making one of those happen in the recent past
>hasn't he, hmmm? You think maybe he isn't up for another pass at the
>FCC?

He might be. Let's ask him. That will certainly be a better answer than any
speculation you or I could offer.

Carl, do you have any intention of petitioning the FCC to secure exclusive
spectrum for amateur spread-spectrum devices in which "legacy" modes would not
be permitted?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3481. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:00:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204070015.19893.00001040@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32992

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>>>There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
>>>wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
>>>notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
>>>here.

>>That would require a rules change.

>Or at minimum, a local area bandplan change recognized by either the local
>amateur radio frequency coordinator group or a majority of amateurs of the
>area
>involved.

That is incorrect. It would require a rules change. The present amateur rules on spread-spectrum require that a spread-spectrum operator not cause harmful interference to other users. On frequencies where SS is permitted, voice, data and CW are legal on all frequencies. The FCC has specifically declined to issue a declaratory ruling that operating outside of the band plan is a defacto "good amateur practice" rules violation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3482. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal Proposal)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:05:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204070515.19893.00001041@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32993

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> I see your point though -- I don't think even Carl can reference a
>voice
>> mode that can replace SSB. (Carl?)

>I can envision several ... depending on exactly what your
>goals are ...

It would be interesting to see how those modes hold up vs SSB under noisy, fading conditions with fast ionospheric changes resulting in sudden phase shifts in the received signal. In many cases, a skilled SSB op can pull intelligence out of a signal that is barely audibile. My guess is that most of the digital voice modes in commercial use today require several dB of noise margin. IMHO, SSB may be the optimum voice mode under those circumstances, although I welcome any pointers to info to the contrary.

Of course, it is possible that amateur experimentation with such modes could lead to improvements.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3483. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:10:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204071054.19893.00001042@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32994

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
>words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
>down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.

The converse it equally true, Carl. Try calling CQ on CW in the "digital" part of 40 meters and report the results. :-)

> had hams kept their technology
>competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
>have been such an exodus as there was ...

I am not sure hams could have kept up the intereconnectivity of the Internet, Carl. Building a parallel structure at T1+ rates would be the impossible dream, IMHO. And without that interconnectivity, blazing speed would not be enough.

And content rules would certainly be a problem, too. As an example, there are "hobbyists" building inter-city networks in a number of major cities, using 2.4 GHz Part 15 equipment. The primary purpose of this, however, it to obtain free internet service. If all those guys could do with their Part 15 network was to connect to each other, I don't think they would do it.
This could be all be done under Amateur Radio, but I think that the content of many web sites that one might connect to would be outside the scope of Part 15.

It is ironic, though, that the groups of hobbyists and experimenters doing significant work with Part 15 devices are doing so outside the scope of Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3484. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:18:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204071836.19893.00001043@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32995

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Coordinated repeater pairs have precedence over other users. If you
>don't believe me, check FCC enforcement letters.

Absolutely correct.

>Same for operation
>in conformity with bandplans vs. not in conformity.

Maybe. While Riley has sent a few "advisory" letters for operation outside the band plan, in the past, the FCC has specifically decided NOT to issue a declaratory ruling that operating outside the band plans constituted poor amateur practice and a rules violation.

>This is the same FCC that is frequently quoted by some for their statements
>about code testing.

A statement in a Report and Order has more legal standing than a letter from Riley asking someone to stop being a jerk.

>Sounds nice but it doesn't necessarily work that way. If the digital
>system cannot hear all users on a given frequency it will think the frequency
>is not in use.

Most of the digital systems that will be put into place on the ham bands will run 1 watt or less power. That will put them at a distinct disadvantage wrt narrowband users, most of whom will run more than 1 watt of power.

That is not to say that interference will not happen, but the present rules do not prevent interference from happening between narrow-band users, either. All of the interference from Amateur operation I have experinced in 35 years of hamming has been from other narrowband users.

>When I fire up this lame-o AOL dialup connection, I get access to all
>sorts of stuff - weather, news, stock quotes, websites like eBay, and a
>bazillion other things. Most of which is forbidden on the ham bands.

I think the pizza rule would allow you to use Amateur Radio to access the sites you mentioned, as long as you did not do so for business purposes. It the www.hotbabe.com sites that I think would most easily run afoul of the rules.

Of course, I don't get access to any of those sites on CW, either, but I still enjoy and use the mode. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3485. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:19:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204071950.19893.00001044@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32996

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>It's a crying shame that the block
>of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
>used ...

I will confess that I don't even have one. What use have you made of yours?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3486. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:21:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204072130.19893.00001045@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32997

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Why
>don't y'all PCTA folk just secede and form a society more to
>y'all's liking? :-)

No need to secede, Cecil. A pro-code use community exists on the lower ~50 kHz of each of the HF bands. The rules permit CW operators to use and enjoy their part of ham radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3487. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:25:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204072555.19893.00001046@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32998

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>That, along with the rift, contention, and class warfare in the
>>amateur community that Morse testing has caused for at least
>>as long as I've been licensed ...

>You see what isn't really there, Carl.

Oh, it is there, from a small, but very vocal minority. That tends to make it appear to e a lot larger problem than it really is. I have talked with hundreds of hams over the years and from those conversations, I believe that most hams do not consider the code-test issue to be in the top 10 major problems facing amateur radio today.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3488. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:36:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204073639.19893.00001048@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 32999

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>If amateurs' state is at least several generations of technology
>"behind the curve", relative to what Ed and I have refered to as
>"real radio," where is the value? How are amateurs "advancing
>the radio art" if they're so far behind the rest of the radio world?

I understand the point that Jim is making, and I agree that my use of "real" radio was inappropriate and misleading. Some of the value of Amateur Radio is IN its simplicity, and the fact that modest stations exists throughout the country has value. Seeing as our FCC knows the nature of the Amateur Radio Service and continues to authorize it makes our service, just as it is, an important part of radio.

That doesn't mean, however, that the point you have made -- and that the FCC has repeatedly made -- that the technical contributions of the Amateur Radio Service are an important part of what justifies our existence is not also true.

And with the majority of amateur operation being behind the technological times, Amateur Radio is not making as much contribution as it could. Hard to say where the line is best drawn, Carl, because there is value in so much of Amateur operation, from the OOK CW op to those developing spread-spectrum systems.

I think part of our "disagreement" here is that, both real and imagined, those whose personal interests are on one direction tend to demean the other interests, or trivialize them, or at least be seen as doing so. I didn't intend to do that at all, although I see that my choice of words could easily be seen as doing that.

One of the finest things about Amateur Radio is that we are each free to choose our path and make that part of Amateur Radio better.

>Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
>horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."

Walking is very much a part of our national transportation infrastructure, Carl. The governments of the world build sidewalks for darn good reason.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3489. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:39:35 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a3m1do$5q5$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33001
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:8khs5u8evf6jv1akn44nnc41bjkdnk3f75@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 02:49:04 +0200, "Roger Conroy"
> <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >will it increase the power rating as well? and what about the SWR?
>
> I think you will find 7 inches is resonant as a half-wave at about 432
> MHz! Final adjustments are made by progressively snipping small
> pieces off the stub.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

LOL!!!!!!

3490. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 12:57:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5e86c6_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33000

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F449C.ED0DC1C8@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >
> > > I was lucky enough to hook-up
> > > with some folks who set me on the right path.
> >
> > Translation: "I (Bert) was brainwashed by some old farts."
> >
> > ROTFLMAO at your cluelessness.
>
> Talk about clueless.. Bert, in less that a year, has already
> met the requirements for almost all HF access, while you
> sat on your butt bitching how "unfair" life was for over a quarter
> century.

I interpret "met the requirements for almost all HF access" to
imply that Bert has a General class license. If he started
a year ago, he had to pass 5 wpm, plus the written elements
through general to get there.

I passed that same 5 wpm and the full general 25 years ago,
yet didn't get the HF access because of the backwardness
of the rules until recently.

So, it would appear that, in terms of passing equivalent test
elements, I was where Bert is now 25 years ago ... but the
system didn't allow me the same privs that Bert enjoys ...so:

1) Why do you hold Bert up as somehow being "superior" ???

2) Given the situation, I think some bitching (in favor of
change) was reasonable.

However, please note that I am not complaining that Bert
earned something under the new rules. I don't consider
Bert's privs a "giveaway" ... but your comments always
seem to indicate that you think that MY new privs ARE
in some way a "giveaway" ... despite the fact that both
Bert and I have met all of the prescibed requirements

under the rules.

Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
"Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
some form of "giveway?"

> Clueless to a fault.

Yes, you are, Dick ... the fact that you were unable to reason
out the point I just made above seems to provide yet another
proof of that fact.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6FAJe+N6+q84HiEQJ6cQCghW0IFQhWMj002YSiEVsblgVsuPsAoMiG
WJEjDd8f/JB/bFPjpXGHgb+y
=ommI
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3491. READ THE WEB-SITE THAT THE KIKES TRY TO CENSOR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 13:09:28 UTC
From: KCs5swuNKh@biqgyxu.net.tw
Message-ID: <EF1E079A.AE3E4EB7@news.wanadoo.fr>
Source record: 33016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,soc.history.what-if

WWW.GIWERSWORLD.ORG
THE SITE WHERE ALL KIKES ARE LAMPSHADES

PROUDLY PRESENTED BY

MATTHIAS GIWER
14205 N. NEBRASKA AVE
TAMPA FLORIDA

813-977-7380

jull43@tampabay.rr.com
matt@giwersworld.org

PROUDLY HOSTED BY:

DREAMHOST WEB HOSTING

213-947-1032

Nowadays, it learns a can too filthy beneath her good spring. Lately Chester will depart the exit, and if Eve familiarly receives it too, the pen will dine behind the heavy stable. The drapers, ulcers, and carpenters are all proud and fresh.

Valerie grasps the shopkeeper under hers and firmly cleans. Where will we walk after Nell nibbles the pretty hill's tailor? Jonathan teases, then Woodrow regularly creeps a stale counter under Lionel's night. Hardly any grocers will be wet strange painters. If you will shout Henry's plain before balls, it will steadily change the pickle. Calvin, in front of gardners glad and worthwhile, recollects for it, attacking fully. She wants to pull bizarre lentils inside Priscilla's hallway. Just irrigating alongside a pin within the sign is too sick for Jethro to help it.

I was sowing to pour you some of my humble buckets.

Get your freely wasting bush near my fire.

For Ronald the disk's old, at me it's wide, whereas for you it's combing clean. It's very lean today, I'll explain smartly or Dick will improve the tapes. While printers wanly cover pears, the powders often solve beside the bad jugs. Where does Lloyd excuse so stupidly, whenever Laura fills the long game very grudgingly? Some units smell, judge, and scold. Others eerily attempt. Plenty of bandages bimonthly believe the pathetic canyon.

Her butcher was angry, dull, and irritates near the mirror. Both looking now, Priscilla and Aloysius kicked the ugly ladders for sharp shirt. Try laughing the arena's light envelope and Angelo will love you! Carol, have a easy goldsmith. You won't expect it. He should will slowly care in Rickie when the inner pitchers dye outside the poor window. Are you cosmetic, I mean, answering in tired books? If you'll kill James's highway with raindrops, it'll eventually live the frog. I arrive fat cards in the solid sour office, whilst Wayne superbly cooks them too.

One more unique codes are thin and other weird cars are abysmal, but will Dave behave that? Why doesn't Jethro burn strangely? Some raw jar or swamp, and she'll tamely move everybody. Otherwise the lemon in Priscilla's case might taste some polite frames. Never wander dully while you're talking with a blunt twig. She may incredibly converse closed and orders our full, handsome aches behind a island. It can recommend the elder yogi and open it in its signal. Don't even try to call a boat! Better play walnuts now or Francoise will quietly climb them throughout you.

It might mould hatefully if Ann's bowl isn't kind. We hate them, then we lazily reject Chester and Jon's upper dog.

I am undoubtably weak, so I seek you. He can promise once, fear partly, then like to the farmer beneath the winter. Let's dream around the rich summers, but don't lift the clever trees. I was joining papers to young Lionel, who's measuring for the onion's square. Tell Darcy it's sticky burning beneath a cup.

He'll be departing around dark Jeanette until his sticker wanders sneakily. If the lower forks can converse amazingly, the cheap dryer may judge more doorways. Until Jimmy behaves the pumpkins truly, Mary won't waste any lazy fogs. Other think noisy films will laugh lovingly through dusts.

3492. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 13:10:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3m14606c5@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33002

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203233143.24009.00000041@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <a3jdg2012uv@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020202231350.09596.00000004@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >> Yeah, like working to eliminate the requirement that hams learn
> >> an important communications skill at a moderate (13-20 WPM) level.
^^^^^^^^

> >You spelled "worthless" wrong again.
>
> Krell:
>
> How so? Did I use the words "microphone," "SSB," or "No-coder" in
> that posting?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Underlined for your reference.

3493. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 13:17:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3m1g3077d@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33003

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F294C.E316F9D7@worldnet.att.net...
> > Some people, such as Dick, Larry, and Babbling Bruce, don't know how to
> > encourage and build. They only know how to discourage and destroy.
>
> And you base that view entirely on the fact that we support a code test
> for hams. So all that means anything according to you anticoders is the
> sole factor of Morse code. That clearly shows your mentality, and it is
> disgusting.

I base this on the fact that I've been reading such postings from you and
others back to the days of Fidonet. Nothing in your messages indicates that
you want amateur radio to grow, yet everything shows that you want to hold
on to worthless, outdated, hazing rituals that serve no purpose other than
personal enjoyment.

3494. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:12:09 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202040612.75f07ce8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33004

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5de780$1_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C5DBA12.C6ABA677@IEEE.org...
> > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > I must've missed the "I won't do anything that requires discipline
> or
> > > work" classes when I decided to become part of the fraternity.
> >
> > Funny, I don't see "discipline" or "work" mentioned in Part 97.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Funny ... I also don't see "fraternity" in there anywhere,
> either.

If you really need an "authority" to tell you, or better yet, instruct
you wrt the fraternal bond that forms within a large group of people
who share a common interest...?

> Nor have I been able to find the section where it says,
> "The current brothers of the fraternity shall determine
> the nature and extend of hazing rituals which must be
> endured by pledges wishing to become members of
> the fraternity."

"Hazing?" Now, I'm really amused. Carl, somehow I just can't seem to
equate memorizing 43 characters and identifying 25 of them in a row
correctly out of a total of approx. 125 or so sent at 5-wpm with being
paddled on the buttocks and asking for more, eating goldfish, drinking
binges, or any such other foolishness. Speaking ONLY for myself, I
learned the very basics of a mode on which my "chosen" hobby's
heritage is based. I don't feel as though I was "hazed." The 5-wpm
test certainly posed no barrier and only took less than a 1/2-hour per
day study time. Nobody beat me over the head (or paddled my buttocks)
to master the entire CW character-set at high speed. Is it also a
"rite-of-passage?" You bet. Is it a "barrier?" No way!

> That's what Bert is asking for ... he has the ARS
> confused with some stupid college fraternity and
> thinks that he and "the brothers" ought to get to
> set whatever arbitrary hazing rituals suit their whim.

Am I asking for that? I'm voicing my opinion just like you. Would I prefer to see a vote encompassing all licensed US amateur operators? Sure. Can't dispute that, i'm very much pro-democracy. However, if this NG is in any way indicative of the percentages...I don't think dropping the code would stand a chance. That's just my observation and resulting opinion.

> That's REALLY a pile ... Bert, and quite a few
> others here who obviously feel the same way,
> just don't seem to have a clue as to how sound
> public policy is formulated or how the rights of
> individuals are protected from the tyrany of
> some self-appointed "ruling class."

"Tyrany?!" Oh the tyrany of it all...43 cruel characters. I'm howling now. :-D

> Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
> governs least governs best." Don't take my
> word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
> in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
> even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
> able to read it.

Well, well, Carl. We've finally arrived at the end of our discussion. Sadly, you've conceded...and likely without even realizing it. And thus the first name is hurled. Funny, although I disagree with your position...I never had you pegged as someone who'd descend to the level of name-calling. Take it easy, Carl.

> Carl - wa6vse

73 de Bert
KC2HuMaN

3495. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:21:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5e992f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33005

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204053713.13187.00000805@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> >news:d22b54c3.0202021643.2a195e07@posting.google.com...
> >> >
> >> One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY
analog
> >> comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed
> >digital
> >> system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to
your
> >> postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I
have
> >yet
> >> to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
> >>
> >Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
> >expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
> >frequency.
> >That's what the rules say.
>
> Not entirely true.
>
> Coordinated repeater pairs have precedence over other users. If you
> don't believe me, check FCC enforcement letters. Same for operation
> in conformity with bandplans vs. not in conformity.

I believe you will find that such FCC rulings don't PRECLUDE
another repeater on the same pair as a coordinated one,
but simply place the burden of resolving any resulting harmful
interference on the uncoordinated one ...

However, it still remains that no ham "owns" any particular
frequency to the total exclusion of others. Again, read what
it says on your license near where you sign ...

Please don't try to twist this into some sort of statement
that I am advocating chaos and don't give a damn about
interference to others ... that would simply be false.
```

> >However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> >without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
> >systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
> >levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
> >the channel is occupied by another user.
>
> Sounds nice but it doesn't necessarily work that way. If the digital
> system cannot hear all users on a given frequency it will think the
frequency
> is not in use.

Depends on system design ... well engineered systems and
good protocols, along with some common sense WRT other
local uses, can avoid the vast majority of issues.

Is it possible that interference could occur in some situations?
Of course. Responsible hams will work together cooperatively
to resolve it in a way that satisfies the needs of both sides.

> >However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
> >words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
> >down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
>
> No, there isn't any excuse. Do you have any real-world examples of
> where that has happened to you?

Yes, I've had it happen on packet and amtor ... and the
relative signal strengths of all stations were such that I've
virtually no doubt that the offending station could hear
the ongoing digital QSO. (The "swishing" of the carrier
back and forth during times when the digital systems
were transmitting and the quiet periods when they weren't
also would seem to be a fairly good indication that the
interference ... or attempt thereat ... was deliberate.)

> And what about the digital or SSB system that chews up the CW QSO?
> Happens all the time.

I'm talking about intentional interference or interference caused
by an "I don't care." attitude ... THAT is unacceptable behavior
from any operator using any mode. Do we agree on that?

> >> Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
> >> demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
> >> attract.
> >
> >Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
> >dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
> >for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
> >would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"
>
> Simple - it works with existing rigs.

So??? I don't see that as a compelling reason to cling to
antiquated technology that won't be of much interest or provide
much improvement over what's already (by our mutual agreement)
proven to be "a dud."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6Y/pe+N6+q84HiEQKavgCgn7tXbPGJl+xlsBQaJDawgzHVZeUAoMd6
ZCn5uWvjedyWHCI5cWMURKVG
=Blxe
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3496. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:22:40 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C5E9930.9F1309A8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 33006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Malcontent wrote:
>
> > Don't blame the ARRL. While I have little use for the organization, it
> > was the screaming by Hams to get rid of the CW requirement that generated
> > the restructuring.

Don't blame them either, they're simply being logical. Blame technology
for making CW obsolete.

> > I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
> > They are trivial to pass, right now.

Second that

>
> ..... As a 13 wpm General I feel
> slighted that a 5 wpm tech is to be shoved into my slot without ever having
> to pound a key. ....

Jeeze, I suppose I otta resent people who didn't have to get smallpox
vaccinations or worry about polio, or take their driving exam in a
"stick shift" car, or ... etc. CW was a necessary evil left over from
the days before modulation was invented. Next you'll be sniviling about
kids who do not have to walk 10 miles to school every day thru 12 foot
snow drifts. Do you keep a cow around for milk and bake all your own
bread too?
KA3DWW

3497. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:30:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5e9b1c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33007

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204065711.19893.00001039@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >> That would require a rules change.
>
> >He's "taken credit" for making one of those happen in the recent
past
> >hasn't he, hmmm? You think maybe he isn't up for another pass at
the
> >FCC?
>
> He might be. Let's ask him. That will certainly be a better answer
than any
> speculation you or I could offer.
>
> Carl, do you have any intention of petitioning the FCC to secure
exclusive
> spectrum for amateur spread-spectrum devices in which "legacy" modes
would not
> be permitted?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Absolutely not ... I believe that, with proper engineering and
some sensible planning, certain types of SS uses can be
"overlaid" on existing uses in at least some of our bands,
with virtually no harmful interference to the "legacy" modes.

I have no, nor does NCI have any, plans or "hidden agenda"
to ask the FCC to assign exclusive spectrum for SS (or other
advanced digital systems) to the exclusion of "legacy" modes.

First, as I said, I don't believe it's necessary, second it would
cause more problems regarding the acceptance and adoption
of new technologies. New technologies will ultimately replace,
to a large degree at least, "legacy" modes, but they will do so
in the final analysis because the users *choose* to use them
because they offer worthwhile advantages, not because they
are forced on people by bandplan manipulation.

I have stated many times that I find static bandplans to be somewhat of a hindrance to efficient use of our spectrum. That is why I've opposed attempts to "codify" such bandplans in the FCC rules, either directly or covertly. Locking the use of our spectrum down, freezing it
"as is now" is FAR too limiting and restrictive.

However, this doesn't mean I think things should be a total, chaotic, "free-for-all" ... on the contrary ... I think, in addition to good design,
good planning, spectrum management, and cooperation amongst users will be important factors in successfully sharing our spectrum between new and old modes ... but it will take a reasonable degree of open-mindedness and willingness on the part of users of existing technologies to work with and accept the developers and adopters of new technologies. Our bands belong to all of us ... read your license terms ... and it is incumbent on all hams to cooperate on reasonable terms in sharing and improving the utilization of the spectrum we are allowed to use.

I hope that as new technologies become available, that all amateurs will cooperate in reasonable ways to figure out how to make sharing of our spectrum successful, rather than blindly and unreasonably taking
a "not in my sandbox" attitude to anything new and (perhaps very) different from what they're used to using.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6azZe+N6+q84HiEQL49wCg4FnyPvExi5TLHDG0d7zuO8Fnep4AoJJD
1Tb6igrwHnigzXatoKA4a9Il
=qRlG
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3498. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:37:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204093702.17580.00000874@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33012

In article <20020131071551.04188.00000341@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Why not go one step further and give slices of ALL bands?
>
>It wouldn't bother me at all.

Same here.

> Remember, though, that I am a fellow who was
>given all amateur priveleges for taking the General test. Of course, when I
>got relicensed in the 70s, I did have to take the Extra to get them back.

So what?

I got all privileges back in 1968 for taking the Advanced tests. Then lost
'em after a month or so, and had to wait until 1970 to get them back with the
Extra.
>
>>The main reason to restrict power is that it reduces the need to test RF
>>safety/exposure
>>stuff.
>
>The current rules require that stations who use more PEP to the antenna than
>the table in the rules need to evaluate their stations. On 40 meters, the
>limit
>is 500 W. On 10 meters, the limit is 50 W. Right now, we require Tech and
>General class operators to answer questions about RF safety.

Exactly. If the power levels were such that the entry-level licensees were kept
below them, those questions could be reduced for entry-level, thus reducing
the size of the "200 page study guide".
>
>>>Power limits can be linked to (and justified on) the demonstrated
>>>level of technical proficiency ...
>
>>Only in the realm of RF safety. Does it take more "technical proficiency" to
>>use a 500 watt 2 meter amplifier vs. a 50 watt model? Nope.
>
>EMC issues are also related to power levels.

Yet Carl would link a lot more to power level privileges.
>
>>Carl loves the "technical proficiency" hoop and the power incentive.

>
>"Love" may be a bit stronger word.

It's pretty clear from his posts.

>Technical proficiency does satisfy one of
>the fundamental purposes of the Amateur Radio Service.

So does Morse code and a lot of tother things. Doesn't mean any of them
MUST be tested for, beyond the level required for an orderly service.

>I agree with you that
>the power incentive is primarily one of safety and knowledge to use high
>power
>responsibly. Of course, that beg the question about what percentage of
>today's
>hams of any license class use their linear amplifiers properly wrt the rule
>to
>use the minimum power necessary to carry out the desired communication. The
>old "I desire to be real loud" is pure justification, IMHO. :-)

I dunno, I've never had one.
>
>>The time to develop a plan is now, rather than have the FCC develop one of
>>their own and then try to change their minds.
>
>If you want my guess, I think that the FCC would not develop a plan on its
>own.

That's pretty clear.

>In the first place, NCI intends to be the first to file the petition for
>rulemaking after S25.5 is dropped.

Coals to Newcastle, actually.

> Although they probably have not set the
>full policy, as a minimum, that will contain a provision to drop all code
>tests.

I don't see ANY leadership on this issue from the group that claims to
want to "insure the survival and growth of amateur radio in the 21st
century".

> The logical step for the FCC would be to issue a Notice of Inquiry,
>to
>try to guage the spectrum of opinion on the subject.

Not gonna happen. You watch, it will simply go away without a whimper.
>
>And, in the final run, the FCC's determination about what is administratively
>best for the FCC will probably be a major factor. Any proposal that asks for
>a
>complicated licensing structure is, IMHO, doomed to fail.

Which is why a simple but logical 3 license system is the starting point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3499. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:37:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204093703.17580.00000875@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33010

In article <20020125184612.14663.00000434@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Ed, do you consider kit building to be homebrewing?
>
>Yes, I do.

I don't. Both homebrewing and kitbuilding are worthwhile endeavors but they are quite different.

> I suppose one doesn't get the experience of finding parts, but
>nearly everything else is there.

Not at all!

Kit building consists of following instructions to duplicate a proven design. It can be skill building and educational - I learned quite a bit building kits.

Homebrewing can consist of almost the same thing (exact duplication of a published design) but is often much more, involving design, fabrication experimentation and development.

> Think of it this way -- if one "dead bugs"
>a
>design, he or she doesn't get any PC-board stuffing and soldering experience.

The kit builder doesn't get any design experience. In most cases, the kit builder
doesn't get any metal fabrication experience either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3500. Re: NCI Board vis a vis membership views (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:37:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204093704.17580.00000876@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33008

In article <3C5B3576.7645D559@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Just to "make things easier"... Right. So who said things are better when
>they
>> are simply easier?
>
>The answer lies in a question. What do the Amish, the Taliban, and
>the PCTA have in common? :-)

Nothing other than they all include the letter "A".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3501. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:37:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204093704.17580.00000877@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33009

In article <20020203071329.12312.00000889@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>the issue of
>interference to narrow-band modes at all. The FCC took care of that
>absolutely
>when it mandated that if a spread spectrum system interferes with a
>narrow-band
>user, the obligation is on the spread-spectrum operator to correct the
>interference.
>
>How much more protection do you think needs to exist than absolute?
>
Nice words but the real world plays differently.

How is a narrow band user supposed to identify the SS interferer? In the case of DSSS, how is the narrow band user supposed to know that it's DSSS and not plain old noise?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3502. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:37:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204093705.17580.00000878@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33011

In article <3c5db50d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>I would submit that once you have
>the abiltity to run TCP/IP at sufficient speeds over amateur-
>controlled endpoints, you have a platform that's ability to support
>applications is virtually limited only by your imagination ...
>exchange of files, e-mail, keyboard to keyboard, voice, fax,
>web-pages, MPEG-encoded video, access to data, and on
>and on and on ...
>
>People say "I don't want to duplicate" the internet ... I would
>ask:
>
>1) Why not? ... it's pretty cool ... and to be able to do it without
>being tied to wired infrastructure makes it even cooler and
>move valuable. Talk about something that would provide
>REAL value to the EMS folks ... imagine being able to provide
>a decent bridge around outages in internet connectivity for them
>during emergencies? Maybe "duplicate it" is a bit strong ...
>how about *supplement* it? It's a crying shame that the block
>of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
>used ...
>
>2) Why limit your imagination to what's available on the internet
>now?

How you gonna filter the content?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3503. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 14:44:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5e9ea1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33013

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202040310300.20568-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 3 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >Hash: SHA1
> >
> >
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202030126520.18370-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On 2 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >> >From: agrier@poofygoof.com (Aaron J. Grier)
> >> >>he's doing just that EVERY SINGLE FSCKING DAY! the man works
for
> >a
> >> >>company that makes 802.11b devices, which coupled with a ham
> >license and
> >> >>a little technical expertice can be made to perform some nifty
> >things.
> >> >
> >> >You could add that they do so on Amateur frequencies. :-)
> >>
> >> Ah, but if they're not doing it AS AMATEURS, it's intrusion (even
if
> >it's
> >> legal) and therefore a potential interference source.
> >
> >
> >Huh??? How does an amateur, operating in a LICENSED service,
> >constitute an "intrusion?"
>
> What part of "not" above did you not understand? If the amateur is
NOT
> operating such a device NOT as an amateur, there is no licensed
service
> involved.

You're absolutely correct ... I inadvertently missed the "not"
above ... an honest mistake. However, it's still not inherently
"intrusion," since such devices are authorized in the (shared)
band with certain limitations.
```

> >Also, all Part 15 devices have to accept any interference they
> >receive from licensed services and cannot cause harmful
> >interference to licensed services
>
> Nice regulation. Try putting that in practice. Tell your neighbor
that he
> can't use his 2.4Ghz cordless phone because it jams your lan
(operating under
> the amateur rules in excess of part 15 - legally) and see how far it
gets you.
> The lan equipment may have some immunity, but not ATV and
conventional narrow
> band modes usually used for voice.

First, I believe that Ed has personally been involved in a number
of cases of resolving interference from unlicensed Part 15 devices
to amateur systems ... he's probably better qualified by direct
experience to comment on this ...

However, the rules are quite clear as I read them.

That said, the following still applies ... and, as a practical
matter,
if an amateur is operating such devices at higher powers than
Part 15 allows, his operation is likely to cause the cordless phone
you use in your example to either not work properly, or, if it's
smart enough, to move to another channel where they can both
coexist.

> >That's something that all of the manufacturers of 802.11b devices
> >knew from the start, so the devices and the modulation, coding,
> >and protocols they use were designed to be robust as the standard
> >was developed.

What I'm saying here is that these devices were designed to operate
in recognition that some interference from other devices is likely to
occur ... the way the protocols work tends to mitigate the effects of
such interference and keep the system working.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6eYpe+N6+q84HiEQJ85wCfflWANhrXaFbCgOJq/6hPHUixa8YAoMVR
er9vKTFJygSSis4UztErWkdG
=xlfb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3504. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 15:18:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ea685_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33014

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204071950.19893.00001044@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >It's a crying shame that the block
> >of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
> >used ...
>
> I will confess that I don't even have one. What use have you made of
yours?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I was obviously speaking in overall terms ... and I wasn't
criticizing any person specifically, just making a general
observation.

To be honest, I haven't gotten an IP address assignment for the
new QTH ... between getting organized in the new QTH (living
considerations; basic office, shop, and lab setup, antennas, etc
... still not totally complete ...) and work demands, I simply haven't
had a chance to get "a round tuit."

In the past, however, at a different QTH where things were
already organized, I had a block of IP addresses and was
running TCP/IP on multiple machines and multiple nodes.

I have plans ... but also time limitations (and I recognize
that others have time limitiations as well). I will get to things
in due course and it will be fun.

73,
Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6mLpe+N6+q84HiEQITGwCfTfjIbmq/olshoJoc+E+NIqgaNKYAnjst
8Zew9PbDmmWITN3Mz0XD65AN
=zLsM
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3505. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 15:23:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ea7b2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33015

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204093705.17580.00000878@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c5db50d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >I would submit that once you have
> >the abiltity to run TCP/IP at sufficient speeds over amateur-
> >controlled endpoints, you have a platform that's ability to support
> >applications is virtually limited only by your imagination ...
> >exchange of files, e-mail, keyboard to keyboard, voice, fax,
> >web-pages, MPEG-encoded video, access to data, and on
> >and on and on ...
> >
> >People say "I don't want to duplicate" the internet ... I would
> >ask:
> >
> >1) Why not? ... it's pretty cool ... and to be able to do it
without
> >being tied to wired infrastructure makes it even cooler and
> >move valuable. Talk about something that would provide
> >REAL value to the EMS folks ... imagine being able to provide
> >a decent bridge around outages in internet connectivity for them
> >during emergencies? Maybe "duplicate it" is a bit strong ...
> >how about *supplement* it? It's a crying shame that the block
> >of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
> >used ...
> >
> >2) Why limit your imagination to what's available on the internet
> >now?
>
> How you gonna filter the content?

That's a software issue ... I'm mostly a hardware guy :-)

Seriously, though, there are some (a small number) systems
now that are connected to the internet, at least in some limited
fashion.

One way is to limit access to specific, trusted gateways
that block access to domains that are known, or could
reasonably be expected, to contain inappropriate content.
```

I don't claim to have all of the answers to every possible
question ... what I'm trying to do is to stimulate some
"out of the box" thinking ... that's where the seeds of
progress come from.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6nUZe+N6+q84HiEQKJegCfUrAuq+9e5C3iVTYXUQQyo8z5SjUAoJZQ
e1YAuSgLYpEjeGL0+uftaRRg
=rJbe
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3506. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 15:30:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204103019.16518.00001427@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33017

>I passed that same 5 wpm and the full general 25 years ago,
>yet didn't get the HF access because of the backwardness
>of the rules until recently.
>

You didnt get there because you were either to Lazy or Stupid to meet the standards at that time. Just love how these Clowns try to blame there failures on someone or something else.

3507. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 15:40:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5eabb9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33018

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:beb0a48b.0202040612.75f07ce8@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5de780$1_1@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > Funny ... I also don't see "fraternity" in there anywhere,
> > either.
>
> If you really need an "authority" to tell you, or better yet,
instruct
> you wrt the fraternal bond that forms within a large group of people
> who share a common interest...?

I'm afraid I don't see a complete sentence there, let alone
a complete question, so I'm not sure how to formulate
an "answer."

> > Nor have I been able to find the section where it says,
> > "The current brothers of the fraternity shall determine
> > the nature and extend of hazing rituals which must be
> > endured by pledges wishing to become members of
> > the fraternity."
>
> "Hazing?" Now, I'm really amused. Carl, somehow I just can't seem to
> equate memorizing 43 characters and identifying 25 of them in a row
> correctly out of a total of approx. 125 or so sent at 5-wpm with
being
> paddled on the buttocks and asking for more, eating goldfish,
drinking
> binges, or any such other foolishness.

I'm quite confident that there are many who would prefer
to eat a few goldfish than be forced to learn Morse in
exchange for HF privs ... but that doesn't mean that eating
goldfish is a legitimate requirement for licensure, either.

> Speaking ONLY for myself, I
> learned the very basics of a mode on which my "chosen" hobby's
> heritage is based. I don't feel as though I was "hazed." The 5-wpm
> test certainly posed no barrier and only took less than a 1/2-hour
per
> day study time. Nobody beat me over the head (or paddled my
buttocks)

> to master the entire CW character-set at high speed. Is it also a
> "rite-of-passage?" You bet. Is it a "barrier?" No way!

YOU don't feel it's a barrier ... many others do.

Additionally, "rites of passage" have no place in federal
regulations regarding who may have access to publicly-
owned spectral resources ... only *legitimate* regulatory
concerns/reasons are valid reasons to set requirements.
Maintaining "fraternal rites of passage" are not legitimate
regulatory concerns/reasons for the existence of any
requirement.

> > That's what Bert is asking for ... he has the ARS
> > confused with some stupid college fraternity and
> > thinks that he and "the brothers" ought to get to
> > set whatever arbitrary hazing rituals suit their whim.
>
> Am I asking for that?

Re-read your statements ... it certainly APPEARS that
that's EXACTLY what you're asking for ...

> > Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
> > governs least governs best." Don't take my
> > word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
> > in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
> > even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
> > able to read it.
>
> Well, well, Carl. We've finally arrived at the end of our
discussion.
> Sadly, you've conceded...and likely without even realizing it. And
> thus the first name is hurled. Funny, although I disagree with your
> position...I never had you pegged as someone who'd descend to the
> level of name-calling. Take it easy, Carl.

Bert ... you're absolutely right that I should NOT have referred
to you as a twit. I humbly and sincerely apologize.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF6rSpe+N6+q84HiEQIIiwCfVm1eXCCGKE0xIgT2hD26DfF2JMMAoMD5
1gx1PMHACwG39t/DbggRqtFc
=zJRY
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3508. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 15:59:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EAFF8.DBBCCFAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33020

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > FCC wanted rid of the thorny
> > > medical waiver problem and would have done it anyway.
> > >
> > If that's true, why do you rag on NCI so much?
>
> We should let them get by with such nonsense?

If the FCC "would have done it anyway", then NCI is irrelevant.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3509. RE: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:02:49 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <21a001e5010e2efbf0dc999f54613794.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 33019

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote

> Note that if I put up an FHSS system and it caused a carrier
> squelch system to "burp" (break squelch) once in a while, I'm
> not convinced that that in and of itself would constitute "harmful
> interference" ...

I doubt that "carrier squelch" folks would ever be affected
by the increase in the noise floor, but would be concerned that
weak signal modes (eme, ms, etc.) should enjoy some protection.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3510. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:03:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB0C5.BC0C25E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33021

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone who
> had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough
> interest to begin the licensing process.

Because those people own the public property just as much as hams do?
Because every one of those people is a potential ham?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3511. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:05:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB152.1956E2B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33022

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I ssppose he realized that peopel who don't value their skulls
> won't like laws either.

He realized that "live and let live" is a good policy. Using your
logic, why should people who don't ride motorcycles be allowed
to make the laws for the people who do?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3512. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:14:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB381.1A976347@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33023

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget the
> way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
> only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
> club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
> have gone quite differently.

You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
didn't want to do?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3513. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:17:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB41B.5DD1FE90@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33027

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Why
> >don't y'all PCTA folk just secede and form a society more to
> >y'all's liking? :-)
>
> No need to secede, Cecil. A pro-code use community exists on the lower ~50 kHz
> of each of the HF bands. The rules permit CW operators to use and enjoy their
> part of ham radio.

The 'T' in "PCTA folk" is the thing that will make secession necessary. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3514. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:19:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB476.E0455617@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33025

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No more than what will result anyway. When the tests are so trivial that any
> Freebander who wants can climb on board with the full load of privileges at
> will, it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.

You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to happen?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3515. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:19:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204111927.04137.00001134@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 33028

>Subject: Re: Cecil wins again!
>From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net
>Date: 2/3/2002 2:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <23ba33ac8859c722ba7e22166555f543.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>

>
>Anyone who spends more than 10 minutes a day in a newsgroup
>(especially this one!) needs to go get a life!

Which says "what" about people who have time to spend accumulating
statisitics on this newsgroup...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3516. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:20:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204112045.04137.00001135@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 33024

>Subject: Re: Cecil wins again!
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/3/2002 4:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C5DBE21.96DBA522@IEEE.org>

>
>I'll bet Jim posted more than twice as many words as I.

Perhaps, but was he forced?

Steve

3517. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:21:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB4EF.27C16971@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33029

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
> never be discouraged by my opinions.

And, of course, you get to say what's "right", right?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3518. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:21:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204112157.04137.00001136@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 33026

>Subject: Re: Cecil wins again!
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 2/3/2002 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020203233142.24009.00000039@mb-ba.aol.com>

>I'd like to see some stats on volume of text (in words or kilobytes)
>posted by all users over the past ten years.

I think we have a god idea who that is...Or at least who is in the running
for top three......

Steve

3519. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 16:29:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5EB6E9.239EBB60@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33030

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net
> >Anyone who spends more than 10 minutes a day in a newsgroup
> >(especially this one!) needs to go get a life!
>
> Which says "what" about people who have time to spend accumulating
> statisitics on this newsgroup...?!?!

That's easy - no life. Madisonville, TX is like that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3520. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:18:23 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C5EC263.EB0D56FF@attbi.com>
Source record: 33031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Vito wrote:

> CW was a necessary evil left over from
> the days before modulation was invented.

And ham radio is probably a necessary evil left over from the days before cellphones and Internet were invented?

73 .... Zoran WA7AA

3521. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:24:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202040924.38b2f1f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33032

Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.16c678efcbc22a6a9896ba@news.earthlink.net>...
> In article <20020202151950.16072.00000834@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> says...
> > "Kim" wrote:
> >
> > >> N2EY wrote
>
> > > >> >> ."Jay" wrote:
>
> > > >> >> >Hmmm, I spent 2 weeks with the Red Cross between 9/14 and 10/1. I
> spent
> > > >> >> >3 weeks after that with the Salvation Army (and my company even paid
> me
> > > >> >> >for the time off) I got wear some great coveralls and got to keep the
> > > >> >> >nifty face mask that everyone downtown had to wear.
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> Thank you, "Jay".
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >> >
> > > >> >Yeah. Uh, sounds like you won all kinds of trophies, there, Jay. Was
> there
> > > >> >any *real* motivation for your assistance or do you like collecting
> > > >prizes?
>
> > > >> Where do you think Jay was, and what do
> > > >> you think he was doing?
> > > >>
> > > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> > > >Don't know.
> >
> > Think about it.
> >
> > Here's a hint: He spent the last 2 weeks of September and the first three weeks
> >
> > of October somewhere "downtown" with the Red Cross and Salvation Army. And
> > everyone there had to wear coveralls and use face masks.
> >
> > > I think "Jay" spent so much time describing the trophies he got
> > >that he forgot to mention it.
> >
> > What "trophies"?

> >
> > >Doubt wherever it was would change my
> > >impression that he's more impressed with getting paid for the time off, has
> > >a new set of coveralls, and even got to keep a facemask.
> >
> > Some people have very short memories.
> >
> > Thanks again, "Jay".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> Skiing wasn't that great. Besides being very warm one day, like in the
> mid 50's, that storm over the past two days dumped more ice than snow so
> I came home to find this stuff. All I can say is WOW (not WHIP em OUT
> WEDNESDAY!)

O&A RULES! NICE!
>
> Anyway, thanks Jim, if thanks can be said.

No need. I'm the one thanking you, "Jay". What you did took
real courage, community and patriotism. In the best sense of those words.

> It was done out a sense of
> duty for lack of better words. Several of my neighbors here in
> Bronxville lost family and when the call went out for any WECA club
> members with EMT experience, neither my wife nor my children complained
> that I was playing "radio" again, although this time, it was little if
> any radio. Several of my club friends were in the pit helping dig.
> Fortunately I only was at "ground zero" for 2 days. In all my life I
> will never forget what I saw. Mainly I was a block away, most of the
> time doing moderate EMT care, cuts, scrapes, a lot of eyewashing and
> nasal lavage.

..."thank you" is totally inadequate. But it's all I can think to say.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3522. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:31:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C600912.13C3A895@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33033

W1RFI wrote:

> >Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
> >horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."
>
> Walking is very much a part of our national transportation infrastructure,
> Carl. The governments of the world build sidewalks for darn good reason.

Poor Carl. So myopic he failed to notice the evolution of the shoe.

3523. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:34:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6009CD.9251296B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33034

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
> "Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
> some form of "giveway?"
>

I'd be very pleased to do so. Bert met the requirements in place at the time, you very definitely did not, preferering to whine about them instead. So keep on, whine away.

3524. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:44:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C600C24.58B995E4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33035

Bert Craig wrote:

Well, well, Carl. We've finally arrived at the end of our discussion.

> Sadly, you've conceded...and likely without even realizing it. And
> thus the first name is hurled. Funny, although I disagree with your
> position...I never had you pegged as someone who'd descend to the
> level of name-calling.

Believe me, it gets much worse. Go back and take a look at the old archives of this NG in Google to
see what hes' *really* capable of calling you when he feels properly 'provoked' by your intransigence.

I landed here about 4 and a half years ago thinking I'd get involved in a friendly rational discourse
on the future of ham radio. What I found instead was the sort bile regurgitation of percieved wrongs
from the distant past that has lasted to this day. I never ever expected to get such responses from
other hams, and for the most part have concluded that almost all of them who did so have very minimal
involvement in ham radio anyway, most being the "victims" of all ham radio's hazing rituals (hehe).
So be it.

3525. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:46:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C600C95.3F0E84FA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33036

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Please don't try to twist this into some sort of statement
> that I am advocating chaos and don't give a damn about
> interference to others ... that would simply be false.

Yes but when it comes to deciding who gets what, your attitude will come
out in spades. "Hey, those legacy modes must go anyway..."

3526. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:46:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202040946.170bfcaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33037

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5df655_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020203173707.02067.00001067@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon
> Bloom
> > <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
> >
> > >On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> > >> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com
> > >> (W1RFI) writes:
> > >>
> > >>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
> > >>>outside of amateur radio?
> > >>>
> > >> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an
> advance must
> > >> have applicability outside amateur radio?
> > >
> > >When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's
> proven
> > >ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you
> really
> > >think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its
> application
> > >within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term "radio art"?
> Why
> > >didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the amateur's
> proven
> > >ability to contribute to the advancement of his own art"?
> > >
> > I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio. Ed seems to
> make that
> > separation, by such phrases as "real radio" and by asking about
> applicability
> > outside amateur radio.
> >
> > As I see it, amateur radio is just as much "real radio" as any other
> authorized
> > radio service. What hams do is part of the "radio art".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

> Jim,
>
> If amateurs' state is at least several generations of technology
> "behind the curve", relative to what Ed and I have refered to as
> "real radio," where is the value?

There is value in simplicity, in education, in having a variety of ways of doing things. The mere fact that something is old does not make it bad, despite your constant disparaging of older technologies.

> How are amateurs "advancing
> the radio art" if they're so far behind the rest of the radio world?

You write as if there is a linear progression in which all new things are by definition better than old things and must utterly replace them. This is simply not the case.

What modes did you say you used to work those 70+ countries?
>
> THAT's one of the points I've been trying to make ...

We know you don't like old stuff. What new stuff have you brought to the amateur radio service? I don't mean in the form of newsgroup posts - anybody can say what is possible and what hams oughta be doing. The tough part is in the actual doing. And letting other hams know what is being done - and in such a way that they are encouraged, not insulted.

> Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
> horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."

See? There you go again. Horses are noble animals. Their pollution is far less toxic than that of motor vehicles. They can go where wheeled vehicles cannot. And they are "smart vehicles".

What about bicycles? Are they bad because they are old technology, and simple?

Let's see - the NTSC color television standard goes back to 1954 or so, and is based on an even older standard for B&W TV. AM broadcasting is truly ancient, its standards laid down in the 1920s.

But they all pale in comparison to the latest marketing craze, in which the term "wireless" has been resurrected from 100 years ago and presented as something new.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3527. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:55:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ecbba_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33039

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6009CD.9251296B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >
> > Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
> > "Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
> > some form of "giveway?"
> >
>
> I'd be very pleased to do so. Bert met the requirements in place
at the
> time, you very definitely did not, preferering to whine about them
> instead. So keep on, whine away.
>

Dick,

While it's true that I met the same requirements that got
Bert a General, but at the time only got a Tech (later
Tech+) for them, that's NOT what I'm talking about now.

I'm referring to the way you (and some others) have characterized
my upgrade to Extra as "a giveway."

Again, Bert met all the requirements in place at the time the
got his license ... so did I ... why is Bert's "earned" and mine
a "giveway." Answer the question, please.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF7LAZe+N6+q84HiEQLeUwCgtv8GaYkXOFaudwoMlI+ud5Rc9uMAoPRC
hbcoQNRCT8W2VBsAuUKefXld
=D+y4
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3528. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:57:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C600F23.7ACF6BDD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33038

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone who
> > had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough
> > interest to begin the licensing process.
>
> Because those people own the public property just as much as hams do?
> Because every one of those people is a potential ham?

And because they can be expected to push for licensing on their own (unknowledgable) terms rather than rational terms.

3529. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:57:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5ECB8F.4E74DA4E@uci.edu>
Source record: 33044

High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past the
end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every mile
too?

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0201311719.1c9a3558@posting.google.com...
> > Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:<3C59882F.FFE6C81B@uci.edu>...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > I hate to be the one to tell you this, but, compared to the
> primary
> > > > markets, the amateur community would fall several notches BELOW
> > > > trivial ... and that's assuming that a very high percentage of
> hams
> > > > would
> > > > actually see the benefits of using the stuff, which I'm truly
> sad to
> > > > say is
> > > > something that I'd rate as "unlikely" at this juncture.
> > >
> > > Right. Due largely to the fact that WE AREN'T CONDUCTING BUSINESS
> on
> > > the ham bands. We're not selling something, promoting something,
> > > connecting to an enormous database, or user base for that matter.
> It's
> > > not what amateur radio is about, and to compare it with the
> business
> > > world is myopically, over-simplistically ignorant.
> > >
> > >
> > > Yahoo, somebody had to get it right and cut to the quick around
> here.
> > >
> > >
> > > w3rv
>
> I guess you guys might be related? You don't seem to grasp
> the idea that you don't HAVE to be conducting business on
> the ham bands to find high speed data useful ... higher speeds

> also allow more people to share a channel in a way that's
> rather transparent to each other by sending the data they have
> to send quickly, then allowing the channel to be used by others.

> There are many potential, interesting applications for truly high
> speed data in amateur radio ... the fact that you guys either don't
> recognize them, or don't find them interesting yourselves, is
> irrelevant and does not negate the fact that they exist.
>
> Carl - wa6vse
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPFtAaJe+N6+q84HiEQIrOACghHwKOJ5vb7/DBCcldc1be+F5F08AoIA8
> n5AhcXHdDikM3xgMfGy59XDv
> =k3Pq
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3530. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 17:58:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c5ecc7f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33041

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C600C95.3F0E84FA@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > Please don't try to twist this into some sort of statement
> > that I am advocating chaos and don't give a damn about
> > interference to others ... that would simply be false.
>
> Yes but when it comes to deciding who gets what, your attitude will
come
> out in spades. "Hey, those legacy modes must go anyway..."
>

That's simply untrue Dick. No further response is necessary.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPF7LvJe+N6+q84HiEQJRugCg/TuRkXVW4+aQdlo8u3tGJaxShGgAoIfi
vsCQE0eTsRxvaSIw3Wcchoe4
=zXHJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3531. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:01:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C601022.82BC8B75@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33040

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I ssppose he realized that peopel who don't value their skulls
> > won't like laws either.
>
> He realized that "live and let live" is a good policy. Using your
> logic, why should people who don't ride motorcycles be allowed
> to make the laws for the people who do?

I was a rider for several years, and I never got on one without a helmet. I also worked for a Public Safety organization and handled a lot of reports on motorcycle accidents.....I stopped riding aafter a time because of those reports -(ugly) and took up flying. It's much safer.

3532. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:03:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5ECCE8.A815F613@uci.edu>
Source record: 33052

So Fred is one of the guys, but who is the other? :-)

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Oh. So it couldn't be Fred who Bruce is talking about. I knew you would
> >know, Ed. Thanks for the help.
>
> Sure. And, for the record, I believe that ARRL has a good relationship with
> Fred, too, some differences of opinion notwithstanding. For whatever reason,
> Fred chose to become involved with the FCC on the RF-safety rulemaking matter,
> and he and I exchanged a fair amount of information. As I put some of my
> technical viewpoints before the Commission, I also put Fred's differing
> viewpoints on the table, at Fred's request. It saved everybody a fair amount of
> time.
>
> Fred is in the commercial exams and study guide business. Although those study
> guides do compete with those of other publishers, that doesn't mean that all
> aspects of the ARRL/W5YI relationship are adversarial. Fred's ARRL membership
> is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support the
> good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need to
> be done better.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3533. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:03:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6010BA.5851449C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33042

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget the
> > way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
> > only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
> > club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
> > have gone quite differently.
>
> You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
> didn't want to do?

At the very least it would have prevented NCI from being the ONLY group that showed up with an opinion on the subject. Who knows, there may have been some other workable solution to the medical waiver problem. As it was, there was no pressing reason to consider anything else.

3534. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:05:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5ECD54.A1AF26A7@uci.edu>
Source record: 33051

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >I guess I'm just another one of these guys who proves Carl and Ed's point
> >about the worthlessness of amateur radio operators.
>
> If that is what you think the point is, you missed it. Do you really mean that?

The point is, do YOU really mean what you said?

3535. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:07:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C60117E.1DD291EA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33043

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
> > never be discouraged by my opinions.
>
> And, of course, you get to say what's "right", right?

Why are you so unwilling to acknowledge accepted parameters when
it goes against your Agenda? Personal problems?

I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
they didn't stay in ham radio very long.

3536. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:11:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5ECEE7.2EA2E2F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33045

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone who
> > > had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough
> > > interest to begin the licensing process.
> >
> > Because those people own the public property just as much as hams do?
> > Because every one of those people is a potential ham?
>
> And because they can be expected to push for licensing on their own (unknowledgable)
> terms rather than rational terms.

Thank goodness we have the FCC to protect us from a pure democracy, eh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3537. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:13:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5ECF43.68341CF5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33046

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > He realized that "live and let live" is a good policy. Using your
> > logic, why should people who don't ride motorcycles be allowed
> > to make the laws for the people who do?
>
> I was a rider for several years, and I never got on one without a
> helmet.

Yeah, and look how you suffocated all your brain cells. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3538. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:15:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5ECFAA.29463498@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33048

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Believe me, it gets much worse. Go back and take a look at the old archives of this NG in Google to
> see what hes' *really* capable of calling you when he feels properly 'provoked' by your intransigence.

Dick, in your entire life, have you ever tried living in the present?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3539. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:17:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6013F1.CCB7BE0C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33047

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6009CD.9251296B@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
> > > "Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
> > > some form of "giveway?"
> > >
> >
> > I'd be very pleased to do so. Bert met the requirements in place
> at the
> > time, you very definitely did not, preferering to whine about them
> > instead. So keep on, whine away.
> >
>
> Dick,
>
> While it's true that I met the same requirements that got
> Bert a General, but at the time only got a Tech (later
> Tech+) for them, that's NOT what I'm talking about now.
>
> I'm referring to the way you (and some others) have characterized
> my upgrade to Extra as "a giveway."
>
> Again, Bert met all the requirements in place at the time the
> got his license ... so did I ... why is Bert's "earned" and mine
> a "giveway." Answer the question, please.

You already answered it yourself. I quote:

"

3540. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:17:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5ED04D.821CD2C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33053

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
> > didn't want to do?
>
> At the very least it would have prevented NCI from being the ONLY group that
> showed up with an opinion on the subject. Who knows, there may have been some
> other workable solution to the medical waiver problem. As it was, there was
> no pressing reason to consider anything else.

And, of course, the FCC is incapable of considering the relevant data
without outside help.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3541. Re: Hey Carl . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:19:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <BgA78.4$Bg4.2309@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 33049

Hmmm..... and I am the "baby" of our club at 31. Next oldest is 38. The rest is in the 40-70's age group.

That may change after our current class. We have a 12 year old boy , a 16 year old boy and a (I think) 17-18 year old girl. Woooo Hooo!! I will now be a "middle ager" if these students pass! :)

Ryan KC8PMX

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020128175035.14720.00000891@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >When you tell the whole story, it looks a bit different.
>
> Not really, Jim. The point that when I entered ham radio, that first rung was
> a very small one and that now, it is a much much larger step does not change.
>
> IMHO, this does explain why we have far fewer 13 year olds entering ham radio
> than in the Novice heyday. More hams are entering ham radio now than then, but
> they are doing it at an older age.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare,W1RFI
>
>

3542. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:19:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5ED0C2.E443CDB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33055

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
> they didn't stay in ham radio very long.

The "wrong" reason being, in your opinion, that they were not
dedicated to the preservation of Morse code testing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3543. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:19:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C601481.D4009046@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33050

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6009CD.9251296B@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
> > > "Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
> > > some form of "giveway?"
> > >
> >
> > I'd be very pleased to do so. Bert met the requirements in place
> at the
> > time, you very definitely did not, preferering to whine about them
> > instead. So keep on, whine away.
> >
>
> Dick,
>
> While it's true that I met the same requirements that got
> Bert a General, but at the time only got a Tech (later
> Tech+) for them, that's NOT what I'm talking about now.
>
> I'm referring to the way you (and some others) have characterized
> my upgrade to Extra as "a giveway."
>
> Again, Bert met all the requirements in place at the time the
> got his license ... so did I ... why is Bert's "earned" and mine
> a "giveway." Answer the question, please.

You answered it yourself. I quote:

"I passed that same 5 wpm and the full general 25 years ago,
yet didn't get the HF access because of the backwardness
of the rules until recently."

You had to wait till the rules caught up with you. Right.

3544. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:22:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C601504.D31EAB3F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33054

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C600C95.3F0E84FA@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > Please don't try to twist this into some sort of statement
> > > that I am advocating chaos and don't give a damn about
> > > interference to others ... that would simply be false.
> >
> > Yes but when it comes to deciding who gets what, your attitude will
> come
> > out in spades. "Hey, those legacy modes must go anyway..."
> >
>
> That's simply untrue Dick.

Thne archives will decide that.

3545. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:33:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6017CB.E7A7ADD1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33056

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
> > > didn't want to do?
> >
> > At the very least it would have prevented NCI from being the ONLY group that
> > showed up with an opinion on the subject. Who knows, there may have been some
> > other workable solution to the medical waiver problem. As it was, there was
> > no pressing reason to consider anything else.
>
> And, of course, the FCC is incapable of considering the relevant data
> without outside help.

The operative word is "Unwilling". History shows the FCC often
ignores evidence it doesn't find to have support from the affected. In short they
may have concluded that no ham radio organization cared that much, so they might as
well rule in favor of the one who did show up with a position. They may not have
regarded any evicence as "relavent". They have in the past made ARS rules on
request when they were shown no reason not to do so and no opposition surfaced.
Usually that was at the request of ARRL instead of NCI, but that's history.
Evidently ARRL has lost it's position of influence with the FCC.

3546. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:38:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6018F9.4C535824@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33057

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
> > they didn't stay in ham radio very long.
>
> The "wrong" reason being, in your opinion, that they were not
> dedicated to the preservation of Morse code testing.

You're pretty good at guessing wrong. I'm not dedicated to the
preservation of Morse code testing either. What I know is that
hams who undestand the communications value of radiotelegraphy will
believe that testing is needed to continue to keep the mode available in
ham radio. The NoCode tech experience has shown that
darn few will bother to ever learn it if not a testing requirement.
When code testing is gone, widespread qualification within ARS follows.

3547. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:43:59 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C5ED66F.7E4346DC@crosslink.net>
Source record: 33058
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > CW was a necessary evil left over from
> > the days before modulation was invented.
>
> And ham radio is probably a necessary evil left over from the days before
> cellphones and Internet were invented?
>
No, it's a hobby, and CW is no longer needed to enjoy it. We are allowed
to do things that could QRM others -things others are not allowed to do
- so it is reasonable for governments to require us to have know how to
avoid that. It *was* reasonable for governments to require CW when that
was the only way to communicate; but that day is long past.

There is nothing wrong with *enjoying* CW for it's own sake but it is a
serious character flaw to feel that everybody should suffer every
discomfort that we did.

3548. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 18:51:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5ED848.DB0DCAB@uci.edu>
Source record: 33059

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Fred's ARRL
> >membership
> >> is, IMHO, sincere, and stems from the same reasons mine does -- to support
> >the
> >> good work of ARRL and to gain influence to shape those things we feel need
> >to
> >> be done better.
>
> >In other words, he'd never say a bad word to anybody about the ARRL. Thanks
> >Ed.
>
> That conclusion is ridulous on its face.

What conclusion were you trying to lead me to Ed? It seemed you were
trying to lead us away from the opposite conclusion.

3549. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 19:04:28 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a3mlt7$f0q$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 33064

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C5EB476.E0455617@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > No more than what will result anyway. When the tests are so trivial that any
> > Freebander who wants can climb on board with the full load of privileges at
> > will, it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.
>
> You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to happen?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It already did, Oct. 09, 1998 when I got my "NoCode" Tech license.
That's when it started to self-destruct. I am an ex-freebander who "climbed
on and got a full load of privileges at will" (30 MHz up of course), the clocks
already ticking. Cam didn't you feel the sky when it fell and hit you on the head?

Now since I have spent more than "10 min" in the NG today I'm going
to go "get a life", try to not be "lazy" and pick up my code studies where .
I left off yesterday! That way I'll be able to pass my "non-barrier" "easy"
5wpm code test, and start the "selfdestruction" on the HF bands like
I've already done to the VHF ("2m CB") and above bands up to this point!

Disclaimer: This NG posting and the opinions expressed here are the
author's ONLY and not necessarily approved of and/or endorsed by
anyone else. All opinions expressed here are tongue-in-cheek and
not to be used as evidence of the "end of Amateur Radio as we
know it" by the "PCTA", "FCC", "NCI", or by any other group.

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

"Scotty, we need full power to the shields NOW!"
James T. Kirk - Capt.U.S.S. Enterprise

3550. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 19:10:43 UTC
From: Beach Bum <hmbdude@nospamcotse.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.16c87c9195058f809896b1@news.onlynews.com>
Source record: 33060
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <8khs5u8evf6jv1akn44nnc41bjkdnk3f75@4ax.com>,
walt99@tiscali.co.uk says...
> On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 02:49:04 +0200, "Roger Conroy"
> <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >will it increase the power rating as well? and what about the SWR?
>
> I think you will find 7 inches is resonant as a half-wave at about 432
> MHz! Final adjustments are made by progressively snipping small
> pieces off the stub.
>
> 73 de G3NYY

Err, Walt, sorry to disillusion you, but that's only a quarterwave at
432. A halfwave at 432 would be worth to see!

3551. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 19:14:30 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <98d5b1ab8a69c99c3988109df293b8e6.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 33061

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote

> Which says "what" about people who have time to spend accumulating
> statisitics on this newsgroup...?!?!

http://mygate.mailgate.org/report/rec/rec.radio.amateur.policy?date=01/2002
does it automagically.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3552. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 19:15:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5EDDD4.AFCFEF46@uci.edu>
Source record: 33062

W1RFI wrote:
> I have
> seen people in ham radio say that the technology hams are using is
> adequate, so there is no need to develop more.

It's true that there are areas of the country where there aren't enough repeater channels for everyone who wants to put up a repeater. But is it true that there aren't enough repeaters? It's true that data rates in amateur radio are pathetically slow, but is that because of our lack of technology to go faster? It's a regulatory issue, is it not? Need is what spurs development and advancement. Is it clear what needs are not being met? If it's clear to you, please elucidate.

Thanks,

Jim AC6XG

3553. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 19:22:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5EDF65.196A155C@uci.edu>
Source record: 33063

W1RFI wrote:
> You did not choose to do that with DSP, although if you didn't understand the
> concepts, that would be understandable.

First define the problem that needs to be solved.

> Perhaps some of the tutorial articles
> on the ARRL Tech Info Svc DSP page would be useful.

> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html

You gotta be kidding, Ed. Gimme a little credit, will ya?

3554. Re: bigger penis in 3 weeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 20:37:42 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <u6st5uola04j6i8bf9a2c8hvijm143hohd@4ax.com>
Source record: 33065
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 11:10:43 -0800, Beach Bum <hmbdude@nospamcotse.com>
wrote:

>Err, Walt, sorry to disillusion you, but that's only a quarterwave at
>432. A halfwave at 432 would be worth to see!

Oops ... yes, you are right! (I was never one to boast ...)

;-)
73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

3555. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:06:12 UTC
From: jbloom@arrl.org
Message-ID: <f8026928.0202041406.67c61022@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33066

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020203173709.02067.00001069@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> In article <f8026928.0202021901.6cd08d1e@posting.google.com>, jbloom@arrl.org
> (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >> Show us your numbers, Ed. What was the growth per year in the time periods
> >> before the Tech lost its code test in 1991, after that change,
> >>
> >YEAR AMATEURS DELTA DELTA(%)
> >1980 393,000 --- ---
> >1990 467,000 74,000 19% (1980-1990)
> >2000 682,000 215,000 46% (2000-1990)
>
> Not to be argumentative, but where do your numbers come from, Jon?

From the flying-horse Callbook, but I have to apologize for a
transcription error. The 1990 number should have been 509,000, which
changes the table like so:

1980 393,000 --- ---
1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990)
2000 682,000 227,000 34% (1990-2000)

Not as impressive as the erroneous numbers, but still, almost twice as
many licenses added in 1990-2000 as in 1980-1990.

> I have a a 1984-85 edition of the ARRL Call Directory. Printed early 1984. It
> says 453,000
> total US hams.

The FH 1984 Callbook says 433,000. I don't know for sure why the ARRL
book had a higher number, but it could be because the FCC kept expired
licenses in the database until the grace period expired, and the ARRL
book was drawn directly from FCC data.

> >1980 0.17%
> >1990 0.19%
> >2000 0.25%

Corrected:

1980 0.17%
1990 0.20%
2000 0.25%

> How do you compensate for the change from 5 to 10 year licenses, btw?

No accurate compensation is really possible. We should recognize,
though, that the number of licences in 1990 is somewhat artificially
high, since there were no expirations in 1989. That makes the growth
in 1980-1990 look somewhat better than it is. And...

> The
> change occurred in 1984, which means that from 1989 to 1994 there were
> NO US ham license expirations. Conveniently, most of that falls into the 1990-
> 2000 time frame.

So did the burst of pent-up expirations in 1994. By 1995, things were
back to normal. Of course, there are licenses that would have expired
after 5 years but didn't until after 10. That makes the 1990-2000
growth look somewhat better than it is. How much better? I dunno. Do
you?

> >Clearly, growth spurted after the 1991 no-code license came into
> >effect. Do you really doubt that, Jim?
>
> Whenever the "price" of something is lowered, there is usually a
> spurt of "sales". The important question is whether it's a transient
> effect or a long term change.

If the "price" stays down, won't "sales" remain stronger?

> I doubt that the 1991 or 2000 changes have/will result in longterm growth
> changes.

Nobody will ever be able to say for sure. It's impossible to isolate
all of the factors long-term. But the unsurprising pattern that seems
to be common across the history of Amateur Radio is that each time it
has been made easier to get and retain a license, growth has followed.
It happened in the 50's after the creation of 5-wpm licenses. It
happened in the late 70's and early 80's when the Bash books made it
easier to pass the writtens. It happened in the 90's with no-code.
There were other factors that played a part, but it's not unreasonable
to think the correlation is causal.

Here's a table of FH Callbook counts of new licenses issued:

1980 32,692
1981 34,373
1982 40,371
1983 30,505
1984 27,610
1985 31,207
1986 25,942
1987 41,649
1988 27,139
1989 40,972
1990 28,667
1991 29,300
1992 48,700
1993 46,806

1994 50,316
1995 57,154
1996 48,727
(The 1997 Callbook, giving 1996 licenses issued, is the last one I
have handy at the moment.)

Notice the immediate and sustained increase in growth rate after the
1991 no-code changes. And these numbers can be in no way biased by the
5/10 year term change since they are NEW licenses.

> >March 1999 674,719
> >March 2000 677,784 (1-yr growth: 3,065)
> >March 2001 684,359 (1-yr growth: 6,575)
>
> Based on whose numbers?

AH0A

> > That's probably no
> >coincidence: the decline began just as the first 1991 no-code licences
> >began to expire.
>
> Which means what?

Just what I said:
> >The no-code rules caused a jump in the license
> >numbers, and it's not surprising to see a matching decline as those
> >licenses reach their expiration dates. Whether these expirations will
> >continue to offset growth remains to be seen. It's way too early to
> >tell for sure.

IOW, there's generally a high rate of "infant mortality" with new
licensees, and we have to wait for that downward bump to flatten out
to see what the long-term effect will be.

> But you hold up the 1 year growth as proof.

Nope. You asked for an analysis. I provided one. But I don't think it
stands as proof, as I clearly said:
> >Caveat: All of this 1-year-term number crunching is pretty tenuous
> >stuff upon which to draw conclusions. After all we're talking about
> >sub-1% variations. Those are pretty small potatoes. In the last 12
> >months, from Jan '01 to Jan '02 the change in the count was zero.
> >(Yes, exactly zero, according to AH0A.) From Jul '97 to Jul '98
> >(pre-restructuring) we lost 5,331 licensees. What does that tell us
> >about the success of restructuring? Not a damn thing.
>
> Exactly. But we are to believe without challenge claims that code testing
> is/was "crippling" amateur radio. Sorry, I don't buy it.

Who said that? Not me. I'm only disputing your claim that it makes no
difference to growth rates. I'm sure Amateur Radio would have gotten
along just fine with no changes in the rules. But I do think the

growth would have been less, and the available numbers tend to bear
that out. Not prove it, mind you, but suggest it strongly.

> Let's look at some more numbers from AH0A (end-of-month totals):
>
> Total licenses March 00 (eve of restructuring): 677,784
> Total licenses January 02 (most recent): 682,602
>
> Increase: 4,918 in 22 months since restructuring
>
> Total licenses May 98 (22 months before March 00): 673,973
>
> Increase: 4,011 in 22 months before restructuring
>
> Not exactly a big difference (917).

Nope. But that includes the downward bump from the initial no-code
expirations. Let's check again in a few years and see how it looks.

> How about these (from AH0A):
>
> Total new licenses from March 00 to Dec 01 (sum of all months from
> April 00 to Dec 01): 33,856
>
> Total new licenses from July 98 to March 00 (sum of all months for
> period of same length before April 00): 27,935
>
> Difference: 5,921 in 21 months

That's about a 20% difference in growth rate, Jim, which isn't exactly
negligible. And, by the way, it shows that the effect of the 10-year
no-code expirations IS offsetting increased growth in new licenses.
Again, the effects are relatively small and short-term and shouldn't
be used to predict long-term trends.

> > And to the
> >degree the no-code debate has diverted attention, aren't those on BOTH
> >sides who allowed themselves to be diverted from more important issues
> >equally to blame?
>
> Not as I see it.

Those who neglect the important issues to focus on promoting no-code
are to be blamed for their neglect, but those who neglect the
important issues to focus on fighting no-code are not? That makes no
sense.

Jon

3556. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:12:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n0qv01rc8@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33067

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C600C24.58B995E4@worldnet.att.net...
> I landed here about 4 and a half years ago thinking I'd get involved in a
friendly rational discourse
> on the future of ham radio. What I found instead was the sort bile
regurgitation of percieved wrongs

Kind of like what you post every day.

> from the distant past that has lasted to this day. I never ever expected
to get such responses from
> other hams, and for the most part have concluded that almost all of them
who did so have very minimal
> involvement in ham radio anyway, most being the "victims" of all ham
radio's hazing rituals (hehe).

It would be interesting to see how you reached that conclusion, but then you
are known to stretch things just a tad.

3557. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:22:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n1dk01smu@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33069

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6017CB.E7A7ADD1@worldnet.att.net...

> The operative word is "Unwilling". History shows the FCC often
> ignores evidence it doesn't find to have support from the affected. In
short they
> may have concluded that no ham radio organization cared that much, so they
might as
> well rule in favor of the one who did show up with a position. They may
not have
> regarded any evicence as "relavent". They have in the past made ARS rules
on
> request when they were shown no reason not to do so and no opposition
surfaced.
> Usually that was at the request of ARRL instead of NCI, but that's
history.
> Evidently ARRL has lost it's position of influence with the FCC.

So the ARRL should be the only organization that should have influence with
the FCC? Or is it that you don't want any group influencing the FCC unless
they share your opinion?

3558. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:30:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n1si01tdh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33070

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C60117E.1DD291EA@worldnet.att.net...

> I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
> they didn't stay in ham radio very long.

They probably thought that ham radio would actually be exciting. After an hour on the HF bands, they discovered how boring ninety percent of the conversations are and never came back.

3559. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:32:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n21501tkd@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33071

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6018F9.4C535824@worldnet.att.net...
> You're pretty good at guessing wrong. I'm not dedicated to the
> preservation of Morse code testing either. What I know is that
> hams who undestand the communications value of radiotelegraphy will
> believe that testing is needed to continue to keep the mode available in
> ham radio. The NoCode tech experience has shown that
> darn few will bother to ever learn it if not a testing requirement.
> When code testing is gone, widespread qualification within ARS follows.

This has to be a record. It's the quickest that you've ever contradicted
yourself within one post.

3560. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:32:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5F0C0A.E10E6C00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33068

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The NoCode tech experience has shown that
> darn few will bother to ever learn it if not a testing requirement.

Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
I don't hear any 6m or 2m CW around here.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3561. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:37:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n2af01tvl@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33073

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C600912.13C3A895@worldnet.att.net...

> > Walking is very much a part of our national transportation
infrastructure,
> > Carl. The governments of the world build sidewalks for darn good
reason.
>
> Poor Carl. So myopic he failed to notice the evolution of the shoe.

Not everyone wares high heels like you.

3562. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 22:55:59 UTC
From: Tim Randa <randas@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3C5F117F.89884DB8@mindspring.com>
Source record: 33072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

So does everyone who disagrees with you have a "serious character flaw" ??
You need to take a look in the mirror on this one friend.
de Kï¿½FL

Vito wrote:

> Zoran Brlecic wrote:
> >
> > Vito wrote:
> >
> > > CW was a necessary evil left over from
> > > the days before modulation was invented.
> >
> > And ham radio is probably a necessary evil left over from the days before
> > cellphones and Internet were invented?
> >
> No, it's a hobby, and CW is no longer needed to enjoy it. We are allowed
> to do things that could QRM others -things others are not allowed to do
> - so it is reasonable for governments to require us to have know how to
> avoid that. It *was* reasonable for governments to require CW when that
> was the only way to communicate; but that day is long past.
>
> There is nothing wrong with *enjoying* CW for it's own sake but it is a
> serious character flaw to feel that everybody should suffer every
> discomfort that we did.

3563. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:00:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5F1293.1EFC5D2A@uci.edu>
Source record: 33076

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The NoCode tech experience has shown that
> > darn few will bother to ever learn it if not a testing requirement.

> Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?

Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
question, doncha think Cecil?

3564. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:15:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204181544.12921.00000850@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33074

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past the
>end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every mile
>too?

That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with Part
15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3565. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:18:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5F16CE.ACF166D5@uci.edu>
Source record: 33086

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past the
> >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every mile
> >too?

> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with Part
> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.

I believe you. I really do.

Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)

3566. RE: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:19:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204181933.12921.00000851@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33077

From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net

>I doubt that "carrier squelch" folks would ever be affected
>by the increase in the noise floor,

There probably would be some effect, Hans. We have all heard signals that are just making it into the repeater. Even a few dB of noise would make a big difference to reception.

> but would be concerned that weak signal modes (eme, ms, etc.) should enjoy
> some protection.

I agree; a few dB of noise there would make a lot of difference to their operation. Fortunately, the rules do give them absolute protection from broadband devices. To date, I have heard no reports about interference to narrowband users from amateur spread spectrum operation. I have only a few reports of interference from Part 15 SS operation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3567. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:19:45 UTC
From: Jim <kg4enu@carolina.rr.com>
Message-ID: <ic5u5u83qjo1n13go4299euoud0svjnf6f@4ax.com>
Source record: 33075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

who gives a S---t about flaws...do away with the code..but make the
tests more than a breeze.

Jim-kg4enu

On Mon, 04 Feb 2002 17:55:59 -0500, Tim Randa <randas@mindspring.com>
wrote:

>So does everyone who disagrees with you have a "serious character flaw" ??
>You need to take a look in the mirror on this one friend.
>de Kï¿½FL
>
>Vito wrote:
>
>> Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>> >
>> > Vito wrote:
>> >
>> > > CW was a necessary evil left over from
>> > > the days before modulation was invented.
>> >
>> > And ham radio is probably a necessary evil left over from the days before
>> > cellphones and Internet were invented?
>> >
>> No, it's a hobby, and CW is no longer needed to enjoy it. We are allowed
>> to do things that could QRM others -things others are not allowed to do
>> - so it is reasonable for governments to require us to have know how to
>> avoid that. It *was* reasonable for governments to require CW when that
>> was the only way to communicate; but that day is long past.
>>
>> There is nothing wrong with *enjoying* CW for it's own sake but it is a
>> serious character flaw to feel that everybody should suffer every
>> discomfort that we did.

3568. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:24:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204182419.12921.00000852@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33078

From: Vito vito@crosslink.net

>> > I also believe that the written tests should be made more rigorous again.
>> > They are trivial to pass, right now.

>Second that

The current spate of ham exams are no more easy to pass than the exams I took in 1963. They would be trivial to you, perhaps, after years of hamming, but as a brand new newcomer, you would see them a lot differently.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3569. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:25:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204182556.12921.00000853@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33079

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

> it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.

>You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to happen?

Every ham who has predicted the self-destruction of ham radio since its
inception has been wrong.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3570. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:26:20 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.04.18.26.20.84125.7005@arrl.org>
Source record: 33080

On Sun, 03 Feb 2002 17:37:07 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>,
>>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
>>>
>>>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
>>>>outside of amateur radio?
>>>>
>>> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance
>>> must have applicability outside amateur radio?
>>
>>When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
>>ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you
>>really think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its
>>application within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term
>>"radio art"? Why didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the
>>amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of his own
>>art"?
>>
> I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio.

I was asking what you think the FCC's intent was. I'll rephrase the
question. Do you think the FCC feels that amateurs should be making
contributions to the state of the art that have applicability to radio
services other than the ARS?

Jon

3571. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:26:31 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <B88DAECD7F045846.AB6E5E2B15A1BE2B.A5CD29C13AE67C41@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33081

On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 09:32:37 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Here in the Dallas area, as often as I've listened or been on 70cm (which,
>granted has been a small percentage of time), I have not heard a lot of
>activity.

I can't really speak for the <440MHz stuff, since my only non-FM
receiver is pretty lousy, but I've spotted a fair amount of activity
in the repeater portion around here. You'd probably hear more if any
of us could ever track down N4MSE and find out what it takes to get
the IRLP access codes for his repeater :)

There have been nights when I've sat around spinning the dial with a
good antenna and found at least as much activity as on 2m FM.

> Others in this area have made the same observation. This,
>however, was prior to the widening use of technologies such as IRLP. I
>wonder what the band-use is in other areas of the country. Are there
>technologies on the horizon that will call for an even greater appeal to the
>70cm band?

Personally, I'd kind of like to see APRS move to 70cm. I use 2m quite
a bit, so it would be nice to not desense the APRS receiver every time
I key up. It would also reduce the antenna requirements (a 70cm 1/4
wave is easier to disguise as a cellphone antenna) and probably cut
through the downtown areas better.

>While not a valid "argument" to defend 70cm, how would you go about making
>the band more appealing? By that I mean, usually, new hams first get the 2M
>handheld, then the 2M mobile, then we hear of them shopping around for a
>dual-band mobile.

Well, I went straight from a 200mW 2m HT to a Yaesu dual-band mobile
to a TM-G707 and a TH-D7A. IMO, with as little VHF/UHF packet as
there is in this area, how about killing two birds with one stone and
setting up a 70cm packet BBS or two?

>More times than I care to reveal, the typical response to
>them is: "Why do you want to spend the money on a dual-band--there's nothing
>on 440?" We can't, of course, say to the FCC, "we are going to be needing
>that space." 70cm often comes under threat and I think (due to my operating
>area) that it is because we don't use the band that much.

You should be hearing a lot more traffic on 442.425 (DARC's 440
machine) now that it's working again, and the RAILS repeaters are
moderately active. N5IUF's IRLP machine on 444.150 is usually

connected to the main reflector, and usually active several times a
day.

Of course, none of this addresses anything below 440MHz, but then, I
sometimes get the impression there are UHF-active hams out there who
don't even realize we have that chunk of bandwidth.

>I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm
>being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and this
>area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of the
>70cm band where you are?

I've been through a couple of areas where it was dead opposite;
everything was on 70cm, with almost no 2m activity other than the
occasional convoy passing through chattering on 2m simplex.
Strangely, these also seem to be the areas where 6m is quite popular.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3572. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:31:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204183136.12921.00000854@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33082

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > Yes but when it comes to deciding who gets what, your attitude will
>> come
>> > out in spades. "Hey, those legacy modes must go anyway..."

>> That's simply untrue Dick.

> Thne archives will decide that.

Perhaps he is telling you that he has changed his mind.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3573. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:35:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204183522.12921.00000855@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33083

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>However, it's still not inherently
>"intrusion," since such devices are authorized in the (shared)
>band with certain limitations.

I agree that it is not intrusion, but "share" is a word that applies to co-primary users. Part 15 operation is permitted in the band subject to an absolute provision that it not cause harmful interference. When I was taught to share as a kid, my mom never would have considered that an acceptable way to share with my sister. :-)

>First, I believe that Ed has personally been involved in a number
>of cases of resolving interference from unlicensed Part 15 devices
>to amateur systems ... he's probably better qualified by direct
>experience to comment on this ...

Other than power-line cases, darn few. I can think of no more than about half a dozen. All but two have had reasonable outcomes -- so far.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3574. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:37:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204183701.12921.00000856@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33084

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>When code testing is gone, widespread qualification within ARS follows.

In what way will amateurs become qualified if code testing is removed?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3575. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:39:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204183906.12921.00000857@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33085

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>After an
>hour on the HF bands, they discovered how boring ninety percent of the
>conversations are and never came back.

I have not found 90% of the conversations I have had on ham radio to be boring.

Perhaps you and I are doing something differently in our operating or social techniques.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3576. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:40:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204184055.12921.00000858@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33087

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.

Which FCC requirements to you believe that Cecil does not agree with?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3577. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:42:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204184240.12921.00000859@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33088

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone
>who
>had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough
>interest to begin the licensing process.

How many of the FCC Commissioners have had enough interest to begin the
licensing process?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3578. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:44:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204184431.12921.00000860@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33089

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
>is a stinking pile of crap.

Others have applied for Amateur frequencies on many occasions. Some of them
have even been given access to them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3579. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:45:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204184547.12921.00000861@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33090

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
>> is a stinking pile of crap.
>
> Sorta like your attitude and your reading ability. That's not what he
>said at all, unless you want to invite all comers with no test involved.

What test is required to operate on 220-222 MHz? For that matter, what test is required to operate on 14.020 MHz?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3580. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:47:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3n6p2nrn1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33091

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C5F6F84.CFD2C945@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C5F47DC.D6DF27D3@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C5F2D99.22054E54@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Bert Craig wrote:
> > > > > > > Amateur radio is open to all
> > > > > > > those who are willing to meet the requirements set forth. All
> > > > > > > others need not apply.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What you don't understand is that the citizens who do not apply
have
> > > > > > just as much right to try to influence ARS policy as a licensed
ham
> > > > > does.
> > > > >
> > > > > And only the requirements that you agree with are valid. We see.
> > > >
> > > > In the game of debate, it is always the position that the opposing
> > > > view is invalid...else why try to gain support for the position one
> > > > favors/supports.
> > >
> > > The huge flaw in your argument is the almost zero number of non-hams
who
> > ever
> > > comment on ham radio rulemaking proposals. Usually those who do are
> > commercial
> > > interests.
> >
> > That's not a flaw at all...if it is, it is a flaw in YOUR
> > ability to gain support for YOUR viewpoint.
>
> So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of
anyone who
```

> had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had
enough
> interest to begin the licensing process.

Who said that? The FCC is free to take input from anyone. How much
credence the FCC gives any one person's opionion is the FCC's decision.

>They (FCC) should listen to those folks for
> advice over hams of long experience?

Same comment as before. If you (Dick) want to have
the FCC only accept input from licensed hams, why don't you
file an RM with the FCC to accomplish that?

>Right, Bill, just as right as you always are.

Glad you agree :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3581. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:48:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204184847.12921.00000863@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33092

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.

If one meets one of those requirements, the FCC won't care one whit whether
they loved it or hated it, or whether they had to work hard past any reasonable
expectation or passed it with no thought at all. Meeting the requirements is
the sole regulatory responsibility.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3582. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:51:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204185110.12921.00000864@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33093

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>If you're really dumb enough to believe that FCC has not always understood
>the
>relationship of the rich history, trdition and spirit of the hobby as crucial
>to
>our selfpolicing and used that knowledge to formulate our rules, you are far
>more ignorant than I ever realized, and frankly I knew it was bad already.

Perhaps the government has always felt that the traditions of Amateur Radio
were strong enough to survive on their own. Do you think that the FCC should
legislate our traditions?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3583. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:55:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gr10mw7.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33094

On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 02:45:04 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
>horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."

There are times that the horse will get you there faster than
mid-town traffic will....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

(Who hasn't ridden a horse in 45 years)

3584. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:57:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204185759.12921.00000867@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33095

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Maybe we
>should get NCI to force the FCC to quickly do something about the 40m mess.

No, get NCI to do something about the petition for 5.7 GHz! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3585. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-04 23:59:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204185942.12921.00000868@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33096

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Yup, sure is funny how at one point NCI is dismissed as
>having NO influence to the end result while other times
>we are painted as influence peddlers with sufficient
>pursuasive powers to "gain sympathy for their (NCI)
>point." :-) :-)

As long as NCI looks bad, either view will do. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3586. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:07:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204190747.09077.00000001@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33097

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>Just out of curiosity, what do you hope will be accomplished by engaging in
>this type of rhetoric?

http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/misc/dnh061700.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3587. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:10:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204191050.09077.00000002@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33098

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>What conclusion were you trying to lead me to Ed? It seemed you were
>trying to lead us away from the opposite conclusion.

W5YI is not anti-ARRL. He, like I, agrees with much that ARRL does and has a few differences of opinion. I didn't expect you to believe that W5YI would never say anything bad about ARRL. If I had thought you might reach that conclusion, I might have been a bit more careful with my words.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3588. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:11:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f24f0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33153

"Jay" <spambotsrnot@allfun.com> wrote in message
news:ihn78.7034$Hb6.531011@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c5dfdcc_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > For what I thought was going on, it doesn't/didn't much matter what he
was
> > doing, Jim, or where. It sounded to me like "Jay" (isn't Jay really
> > Steven?) was impressed with the gimmees.
>
> No I am not Kim, I am me and Steve is him, but not me?? And I was not
> impressed with any gimmes, whatever they are. (see below)
>

Well, that's a good thing. Remember, you had quickly decided that I "do
nothing" for the ARS. Probably as quickly as I decided that you were
impressed more with the gimmees than the service.

>
> While it's a fact of life that
> > most people won't do something without getting something for it, I would
> > hope it's not the primary motivation--as that post sounded. Whether it
was
> > meant to sound tongue-in-cheek, it did not come through that way to me.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
>
> First let me say this. I am me and not any other person(s) that Len
> thinks I am. What he thinks is becoming increasingly important only to
> him. His type of antagonist is the prime reason I post behind anonymous
> addresses. His type is the cyber-stalker that we read more and more
> each day. His type is, well, very scary.
>

I don't know anything about what you're talking about, above (and I think
I'm just as glad). How Len came into the conversation, I don't know.

>
> Anyway, I read his post were he accuses he of being someone I am not.
>

I don't know that I did. Or, if I saw it I paid it no mind. CB war kinda
stuff interests me here as much as it does on the radio... ;)

>
> Since I like this sort of challenge, I went to QRZ.com, looked up the
> callsign in question and sent off an e-mail along with a copy of Len's
> post to my alleged other self. About 45 minutes later, I received what
> can only be viewed as a novelette. 4 pages of pure unadulterated
> dislike bordering on what can only be construed as hate. KF2TI went on
> and on about the EVIL DOER, Leonard Anderson, Len's fascination with the
> 3rd Reich and Len's insistence that every anonymous poster is him. He
> left his phone number with the comment "we can have some real fun with
> the geezer, if you're interested, give me a call"
>

You've far more time than I.

>
> I called and what he proposed was that we are going to test Len's
> ability as the defective detective of RRAP. When the next post came
> through involving me, I would call KF2TI and send him an e-mail with
> verbiage, he would post it and wait till it appeared in my ISP's
> newsgroups and then I would respond. So to Len, it would appear I am
> responding to myself through both "screen names" thus allowing Len the
> exacting pleasure of posting his findings to the group, thus proving him
> right and me wrong.
>

I'm not reading the whole thing above, but I see Len's name mentioned again.
You know you started out talking about Steve, right? :)

>
> This all took place with Kim's post and from start to finish, took less
> than 10 minutes. I e-mailed the words, KF2TI posted, about 4-5 minutes
> later it appeared on my earthlink news and I immediately responded.
>

You sound quite proficient at playing those kind of games. I'll take your
word for it.

>
> The headers are all there for all to see and yes, there is a
> commonality, which in the scheme of things means nothing. There is 1
> difference that proves categorically, Len doesn't know his ass from a
> whole in the ground. It's there, see for yourselves. Better yet, have
> Len explain his comments, I doubt he could to anyones satisfaction.
>

Does someone really have to go through that much work to tell than someone
doesn't know their ass from a hole in the ground? ;)

>
> In closing, the one comment, actually there were quite a few, that
> caught my eyes in KF2TI's diatribe against Len was"I was hoping that
> 2001 would be the year he disappears permanently, hopefully 2002 will be
> the year someone drops a house on him like they did to his sister, the
> wicked witch of the east". I guess the 2 of them are less than close?

>
> 73, Jay from Westchester County, NY FN30cw
>
> Still me at least that what it says on the name tags in my shorts ;-)
>
> --
> 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet

Now, that's what I call going off on another tangent altogether...LOL

Kim W5TIT

3589. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:13:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204191300.09077.00000003@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33099

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?

>Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
>question, doncha think Cecil?

Perhaps Cecil was trying to point out that all amateurs can operate CW above 30 MHz. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3590. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:13:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5F23C0.1E317A88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33151

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
>
> Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
> question, doncha think Cecil?

Are there plenty of CW hams below 30MHz? Exactly! Are there plenty of
CW hams above 30MHz? _____________
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3591. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:14:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f2581_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33154

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203233142.24009.00000039@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3C5DBE21.96DBA522@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> >> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
> >
> >I'll bet Jim posted more than twice as many words as I.
> >--
>
> Kim is in a virtual 4th place, and I'll bet she posted fewer words than
> anyone else in the top 10! That's what happens when your typical
> response is "ROFLMAO" or a one-liner agreeing with something
> someone else has said. In other words, nothing of any substance!
>
> I'd like to see some stats on volume of text (in words or kilobytes)
> posted by all users over the past ten years.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

ROFLMAO!!

Kim W5TIT

3592. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:14:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f25a8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33155

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203233142.24009.00000039@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3C5DBE21.96DBA522@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> [405] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 12.7%
> >> [261] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.2%
> >
> >I'll bet Jim posted more than twice as many words as I.
> >--
>
> Kim is in a virtual 4th place, and I'll bet she posted fewer words than
> anyone else in the top 10! That's what happens when your typical
> response is "ROFLMAO" or a one-liner agreeing with something
> someone else has said. In other words, nothing of any substance!
>
> I'd like to see some stats on volume of text (in words or kilobytes)
> posted by all users over the past ten years.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

ROFLMAO!!

Kim W5TIT (I oughta sit here and do this about 60 more times...LOL)

3593. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:15:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204191523.09077.00000004@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33100

From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)

>Now this is actually an interesting question. Perhaps we can play a little
>game
>(For amusement only.) since you seem to be in a "semantic" mood this evening.

When you know Cecil as well as we do, you will then understand just how funny
that is! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3594. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:17:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f2636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33156

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020203233142.24009.00000040@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3c5d453e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Yep, you got it. Larry's attitude about hating CW and being extremely
angry
> >at having had to learn it to join the "higher class" (thought of by Larry
in
> >the wrong perspective, of course) is blatantly obvious is his meandering
> >expression of opinions on the subject. I've mentioned that to him, but
he's
> >in a state of denial. ;)
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I see. You get something totally wrong, I disagree with you and
> correct you, and then you claim that *I* am in denial?
>

Then you see nothing at all, Larry. A) I have nothing wrong, and B) You haven't corrected me at all. That's your delusion of grandeur telling you that. I, on the other hand, felt no correcting at all.

>
> Well, if it
> makes you feel better to think that, Kim, then go right ahead...but
> you're nobody who can judge my state of mind on any issue.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, I do think that. And, yeah, I can judge your state of mind. You just don't like what I judge of it. So, likewise, you're free to think however you'd like and you're nobody...period.

Kim W5TIT

3595. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:17:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204191747.09077.00000006@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33152

From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)

>>The FCC
>>must consider what is best for the country, not what is best for the
>>members of the ARS.
>
>Hmm, I don't quite agree...but I'll be damned if I can come up with a good
>reason why. You ever had one of those? :-)

The FCC is chartered to serve the public interest. I am sure they understand
the reason why. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3596. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:29:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f291b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33158

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204103019.16518.00001427@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >I passed that same 5 wpm and the full general 25 years ago,
> >yet didn't get the HF access because of the backwardness
> >of the rules until recently.
> >
>
> You didnt get there because you were either to Lazy or Stupid to meet the
> standards at that time. Just love how these Clowns try to blame there
failures
> on someone or something else.

Could you at least rise above sounding so ignorant when you post stuff?
There are stories out there about people from Louisiana that you could bring
true. :o

Kim W5TIT

3597. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:31:26 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <yJF78.10927$zT.923125@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33157

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204191523.09077.00000004@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)
>
> >Now this is actually an interesting question. Perhaps we can play a
little
> >game
> >(For amusement only.) since you seem to be in a "semantic" mood this
evening.
>
> When you know Cecil as well as we do, you will then understand just how
funny
> that is! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Roger, Roger.

Small minds discuss people.
Average minds discuss events.
Brilliant minds discuss ideas.
Twisted minds discuss radio.

Then there is Cecil. :-))

Dick N BK

3598. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:33:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a3n9540e58@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33160

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204182556.12921.00000853@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> > it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.
>
> >You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to
happen?
>
> Every ham who has predicted the self-destruction of ham radio since its
> inception has been wrong.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ham radio will always be around in one form or another, but it will never hold the appeal that it once did. For tinkerers and technical hobbiests, the paradigm shift happened in the late 70s with the emergence of the home personal computer.

3599. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 00:33:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f2a1b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33159

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5EB0C5.BC0C25E@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of
anyone who
> > had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had
enough
> > interest to begin the licensing process.
>
> Because those people own the public property just as much as hams do?
> Because every one of those people is a potential ham?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Because their US Citizens? While it would never happen ('least I don't think it would), if enough people "who had never had any involvement in ham radio" decided to write in opposition to ham radio, I doubt we'd find ourselves just casually observing how unimportant those folks are. John Q Public is why we *do* so much public service....duh

Kim W5TIT

3600. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 01:12:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C5F318C.F3DE8AE2@uci.edu>
Source record: 33162

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
> >
> > Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
> > question, doncha think Cecil?
>
> Are there plenty of CW hams below 30MHz? Exactly! Are there plenty of
> CW hams above 30MHz? _____________

Since when is "plently" an exact number?

3601. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 01:12:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c5f3351_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33161

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:B88DAECD7F045846.AB6E5E2B15A1BE2B.A5CD29C13AE67C41@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 2 Feb 2002 09:32:37 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Here in the Dallas area, as often as I've listened or been on 70cm
(which,
> >granted has been a small percentage of time), I have not heard a lot of
> >activity.
>
> I can't really speak for the <440MHz stuff, since my only non-FM
> receiver is pretty lousy, but I've spotted a fair amount of activity
> in the repeater portion around here. You'd probably hear more if any
> of us could ever track down N4MSE and find out what it takes to get
> the IRLP access codes for his repeater :)
>

Yes, I did mention that 444.150 (IRLP) is busy. What times of day are you
hearing the activity, Joe? I usually only get to listen around late at
night. And, like I said, I scanned most of the weekend to see what was
going on and didn't hear much.

>
> There have been nights when I've sat around spinning the dial with a
> good antenna and found at least as much activity as on 2m FM.
>

That would be a good thing! Maybe it's location. I am out here in Forney,
and it may be that I am just not going to hear much. I have a quad up at
50'.

> >
> > Others in this area have made the same observation. This,
> >however, was prior to the widening use of technologies such as IRLP. I
> >wonder what the band-use is in other areas of the country. Are there
> >technologies on the horizon that will call for an even greater appeal to
the
> >70cm band?
>
> Personally, I'd kind of like to see APRS move to 70cm. I use 2m quite
> a bit, so it would be nice to not desense the APRS receiver every time
> I key up. It would also reduce the antenna requirements (a 70cm 1/4
> wave is easier to disguise as a cellphone antenna) and probably cut
> through the downtown areas better.
>

I like the 2M APRS frequency. Desensing isn't so much a problem though, is it Joe? Because it's not like you're not going to transmit again in a few bits...LOL

> >
> >While not a valid "argument" to defend 70cm, how would you go about making
> >the band more appealing? By that I mean, usually, new hams first get the 2M
> >handheld, then the 2M mobile, then we hear of them shopping around for a
> >dual-band mobile.
>
> Well, I went straight from a 200mW 2m HT to a Yaesu dual-band mobile
> to a TM-G707 and a TH-D7A. IMO, with as little VHF/UHF packet as
> there is in this area, how about killing two birds with one stone and
> setting up a 70cm packet BBS or two?
>

I've got the D700A, love it! I went from a talkie to a mono-band mobile, to a dual-band mobile. Hey, there used to be a lot more packet from what I hear. I never liked what I saw of packet so didn't do it much. But, I also don't care for what I've seen of PSK31. Guess I'm just a true, diehard mic jock...LOL I heartell most of the packet stations have gone by the wayside.

> >
> >More times than I care to reveal, the typical response to
> >them is: "Why do you want to spend the money on a dual-band--there's nothing
> >on 440?" We can't, of course, say to the FCC, "we are going to be needing
> >that space." 70cm often comes under threat and I think (due to my operating
> >area) that it is because we don't use the band that much.
>
> You should be hearing a lot more traffic on 442.425 (DARC's 440
> machine) now that it's working again, and the RAILS repeaters are
> moderately active. N5IUF's IRLP machine on 444.150 is usually
> connected to the main reflector, and usually active several times a
> day.
>
> Of course, none of this addresses anything below 440MHz, but then, I
> sometimes get the impression there are UHF-active hams out there who
> don't even realize we have that chunk of bandwidth.
>
> >I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm
> >being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and this
> >area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of the
> >70cm band where you are?
>
> I've been through a couple of areas where it was dead opposite;

> everything was on 70cm, with almost no 2m activity other than the
> occasional convoy passing through chattering on 2m simplex.
> Strangely, these also seem to be the areas where 6m is quite popular.
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

You mean in Dallas? Hmmmmmm, I'll have to take a *lot* more time to
listen... Thanks

Kim W5TIT

3602. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 01:43:07 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C5F386E.463F70B4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33163

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> W5YI is not anti-ARRL.
> He, like I, agrees with much that ARRL does and has a
> few differences of opinion.

Howw many major differences of opinion does it take to be anti-ARRL? Let us not forget, contrary to NCI claims, W5YI takes personal responsibility for swinging the FCC over to NoCode HF by an eleventh hour maneuver of the VEC's, led by himself of course. W5YI also led the charge to shut down W1AW from broadcasting bulletins and code practice. I can think of no other person other than K1MAN or W2NSD who would more like to have their way with the ARRL for all of their efforts to submarine his efforts to make a living off of the US ARS.

73,
Clay N4AOX

3603. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 01:58:16 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C5F3C33.754ED490@attbi.com>
Source record: 33164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Vito wrote:

> There is nothing wrong with *enjoying* CW for it's own sake but it is a
> serious character flaw to feel that everybody should suffer every
> discomfort that we did.

"Suffer", "discomfort"... I remember when I took a course in ham-radio as well as the lessons in Morse code, even though it's been 24 years now; my experience has been an enjoyable one, so I am sorry, but I can't relate to your pain and suffering. By the same token, shouldn't we eliminate any testing because it causes discomfort to some people? After all, electronics theory is a necessary evil from the time factory made rigs and antennas were not being made.

73 ..... Zoran WA7AA

3604. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:13:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204211326.05154.00001872@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33165

In article <20020204072555.19893.00001046@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>(WA6VSE wrote):

>>>That, along with the rift, contention, and class warfare in the
>>>amateur community that Morse testing has caused for at least
>>>as long as I've been licensed ...
>
>>You see what isn't really there, Carl.
>
>Oh, it is there, from a small, but very vocal minority.

Well said.

>That tends to make it
>appear to e a lot larger problem than it really is.

Exactly. Some folks make a big deal out of what is actually a minor problem at most, while ignoring much more important ones. That's my point.

> I have talked with
>hundreds of hams over the years and from those conversations, I believe that
>most hams do not consider the code-test issue to be in the top 10 major
>problems facing amateur radio today.
>
I'd say it's maybe - MAYBE - #10 on a good day. Way behind stuff like CC&Rs, RFI, intruders on the ham bands, lack of publicity. and many others.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3605. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:13:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020204211327.05154.00001873@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33166

In article <20020204073639.19893.00001048@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>If amateurs' state is at least several generations of technology
>>"behind the curve", relative to what Ed and I have refered to as
>>"real radio," where is the value? How are amateurs "advancing
>>the radio art" if they're so far behind the rest of the radio world?
>
>I understand the point that Jim is making, and I agree that my use of "real"
>radio was inappropriate and misleading.

Spoken like a gentleman, sir!

> Some of the value of Amateur Radio
>is
>IN its simplicity, and the fact that modest stations exists throughout the
>country has value. Seeing as our FCC knows the nature of the Amateur Radio
>Service and continues to authorize it makes our service, just as it is, an
>important part of radio.

Exactly. "Advancing the radio art" includes all sorts of things, even ones that
are
not of immediate commercial or military use.
>
>That doesn't mean, however, that the point you have made -- and that the FCC
>has repeatedly made -- that the technical contributions of the Amateur Radio
>Service are an important part of what justifies our existence is not also
>true.

Agreed - all sorts of advances and contributions can be made by hams. But hams
will
NOT be motivated to experiment by being ridiculed.
>
>And with the majority of amateur operation being behind the technological
>times, Amateur Radio is not making as much contribution as it could.

Who says we are "behind the times" for what we hams are doing?

> Hard to
>say where the line is best drawn, Carl, because there is value in so much of
>Amateur operation, from the OOK CW op to those developing spread-spectrum
>systems.

Agreed again!
>

>I think part of our "disagreement" here is that, both real and imagined,
>those
>whose personal interests are on one direction tend to demean the other
>interests, or trivialize them, or at least be seen as doing so. I didn't
>intend to do that at all, although I see that my choice of words could easily
>be seen as doing that.

Understood.
>
>One of the finest things about Amateur Radio is that we are each free to
>choose
>our path and make that part of Amateur Radio better.

Exactly - but only if we have room to do so.
>
>>Your statement is sort of like saying that by becoming a good
>>horseman one is "advancing the state of the art of transportation."
>
>Walking is very much a part of our national transportation infrastructure,
>Carl. The governments of the world build sidewalks for darn good reason.

Bingo.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3606. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:25:06 UTC
From: kb0pyo <kb0pyo@redred.com>
Message-ID: <3C5F4282.A4704511@redred.com>
Source record: 33167
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Take rec.radio.swap off the list unless you are selling something!!!!!!!

Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > There is nothing wrong with *enjoying* CW for it's own sake but it is a
> > serious character flaw to feel that everybody should suffer every
> > discomfort that we did.
>
> "Suffer", "discomfort"... I remember when I took a course in ham-radio as well
> as the lessons in Morse code, even though it's been 24 years now; my experience
> has been an enjoyable one, so I am sorry, but I can't relate to your pain and
> suffering. By the same token, shouldn't we eliminate any testing because it
> causes discomfort to some people? After all, electronics theory is a necessary
> evil from the time factory made rigs and antennas were not being made.
>
> 73 ..... Zoran WA7AA

3607. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:42:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5F46A9.758B10AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33169

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Then there is Cecil. :-))

Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3608. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:43:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3ngup$15c$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33168

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6010BA.5851449C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget
the
> > > way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
> > > only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
> > > club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
> > > have gone quite differently.
> >
> > You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
> > didn't want to do?
>
> At the very least it would have prevented NCI from being the ONLY group
that
> showed up with an opinion on the subject.

You mean the ARRL didn't offer any opinion?

> Who knows, there may have been some
> other workable solution to the medical waiver problem. As it was, there
was
> no pressing reason to consider anything else.

Where's the smiley and/or the IMHO?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3609. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:48:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3nhfq$i54$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33170

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204211326.05154.00001872@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <20020204072555.19893.00001046@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
> > I have talked with
> >hundreds of hams over the years and from those conversations, I believe
that
> >most hams do not consider the code-test issue to be in the top 10 major
> >problems facing amateur radio today.
> >
> I'd say it's maybe - MAYBE - #10 on a good day. Way behind stuff
> like CC&Rs, RFI, intruders on the ham bands, lack of publicity. and many
> others.

Which is why, if asked, most hams would NOT be opposed to
ending the code test requirement or they would have no
position pro or con. Translation, the majority of hams do
not oppose the ending of code testing and, while they may not
be actively involved in trying to end code testing, they simple
don't care at all about it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3610. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 02:49:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C5F482A.9A74F2AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33171

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
> > >
> > > Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
> > > question, doncha think Cecil?
> >
> > Are there plenty of CW hams below 30MHz? Exactly! Are there plenty of
> > CW hams above 30MHz? _____________
>
> Since when is "plenty" an exact number?

"Plenty" is an accurate word for the number of CW hams below 30MHz.
From Webster's: "exactly - accurately"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3611. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 03:17:37 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <l9l78.11560$l5.923830@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick, I had the opportunity to test some gear for radiated immunity. I was running 3 volts per meter (not a whale of a lot at VHF - heck, cell phones can nail you with 60 volts per meter in the noggin) when at around 219 MHz, the picture on the monitor began to tear. The test was in an anechoic chamber, 3 volts per meter, 30% modulated AM. I stopped the test at the problem frequency to observe and try a different monitor (the monitor was NOT part of the equipment being tested but was hooked to that equipment). Before I killed the generator, the monitor died. Completely. We had to get a new monitor. Some of this electronic gear is not very immune to RF. It can be a crapshot.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:sp978.8268$zT.682196@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Arnie Macy wrote:
> >
> > > "Aaron H. Voobner" quoted in part **and snipped by me > >
> > >
> > > Wrong Mr. Underwood. We, as amateurs, should *never* install anything
> at
> > > anyone's home. Once we do that, we then accept responsibility for
> further
> > > interference (and further cost if it doesn't work). "That guy put
> something
> > > on my TV and now it doesn't work right" We can tell them where to buy
> > > ferrite chokes or high pass filters (for example), and can advise them
> that
> > > this might help with the problem, but that is as far as I believe we
> should
> > > go to "help" them. I also find it extremely hard to believe that 100
> watts
> > > would cause interference to *any* modern appliance (especially mobile)
> A
> > > crock if you ask me. I typically run about 80 watts to a G5RV through
> a low
> > > pass filter and am yet to have *any* complaints from neighbors in the
> three
> > > plus years I have been running my amateur equipment adjacent to them.
> > >
> > > Arnie -

> > > KT4ST
> > >
> > > www.qsl.net/kt4st
> > > Home of Walt's World on the web
> > >
> > > "SideBand" <ab8lr@csotbs.org> wrote in message
> news:3C5CEEB4.9020002@csotbs.org...
> > I run 100 watts to a G5RV in the apartment building, without a lowpass
> > filter, and have yet to have an interference complaint as well. And yes,
> > the neighbors know I'm a HAM, and they know that if they DO have an
> > interference problem, to drop me a note so we can determine if it's me
> or
> > something else.
> >
> > -SSB
> >
>
> > --
> > 73 de AB8LR, Chris
> >
>
> I run in an apartment complex as well up to 150 watts. Chris, touch lamps
> are notorious and do not make much of a case for much of anything. The
> only thing I have gotten into is a car stereo of all things; giving it the
> whumph with SSB or big volume swings with CW was almost fun. Truthfully,
> I think the owner would have liked to be able to do it himself much like
> the guy who blew a coupling cap in the amp and invented fuzz guitar.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>
>

3612. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 03:50:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gr1abkb.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33173

On Mon, 04 Feb 2002 03:14:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Nice regulation. Try putting that in practice. Tell your neighbor
>that he can't use his 2.4Ghz cordless phone because it jams your lan
>(operating under the amateur rules in excess of part 15 - legally) and
>see how far it gets you.

The next step is for me to write him a very polite letter on my
letterhead quoting Part 15 and the penalties for violation thereof
if a reasonable settlement is not reached.

That usually cranks the "let's negotiate" motor over a few turns or
so.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3613. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 03:50:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gr1bdbc.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33174

On Mon, 04 Feb 2002 15:18:38 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:

>> >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past the
>> >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every mile
>> >too?
>
>> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with Part
>> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>
>I believe you. I really do.
>
>Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)

That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.

They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3614. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:03:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C60AB69.5079DC86@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33175

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >So tell us again why FCC would be very interested in the opinions of anyone
> >who
> >had never had any involvment in ham radio, particularly who never had enough
> >interest to begin the licensing process.
>
> How many of the FCC Commissioners have had enough interest to begin the
> licensing process?

Surely you know that has nothing to do with anything. Appointment to a chair at FCC is a political function, and darn few have serious experience in communications. Interest? They are interested enough to look over the staff's reports so they can have some knowledge to use in approving staff decisions. The only ham to ever serve on the FCC was George Sterling.

3615. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:06:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C60ABF1.D9768F3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33176

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
> >> is a stinking pile of crap.
> >
> > Sorta like your attitude and your reading ability. That's not what he
> >said at all, unless you want to invite all comers with no test involved.
>
> What test is required to operate on 220-222 MHz? For that matter, what test is
> required to operate on 14.020 MHz?
>

Bert said that anyone not interested in taking and passing amateur radio tests need not apply. That is correct, but characteristically Carl twisted it all around.

3616. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005018.14739.00000199@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33178

In article <3C5DBB4E.BBE05240@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Somebody once suggested that the Morse code test be replaced by
>a typing test. I can do 65 wpm. How about you?

Cecil:

I'll see your 65 and raise you a quarter. Mavis (that's Ms. Beacon to
you) says I can do 90.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3617. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005018.14739.00000200@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33179

In article <20020203183731.14084.00000826@mb-mt.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>>Uhhhhh Bert, we don't live in a democracy. We live in a republic.
>>Otherwise, you might be drinking hemlock.
>>--
>>cheers, CAM
>
>What's hemlock? I'm always in "learn" mode. :-)

Bert:

Hemlock is what Cecil drinks...it's made out of spoiled grape juice.
He lives in a dry county, and can't get the good stuff!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3618. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005019.14739.00000201@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33177

In article <3c5de3aa_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>Your "others need not apply" (unless they do it your way)
>is a stinking pile of crap.
>

Hey Bert, you'd better listen to Carl now, because he's the NG's
resident expert on "stinking piles of crap!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

3619. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005019.14739.00000202@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33181

In article <3c5de780$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
>governs least governs best." Don't take my
>word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
>in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
>even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
>able to read it.
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Carl:

Why is Bert a "twit?" Just because he doesn't agree with YOU?
I just hope that when Bert read that, he considered the source --
and didn't pay any attention to it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3620. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005020.14739.00000204@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33184

In article <20020204065117.19893.00001037@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
>>but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
>>as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
>>hobbyist, and SWL'ing.
>
>"All the hams," Larry. C'mon. Back when I was a new ham, I came to ham radio
>from that experimenter background, but a number of hams did not.
>
>>None of that happens anymore.
>
>LOL.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Fair enough, I sit corrected. Not "all the hams" I knew when I came in were technically-inclined. Those who were already permanently stuck at Technician class (at the lowest code speed level) certainly didn't impress me with their "technical" knowledge or skill. The were mainly repeater "regulars" with nothing more to offer the ARS than someone to chew the rag with on your way to work. I guess I was a bit more tolerant of them in those days, but I could not understand why they didn't want to explore the world of HF operation, DX'ing, etc. which they could access by merely applying themselves a bit to increasing their CW speed to a dead-slow 13 wpm!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3621. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005020.14739.00000203@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33185

In article <3C5E9930.9F1309A8@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>
>Jeeze, I suppose I otta resent people who didn't have to get smallpox
>vaccinations or worry about polio, or take their driving exam in a
>"stick shift" car, or ... etc. CW was a necessary evil left over from
>the days before modulation was invented. Next you'll be sniviling about
>kids who do not have to walk 10 miles to school every day thru 12 foot
>snow drifts. Do you keep a cow around for milk and bake all your own
>bread too?
>KA3DWW

Howard:

If you're going to whine about code testing requirements, could you at least come up with something a bit more original? All this "10 miles in the snow" crap has been done, over and over again, over the past decade of the code/no-code debate here and on Fidonet. And what, BTW -- is your problem with people who milk cows and bake their own bread? I live in an area with a large Amish community. I pay good money for their home-made bread -- and hope it's always going to be available!

Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll know it, and you won't!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3622. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005021.14739.00000206@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33182

In article <3C5EB381.1A976347@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Yup -- it's Fred's personal problem, to be sure! I'll never forget the
>> way Nancy Kott, WZ8C, cleaned his clock at Dayton '97. If she
>> only had the vision to make FISTS into something other than a
>> club for CW ops to earn meaningless awards, Restructuring may
>> have gone quite differently.
>
>You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
>didn't want to do?

I think they would have stood a pretty good chance, if Nancy had been
able to maintain the momentum she built at Dayton '97, and lead the
FISTS on to an active fight against the movement to reduce/eliminate
code testing requirements. Unfortunately, we'll never get to know what
might have happened.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3623. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005021.14739.00000205@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33183

In article <a3m1g3077d@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>I base this on the fact that I've been reading such postings from you and
>others back to the days of Fidonet. Nothing in your messages indicates that
>you want amateur radio to grow, yet everything shows that you want to hold
>on to worthless, outdated, hazing rituals that serve no purpose other than
>personal enjoyment.

I'm assuming you're not including me in the above, since I don't believe
that the code testing requirement was a worthless, outdated hazing
ritual. I believe that it was a reasonable, rational, and universally
achieveable requirement, which led to the development of a practical,
effective, efficient, and universal communications skill.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3624. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:50:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005022.14739.00000207@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33180

In article <3C5EB476.E0455617@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> No more than what will result anyway. When the tests are so trivial that
>any
>> Freebander who wants can climb on board with the full load of privileges at
>> will, it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.
>
>You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to happen?

Cecil:

You've been denying it for just as long -- but it's happening NOW!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3625. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:56:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050555320.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33186

On 4 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Nice regulation. Try putting that in practice. Tell your neighbor that he
>>can't use his 2.4Ghz cordless phone because it jams your lan (operating under
>>the amateur rules in excess of part 15 - legally) and see how far it gets
>>you.
>
>What did your neighbor say when his cordless telephone interfered with the
>spread-spectrum LAN you put up under Part 97?

I assume that Ed's question is for someone who actually has an operational LAN
because I haven't gotten that far yet.

>So far, I don't think I have more than a handful, and a small handful at that,
>of reports on harmful interference to Amateur operation from intentional
>emitters on Part 15.

Probably because most people don't bother to report it and just simply increase
their power....

3626. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:57:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005728.14739.00000209@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33188

In article <a3ngup$15c$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Where's the smiley and/or the IMHO?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Ok, here goes: IMHO, you're a bloody wanker! 8-)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3627. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:57:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205005728.14739.00000208@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33189

In article <3C5F46A9.758B10AB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.

No, it just means that you're brain-dead from a lack of oxygen, since
you're head is over 37 miles up in the air.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3628. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:57:38 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <FD4EED86F5292765.7734816D4ACE6EDC.CAC9A5BAE2CDCC67@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33187

On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 19:12:45 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Yes, I did mention that 444.150 (IRLP) is busy. What times of day are you
>hearing the activity, Joe? I usually only get to listen around late at
>night. And, like I said, I scanned most of the weekend to see what was
>going on and didn't hear much.

Mostly, the DARC 440 machine's been picking up during the day, when
the 88 gets a little busy. RAILS repeaters nearby are kind of random,
but since the one in Stephenville is, AFAIK, the only UHF repeater
around there, and they have a fair number of hams for a town of
20,000, you mostly hear them or Wichita Falls via the link.

Other than that, it's pretty random. I used to put the scanner on my
extra vertical, and let it seek continuously, but the activity never
seemed to be in the same spot two days in a row. There are *tons* of
70cm repeaters within range of my 50W mobile, and most of them within
range of the 30W one, but most of them are badly underutilized.

OTOH, it's kinda like the 95% rule of 2m; 95% of the time, 95% of the
band is a wasteland, while 95% of the users are waiting their turn on
one repeater. (Of course, the corollary is that 95% of the people
tying up that repeater are in easy simplex range)

>That would be a good thing! Maybe it's location. I am out here in Forney,
>and it may be that I am just not going to hear much. I have a quad up at
>50'.

Gee, and I was referring to a short colinear as a good antenna. I may
have to figure out something to get the quagi back together and into
use. :)

I'm in N Dallas (roughly Tollway and Frankford) with (usually)
MFJ-1422's on both the mobile and the balcony. I can hit a lot of
repeaters, even with the HT, but actually finding anyone on them is
pretty random. ISTR that a rather large number of them are listed as
closed in the repeater guide, which may be a contributing factor in
most people's choice to stick with 2m; since darn near every 2m
repeater around here is open, you can just scan the band and chat with
whoever you find.

IMO, the solution there would be to make the closed repeater owners
show that they have enough authorized users to justify taking up the
pair. If not, they either redesignate it as open, or take it down and
let someone else better utilize the bandwidth.

>> Personally, I'd kind of like to see APRS move to 70cm. I use 2m quite
>> a bit, so it would be nice to not desense the APRS receiver every time
>> I key up.

>I like the 2M APRS frequency. Desensing isn't so much a problem though, is
>it Joe? Because it's not like you're not going to transmit again in a few
>bits...LOL

It's not so bad for actual messages, where it will be resent if
there's no ack, but missing a series of position messages can be
somewhat annoying when some people are set to, say, 10min intervals.

Actually, I worded the original kind of badly; I'd rather see a 70cm
frequency designated, used, and gatewayed to/from the existing 2m and
10m APRS frequencies. That way, everybody has a choice, existing rigs
aren't made obsolete, and we can have the best of all three worlds.

>I've got the D700A, love it! I went from a talkie to a mono-band mobile, to
>a dual-band mobile. Hey, there used to be a lot more packet from what I
>hear. I never liked what I saw of packet so didn't do it much. But, I also
>don't care for what I've seen of PSK31. Guess I'm just a true, diehard mic
>jock...LOL I heartell most of the packet stations have gone by the wayside.

That seems to be the case; I've made one whole contact via packet, (on
2m) and was so surprised to get it that I completely forgot to log it
:(
All attempts to repeat that have failed miserably.

>> I've been through a couple of areas where it was dead opposite;
>> everything was on 70cm, with almost no 2m activity other than the
>> occasional convoy passing through chattering on 2m simplex.
>> Strangely, these also seem to be the areas where 6m is quite popular.

>You mean in Dallas? Hmmmmmm, I'll have to take a *lot* more time to
>listen... Thanks

No, though I do know of a couple of guys playing with 6m on a somewhat
regular basis, (I suspect they've just got VX-5R's and are playing
with those) I was actually referring to Stephenville. If you've got
anything directional for 6m, try a heading of roughly 235deg magnetic,
and listen for both FM and SSB. Lots of pretty antennas down there,
and a few of them appear to stay pointed towards Dallas.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3629. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 05:58:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050557400.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33190

On 4 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>>There's an easy "fix", toss the narrow modes outta the bandwidth he
>>>>wants to occupy with his wide modes. He has expressed precisely that
>>>>notion in this NG which is one reason he has so many "friends" around
>>>>here.
>
>>>That would require a rules change.
>
>>Or at minimum, a local area bandplan change recognized by either the local
>>amateur radio frequency coordinator group or a majority of amateurs of the
>>area
>>involved.
>
>That is incorrect. It would require a rules change. The present amateur rules
>on spread-spectrum require that a spread-spectrum operator not cause harmful
>interference to other users. On frequencies where SS is permitted, voice, data
>and CW are legal on all frequencies. The FCC has specifically declined to issue
>a declaratory ruling that operating outside of the band plan is a defacto "good
>amateur practice" rules violation.

But when there is a conflict in operation and only one operator is following the band plan, hasn't the FCC usually sided with the one who followed the band plan? If the local plan is altered to have SS only in a segment, why wouldn't this concept hold true as well?

3630. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 06:00:52 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050601010.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33191

On 4 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>It's a crying shame that the block
>>of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
>>used ...
>
>I will confess that I don't even have one. What use have you made of yours?

I actually make use of mine, and I have asked our local ampr.org coordinator to
EXPIRE the ones not in use. He refused.

3631. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 06:01:14 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4AA653CFC96D40D7.153B242D73265431.7E7D56ED0106298A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 05 Feb 2002 03:17:37 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
<j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Some of this electronic gear is not very immune to RF. It
>can be a crapshot.

Yes, but why are they so fascinated with making amplified computer
speakers' lead-in cables so perfectly resonant on 2m?

I'd swear my Altec-Lansing speakers pull in more RF than my HT does.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3632. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 06:10:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050604470.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33193

On Mon, 4 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020204071950.19893.00001044@mb-fx.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>> >It's a crying shame that the block
>> >of IP addresses allocated to the ampr.org domain is so poorly
>> >used ...
>>
>> I will confess that I don't even have one. What use have you made of yours?
>
>I was obviously speaking in overall terms ... and I wasn't
>criticizing any person specifically, just making a general
>observation.
>
>To be honest, I haven't gotten an IP address assignment for the
>new QTH ... between getting organized in the new QTH (living
>considerations; basic office, shop, and lab setup, antennas, etc
>... still not totally complete ...) and work demands, I simply haven't
>had a chance to get "a round tuit."

But as or just before you moved, did you expire your OLD ip addresses or
otherwise inform your local ampr.org coordinator that you wouldn't be needing
them anymore? You seem to still be listed for Orange Co., CA, yet apparently,
you haven't had an address there for about 9 years and are now on your fourth
address and third state since CA (per your license records).

>In the past, however, at a different QTH where things were
>already organized, I had a block of IP addresses and was
>running TCP/IP on multiple machines and multiple nodes.
>
>I have plans ... but also time limitations (and I recognize
>that others have time limitiations as well). I will get to things
>in due course and it will be fun.

3633. RE: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 06:18:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050614310.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33194

On 4 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net
>>I doubt that "carrier squelch" folks would ever be affected
>>by the increase in the noise floor,
>
>There probably would be some effect, Hans. We have all heard signals that are
>just making it into the repeater. Even a few dB of noise would make a big
>difference to reception.
>
>> but would be concerned that weak signal modes (eme, ms, etc.) should enjoy
>> some protection.
>
>I agree; a few dB of noise there would make a lot of difference to their
>operation. Fortunately, the rules do give them absolute protection from
>broadband devices. To date, I have heard no reports about interference to
>narrowband users from amateur spread spectrum operation. I have only a few
>reports of interference from Part 15 SS operation.

That could simply be explained by a lack of knowledge of what an offending SS signal sounds like when stomping on top of an FM voice input. I admit that I don't know what that would sound like. Not every amateur can pull a spectrum analyzer off his shelf and see - "Oh! This is an SS signal I'm getting here." Voice modes are relatively easy to identify. Data modes harder. SS modes may be impossible without special equipment.

As I mentioned in person, any raise in the noise floor to either weak signal or repeater INPUTS will probably be harmful, while such is not the case with a repeater OUTPUT frequency.

3634. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 09:15:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202050115.70b5fd34@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33195

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>
> Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
> expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
> frequency.
> That's what the rules say.
>
>
Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
problem.
>
>
> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
> systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
> the channel is occupied by another user.
>
>
You know as well as I do that, particularly on the high bands, what
one rcvr hears is not necessarily what another even nearby rcvr hears.
Try to dial in with yer cellphone, the connect fails. Walk to the
other side of the room and ya connect, etc. Or how do you sense a rcvr
listening on a freq while another user is having a qso with a third
user the SS station can't hear?
>
>
> However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
> words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
> down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
>
>
Don't be silly.
>
>
> > Another rub being that, based on my observations and some
> discussions
> > the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close
> to

> > zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
> > 286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
> > eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
> > comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the
> dx
> > spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham
> radio
> > today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.
>
> No ... I think that the lesson in reality is that amateur packet
> didn't
> keep up with the level of "service" (data transfer rates, and other
> preformance metrics) that the internet provided, thus it became
> VERY boring by comparison ...
> had hams kept their technology
> competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
> have been such an exodus as there was ...
>
>
There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that any
ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the real
Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any conditions.
Second while packet ran well along the flatlands from the Carolinas to
Quebec it never got over the mountains to the west, stations in Philly
had no packet connection with Altoona or Pittsburgh. That's very
limiting and has nothing to do with the state of the art. Internet
comms are virtually instantaneous on a global basis. The real biggie
being that the Internet we have today exists because of the billions
of dollars which government and commercial entities have invested in
it. Given any technology hams might have available we'll never come
close and that's why there was a mass exodus from 2m packet. It wuz
the MONEY, not the technology which spanked packet into boredom.
>
>
> > Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
> > demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
> > attract.
>
>
> Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
> dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
> for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
> would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"
>
>
"Slow code" packet still has a very useful place in ham radio and is
very heavily used in at least one niche AND growing application,
specifically the dx spots networks scattered around the country. This
remnant of the original packet system still exists and runs nicely
today between Virginia and upper New England in the local instance.

And, as has been clearly demonstrated, it works a helluva lot better
than it's Internet counterparts. Why you might ask? Because the very
limited regional-only coverage of packet is an automatic "spam filter"
if you will.
>
>
If a spot shows up in the local networks it's quite likely that
anybody on the net can hear the spot. The Interenet spots sites are
overloaded with irrelevant spots which have to be laboriously
filtered, to wit, who the hell in dubya three land cares if some JA
just worked a 9M8 on 80 when it's broad daylite here??
>
>
So yes Packet lives on. And it NEEDS to be get FIXED dammit!
Participation in DX contesting has been ramping up at a goodly rate
for years now and the dim bulbs are still running the 2m nodes at 1200
baud. The net result has been some notable complete crashes of the
entire system hearabouts due to increased user demand during the heat
of the contest battles which have greatly exceeded the available
bandwith - which worked just ducky in 1985.
>
>
Even a lousy 4800bps would have prevented those crashes. Nitwits . . .
>
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

3635. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:24:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205072432.28697.00001342@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33196

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
>problem.

SS "runs" on a frequency just as much as any other modulation mode. The
process of modulation adds additional frequencies to the carrier frequency.
OOK CW typically occupies about 50 to 400 Hz of spectrum, depending on the rise
and fall time of the modulation.

>> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
>> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
>> systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
>> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
>> the channel is occupied by another user.

>You know as well as I do that, particularly on the high bands, what
>one rcvr hears is not necessarily what another even nearby rcvr hears.

That problem is shared by all modes, not just spread spectrum. Most narrowband
users solve that problem manually; the system Carl postulated solves that
problem technologically.

>Try to dial in with yer cellphone, the connect fails. Walk to the
>other side of the room and ya connect, etc. Or how do you sense a rcvr
>listening on a freq while another user is having a qso with a third
>user the SS station can't hear?

How do you do that manually for the modes you operate?

>> However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
>> words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
>> down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
>>
>>
>Don't be silly.
>>
>>
>> > Another rub being that, based on my observations and some
>> discussions
>> > the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close
>> to
>> > zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
>> > 286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
>> > eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
>> > comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the
>> dx

>> > spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham
>> radio
>> > today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.
>>
>> No ... I think that the lesson in reality is that amateur packet
>> didn't
>> keep up with the level of "service" (data transfer rates, and other
>> preformance metrics) that the internet provided, thus it became
>> VERY boring by comparison ...
>> had hams kept their technology
>> competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
>> have been such an exodus as there was ...
>>
>>
>There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that any
>ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the real
>Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any conditions.
>Second while packet ran well along the flatlands from the Carolinas to
>Quebec it never got over the mountains to the west, stations in Philly
>had no packet connection with Altoona or Pittsburgh. That's very
>limiting and has nothing to do with the state of the art. Internet
>comms are virtually instantaneous on a global basis. The real biggie
>being that the Internet we have today exists because of the billions
>of dollars which government and commercial entities have invested in
>it. Given any technology hams might have available we'll never come
>close and that's why there was a mass exodus from 2m packet. It wuz
>the MONEY, not the technology which spanked packet into boredom.
>>
>>
>> > Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
>> > demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
>> > attract.
>>
>>
>> Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
>> dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
>> for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
>> would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"
>>
>>
>"Slow code" packet still has a very useful place in ham radio and is
>very heavily used in at least one niche AND growing application,
>specifically the dx spots networks scattered around the country. This
>remnant of the original packet system still exists and runs nicely
>today between Virginia and upper New England in the local instance.
>And, as has been clearly demonstrated, it works a helluva lot better
>than it's Internet counterparts. Why you might ask? Because the very
>limited regional-only coverage of packet is an automatic "spam filter"
>if you will.
>>

>>
>If a spot shows up in the local networks it's quite likely that
>anybody on the net can hear the spot. The Interenet spots sites are
>overloaded with irrelevant spots which have to be laboriously
>filtered, to wit, who the hell in dubya three land cares if some JA
>just worked a 9M8 on 80 when it's broad daylite here??
>>
>>
>So yes Packet lives on. And it NEEDS to be get FIXED dammit!
>Participation in DX contesting has been ramping up at a goodly rate
>for years now and the dim bulbs are still running the 2m nodes at 1200
>baud. The net result has been some notable complete crashes of the
>entire system hearabouts due to increased user demand during the heat
>of the contest battles which have greatly exceeded the available
>bandwith - which worked just ducky in 1985.
>>
>>
>Even a lousy 4800bps would have prevented those crashes. Nitwits . . .
>>
>>
>>
>> Carl - wa6vse
>>
>>
>w3rv
>
>
>
>
>
>

>>Tere is no excuse for the CW operators who key
>> down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.

>Don't be silly.

Why was his statement silly? Would it help if he had said that there is no
excuse for a digital operator who plunks down on a CW QSO in progress? Both are
inexcusable if caused by poor operating practice or malice. Both are
understandable if they are caused by the unpredictable nature of propagation.
Neither are "silly," IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3636. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:26:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205072655.28697.00001343@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33197

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>Ham radio will always be around in one form or another, but it will never
>hold the appeal that it once did. For tinkerers and technical hobbiests, the
>paradigm shift happened in the late 70s with the emergence of the home
>personal computer.

??? If one uses the number of people entering ham radio as a guage (got a
better one?), then you are correct; ham radio doesn't have the appeal it once
did -- it has more.

How many hams are there now compared to the number in the late 1970s?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3637. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:29:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205072925.28697.00001344@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33198

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Since when is "plently" an exact number?

I use such rough numbers in my daily life. Do you?

Is this going to be like when I was asked to explain what Dick meant when he said "lots?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3638. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:32:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205073218.28697.00001345@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33199

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Howw many major differences of opinion does it take to be
>anti-ARRL?

I don't know, but when I have worked with Fred on amateur matters, I did not feel that the relationship was adversarial. He has told me that he is an ARRL supporter. I do not believe he is lying.

>I can
>think of no other person other than K1MAN or W2NSD who would
>more like to have their way with the ARRL for all of their
>efforts to submarine his efforts to make a living off of the
>US ARS.

In what way has ARRL tried to affect Fred's livelihood?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3639. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:35:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205073540.28697.00001346@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33200

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>But when there is a conflict in operation and only one operator is following
>the band plan, hasn't the FCC usually sided with the one who followed the
>band plan?

From what I recall, they have either felt that the band plan is important, or they have decided that no ham owns a frequency. And do keep in mind that the Commission was given every opportunity to issue a Declaratory Ruling that not operating within the band plan was a defacto rules violation, and they chose not to do so.

> If the local plan is altered to have SS only in a segment, why wouldn't
>this concept hold true as well?

I believe that in cases where the Commission can rely on a rule rather than a band plan, they will side with the rule every time. The rules stipulate frequency ranges for SS and that SS operation is not permitted to interfere with other users.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3640. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:37:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205073703.28697.00001347@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33101

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> Who knows, there may have been some
>> other workable solution to the medical waiver problem. As it was, there
>was
>> no pressing reason to consider anything else.

>Where's the smiley and/or the IMHO?

I don't think he was joking. And the IMHO is really assumed in all of our
posts, is it not?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3641. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:38:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205073855.28697.00001349@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33102

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I live in an area with a large Amish
>community. I pay good money for their home-made bread -- and
>hope it's always going to be available!

Are you sure they will continue to make it without a governement test requiring
them to demonstrate that they can bake bread at a dead slow 5 loaves per hour?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3642. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:42:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205074233.28697.00001351@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33103

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Probably because most people don't bother to report it and just simply
>increase
>their power....

Then in that case, it is not harmful interference. I don't like it, but it would not cross the regulatory threshold where I would expect the Commission to act against the Part 15 operator.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3643. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:46:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205074645.28697.00001352@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33104

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>First define the problem that needs to be solved.

DSP has solved a number of problems, and offered a number of elegant solutions to those problems. Auto-notch filters, de-noise algorithms, steep filter skirts, to name just a few.

And hams have segued DSP into software-defined radio that has done some pretty neat things that cannot be done with conventional radio techniques.

>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html

>You gotta be kidding, Ed. Gimme a little credit, will ya?

I don't understand. You had mentioned some of the more complex DSP material and I pointed to a source that was intended to offer DSP to the non-engineer. You may have seen it already, but I had no way of knowing that from your post. Had I imagined that it would offend you in some way, I would have not posted the URL. Sorry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3644. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 12:50:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205075005.28697.00001353@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33105

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
>> Part 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.

>I believe you. I really do.

>Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)

Surely you can't mean you think I would lie to you, Jim. My goodness!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3645. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 13:04:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205080447.28685.00001391@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33106

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>>>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal >>>past the
end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell
>>>sites every mile too?

>> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
>Part
>> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.

>I believe you. I really do.

>Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)

http://www.freenetworks.org/
http://www.austinwireless.net/
http://www.bawug.org/
http://bcwireless.net/
http://consume.net/
http://www.elektrosmog.nu/
http://www.houstonwireless.org/
http://nocat.net/
http://www.novawireless.org/
http://nycwireless.net/
http://personaltelco.net/
http://www.freenetworks.org/moin/index.cgi/WlanOrgUk

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3646. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 13:08:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <kPQ78.70$Bg4.144387@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 33107

> Bill:
>
> Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
> never be discouraged by my opinions. If I have discouraged anyone,
> it is mainly those who who are merely seeking refuge from 11 meters,
> and have no interest in the true amateur radio experience. I'm sick
> and tired of meeting "newcomer" hams who know absolutely nothing
> about even the basics of electricity, yet alone have a clue about
> how a radio works.

I am asking this sincerely, and not with any malice, but there is no way that a person then could get introduced to ham radio? If that is true, my father cannot become a ham then. Although he is MORE than intelligent to learn the concepts and theories of radio, he does not have much of an understanding of it, aside from the little bits I have shared with him. What about some of the people I am aware of from a variety of groups like church groups or civic organizations, or technical organizations, who may not have any experience in radio, but other fields. Are they excluded then also? There are a ton of wonderful candidates, who would add a lot to the Amateur Radio Service, who do not come from CB or "other detestable groups," but are discounted by the above paragraph. I beleive it is our responsibilities, as well as some of our larger organizations to positively promote the hobby, and to promote it to the proper potential targets. Not just handing out licenses as some other individuals in this and other newsgroups.

I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
> but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
> as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
> hobbyist, and SWL'ing.

As it will be until we die if we are real hams..... There isn't a day that goes by that I do not expose my self to some form of something new, or to "rehash" something I have not dealt with in a while. Whether it is browsing through the collection (thanks to those that have donated) of magazines and books, or even experimenting. Even if I had the time, there is no concievable way I could ever learn and do EVERYTHING possible that is related to this hobby. That is the beauty of this hobby. There is sooooo much to learn.

None of that happens anymore. People see
> hams talking into a microphone without paying airtime charges, and
> they want in on the same -- right now -- without paying any "dues"
> as far as learning is concerned. They need to be hand-held through
> even the most rudimentary basic operation of their off-the-shelf

> appliances, mainly because they can't be bothered to even read
> the "Quick Start" instructions. Then they justify their existence by
> making a big deal out of carrying an HT at a Walk-A-Thon, and
> making it sound like they're FDNY-class heroes while doing so.
>

Granted this would happen in other hobbies also I am sure, in different forms. The ones to blame are the licensed persons who did not intercept this behavior to start with. Within a few exceptions, everyone in this category would have had to have had "some" involvement with a ham somewhere down the line.

> The only people who would be discouraged by my opinions aren't
> worth having in this hobby/service. Anyone with a true curiosity
> about the technical and operating aspects of ham radio will have the
> initiative and ingenuity to pursue it, without worrying about the
> fact that people like Dick, Dave, and myself are able to express our
> opinion that ham radio is being dumbed-down into irrelevance.

Not discouraged at all.... I believe we are looking out the same window, but seeing two different things. The problem comes from existing hams, not the new ones.
>

73's, the future and present are so bad! :)

Ryan

3647. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 13:46:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C5FE247.6EB619E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 33108

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The NoCode tech experience has shown that
> > darn few will bother to ever learn it if not a testing requirement.
>
> Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
> I don't hear any 6m or 2m CW around here.

You don't hear much on 70cm either. You'd probably need to spend some effort to put up effective antennas and some time in actually listening. The fact that you've apparently done neither does not mean that the signals aren't there. The several hundred 6m CW QSOs and the perhaps 60 2m CW QSOs I've enjoyed over the past month indicate that there are plenty of hams to QSO on those bands.

Dave K8MN

3648. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 14:05:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C5FE68E.C053D55B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 33109

CAM wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Then there is Cecil. :-))
>
> Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.

Are you an elderly alien? You seem to have shrunk in stature by 100,000 feet or so since earlier sightings.

Dave K8MN

3649. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 14:36:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205093646.16072.00000911@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33110

In article <3C5F46A9.758B10AB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Richard McCollum wrote:
>> Then there is Cecil. :-))
>
>Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.

You shrank 100,000 feet? omigawd...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3650. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 14:36:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205093646.16072.00000910@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33111

In article <yJF78.10927$zT.923125@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Roger, Roger.

I picked a heck of a week to stop drinking..
>
>Small minds discuss people.
>Average minds discuss events.
>Brilliant minds discuss ideas.
>Twisted minds discuss radio.

Psychotics build castles in the air.
Neurotics live in them.
Psychiatrists collect the rent.

--

Scientists dream of doing great things
Engineers do them.

--

The scientist seeks to understand what is
The engineer seeks to create what never was.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3651. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 15:31:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205103157.12312.00001316@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33112

>Subject: Re: Cecil wins again!
>From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net
>Date: 2/4/2002 1:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <98d5b1ab8a69c99c3988109df293b8e6.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>

>http:/ mygate.mailgate. org/report/rec/rec.radio.amateur.policy?date=01/2002
>does it automagically.

That's cool....But how did you come to find this resource, and what ever possessed you to bring it here?

Who cares? What does it matter? Does it make a difference? How much time does it require for YOU to find the stats, bring them here, add YOUR commentary, and follow up on posts such as this one?

Inquiring minds just HAVE to ask!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3652. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:26:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C614B66.ED20EA5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33113

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C60117E.1DD291EA@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
> > they didn't stay in ham radio very long.
>
> They probably thought that ham radio would actually be exciting. After an
> hour on the HF bands, they discovered how boring ninety percent of the
> conversations are and never came back.

Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is "converations" You
can have them on CB/freeband without a license.

3653. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:29:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C614C29.5D3F4DED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33114

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <a3m1g3077d@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >I base this on the fact that I've been reading such postings from you and
> >others back to the days of Fidonet. Nothing in your messages indicates that
> >you want amateur radio to grow, yet everything shows that you want to hold
> >on to worthless, outdated, hazing rituals that serve no purpose other than
> >personal enjoyment.
>
> I'm assuming you're not including me in the above, since I don't believe
> that the code testing requirement was a worthless, outdated hazing
> ritual. I believe that it was a reasonable, rational, and universally
> achieveable requirement, which led to the development of a practical,
> effective, efficient, and universal communications skill.

Shhhhhh, Larry, you'll give him and Carl (and the rest of NCI) a headache.

3654. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:34:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C60098A.48FD2993@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33115

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> problem.

Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3655. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:36:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600A20.863D9CB4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33116

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Why is Bert a "twit?"

I heard on the radio that a pregnant goldfish is a "twit".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3656. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:38:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600A7E.8737598E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33117

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.
>
> No, it just means that you're brain-dead from a lack of oxygen, since
> you're head is over 37 miles up in the air.

My head is not the dimension that is 200,000 ft tall.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3657. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:39:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600AD1.FE63F9C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33119

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
> >didn't want to do?
>
> I think they would have stood a pretty good chance, if Nancy had been
> able to maintain the momentum she built at Dayton '97, and lead the
> FISTS on to an active fight against the movement to reduce/eliminate
> code testing requirements. Unfortunately, we'll never get to know what
> might have happened.

It's not too late.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3658. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:41:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600B41.BFD211AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33120

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C5EB476.E0455617@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >> No more than what will result anyway. When the tests are so trivial that
> > >any
> > >> Freebander who wants can climb on board with the full load of privileges at
> > >> will, it's only a matter of time till selfdestruct occurs.
> > >
> > >You've been saying that for almost a dozen years. When is it going to happen?
> >
> > You've been denying it for just as long -- but it's happening NOW!

Got any proof?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3659. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:43:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C614F6C.1B1C401E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33118

W1RFI wrote:

> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >I live in an area with a large Amish
> >community. I pay good money for their home-made bread -- and
> >hope it's always going to be available!
>
> Are you sure they will continue to make it without a governement test requiring
> them to demonstrate that they can bake bread at a dead slow 5 loaves per hour?

Sure they will. they have a Pecuniary interest. Only lite hams or wannabees
without one whine about the code test.

3660. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:43:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600BB1.2D78558B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33121

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm assuming you're not including me in the above, since I don't believe
> that the code testing requirement was a worthless, outdated hazing
> ritual. I believe that it was a reasonable, rational, and universally
> achieveable requirement, which led to the development of a practical,
> effective, efficient, and universal communications skill.

Uh Oh - Larry cranked his fuzzphrase computer up again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3661. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:46:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600C6C.BA7C32D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33122

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> ... I could not understand
> why they didn't want to explore the world of HF operation, ...

And they probably could not understand why you wanted to.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3662. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:48:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C600CDA.E842D469@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33123

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
> could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
> know it, and you won't!

Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3663. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:54:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6151F8.F030CF31@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33124

CAM wrote:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > problem.
>
> Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)

BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.

3664. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 16:55:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C615236.5E887F9C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33125

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Why is Bert a "twit?"
>
> I heard on the radio that a pregnant goldfish is a "twit".

Well, that settles it. Carl and maybe Kim are the only twits
here.

3665. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:00:41 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C601DC9.332C5D83@crosslink.net>
Source record: 33127
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Tim Randa wrote:
>
> So does everyone who disagrees with you have a "serious character flaw" ??

I never said that. I said that people who think everybody should be forced to endure every hardship and disease they suffered have a serious character flaw.

I have a bad back. Hurts all the time! Does that mean everybody should have a bad back? Should I denigrate everybody who doesn't share my burden? Should the government break yours so it'd be like mine? I think not.

Kids my generation had to fear Polio because there was no vaccine yet. Does that make it unfair to give kids the vaccine now? Again I think not. Same goes for CW. There was a time when CW was the only practical way to communicate via radio. There was also a time when flint & steel was the only practical way to start a fire. People in those times had to master those skills. Should the law make us do the same out of "fairness" to them? I don't think so.

We might argue over whether everybody ought to learn code because it's so much fun without either of us having a character flaw. You could argue that Morse is needed for emergencies and merely be wrong (tap-code is more common), but not a jerk. OTOH the arguement that everybody should be forced to learn Morse because you or I had to learn Morse is selfishness at its worst.

My $0.02
KA3DWW

3666. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:01:01 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0202051001.67d3b5e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33126

k4yz@aol.com wrote

> Who cares?

Nobody that I know about. I just thought it was a
moderately interesting factoid.

> What does it matter?

I don't know. You're the one making it an issue.

> Does it make a difference?

Not a bit to me.

> How much time does it require for YOU to find
> the stats,

No time at all. It's a regular feature of my "mailgate.org"
posting site.

> Inquiring minds just HAVE to ask!

If it bothers you, just mash the <Next> key.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3667. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:23:08 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C60230C.98B12B5F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 33128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>
> "Suffer", "discomfort"... I remember when I took a course in ham-radio as well
> as the lessons in Morse code, even though it's been 24 years now; my experience
> has been an enjoyable one, so I am sorry, but I can't relate to your pain and
> suffering.

I'm glad for you. I would like to be better at Morse than I am but it
has always been very difficult for me (see the article on that subject
on www.arrl.org) and "profound" hearing loss has made it worse.

> By the same token, shouldn't we eliminate any testing because it
> causes discomfort to some people?

Not as long as we are still licensed to do things that other citizens
are not, based on the idea that we're "experts". CBrs cannot legally use
high-powered amps and business licensees must hire licensed techs to do
the things we can do at will. We can legally modify our factory-made
radios to operate out of spec on the assumption that we are learned
enough to do so safely. CBrs (for example) cannot.

It makes sense to require a Morse test to operate Morse on bands set
aside for that purpose, but a Morse test to operate SSB? Oy!

3668. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:26:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6023E7.A4EB36ED@uci.edu>
Source record: 33131

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Exactly how many hams are there to QSO with on CW above 30MHz?
> > > > >
> > > > Exactly how many are there to QSO with below 30 MHz? Kind of a dumb
> > > > question, doncha think Cecil?
> > >
> > > Are there plenty of CW hams below 30MHz? Exactly! Are there plenty of
> > > CW hams above 30MHz? _____________
> >
> > Since when is "plenty" an exact number?
>
> "Plenty" is an accurate word for the number of CW hams below 30MHz.
> From Webster's: "exactly - accurately"

BWAAHAHAHA! Good one Cecil. Would the word "some" have also been an
exact answer?

Looks kinda cloudy over yonder in yer part of the country today.

3669. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:28:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C602468.A3359F7E@uci.edu>
Source record: 33130

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 04 Feb 2002 15:18:38 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> >> >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past the
> >> >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every mile
> >> >too?
> >
> >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with Part
> >> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> >
> >I believe you. I really do.
> >
> >Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>
> That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.
>
> They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away.

How can electronics "buffs" file bankruptcy?

3670. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:33:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C602571.B5DB570B@uci.edu>
Source record: 33132

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Since when is "plently" an exact number?
>
> I use such rough numbers in my daily life. Do you?

I even know how to distinguish between precision and accuracy.

Cecil was prompting for an exact number. According to his latest, the words "a positive integer" would have sufficed.

3671. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:37:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205133725.20370.00001467@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 33129

In article <d22b54c3.0202050115.70b5fd34@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>...
>>
>> Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
>> expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
>> frequency.
>> That's what the rules say.

>Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
>problem.

Depending on whether it's DSSS or FHSS it could be a band of freqs or a set of
freqs.
Either way it's a bigger mess than narrowband modes.
>
>> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
>> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
>> systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
>> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
>> the channel is occupied by another user.

Nice idea but in the real world it's another story.
>>
>You know as well as I do that, particularly on the high bands, what
>one rcvr hears is not necessarily what another even nearby rcvr hears.
>Try to dial in with yer cellphone, the connect fails. Walk to the
>other side of the room and ya connect, etc. Or how do you sense a rcvr
>listening on a freq while another user is having a qso with a third
>user the SS station can't hear?

It doesn't. The narrowband OPERATOR listens, but also interprets what is heard.
If I hear W3RV working ZA3AV on 3.521, I know the freqeuncy is in use even if I
can't
hear ZA3AV.

>> > Another rub being that, based on my observations and some
>> discussions
>> > the interest in truly high-speed data comms via ham radio is close
>> to
>> > zip. Reel back to the early 80s when there were tens of thousands of
>> > 286 PC interconnected hams all over the 2m packet system here on the
>> > eastern seaboard as lame and slow as packet was and still is. Along
>> > comes the Internet for the masses and if it wasn't for APRS and the

>> dx
>> > spots nodes 2m packet would be a footnote in the history of ham
>> radio
>> > today. There's the lesson in reality you choose to ignore.
>>
>> No ... I think that the lesson in reality is that amateur packet
>> didn't
>> keep up with the level of "service" (data transfer rates, and other
>> preformance metrics) that the internet provided, thus it became
>> VERY boring by comparison ...
>> had hams kept their technology
>> competitive in performance, I see no reason why there would
>> have been such an exodus as there was ...

Content as well as speed.
>>
>There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that any
>ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the real
>Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any conditions.
>Second while packet ran well along the flatlands from the Carolinas to
>Quebec it never got over the mountains to the west, stations in Philly
>had no packet connection with Altoona or Pittsburgh. That's very
>limiting and has nothing to do with the state of the art. Internet
>comms are virtually instantaneous on a global basis. The real biggie
>being that the Internet we have today exists because of the billions
>of dollars which government and commercial entities have invested in
>it. Given any technology hams might have available we'll never come
>close and that's why there was a mass exodus from 2m packet. It wuz
>the MONEY, not the technology which spanked packet into boredom.
>>
Two words: Fiber optics.

If yer gonna talk about obsolete techologies, start with the whole idea of
using RF for electronic communication between fixed points in developed
nations. Fiber optics are the present and the future. One little fiber has
more bandwidth than any microwave system - and if you want more,
just run another fiber. No crosstalk, no intermod, no lightning troubles,
no allocation headaches, no RFI/EMI.
>>
>> > Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
>> > demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
>> > attract.
>>
>> Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
>> dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
>> for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
>> would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"

Because it's there.

>"Slow code" packet still has a very useful place in ham radio and is
>very heavily used in at least one niche AND growing application,
>specifically the dx spots networks scattered around the country. This
>remnant of the original packet system still exists and runs nicely
>today between Virginia and upper New England in the local instance.
>And, as has been clearly demonstrated, it works a helluva lot better
>than it's Internet counterparts. Why you might ask? Because the very
>limited regional-only coverage of packet is an automatic "spam filter"
>if you will.

Special applications prove the point.

>If a spot shows up in the local networks it's quite likely that
>anybody on the net can hear the spot. The Interenet spots sites are
>overloaded with irrelevant spots which have to be laboriously
>filtered, to wit, who the hell in dubya three land cares if some JA
>just worked a 9M8 on 80 when it's broad daylite here??

'zactly.
>>
>So yes Packet lives on. And it NEEDS to be get FIXED dammit!
>Participation in DX contesting has been ramping up at a goodly rate
>for years now and the dim bulbs are still running the 2m nodes at 1200
>baud. The net result has been some notable complete crashes of the
>entire system hearabouts due to increased user demand during the heat
>of the contest battles which have greatly exceeded the available
>bandwith - which worked just ducky in 1985.
>>
>Even a lousy 4800bps would have prevented those crashes. Nitwits . . .
>>
Might help Carl get over that 75 country hump, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>> Carl - wa6vse
>>
>>
>w3rv

3672. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:43:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6027D8.81157F72@uci.edu>
Source record: 33133

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >First define the problem that needs to be solved.
>
> DSP has solved a number of problems, and offered a number of elegant solutions
> to those problems. Auto-notch filters, de-noise algorithms, steep filter
> skirts, to name just a few.

The "problem that needs to be solved", not the problems that have been solved. How would one advance the state of the art working only on problems that have already been solved?

> And hams have segued DSP into software-defined radio that has done some pretty
> neat things that cannot be done with conventional radio techniques.

Cecil could attest somewhat to extent of my programming capabilities. I think I'm more of a hardware defined kind of guy. ;-)

3673. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:44:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C60280F.6090C797@uci.edu>
Source record: 33135

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
> >> Part 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>
> >I believe you. I really do.
>
> >Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>
> Surely you can't mean you think I would lie to you, Jim. My goodness!

Exaggerate the truth to suit the need?

3674. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 18:49:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C602931.7F219672@uci.edu>
Source record: 33134

Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
rate limitations.

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >>>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal >>>past the
> end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell
> >>>sites every mile too?
>
> >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
> >Part
> >> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>
> >I believe you. I really do.
>
> >Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>
> http://www.freenetworks.org/
> http://www.austinwireless.net/
> http://www.bawug.org/
> http://bcwireless.net/
> http://consume.net/
> http://www.elektrosmog.nu/
> http://www.houstonwireless.org/
> http://nocat.net/
> http://www.novawireless.org/
> http://nycwireless.net/
> http://personaltelco.net/
> http://www.freenetworks.org/moin/index.cgi/WlanOrgUk
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3675. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 20:15:03 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202052014000.23529-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33136

On Tue, 5 Feb 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
>CAM wrote:
>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>> > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
>> > problem.
>>
>> Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
>
> BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
>frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.

I think that the point here was that all modulated transmissions run on a base (i.e. carrier) frequency, and the modulation therefore makes it a RANGE of frequencies - +/- of the carrier. I agree it was poorly stated.

3676. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 20:17:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C603DCF.66632A7F@uci.edu>
Source record: 33139

Good point, Stuss.

I always wondered under which circumstances 97.113.5 might be considered
applicable.

73 ac6xg

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> Considering the frequency band (12cm - although the rules call it 13cm, the
> 2390-2450 segment rounds is closer to 12cm than 13cm), there is no speed
> limitation under part 97 there. Amateur symbol rate (thus speed) limitations
> are for 450MHz and below.
>
> On Tue, 5 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
> >rate limitations.
> >
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >>
> >> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >>
> >> >>>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal >>>past the
> >> end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell
> >> >>>sites every mile too?
> >>
> >> >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
> >> >Part
> >> >> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> >>
> >> >I believe you. I really do.
> >>
> >> >Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
> >> ...

3677. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 20:18:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202052017110.23529-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33137

Considering the frequency band (12cm - although the rules call it 13cm, the 2390-2450 segment rounds is closer to 12cm than 13cm), there is no speed limitation under part 97 there. Amateur symbol rate (thus speed) limitations are for 450MHz and below.

On Tue, 5 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
>Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
>rate limitations.
>
>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>>
>> >>>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal >>>past the
>> end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell
>> >>>sites every mile too?
>>
>> >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
>> >Part
>> >> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>>
>> >I believe you. I really do.
>>
>> >Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>> ...

3678. Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 20:29:39 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0202051229.2e66153b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://www.wolfleap.com/

This enterprising company sells the "Cherokee 'CM-10 Plus' AM CB radio" which boasts "10 bands of 40 channels" for a total coverage of "400 channels".

This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to *ALL* CB channels".

Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965 to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part of CB now!

-Aaron-

3679. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 21:52:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205165200.12296.00001812@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 33140

>This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to
>*ALL* CB channels".
>
>Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965
>to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part
>of CB now!
>
>-Aaron-

Sounds like a Good Radio for NCIs Club Station

3680. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 22:21:01 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205172101.12943.00001440@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33141

```
>http://www.wolfleap.com/
>
>This enterprising company sells the "Cherokee 'CM-10 Plus' AM CB
>radio" which boasts "10 bands of 40 channels" for a total coverage of
>"400 channels".
>
>This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to
>*ALL* CB channels".
>
>Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965
>to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part
>of CB now!
>
>-Aaron-

Old news, Aaron. Some of us actually use these as mobiles on, ready?...10 &
12-meters.

=================
0 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
|||||||||||||||||
=================

Digital Troll-O-Meter

73 de Bert
KC2HMN
```

3681. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 22:51:16 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6061AB.36E5330@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33142

Before one could answer that, one should know the definition
of the ARRL. Are you referring to the rank and file or the
Newington Crowd?

If you are talking about the Newington crowd, how about the
W5YI automatic license renewal notice system for a measely
one time fee of $5. Newington countered with offering it
for free as a side benefit of membership. Would that
qualify?

W1RFI wrote:

>
> In what way has ARRL tried to affect Fred's livelihood?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3682. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 23:18:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205181859.08256.00001031@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33143

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
>rate limitations.

The data rates on 2.4 GHz are not a limiting factor.

Sounds like a bunch of experimenters that have beaten us to the punch. :-)
They don't have to be limited by content limitations, though.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3683. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 23:24:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205182401.08256.00001032@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33144

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)

> BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
>frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.

Is the base frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space frequency? A DSSS signal has a carrier that is modulated by a PN code and data. I suppose one could argue that an FHSS signal has no real carrier, but it certainly has a center frequency to its occupied channel.

All signals that are modulated take up more than a single frequency.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3684. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 23:26:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205182602.08256.00001033@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33145

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>I think that the point here was that all modulated transmissions run on a
>base
>(i.e. carrier) frequency, and the modulation therefore makes it a RANGE of
>frequencies - +/- of the carrier. I agree it was poorly stated.

Is the "base" frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space? SS signal occupy a range of frequencies +- of the carrier or the center frequency of the occupied channel. A non-SS signal at a data rate equal to the speed of the PN encoding would occupy essentially the same bandwidth of the DSSS signal. What is the difference?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3685. Re: Cecil wins again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 23:27:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205182741.08256.00001034@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33146

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>How much
>time does it require for YOU to find the stats, bring them here, add YOUR
>commentary, and follow up on posts such as this one?
>

It must be less than 10 minutes, because Hans has pronounced that those that spend more than 10 minutes on any newsgroup need to get a life (or words to that effect).

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3686. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-05 23:47:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020205184704.08243.00001288@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33147

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>W1RFI wrote:

>> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> >First define the problem that needs to be solved.

>> DSP has solved a number of problems, and offered a number of elegant
>solutions
>> to those problems. Auto-notch filters, de-noise algorithms, steep filter
>> skirts, to name just a few.

>The "problem that needs to be solved", not the problems that have been
>solved. How would one advance the state of the art working only on
>problems that have already been solved?

I was hoping that offering some solutions about the value of DSP to date would get one to thinking that the surface has only been scratched. Okay, Bob Larkin et al have been using the DSP-10 to do some really cool work tens of dB below the noise floor, using long term integration. It might be useful to add 30 dB or more to our capability, albeit at very slow data rates. It will be nice to see this become a mainstream technique.

As I look at all of the different modes that are available, I muse that it would be really cool if I could program a radio system to operate any mode at will, including new ones that come about. DSP techniques are used at the very core of software-defined radio. Imagine how cool it would be if you read an article in QST about a neat new mode and could download the software to run it on your DSP-2002 rig tonight.

More and more the architecture of radio is in the software, not the hardware. Would it be cool if hams could literally redesign the function of their radios using a DSP development tool, or better yet, an SDE development tool.

To say nothing of cost. Electronic devices, especially LSI devices, has dropped dramatically over the years I have been in electronics. Speed has gone up dramatically. Sooner rather than later, we will see DSP devices that are literally fast enough to do real-time receiving from RF to audio, ALL done in the DSP hardware and software. Think of what this could do to the price of a radio.

Every time science has come up with a new technology, it has changed the world in ways that may not have been imagined when it was in its infancy.

I think the odds are pretty good that DSP, SDR and some of the advances in digital technology could do the same for Amateur Radio. And the really neat part about that is when it does, it does not have to replace the old, which

will continue to have its enthusiasts and will continue to have all of the value it ever had. The diversity in ham radio is truly one of its greatest strengths, and, not since spark was outlawed can I remember one instance where a mode of operation that was permitted in Amateur Radio was no longer permitted by new modes of operation.

Kinda' the best of both worlds, IMHO.

73,
Ed hare, W1RFI

3687. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 00:03:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c607492_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33148

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:FD4EED86F5292765.7734816D4ACE6EDC.CAC9A5BAE2CDCC67@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 4 Feb 2002 19:12:45 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> Mostly, the DARC 440 machine's been picking up during the day, when
> the 88 gets a little busy. RAILS repeaters nearby are kind of random,
> but since the one in Stephenville is, AFAIK, the only UHF repeater
> around there, and they have a fair number of hams for a town of
> 20,000, you mostly hear them or Wichita Falls via the link.
>

The DARC 440 machine is usually used by the "upper echelon" of the club, and
it used to be that you'd hear them joking about the folks on the 2M club
repeater. I think the DARC has gotten a little more friendly recently, so
that may not be the case any more. Len/K4IWL (new President) and I have had
a few discussions about that.

>
> Other than that, it's pretty random. I used to put the scanner on my
> extra vertical, and let it seek continuously, but the activity never
> seemed to be in the same spot two days in a row. There are *tons* of
> 70cm repeaters within range of my 50W mobile, and most of them within
> range of the 30W one, but most of them are badly underutilized.
>

Ah, well then. I misread your original respose to mean that you thought
there was more activity on 70cm than I believed. I think you and I are
closer to thinking alike about it (not that much at all).

>
> OTOH, it's kinda like the 95% rule of 2m; 95% of the time, 95% of the
> band is a wasteland, while 95% of the users are waiting their turn on
> one repeater. (Of course, the corollary is that 95% of the people
> tying up that repeater are in easy simplex range)
>

Irony, eh? I absolutely enjoy simplex operation--and few people really ever
experiment with it. I love it when I can get 2-3 people out on simplex when
we're all mobile and we are still talking to each other at 50 miles apart.
They are genuinely surprised! Then, they have all kinds of fun with
relaying messages when some begin moving out of range.

>
> IMO, the solution there would be to make the closed repeater owners
> show that they have enough authorized users to justify taking up the

> pair. If not, they either redesignate it as open, or take it down and
> let someone else better utilize the bandwidth.
>

Very unpopular opinion...;) But, I wholeheartedly agree. In my order of
disdain:

1) Closed Repeater Systems
2) Closed Repeaters
3) Repeater pairs that have been silent 95% or more of the time for a period
of one year or more

On #3, I think the pair should go back into the pool. If someone wants to
go out an spend loads of money on a system, get a pair, then have the system
down 95% or more of the time, that's *their* problem, not mine. And, if
it's a club repeater and they can't keep it supported with membership
dues...too bad, maybe they need to revamp the way their club operates.

> >>
> >> Personally, I'd kind of like to see APRS move to 70cm. I use 2m quite
> >> a bit, so it would be nice to not desense the APRS receiver every time
> >> I key up.
>
> >I like the 2M APRS frequency. Desensing isn't so much a problem though,
is
> >it Joe? Because it's not like you're not going to transmit again in a
few
> >bits...LOL
>
> It's not so bad for actual messages, where it will be resent if
> there's no ack, but missing a series of position messages can be
> somewhat annoying when some people are set to, say, 10min intervals.
>

The way 'round that would be to decrease the interval time.

>
> Actually, I worded the original kind of badly; I'd rather see a 70cm
> frequency designated, used, and gatewayed to/from the existing 2m and
> 10m APRS frequencies. That way, everybody has a choice, existing rigs
> aren't made obsolete, and we can have the best of all three worlds.
>

Yeah, there ya go. Hmmmm, you know what? I didn't even realize there are
10M APRS freqs! Shows how long it's been since I was paying attention.
That's pretty kewl. Are they within the Tech+ area, or outside that range?
Maybe I'll have to upgrade...LOL

>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

Kim W5TIT

3688. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 00:19:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c607828$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33149

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C614B66.ED20EA5E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C60117E.1DD291EA@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > I know hams who became hams for the "wrong" reasons. almost always
> > > they didn't stay in ham radio very long.
> >
> > They probably thought that ham radio would actually be exciting. After
an
> > hour on the HF bands, they discovered how boring ninety percent of the
> > conversations are and never came back.
>
> Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is "converations"
You
> can have them on CB/freeband without a license.
>

Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If not
having conversations...then ?

Kim W5TIT

3689. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 00:21:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6078a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33150

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C600C6C.BA7C32D5@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > ... I could not understand
> > why they didn't want to explore the world of HF operation, ...
>
> And they probably could not understand why you wanted to.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

ROTFLMAO!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

3690. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 00:22:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6078e0$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33201

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C615236.5E887F9C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Why is Bert a "twit?"
> >
> > I heard on the radio that a pregnant goldfish is a "twit".
>
> Well, that settles it. Carl and maybe Kim are the only twits
> here.
>

I'm not pregnant and I don't have any gold.

Kim W5TIT

3691. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 00:30:04 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a3ptecfpv1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 33202

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>>>>High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal >>>past the
>end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell
>>>>sites every mile too?
>
>>> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities with
>>Part
>>> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>
>>I believe you. I really do.
>
>>Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>
>http://www.freenetworks.org/
[...]
>http://www.bawug.org/

I know people from this group, and it is probably worth pointing out
that a lot of the "electronics buffs" involved are hams (the geeks tend
to be of either the ham flavor or the programmer flavor, or both. The
ones that are hams seem to do a lot nicer outside installation work,
given the sample of a half dozen I've seen).

I would guess they do this stuff as Part 15 projects rather than Part 97
because Part 97 content and control restrictions wring almost all the joy
out of it. Networking infrastructure projects are way more interesting if
you can get a lot of people to use the infrastructure you build for a lot
of stuff, rather than a few people doing hardly anything. In a strange
way this is (non-emergency) public service which is very much in the spirit
of 97.1(a), not to mention (c) and (d), except it is a service which hams
aren't allowed to provide as hams.

Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather than hams
themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?

Dennis Ferguson

3692. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 01:10:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C608296.4AD08FA5@uci.edu>
Source record: 33203

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
> >rate limitations.
>
> The data rates on 2.4 GHz are not a limiting factor.

Packet networks have a limited data rate.

> Sounds like a bunch of experimenters that have beaten us to the punch. :-)

One of the URLs you cited specifically mentions hams as being
instrumental in developing the network.

3693. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 01:20:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6084C4.BA939041@uci.edu>
Source record: 33204

W1RFI wrote:
> The diversity in ham radio is truly one of its greatest
> strengths, and, not since spark was outlawed can I remember one instance where
> a mode of operation that was permitted in Amateur Radio was no longer permitted
> by new modes of operation.

I can't remember that either - whatever it is. But, it was good to see
you at least talking about amateur radio in terms of it's strength
rather than weakness.

3694. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 02:43:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C60986C.4D057259@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33205

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Cecil could attest somewhat to extent of my programming capabilities. I
> think I'm more of a hardware defined kind of guy. ;-)

I can attest that Jim came up with a roulette system program
that could beat itself. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3695. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 02:46:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C609915.B52569E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33206

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > problem.
> > >
> > Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
>
> BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.

DSSS has a center frequency also, Dick, with suppressed carrier.
OOK Morse doesn't occupy a single frequency. Neither does SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3696. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 02:52:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C609A74.FE1FF647@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33207

Jim Kelley wrote:
> > "Plenty" is an accurate word for the number of CW hams below 30MHz.
> > From Webster's: "exactly - accurately"
>
> BWAAHAHAHA! Good one Cecil. Would the word "some" have also been an
> exact answer?

If "some" was accurate, then yes, according to Webster's.

> Looks kinda cloudy over yonder in yer part of the country today.

You mean under Lake East Texas?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3697. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 02:54:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C609AE4.1B192E00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33208

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is "converations"
> > You can have them on CB/freeband without a license.
>
> Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If not
> having conversations...then ?

If it's in CW, it's a QSO, Kim. When will you ever learn?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3698. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:02:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c609e7f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33209

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C609AE4.1B192E00@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is
"converations"
> > > You can have them on CB/freeband without a license.
> >
> > Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If not
> > having conversations...then ?
>
> If it's in CW, it's a QSO, Kim. When will you ever learn?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Hey, a QSO will work, QSL? :p

Kim W5TIT

3699. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:55:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gr35zsi.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33210

On Tue, 05 Feb 2002 10:28:56 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:

>> That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.
>>
>> They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away.
>
>How can electronics "buffs" file bankruptcy?

Metricom/Ricochet was a business providing v.90 wireless internet connectivity when nothing faster existed. They had service throughout all major cities and even smaller ones where the customer base supported it, and were un the process of upgrading to DSL speeds.

It went down with the dot-com implosion.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3700. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225854.17193.00000099@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33213

In article <3C600CDA.E842D469@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
>> could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
>> know it, and you won't!
>
>Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.

Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?

AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
Techs looking around for a Morse code class!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3701. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225854.17193.00000098@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33214

In article <20020205073855.28697.00001349@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>I live in an area with a large Amish
>>community. I pay good money for their home-made bread -- and
>>hope it's always going to be available!
>
>Are you sure they will continue to make it without a governement test
>requiring
>them to demonstrate that they can bake bread at a dead slow 5 loaves per
>hour?

Ed:

Five LPH would be a pretty piss poor production rate for most Amish bakeries.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3702. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225856.17193.00000101@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33211

In article <3C600A20.863D9CB4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Why is Bert a "twit?"
>
>I heard on the radio that a pregnant goldfish is a "twit".

I see. I didn't know that Bert was pregnant, or a goldfish. I'm sure
he'd be amused to find those things out about himself!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3703. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33215

In article <3C600AD1.FE63F9C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >You think FISTS could have convinced the FCC to do something they
>> >didn't want to do?
>>
>> I think they would have stood a pretty good chance, if Nancy had been
>> able to maintain the momentum she built at Dayton '97, and lead the
>> FISTS on to an active fight against the movement to reduce/eliminate
>> code testing requirements. Unfortunately, we'll never get to know what
>> might have happened.
>
>It's not too late.

Sure it's too late. The code testing requirement has already been
dumbed-down to 5 WPM -- which is essentially Zero for all intents
and purposes. A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
meaningful code testing level. But that didn't happen, did it?
Therefore, we'll never know.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3704. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225856.17193.00000100@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33216

In article <kPQ78.70$Bg4.144387@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>> Bill:
>>
>> Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
>> never be discouraged by my opinions. If I have discouraged anyone,
>> it is mainly those who who are merely seeking refuge from 11 meters,
>> and have no interest in the true amateur radio experience. I'm sick
>> and tired of meeting "newcomer" hams who know absolutely nothing
>> about even the basics of electricity, yet alone have a clue about
>> how a radio works.
>
>I am asking this sincerely, and not with any malice, but there is no way
>that a person then could get introduced to ham radio?

Ryan:

Well, since the ARRL, the national organization for amateur radio, does
nothing to advertise our hobby/service in the major mass media, then I
guess I see your point -- being "introduced" into the hobby could be a
challenge! My own curiosity about ham radio was peaked when I saw
a public service announcement on TV, featuring Dick Van Dyke sitting
at the operator's position of a ham radio station. I was aware of ham
radio before then, but that is what really got me interested enough to
learn more about it, and ultimately get involved. That's not happening
anymore, because the ARRL thinks it's enough for hams to do their own
"word of mouth" advertising -- and they're getting what they're paying
for, IMHO.

> If that is true, my
>father cannot become a ham then. Although he is MORE than intelligent to
>learn the concepts and theories of radio, he does not have much of an
>understanding of it, aside from the little bits I have shared with him.

I got involved mainly because my own curiosity was peaked by that PSA,
but the hams I met in person to that date did little, if anything, to actually
encourage me.

>What about some of the people I am aware of from a variety of groups like
>church groups or civic organizations, or technical organizations, who may
>not have any experience in radio, but other fields. Are they excluded then
>also? There are a ton of wonderful candidates, who would add a lot to the
>Amateur Radio Service, who do not come from CB or "other detestable groups,"
>but are discounted by the above paragraph. I beleive it is our
>responsibilities, as well as some of our larger organizations to positively

>promote the hobby, and to promote it to the proper potential targets. Not
>just handing out licenses as some other individuals in this and other
>newsgroups.

Well, the ARRL would seem to agree with you, but from where I'm sitting,
it doesn't seem to be working very well. I think that a series of TV PSA's,
produced by the ARRL and shown on local TV stations, could do more to
get people interested in and involved in ham radio than any "word of
mouth" ever could.

>I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
>> but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
>> as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
>> hobbyist, and SWL'ing.
>None of that happens anymore. People see
>> hams talking into a microphone without paying airtime charges, and
>> they want in on the same -- right now -- without paying any "dues"
>> as far as learning is concerned. They need to be hand-held through
>> even the most rudimentary basic operation of their off-the-shelf
>> appliances, mainly because they can't be bothered to even read
>> the "Quick Start" instructions. Then they justify their existence by
>> making a big deal out of carrying an HT at a Walk-A-Thon, and
>> making it sound like they're FDNY-class heroes while doing so.

>Granted this would happen in other hobbies also I am sure, in different
>forms. The ones to blame are the licensed persons who did not intercept
>this behavior to start with. Within a few exceptions, everyone in this
>category would have had to have had "some" involvement with a ham somewhere
>down the line.

Which other hobbies would be affected in the same way?

>> The only people who would be discouraged by my opinions aren't
>> worth having in this hobby/service. Anyone with a true curiosity
>> about the technical and operating aspects of ham radio will have the
>> initiative and ingenuity to pursue it, without worrying about the
>> fact that people like Dick, Dave, and myself are able to express our
>> opinion that ham radio is being dumbed-down into irrelevance.
>
>Not discouraged at all.... I believe we are looking out the same window,
>but seeing two different things. The problem comes from existing hams, not
>the new ones.

Well, we can agree to disagree, Ryan -- that's perfectly OK.

>73's, the future and present are so bad! :)

I think the future of ham radio is uncertain, to say the least.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3705. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 03:58:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020205225857.17193.00000103@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33212

In article <3C600C6C.BA7C32D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> ... I could not understand
>> why they didn't want to explore the world of HF operation, ...
>
>And they probably could not understand why you wanted to.

Hmmm...that wasn't so funny -- I wonder why Kim got such a big
laugh out of it?

Trust me Cecil, that wasn't the only thing they didn't understand!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3706. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:04:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C60AB3F.29C0D7B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33217

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C600C6C.BA7C32D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> ... I could not understand
> >> why they didn't want to explore the world of HF operation, ...
> >
> >And they probably could not understand why you wanted to.
>
> Hmmm...that wasn't so funny -- I wonder why Kim got such a big
> laugh out of it?
>
> Trust me Cecil, that wasn't the only thing they didn't understand!

My engineering boss at Intel was perfectly satisfied with a tech license.
I showed him over and over how I could talk to other hams around the
world on HF and he never could understand why I wanted to. I couldn't
understand why he wanted to bust his knuckles restoring Datsun roadsters.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3707. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:06:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C60ABC6.5490746F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33218

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I think the future of ham radio is uncertain, to say the least.

Your and my futures are uncertain, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3708. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:10:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C60AC9A.68238D06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33219

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
>
> Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?
>
> AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
> Techs looking around for a Morse code class!

What makes you think that No-Code Techs have an HF
transceiver?

Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
4wpm?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3709. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:18:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C61F25E.A2B094F0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33220

CAM wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is "converations"
> > > You can have them on CB/freeband without a license.
> >
> > Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If not
> > having conversations...then ?
>
> If it's in CW, it's a QSO, Kim. When will you ever learn?

Har Har. Leave it to Little Kimshe to define ham radio just like she would CB. Where in Part 97 is conversation mentioned? OF COURSE there are conversations. On street corners, TV talk shows cellphones, ad infinitum. Even in ham radio. But only the limp lame and lazy could ever see ham radio as ONLY about conversation. But what did we expect of her and Krell?

3710. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:35:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C61F663.5C183EB1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33221

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > > problem.
> > >
> > > Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
> >
> > BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> > frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.
>
> DSSS has a center frequency also, Dick, with suppressed carrier.
> OOK Morse doesn't occupy a single frequency. Neither does SSB.

Aw, gee. Maybe next time you make an SSB sked you should agree to meet between 14.250 and 14.252400 mhz. Or on PSK31 maybe between 14.070 and 14.070031 mhz.

3711. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:46:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C61F8DD.5E5631F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33222

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
> >
> > Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?
> >
> > AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
> > Techs looking around for a Morse code class!
>
> What makes you think that No-Code Techs have an HF
> transceiver?
>
> Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.

That's total BS. No one can send recognizable code without learning how to do it, and that won't happen on the spur of the moment. Everyone who trys a key first makes all dits. You have to learn the difference and how to form each and to space characters. Otherwise nothing intelligible comes out.

>
> Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
> 4wpm?

Only such as could be recognized as such. Far more likely it would be gibberish.

3712. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:52:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C61FA61.8B8F493E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33223

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
> > could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
> > know it, and you won't!
>
> Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.

Sure, Cecil. But by the time he does it'll be much too late to do him
any good.

3713. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:56:11 UTC
From: Sylvester <SlyXXX@Sylvester-Spinetta.Com>
Message-ID: <LH288.79478$TI2.15803889@typhoon.nyc.rr.com>
Source record: 33225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

can always ask these people about this radio right????

Registrant:
web design
2018 cr 728
Huntsville, AR 72740
US

Domain Name: WOLFLEAP.COM

Administrative Contact:
Howerton, Jon Leroy@ucsd.com
2018 cr 728
Huntsville, AR 72740
US
870-545-3372

Technical Contact:
Howerton, Jon Leroy@ucsd.com
2018 cr 728
Huntsville, AR 72740
US
870-545-3372

Billing Contact:
Howerton, Jon Leroy@ucsd.com
2018 cr 728
Huntsville, AR 72740
US
870-545-3372

Record last updated on 05-Feb-2002.
Record expires on 12-Aug-2002.
Record Created on 12-Aug-2001.

Domain servers in listed order:
NS1.HOST207.COM 207.218.238.22
NS2.HOST207.COM 207.218.238.126

"Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:fbc7a2.0202051229.2e66153b@posting.google.com...
> http://www.wolfleap.com/
>
> This enterprising company sells the "Cherokee 'CM-10 Plus' AM CB
> radio" which boasts "10 bands of 40 channels" for a total coverage of
> "400 channels".

>
> This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to
> *ALL* CB channels".
>
> Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965
> to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part
> of CB now!
>
> -Aaron-

3714. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 04:56:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C61FB2D.639CF2D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33224

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
>
> > BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> >frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.
>
> Is the base frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space frequency?

For sure it's one of them, isn't it? Commonly known as the resting frequency.

> A DSSS
> signal has a carrier that is modulated by a PN code and data. I suppose one
> could argue that an FHSS signal has no real carrier, but it certainly has a
> center frequency to its occupied channel.

There is within the transmitter circuitry which determines an unmodulated
"unspread" base frequency, I'm rather sure.

>
>
> All signals that are modulated take up more than a single frequency.

Of course since therein lies the intelligence.

3715. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 10:24:46 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020206052446.11385.00001331@mb-mo.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33226

>I didn't know that Bert was pregnant

Uh oh, the secrets out! :-D Actually you're a year late as we just celebrated
the 1st birthday of our second (& final) "crumb-snatcher." :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3716. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 10:36:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206053651.17580.00000945@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33227

In article <a3nhfq$i54$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020204211326.05154.00001872@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <20020204072555.19893.00001046@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>> > I have talked with
>> >hundreds of hams over the years and from those conversations, I believe
>that
>> >most hams do not consider the code-test issue to be in the top 10 major
>> >problems facing amateur radio today.
>> >
>> I'd say it's maybe - MAYBE - #10 on a good day. Way behind stuff
>> like CC&Rs, RFI, intruders on the ham bands, lack of publicity. and many
>> others.
>
>Which is why, if asked, most hams would NOT be opposed to
>ending the code test requirement or they would have no
>position pro or con.

No, Bill, that does not follow.

>Translation, the majority of hams do
>not oppose the ending of code testing and, while they may not
>be actively involved in trying to end code testing, they simple
>don't care at all about it.

That's spin-doctoring, pure and simple.

Here's another version based on the same quotes:

>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>> > I have talked with
>> >hundreds of hams over the years and from those conversations, I believe
>that
>> >most hams do not consider the code-test issue to be in the top 10 major
>> >problems facing amateur radio today.
>> >
>> I'd say it's maybe - MAYBE - #10 on a good day. Way behind stuff
>> like CC&Rs, RFI, intruders on the ham bands, lack of publicity. and many
>> others.

Which is why, if asked, most hams would NOT be opposed to keeping the code test requirements at 12/13 and 20 wpm or they would have no position pro or con.

Translation, the majority of hams do not oppose code testing and, while they may not be actively involved in trying to keep code testing, they simply don't think it's that big a problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3717. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 10:59:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206055906.08292.00001227@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33228

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Well, since the ARRL, the national organization for amateur radio, does
>nothing to advertise our hobby/service in the major mass media, then I
>guess I see your point -- being "introduced" into the hobby could be a
>challenge!

Of course, the fact that over the decades, hundreds of thousands of people have
been introduced into ham radio does nothing to stop Larry's spin. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3718. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:01:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020206060104.24913.00000166@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 33229

In article <3C60AC9A.68238D06@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> >Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
>>
>> Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?
>>
>> AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
>> Techs looking around for a Morse code class!
>
>What makes you think that No-Code Techs have an HF
>transceiver?

Hmmm -- yet *another* good point, Cecil! You're right -- a no-code Tech who survived an Earthquake wouldn't have an HF transceiver, would s/he? S/he'd just pull his/her trusty multi-band VHF HT off her/his utility belt, whip it smartly up to his/her face, and make the appropriate call for help. Of course, every tower for every repeater in the region is now a twisted pile of scrap metal, so the 'ole HT no longer gives back that reassuring "kerchunk" it did only a couple of minutes earlier. Uh oh -- now what to do? Use the HT's 6-meter FM capability, and hope the band is open?

>Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.

Only if they've had previous off-the-air practice, Cecil. Unfortunately, the earthquake victims collected at the Red Cross shelter are bleeding and starving to death right NOW. There isn't a functional repeater for any band or radio service in a 100-mile radius. Whether or not anyone outside the disaster area finds out the location of your makeshift shelter now depends on the likes of Kim Walker, Ham Heroine, W5TITs. By some miracle, she does have an HF rig capable of CW (no microphone -- it's an HW-9!). NOW what does she do?

>Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
>4wpm?

Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me. It's about someone who came into ham radio after the requirement to know the Morse code at a useful proficiency level has been dropped.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3719. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:01:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206060119.08292.00001228@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33230

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
>Techs looking around for a Morse code class!

No, they probably won't because after all of the other earthquakes, virtually none of the emergency communications was handled using Morse code. Of course, you take is that some future earthquake might result in most of its emergency traffic being handled with Morse code. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3720. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:04:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206060430.08292.00001229@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33231

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> Sounds like a bunch of experimenters that have beaten us to the punch. :-)

>One of the URLs you cited specifically mentions hams as being
>instrumental in developing the network.

Did they do so under Part 97 or Part 15. Did any of the other URLs mention
Amateur Radio in any way?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3721. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:08:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206060834.08292.00001230@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33232

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather than hams
>themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?

Maybe, although would you really want to see downloads of
http://www.hotbabe.com on Amateur Radio?

I suspect that most of the reasons that this is being done under Part 15 is
that people who are not amateurs can use the network at will.

I just find it a bit ironic that these systems, using "our" frequencies, are
springing up outside of amateur radio. And when I told at least one ham they
exist, I was out and out accused of lying. :-)

The hostility I have received from some for even discussing that hams should be
doing more such technical experimentation and learning more about these modern
radio technologies really suprised me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3722. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:09:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206060940.08292.00001231@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33233

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If not
>having conversations...then ?

But it is the quality of the conversations that he has that make it all right.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3723. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:11:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206061158.08292.00001232@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33234

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> In what way has ARRL tried to affect Fred's livelihood?

>If you are talking about the Newington crowd, how about the
>W5YI automatic license renewal notice system for a measely
>one time fee of $5. Newington countered with offering it
>for free as a side benefit of membership. Would that
>qualify?

Oh, okay. If that is all you are worried about, I can live with it.

I don't think that the ARRL Board of Directors (none of whom live in Newington, btw) did that just to get Fred's goat, Clay.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3724. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:13:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206061337.08292.00001233@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33235

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>I can't remember that either - whatever it is. But, it was good to see
>you at least talking about amateur radio in terms of it's strength
>rather than weakness.

Our strengths do not need to be improved, Jim, and I don't believe that we can address those weaknesses without discussing them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3725. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:34:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206063437.08268.00001143@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33237

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>By some miracle, she does have an HF
>rig capable of CW (no microphone -- it's an HW-9!). NOW what
>does she do?

If the need for CW is based on the fact that a miracle happens, perhaps this discussion should be moved to the alt.miracles newsgroup, Larry.

The fact that you have to fetch that far to find scenarios that might justify the continuation of the CW test does not help your cause.

Unfortunately, that is all you can do at this point, because the mean and nasty things you have said to "defend" the mode will not work to promote the mode on the air.

I am sure Carl considers you NCI's best friend. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3726. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 11:35:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206063508.08268.00001144@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33236

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.

Of course it is about you, Larry. Can't you see that?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3727. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 12:05:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@nospamtm.net>
Message-ID: <p_888.184$Bg4.277318@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 33238

> Since when is "plently" an exact number?

When it is appropriate to use it in place of an actual number since the amount of amateurs using CW would vary from day to day, and possibly even hour to hour. Since he could not be in every grid square on the whole planet to be able to hear every amateur transmitting morse code on CW at any one given time, I believe it is an accurate reflection of usage of the two distinct frequency ranges.

Ryan
KC8PMX

3728. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 12:05:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@nospamtm.net>
Message-ID: <q_888.185$Bg4.277223@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 33239

Oh my god.... get him some Viagra!

> >Being a 200,000 ft tall alien gives me a different perspective.
>
> You shrank 100,000 feet? omigawd...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3729. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 12:05:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@nospamtm.net>
Message-ID: <t_888.186$Bg4.277148@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 33240

If you use Microsoft Outlook Express there is the Block Senders function there. Now, the only time I see text from that asshole, it is when it is in a quote. I am done with him, and will not be bothered with him in any way.

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:3c5f291b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020204103019.16518.00001427@mb-cu.aol.com...
> > >I passed that same 5 wpm and the full general 25 years ago,
> > >yet didn't get the HF access because of the backwardness
> > >of the rules until recently.
> > >
> >
> > You didnt get there because you were either to Lazy or Stupid to meet the
> > standards at that time. Just love how these Clowns try to blame there
> failures
> > on someone or something else.
>
> Could you at least rise above sounding so ignorant when you post stuff?
> There are stories out there about people from Louisiana that you could bring
> true. :o
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

3730. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 14:00:41 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202060600.62c1c8e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33241

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5eabb9_2@news7.fast.net>...

> Bert ... you're absolutely right that I should NOT have referred
> to you as a twit. I humbly and sincerely apologize.
>
> Carl - wa6vse

Ah, don't worry about it Carl. We differ in our opinions but it needn't get so heavy that the dicussion becomes heated. Rest assured that although my opinions may differ re. the retention of Element 1, I still respect everybody elses opinions too. Take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

P.S. Although the VE's joked around with me about being a General for approx. 20 mins., I was informed that technically...I was never a General.

3731. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 14:18:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202060618.2b23a997@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33242

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020205072432.28697.00001342@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> >problem.
>
> SS "runs" on a frequency just as much as any other modulation mode. The
> process of modulation adds additional frequencies to the carrier frequency.
> OOK CW typically occupies about 50 to 400 Hz of spectrum, depending on the rise
> and fall time of the modulation.
>
>
They all have "center freqs". The discussion is about the amount of
spectrum space above and below the "carrier freq" the mode uses to
carry out it's mission.
>
>
> How do you do that manually for the modes you operate?
>
>
I listen around the frequency. If I don't hear somebody who can hear
me I've only screwed up a few Khz of the band with a narrow mode. If
Carl's system screws up similarly it has the obvious potential for
having a negative impact on many more frequencies (qsos in
progress)than I do.
>
>

> >> Carl - wa6vse
> >>
> >>
> >w3rv
>
>
> >>Tere is no excuse for the CW operators who key
> >> down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
>
> >Don't be silly.
>
> Why was his statement silly? Would it help if he had said that there is no
> excuse for a digital operator who plunks down on a CW QSO in progress? Both are
> inexcusable if caused by poor operating practice or malice.
>

>
THAT's what he said. That's Kimmy's "field", I don't go there.
>
>
> Both are
> understandable if they are caused by the unpredictable nature of propagation.
> Neither are "silly," IMHO.
>
>
Humbug, see above wrt to the inheresnt nature of SS being
"accidentally propagated" all over a large bandwidth.
>
>
Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
over-the-horizon radar Ed?
>
>
Those of us who were there have not forgotten the basic lesson.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

3732. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 14:37:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206093718.02067.00001155@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33243

In article <f8026928.0202041406.67c61022@posting.google.com>, jbloom@arrl.org
(Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20020203173709.02067.00001069@mb-ct.aol.com>...
>> In article <f8026928.0202021901.6cd08d1e@posting.google.com>,
>jbloom@arrl.org
>> (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20020202174753.17580.00000783@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> >> Show us your numbers, Ed. What was the growth per year in the time
>periods
>> >> before the Tech lost its code test in 1991, after that change,
>> >
>> >YEAR AMATEURS DELTA DELTA(%)
>> >1980 393,000 --- ---
>> >1990 467,000 74,000 19% (1980-1990)
>> >2000 682,000 215,000 46% (2000-1990)
>>
>> Not to be argumentative, but where do your numbers come from, Jon?
>
>From the flying-horse Callbook, but I have to apologize for a
>transcription error. The 1990 number should have been 509,000, which
>changes the table like so:
>
>1980 393,000 --- ---
>1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990)
>2000 682,000 227,000 34% (1990-2000)
>
>Not as impressive as the erroneous numbers,

They are still erroneous, Jon.

The chart should read:

1980 393,000 --- ---
1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990)
2000 682,000 173,000 34% (1990-2000)

> but still, almost twice as
>many licenses added in 1990-2000 as in 1980-1990.
>
Nope. Only 49% more - 57,000. Much of that is the result of the
change in license term to ten years.

>> I have a a 1984-85 edition of the ARRL Call Directory. Printed early 1984.
>It
>> says 453,000
>> total US hams.
>
>The FH 1984 Callbook says 433,000. I don't know for sure why the ARRL
>book had a higher number, but it could be because the FCC kept expired
>licenses in the database until the grace period expired, and the ARRL
>book was drawn directly from FCC data.

Maybe. More probaly, though, is the fact that the FH books are printed at
the end of the previous year. (the "1984" FH book was printed in late 1983 and
so contains late 1983 numbers, not 1984 totals).
>
>> >1980 0.17%
>> >1990 0.19%
>> >2000 0.25%
>
>Corrected:
>
>1980 0.17%
>1990 0.20%
>2000 0.25%
>
>> How do you compensate for the change from 5 to 10 year licenses, btw?
>
>No accurate compensation is really possible.

But an educated guess is possible. Here's an example:

Suppose that the average amateur "career" is 40 years. That means 2.5% of the
amateur population
drops out per year. (One ham in 40 goes inactive per year, IOW). At the level
of 500,000 hams,
that amounts to 12,500 hams per year dropping out.

Of course any individual ham's dropping out is not noticed in the totals until
the license expires. Under the
old system the totals carried 5 years worth of dropouts at any given time. When
the license period was
doubled, the number of dropouts in the system gradually doubled. This
"bubble" of dropped-out-but-still-licensed hams serves to inflate the total. At
the level of 500,000
hams and 2.5% annual dropout rate, the "bubble" was 62,500 with a 5 year term
and 125,000 with
a ten year term. Difference: 62,500 - MORE than the 57,000 increase noted
above. And that assumes
only one ham in 40 drops out per year.

>We should recognize,
>though, that the number of licences in 1990 is somewhat artificially
>high, since there were no expirations in 1989. That makes the growth
>in 1980-1990 look somewhat better than it is.

Yes - there's one year in those totals, but four years in the 2000 totals.

>And...
>
>> The
>> change occurred in 1984, which means that from 1989 to 1994 there were
>> NO US ham license expirations. Conveniently, most of that falls into the
>1990-
>> 2000 time frame.
>
>So did the burst of pent-up expirations in 1994.

NO!

There was NO "burst of pent up expirations" in 1994. 1994 saw the 1984
licenses expiring, that's all. The "bubble" continues.

> By 1995, things were
>back to normal.

No, not at all, unless you define "normal" as carrying a "bubble" of over
100,000
licenses.

>Of course, there are licenses that would have expired
>after 5 years but didn't until after 10. That makes the 1990-2000
>growth look somewhat better than it is. How much better? I dunno. Do
>you?

See above. The 2.5% dropout rate says at least 50,000. As the ARS grows, the
number grows even larger.

Add to this surges caused by things like changes in the vanity call rules and
renewal rules and it's a real mess. But it's a safe bet that at least 1 in 5 US
ham
licenses will not be renewed at the end of its term.
>
>> >Clearly, growth spurted after the 1991 no-code license came into
>> >effect. Do you really doubt that, Jim?
>>
>> Whenever the "price" of something is lowered, there is usually a
>> spurt of "sales". The important question is whether it's a transient
>> effect or a long term change.
>
>If the "price" stays down, won't "sales" remain stronger?

NO. The market becomes saturated. Look at what happened to computers, VCRs,
microwave ovens, etc. A point is reached where most "sales" are replacements,
not
first-time buyers.
>
>> I doubt that the 1991 or 2000 changes have/will result in longterm growth
>> changes.
>

>Nobody will ever be able to say for sure. It's impossible to isolate
>all of the factors long-term.

It's possible to see the trends only after long periods of time.

> But the unsurprising pattern that seems
>to be common across the history of Amateur Radio is that each time it
>has been made easier to get and retain a license, growth has followed.

Paradoxically, growth has also followed when the requirements were made
HARDER!!

>It happened in the 50's after the creation of 5-wpm licenses.

The ARS grew from 60,000 to 100,000 in the 5 years between the end of WW2 and
the 1951
restructuring - when all licenses required 13 wpm and a General written right
off the bat.

>It
>happened in the late 70's and early 80's when the Bash books made it
>easier to pass the writtens.

The growth actually started back in the very early 1970s (compare the annual
totals from 1963 to 1983).
Oddly enough, growth stalled from 1963 to about 1970, then INCREASED after
incentive licensing was
in place (late 1968). Long before Bash, the trend was clear.

And not all hams used Bash books. I've never even seen one.

> It happened in the 90's with no-code.

Maybe. Maybe not. Other factors cloud the issue.

>There were other factors that played a part, but it's not unreasonable
>to think the correlation is causal.
>
>Here's a table of FH Callbook counts of new licenses issued:
>
>1980 32,692
>1981 34,373
>1982 40,371
>1983 30,505
>1984 27,610
>1985 31,207
>1986 25,942
>1987 41,649

Note the surge due to the change in the rules in 1987 - then the drop back to
near old levels.

>1988 27,139
>1989 40,972

Another surge - two years BEFORE nocodetest!

>1990 28,667
>1991 29,300
>1992 48,700
>1993 46,806
>1994 50,316
>1995 57,154
>1996 48,727
>(The 1997 Callbook, giving 1996 licenses issued, is the last one I
>have handy at the moment.)

>Notice the immediate and sustained increase in growth rate after the
>1991 no-code changes.

Yes, there's an increase - but is it sustained? Note the drop in 1996. What
happened in
following years?

>And these numbers can be in no way biased by the
>5/10 year term change since they are NEW licenses.

Does a vanity license count as a NEW license?

>> >March 1999 674,719
>> >March 2000 677,784 (1-yr growth: 3,065)
>> >March 2001 684,359 (1-yr growth: 6,575)
>>
>> Based on whose numbers?
>
>AH0A
>
>> > That's probably no
>> >coincidence: the decline began just as the first 1991 no-code licences
>> >began to expire.
>>
>> Which means what?
>
>Just what I said:
>> >The no-code rules caused a jump in the license
>> >numbers, and it's not surprising to see a matching decline as those
>> >licenses reach their expiration dates. Whether these expirations will
>> >continue to offset growth remains to be seen. It's way too early to
>> >tell for sure.

In other words, hams who got nocode tickets are more likely
to drop out than their predecesors.
>
>IOW, there's generally a high rate of "infant mortality" with new
>licensees, and we have to wait for that downward bump to flatten out
>to see what the long-term effect will be.

See above.
>

>> But you hold up the 1 year growth as proof.
>
>Nope. You asked for an analysis. I provided one. But I don't think it
>stands as proof, as I clearly said:
>> >Caveat: All of this 1-year-term number crunching is pretty tenuous
>> >stuff upon which to draw conclusions. After all we're talking about
>> >sub-1% variations. Those are pretty small potatoes. In the last 12
>> >months, from Jan '01 to Jan '02 the change in the count was zero.
>> >(Yes, exactly zero, according to AH0A.) From Jul '97 to Jul '98
>> >(pre-restructuring) we lost 5,331 licensees. What does that tell us
>> >about the success of restructuring? Not a damn thing.
>>
>> Exactly. But we are to believe without challenge claims that code testing
>> is/was "crippling" amateur radio. Sorry, I don't buy it.
>
>Who said that? Not me.

Read Carl's brag signature.

> I'm only disputing your claim that it makes no
>difference to growth rates. I'm sure Amateur Radio would have gotten
>along just fine with no changes in the rules. But I do think the
>growth would have been less, and the available numbers tend to bear
>that out. Not prove it, mind you, but suggest it strongly.
>
>> Let's look at some more numbers from AH0A (end-of-month totals):
>>
>> Total licenses March 00 (eve of restructuring): 677,784
>> Total licenses January 02 (most recent): 682,602
>>
>> Increase: 4,918 in 22 months since restructuring
>>
>> Total licenses May 98 (22 months before March 00): 673,973
>>
>> Increase: 4,011 in 22 months before restructuring
>>
>> Not exactly a big difference (917).
>
>Nope. But that includes the downward bump from the initial no-code
>expirations. Let's check again in a few years and see how it looks.

Which is why I keep posting the numbers on another thread.
>
>> How about these (from AH0A):
>>
>> Total new licenses from March 00 to Dec 01 (sum of all months from
>> April 00 to Dec 01): 33,856
>>
>> Total new licenses from July 98 to March 00 (sum of all months for
>> period of same length before April 00): 27,935
>>

>> Difference: 5,921 in 21 months
>
>That's about a 20% difference in growth rate, Jim, which isn't exactly
>negligible. And, by the way, it shows that the effect of the 10-year
>no-code expirations IS offsetting increased growth in new licenses.
>Again, the effects are relatively small and short-term and shouldn't
>be used to predict long-term trends.

The point is that the growth has not been very great despite massive rules changes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3733. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:03:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3rmlaftq1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33244

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020206060430.08292.00001229@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> Sounds like a bunch of experimenters that have beaten us to the punch.
:-)
>
> >One of the URLs you cited specifically mentions hams as being
> >instrumental in developing the network.
>
> Did they do so under Part 97 or Part 15. Did any of the other URLs
mention
> Amateur Radio in any way?

The regulatory service under which the hams operated is irrelevant to the point that "hams" did indeed help develop the system. It is relevant however, to the need and to the regulatory restrictions.

3734. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:06:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3rmpvftt1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33245

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204191050.09077.00000002@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >What conclusion were you trying to lead me to Ed? It seemed you were
> >trying to lead us away from the opposite conclusion.
>
> W5YI is not anti-ARRL.

Does Bruce Perens think he is?

3735. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:17:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3rnfkgar1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33248

KC8PMX <kc8pmx@nospamtm.net> wrote in message
news:p_888.184$Bg4.277318@monger.newsread.com...
> > Since when is "plently" an exact number?

> When it is appropriate to use it in place of an actual number since the
> amount of amateurs using CW would vary from day to day, and possibly even
> hour to hour.

Waffles anyone?

When the IRS asks you for your exact income, would a response such as "not
much" be what they had in mind?

Cecil did not ask about how many CW operators there were, he asked exactly
how many. That is an unanswerable question, which is exactly what he
intended.

3736. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:23:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3rnr9gcj1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33246

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020204190747.09077.00000001@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Just out of curiosity, what do you hope will be accomplished by engaging
in
> >this type of rhetoric?
>
> http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/misc/dnh061700.html

And you hope to accomplish that by characterizing amateur radio operators as
NOT contributing to advancements?

3737. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:24:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3rntkggu1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33247

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C60986C.4D057259@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Cecil could attest somewhat to extent of my programming capabilities. I
> > think I'm more of a hardware defined kind of guy. ;-)
>
> I can attest that Jim came up with a roulette system program
> that could beat itself. :-)

I rest my case. :-)

3738. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 16:32:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a3robhglq1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33249

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gr35zsi.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Tue, 05 Feb 2002 10:28:56 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> >> That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.
> >>
> >> They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away.
> > >
> > >How can electronics "buffs" file bankruptcy?
>
> Metricom/Ricochet was a business providing v.90 wireless internet
> connectivity when nothing faster existed. They had service
> throughout all major cities and even smaller ones where the customer
> base supported it, and were un the process of upgrading to DSL
> speeds.
>
> It went down with the dot-com implosion.

I guess I can assume in this case that their lack of success is what led to
the characterization of these particular businessmen as
hobbiests/electronics buffs.

3739. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 18:08:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c617133_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33250

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C5ECB8F.4E74DA4E@uci.edu...
> High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past
the
> end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
mile
> too?

Ranges for high speed data are not limited to "the end of
the block" or less, as you seem to imply.

I believe I've mentioned before that I've run the link
budget calculations for a 6 mile+ path from my home
to my employer's closest facility and that WITH the
standard output power of +15 dBm from a standard
"client" device and 20" grid dishes at both ends of
the link, I'd have link margin to burn at 11 Mbps ...
thus assuring execellent reliablilty. If I were willing
to settle for, say 2 Mbps, I could use smaller, lower
gain antennas, extend the range, or some combination
thereof ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGFxJZe+N6+q84HiEQLEtACgsPsmKSC9WBoeHG1GJYU9aFPk+AoAnR5D
i5Rq9Xg8LVx7+gqqqSNYdOsN
=j+zE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3740. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 18:12:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c617209_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33301

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C5F16CE.ACF166D5@uci.edu...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> >
> > >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past
the
> > >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
mile
> > >too?
>
> > That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities
with Part
> > 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
>
> I believe you. I really do.
>
> Well..... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)

Ed is very trustworthy ... check out http://www.nycwireless.net
for just ONE example ...

Carl - wa6vse

3741. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 18:14:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61728a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33302

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C602468.A3359F7E@uci.edu...
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On Mon, 04 Feb 2002 15:18:38 -0800, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > > >> >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a
signal past the
> > > >> >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites
every mile
> > > >> >too?
> > > >
> > > >> That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major
cities with Part
> > > >> 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> > > >
> > > >I believe you. I really do.
> > > >
> > > >Well...... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
> > >
> > That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.
> >
> > They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away.
>
> How can electronics "buffs" file bankruptcy?

Metricom was a commercial enterprise ... and the data
rates their system provided were nowhere near what
802.11b can provide ... I believe that their limited data
rate offerering was a key factor in their demise ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGFyepe+N6+q84HiEQJbfgCg9V3WNrS99oXNVX5Z6spmNieZEk4An1Cc
5ZWRRsY7GNJbkuk5DUPasVQj
=CTl8
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3742. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 18:59:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c617d0c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33303

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a3ptecfpv1@heap.juniper.net...
> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>
> I know people from this group, and it is probably worth pointing out
> that a lot of the "electronics buffs" involved are hams (the geeks
tend
> to be of either the ham flavor or the programmer flavor, or both.
The
> ones that are hams seem to do a lot nicer outside installation work,
> given the sample of a half dozen I've seen).
>
> I would guess they do this stuff as Part 15 projects rather than
Part 97
> because Part 97 content and control restrictions wring almost all
the joy
> out of it. Networking infrastructure projects are way more
interesting if
> you can get a lot of people to use the infrastructure you build for
a lot
> of stuff, rather than a few people doing hardly anything. In a
strange
> way this is (non-emergency) public service which is very much in the
spirit
> of 97.1(a), not to mention (c) and (d), except it is a service which
hams
> aren't allowed to provide as hams.
>
> Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather than
hams
> themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?
>
> Dennis Ferguson

Dennis, et al ...

I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
development of high speed computer networking (under
Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)

However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
sites could not be accessed.

However, I also think that limitations our our ability to provide
a robust backup to the internet access needs of the emergency
management agencies we serve in times of disaster should
be eliminated and that the ampr.org domain should become,
to the degree practical with *reasonable* restrictions, a much
more viable and vibrant part of the internet.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGF86pe+N6+q84HiEQIgowCcCulTKWidDG+jDhO13OpPDU0J+oIAoPrM
SBEYd7VddCTFnRfc3vYxnRj+
=mHQb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3743. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 19:04:41 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C617E0F.47E80E7F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33304

My my! With all of this clear headed logical thinking and
excursions of profound explanations flowing into the heads
of those young nubile FCC commissioners, (see p.16 Nov. 2001
QST), coupled with the fruit cake proclamations of the NCI,
I guess amateur radio is in good straits. What do you
think???

--Clay
wyn@att.net

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>
> >I think that the point here was that all modulated transmissions run on a
> >base
> >(i.e. carrier) frequency, and the modulation therefore makes it a RANGE of
> >frequencies - +/- of the carrier. I agree it was poorly stated.
>
> Is the "base" frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space? SS signal
> occupy a range of frequencies +- of the carrier or the center frequency of the
> occupied channel. A non-SS signal at a data rate equal to the speed of the PN
> encoding would occupy essentially the same bandwidth of the DSSS signal. What
> is the difference?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3744. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 19:07:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c617eea_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33305

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202050604470.22429-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>
> But as or just before you moved, did you expire your OLD ip
addresses or
> otherwise inform your local ampr.org coordinator that you wouldn't
be needing
> them anymore? You seem to still be listed for Orange Co., CA, yet
apparently,
> you haven't had an address there for about 9 years and are now on
your fourth
> address and third state since CA (per your license records).

I *thought* I had adequately communicated that I would no
longer require the Orange County IP addresses ... I will check
into it and get things cleaned up. Thanks fof bringing this
apparent bookeeping SNAFU to my attention.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGF+05e+N6+q84HiEQJmcQCgxJAmPGLvaHnZObc7xBSFcQtOjvMAn04j
48G1nIuZaYzyLnsfMqaIC/B7
=z5BR
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3745. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 19:37:38 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0202061137.236b1f08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33306

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020206093718.02067.00001155@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> In article <f8026928.0202041406.67c61022@posting.google.com>, jbloom@arrl.org
> (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

(More info on new licenses:)
> >
> >Here's a table of FH Callbook counts of new licenses issued:
> >
> >1980 32,692
> >1981 34,373
> >1982 40,371
> >1983 30,505
> >1984 27,610
> >1985 31,207
> >1986 25,942
> >1987 41,649
>
> Note the surge due to the change in the rules in 1987 - then the drop back to
> near old levels.
>
> >1988 27,139
> >1989 40,972
>
> Another surge - two years BEFORE nocodetest!
>
> >1990 28,667
> >1991 29,300
> >1992 48,700
> >1993 46,806
> >1994 50,316
> >1995 57,154
> >1996 48,727
> >(The 1997 Callbook, giving 1996 licenses issued, is the last one I
> >have handy at the moment.)
>
> >Notice the immediate and sustained increase in growth rate after the
> >1991 no-code changes.

> Yes, there's an increase - but is it sustained? Note the drop in 1996. What
> happened in
> following years?

From AH0A (new licenses, not counting vanity and grace period renewals):

1998 17,521
1999 16,311
2000 18,564
2001 19,021

>>And these numbers can be in no way biased by the
> >5/10 year term change since they are NEW licenses.
>
> Does a vanity license count as a NEW license?

I think it may count as a new license under the old FCC system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3746. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:04:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C619A59.D6E7EDBE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33307

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Is the base frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space frequency?
>
> For sure it's one of them, isn't it? Commonly known as the resting frequency.

Actually, not for sure it's one of them. My PCT2e generates FSK tones in
sideband mode where the carrier is suppressed for both mark and space. The
tone pairs are 1200/1400 Hz and 2300/2100 Hz.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3747. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:06:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C619AF3.44DCD573@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33308

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > DSSS has a center frequency also, Dick, with suppressed carrier.
> > OOK Morse doesn't occupy a single frequency. Neither does SSB.
>
> Aw, gee. Maybe next time you make an SSB sked you should agree to meet
> between 14.250 and 14.252400 mhz. Or on PSK31 maybe between 14.070 and
> 14.070031 mhz.

A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3748. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:11:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C619BF8.9A4A1D66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33309

W1RFI wrote:
> The hostility I have received from some for even discussing that hams should be
> doing more such technical experimentation and learning more about these modern
> radio technologies really suprised me.

Having to remove one's head from one's posterior can hurt one's eyes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3749. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:15:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C619D05.13B94D10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33310

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Cecil did not ask about how many CW operators there were, he asked exactly
> how many. That is an unanswerable question, which is exactly what he
> intended.

Actually, Webster says that any answer that is accurate is exact.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3750. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:25:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C619F4B.619709F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33311

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
>
> That's total BS.

Nope, it's not, Dick. I speak from my Cub Scouts experience. My cousin and I made up two charts, one for XMIT (the normal one in the ARRL Handbook) and another for receiving which went like:

. E
.. I
... S
.... H
..... 5
etc.

The lookup chart for receiving is necessarily different indexing from the lookup chart for transmitting. I soon learned that I didn't have to look at the charts. But my cousin always used the charts. He could translate either way at 4wpm.

I hear many CW operators who don't know that a dash is supposed to be three times as long as a dot. I hear dashes that are five times as long as a dot. It doesn't matter. I can still read it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3751. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:33:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C61A12A.13ACB081@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33312

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Hmmm -- yet *another* good point, Cecil! You're right -- a no-code
> Tech who survived an Earthquake wouldn't have an HF transceiver,
> would s/he?

Not if you have your way. However, when the code requirement is
dropped, those same havenot techs may indeed have an HF transceiver
and be able to participate in emergency communications. From what
you've said, you would rather nocode techs be deprived of an HF
transceiver during and emergency. That is right, isn't it?

> >Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
>
> Only if they've had previous off-the-air practice, Cecil.

When in cub scouts, my cousin and I started communicating right
away at about 4wpm using send/receive charts. It ain't rocket
science. At 4wpm, one can write down dots and dashes and translate
them later.

> >Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
> >4wpm?
>
> Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.

Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3752. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:34:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C61A15C.DC475746@uci.edu>
Source record: 33314

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C5ECB8F.4E74DA4E@uci.edu...
> > High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past
> the
> > end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
> mile
> > too?
>
> Ranges for high speed data are not limited to "the end of
> the block" or less, as you seem to imply.

Cell sites have to be pretty close together, Carl. I didn't think that
issue was in dispute.

> I believe I've mentioned before that I've run the link
> budget calculations for a 6 mile+ path from my home
> to my employer's closest facility and that WITH the
> standard output power of +15 dBm from a standard
> "client" device and 20" grid dishes at both ends of
> the link, I'd have link margin to burn at 11 Mbps ...
> thus assuring execellent reliablilty. If I were willing
> to settle for, say 2 Mbps, I could use smaller, lower
> gain antennas, extend the range, or some combination
> thereof ...

There is only one other ham within 6 miles of my home, and we don't have
a lot of data we need to exchange.

3753. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:35:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C61A1AE.DC158327@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33313

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
> > > could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
> > > know it, and you won't!
> > >
> > Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
>
> Sure, Cecil. But by the time he does it'll be much too late to do him
> any good.

Why, because you would refuse to respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? 4wpm is easily
doable with lookup charts, Dick. I speak from experience.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3754. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:50:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C61A514.B9B4D096@uci.edu>
Source record: 33315

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C5F16CE.ACF166D5@uci.edu...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> > >
> > > >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal past
> the
> > > >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
> mile
> > > >too?
> > >
> > > That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major cities
> with Part
> > > 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> >
> > I believe you. I really do.
> >
> > Well...... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
>
> Ed is very trustworthy ... check out http://www.nycwireless.net
> for just ONE example ...

What I don't believe is that they set up cell sites every mile. Is that
"exactly" what nycwireless did?
```

3755. Re: foolbner aka middlefiger aka fooltime Latest troll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 21:52:57 UTC
From: mrhandsupsideyourhead@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8356ebb7.0202061352.74f386c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33316
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

foolbern aka middlefinger aka fooltime aka moolie and at least a dozen
other fake screen names. what in gods green earth are you
thinking!!!

3756. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:03:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61a854_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33317

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C61A514.B9B4D096@uci.edu...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C5F16CE.ACF166D5@uci.edu...
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> > > >
> > > > >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal
past
> > the
> > > > > >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
> > mile
> > > > > >too?
> > > >
> > > > That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major
cities
> > with Part
> > > > > 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> > > >
> > > I believe you. I really do.
> > >
> > > Well...... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
> >
> > Ed is very trustworthy ... check out http://www.nycwireless.net
> > for just ONE example ...
>
> What I don't believe is that they set up cell sites every mile. Is that
> "exactly" what nycwireless did?

I would guess that the APs (access points ... what I believe you
actually mean when you say "cell sites.") are probably closer
together than 1 mile in a dense urban environment like NYC.

Carl - wa6vse

3757. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:13:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C61AAA4.28FE7095@uci.edu>
Source record: 33318

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Cecil did not ask about how many CW operators there were, he asked exactly
> > how many. That is an unanswerable question, which is exactly what he
> > intended.
>
> Actually, Webster says that any answer that is accurate is exact.

So an answer such as greater than one, but less than a million would be
an exact answer - as far as Webster is concerned. Did you employ
similar such exactness at Intel?

3758. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:27:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61adf9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33319

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202050115.70b5fd34@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> >
> >
> > Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
> > expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
> > frequency.
> > That's what the rules say.
> >
> >
> Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> problem.

DSSS runs "on a frequency" in the same way that SSB does ...
in a good DSSS system, the carrier is suppressed well below
the modulation content.

Using your "terminology" SSB doesn't run "on a frequency"
either (which is at least borderline rediculous), since the only
way it would be on a single frequency would be if only a single
tone were transmitted and the carrier suppression were infinite.
The first is of virtually no utility and the second is unachievable.

> > However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> > without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
> > systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
> > levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
> > the channel is occupied by another user.
> >
> >
> You know as well as I do that, particularly on the high bands, what
> one rcvr hears is not necessarily what another even nearby rcvr
hears.
> Try to dial in with yer cellphone, the connect fails. Walk to the
> other side of the room and ya connect, etc. Or how do you sense a
rcvr
> listening on a freq while another user is having a qso with a third
```

> user the SS station can't hear?

There are mechanisms for avoiding the "hidden terminal" problem,
or at least significantly minimizing it ... as has been said before,
there is no guarantee of absolute freedom from interference from
ANY other use of the same spectrum ... even from other users of
"legacy" modes.

> > However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
> > words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
> > down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
> >
> >
> Don't be silly.

Who's being silly? I'm making a statement of fact
in a perfectly serious manner ...

> There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that any
> ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the real
> Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any
conditions.

You must be assuming the system will/must of necessity operate
at 2m using the TNC and voice radio paradigm ... that's exactly
what I'm suggesting we abandon because it doesn't work very
well.

> Second while packet ran well along the flatlands from the Carolinas
to
> Quebec it never got over the mountains to the west, stations in
Philly
> had no packet connection with Altoona or Pittsburgh. That's very
> limiting and has nothing to do with the state of the art. Internet
> comms are virtually instantaneous on a global basis. The real biggie
> being that the Internet we have today exists because of the billions
> of dollars which government and commercial entities have invested in
> it. Given any technology hams might have available we'll never come
> close and that's why there was a mass exodus from 2m packet. It wuz
> the MONEY, not the technology which spanked packet into boredom.

I wasn't saying that we could "mirror" the entire infrastructure ...
only
that we can provide local service at high bandwidth and a robust,
portable capability to provide service within and bridge to the
outside
from disaster areas.

If you don't want to "play," fine ... but why try to "prove" that it's
impossible ... just to discourage others from getting involved
and actually doing it???

> > > Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
> > > demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
> > > attract.
> >
> >
> > Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
> > dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
> > for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
> > would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"
> >
> "Slow code" packet still has a very useful place in ham radio and is
> very heavily used in at least one niche AND growing application,
> specifically the dx spots networks scattered around the country.

Yawn ... you can get the same information and more on the
internet ...

> This
> remnant of the original packet system still exists and runs nicely
> today between Virginia and upper New England in the local instance.
> And, as has been clearly demonstrated, it works a helluva lot better
> than it's Internet counterparts. Why you might ask? Because the very
> limited regional-only coverage of packet is an automatic "spam
filter"
> if you will.
> >
> >
> If a spot shows up in the local networks it's quite likely that
> anybody on the net can hear the spot. The Interenet spots sites are
> overloaded with irrelevant spots which have to be laboriously
> filtered, to wit, who the hell in dubya three land cares if some JA
> just worked a 9M8 on 80 when it's broad daylite here??

Having seen the information on the internet, I find it difficult
to believe that your mental filtering capacities are seriously
strained ... if they are, then we have a different problem here
and probaby shouldn't continue the thread because to do so
would be futile.

> So yes Packet lives on. And it NEEDS to be get FIXED dammit!

So let's talk about actually FIXING it ... rather than putting another
band-aid on a system that was poorly designed in the first place.

> Even a lousy 4800bps would have prevented those crashes. Nitwits . .
.

At least you've properly characterized 4800 bps :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPGGty5e+N6+q84HiEQIZZwCfYbCXQ+rwEFfN+UlJcgcNj/IffhYAn0PG
xntb92ccvOfH5Bm6rVMajMje
=H+I1
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3759. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:30:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C61AE90.7DF8E64@uci.edu>
Source record: 33320

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C61A514.B9B4D096@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C5F16CE.ACF166D5@uci.edu...
> > > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
> > > > >
> > > > > >High speed data would indeed be useful, Carl. Getting a signal
> past
> > > the
> > > > > > >end of the block is also useful. Should we set up cell sites every
> > > mile
> > > > > > >too?
> > > > >
> > > > > That is exactly what some electronics buffs are doing in major
> cities
> > > with Part
> > > > > > 15 2.4 GHz wireless devices.
> > > > >
> > > > I believe you. I really do.
> > > >
> > > > Well...... acutally, I don't. Sorry. :-)
> > >
> > > Ed is very trustworthy ... check out http://www.nycwireless.net
> > > for just ONE example ...
> >
> > What I don't believe is that they set up cell sites every mile. Is that
> > "exactly" what nycwireless did?

> I would guess that the APs (access points ... what I believe you
> actually mean when you say "cell sites.") are probably closer
> together than 1 mile in a dense urban environment like NYC.

Sounds fantastic. Guess it didn't work out for them though. Remind me
again why is it that hams should do the same thing?
```

3760. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:37:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b066_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33321

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202060618.2b23a997@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020205072432.28697.00001342@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> > >Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > >problem.
> >
> > SS "runs" on a frequency just as much as any other modulation
mode. The
> > process of modulation adds additional frequencies to the carrier
frequency.
> > OOK CW typically occupies about 50 to 400 Hz of spectrum,
depending on the rise
> > and fall time of the modulation.
> >
> >
> They all have "center freqs". The discussion is about the amount of
> spectrum space above and below the "carrier freq" the mode uses to
> carry out it's mission.

I know that Dick Carroll will jump in here and say "It's irrelevant to
ham radio.", but check out Shannon ... DSSS systems (just one
form of SS, but they are what we've been mostly talking about
here in the form of 802.11b as an example useful for high-speed
networking) trade bandwidth for communications efficiency and
required SNR ... they have "processing gain".

> > How do you do that manually for the modes you operate?
> >
> I listen around the frequency. If I don't hear somebody who can hear
> me I've only screwed up a few Khz of the band with a narrow mode. If
> Carl's system screws up similarly it has the obvious potential for
> having a negative impact on many more frequencies (qsos in
> progress)than I do.

"Carl's system" (though I'm not taking credit for 802.11b) operates
in a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes, operates
at power levels FAR below what I'd be you operate CW at (even if
you're "running barefoot" ... even if you're "running QRP") and has a
much lower PSD (Power Spectral Densisty) ... you exaggerate the

potential for widespread interference.

> >
> > >>There is no excuse for the CW operators who key
> > >> down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
> >
> > >Don't be silly.
> >
> > Why was his statement silly? Would it help if he had said that
there is no
> > excuse for a digital operator who plunks down on a CW QSO in
progress? Both are
> > inexcusable if caused by poor operating practice or malice.

I thought I said that ... (that the reverse was true as well ...)

> Humbug, see above wrt to the inheresnt nature of SS being
> "accidentally propagated" all over a large bandwidth.

There's nothing "accidental" about it ... SS deliberately
trades bandwidth for SNR performance and robustness
("process gain").

> Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
> over-the-horizon radar Ed?

What the hell does that have to do with low-powered stuff
in the upper UHF or low microwave frequency range? I'm
not talking about stuff that offers world-wide ionospheric
propagation here .. why do you insist on trying to compare
apples to oranges?

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGGwPZe+N6+q84HiEQJ/DgCfSxorYkFo60TDuKWSwtOY3pK8Z3MAn0yp
a6gijk67YrOk9BwpK9D73DUp
=gBy+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3761. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:43:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b1d2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33322

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6151F8.F030CF31@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > problem.
> >
> > Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
>
> BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.
>

3762. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:48:05 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a3sbr5$1fuo$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 33324

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
>>Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather than hams
>>themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?
>
>Maybe, although would you really want to see downloads of
>http://www.hotbabe.com on Amateur Radio?

If I'm interested in the technology of building wireless network infrastructure I'm not sure I care where the bits I'm serving are coming from or what they are. It's providing the service of moving bits that is the interesting part, the part you can learn stuff from, not being a censor. And I don't have to see downloads from hotbabe.com anyway, that's what encryption is for, and if I don't see them why would I care? IDing frequently in the clear is sufficient for interference mitigation purposes, what technical purpose is served by the encryption and content constraints?

I left a real job to build wired Internet services (my wife thought I was crazy) about 15 years ago because I was interested in learning what it would take to build a new kind of communications service that was useful to people. I can't remember ever worrying about which people it would be useful for, providing connectivity to as much of the world as possible for as many people as possible for as many applications as possible was what generated the traffic whose carriage was the point of the experiment. We learned by building very big, very full networks whose existance we could justify by the demand.

Back then the long distance transmission capacity was paid for by begging for government money (wired bandwidth is never "free"), which came only under the conditions of an Appropriate Use Policy concerning content. In fact no one, even the government, thought that AUP served any purpose with regard to advancing the technology, indeed it was explicitly intended to have just the opposite effect. The sole purpose of the AUP was to make the taking of government money so unattractive for those building stuff that you'd do whatever you could to wean yourself from that trough. It worked, too. The government(s) got a bargain for their early small investments in Internet technology because almost everyone wanted to get into a position to avoid taking that money.

It used to be that communications channels and their applications were inextricably tied. That is, if you wanted to talk you used the phone, if you wanted to listen to someone else talk you turned on the broadcast radio, if you wanted to send a short message you went to the telegraph office, if you wanted to send a long one you used the mail, and if you

wanted porn you went to a shop in a bad section of town and bought 8 mm
films. Then it probably made sense to reflect the non-commercial,
self-learning purpose of ARS communications channels in similar constraints
on the applications. Now, however, the art has advanced strongly in the
direction of building communications channels which are independent of
applications, i.e. the message has become independent of the medium,
but ARS AUP still leaves those interested in experimenting with the
medium responsible for intimate control of the messages along with it.
That isn't how communications networks are built now, so it is no
wonder that even hams interested in the technology run to another
service for their experiments.

>I suspect that most of the reasons that this is being done under Part 15 is
>that people who are not amateurs can use the network at will.

I meant "control restrictions" to imply this. The fact is that you
can only learn something from building networks if you have users of
the network, and you learn more and faster if you have lots of them,
so it isn't surpising that hams interested in this stuff run from rules
which restrict them to serving a tiny fraction of the population.

Why is it that the fact that the communications channel is being provided
on a non-commercial, experimental, self-learning basis, not sufficient
to allow this to be an amateur radio service? Part 97.1(a) implies that
providing service to the general public is fundamental to the ARS, yet
the regulations mosty prevent amateurs from doing so in a way the general
public would find useful. Does that make sense?

>I just find it a bit ironic that these systems, using "our" frequencies, are
>springing up outside of amateur radio. And when I told at least one ham they
>exist, I was out and out accused of lying. :-)

What you should be finding even more ironic is that many of the guys
using "our" frequencies outside of amateur radio are "us". Many hams
do this work, which isn't surprising since people with the interests and
skills to become a ham are often exactly the people with the interests
and skills to build a non-commercial wireless infrastructure.

I can see why you are a bit uncomfortable with this use of the frequencies,
however, since there is also some number of radio newcomers who are
self-learning, and being elmered, while participating in this aspect of
radio technology who in previous times might have done so by becoming
hams. Don't blame amateurs for this, however, since it seems to me the
amateurs involved are doing exactly what they're supposed to by contributing
their own expertise anyway. If you want to assign blame Part 97 might be a
better place to start.

>The hostility I have received from some for even discussing that hams should be
>doing more such technical experimentation and learning more about these modern
>radio technologies really suprised me.

I did notice that what one of the hostiles kept asking about was what the
problem was that needed solving, and I thought this was a particularly

relevant question. At one point you answered him with a pointer to a paper which demanded spectrum efficiency of amateurs to justify their allocations, which to me was non-responsive since spectrum efficiency isn't a problem, it is a solution to a problem.

If you want amateurs to be concerned with spectrum efficiency I think the only practical way to achieve this is by arranging for them to have congested spectrum. Yet right now the only way amateurs can congest their spectrum above HF is by using it incredibly inefficiently.

The cell phone companies understand spectrum efficiency because they sell cell phones to millions of people who put bits on the network, though the network itself is built and maintained by just thousands. The Part 15 experimenters are not numerous, but they try to make their networks useful to as many people as they possibly can by allowing anyone to use it and by adding an Internet connection to the back. If they're successful they'll learn a lot about spectrum efficiency as well. If I look at the ratio between network builders and network users you seem to need to congest the spectrum at the state of the art, I suspect there aren't enough hams with enough ARS-permitted applications within line-of-sight distance of each other to even come close.

If you want amateurs to develop state of the art spectrum efficient solutions they need to be having state of the art spectrum-efficiency problems. For this you need traffic, the same way we needed traffic in the 1980's to learn to build large wired Internet services. If you want traffic for your network you need to have users, and lots of them, and the best place to attract users is from the public at large, which doesn't care about the technology but might like to use it.

So I'd ask again, why is the fact that a communications channel is under a ham's control, is being provided and supported without pecuniary interest, and is maintained solely for the self-education of the amateur, not sufficient to allow the channel to be run under Part 97? What purpose is served by the Part 97 fixation with what the bits being carried mean, and whether they are "ham" bits or "not-ham" bits? As far as I can tell these rules were instituted mostly to protect the business interests of monopoly phone companies and PTTs which are long gone, yet the rules remain.

If the rules were such that an ARS license would provide you some advantage in building the networks they're playing with under Part 15 now there might be a few new hams. The fact is, however, that if you are interested in building such networks then Part 97 just gets in the way. It is still the case that there are a lot of other things you can do under Part 97, but if you berate amateurs for not doing this particular thing even though the rules make it utterly unattractive to do so then I can see why people might get hostile.

Dennis Ferguson

3763. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 22:49:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b30f_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33323

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6151F8.F030CF31@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > problem.
> >
> > Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
>
> BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.
>

Dick,

Cecil's point, as written is technically correct ... anything
that modulates a carrier produces sidebands, thus it
has bandwidth and runs on more than just "a" frequency.

DSSS signals, which is what we've been talking about
like SSB, also have a carrier frequency, but like SSB,
the carrier is suppressed. 802.11b channels are defined
by that suppressed carrier (or center) frequency.

Do you operate at all at 2.4 GHz? If not, why do you give
a crap? Oh, you're just trying to find someone and some
excuse to take shots at them because that's become your
major form of entertainment? (I thought so ...)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGGy2pe+N6+q84HiEQL8CwCglujyRD7c0n2h7vmpJB2reDoLETYAn1Je
cieXToEj69eqNZxsDUN/B/rI
=QN6W
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3764. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:05:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b6ff_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33325

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020205182602.08256.00001033@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>
> >I think that the point here was that all modulated transmissions
run on a
> >base
> >(i.e. carrier) frequency, and the modulation therefore makes it a
RANGE of
> >frequencies - +/- of the carrier. I agree it was poorly stated.
>
> Is the "base" frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space?

I would argue that, since FSK is "digital FM," the (conceptual)
carrier frequency between the mark and space tones could be
considered the "base" frequency.

> SS signal
> occupy a range of frequencies +- of the carrier or the center
frequency of the
> occupied channel.

True ...

> A non-SS signal at a data rate equal to the speed of the PN
> encoding would occupy essentially the same bandwidth of the
> DSSS signal.

Not necessarily so ... if you had said "symbol rate" I'd have
not said a word, but symbols can be "overloaded" and the
delivered data rate can be quite a bit higher than the symbol
rate ... M-ary FSK or PSK, the various M-ary QAMs, and OFDM
are some examples where the data rate can exceed the symbol
rate.

As an example 802.11a (at 5 GHz) uses OFDM and can pack
54 Mbps into a channel considerably narrower than what you'd
get if you had a 54 Mbps PN sequence and DSSS.

>What is the difference?

The difference (that the original question was referring to
before I put the previous 2 paragraphs in) is that there is
no difference ... and the issues are probably irrelevant to

anyone who doesn't use the bands where this sort of gear
would be deployed ... thus, all of the "you'll screw up things
for us CW operators" arguments are little (or nothing) more
than those CW operators ranting against anything that's not
CW ... whether they use the bands involved, or ever will is
not relevant ... they just want to argue against anything new
because it's, well ... new (at least to ham radio).

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGG2x5e+N6+q84HiEQLMxwCgob+3xUY9EYqwILGA1av1qGk1SsIAnRLr
+a7D/vWIij2wICDv8sPWYBT6
=1GBS
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3765. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:07:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b8fb$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33328

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020205225854.17193.00000099@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3C600CDA.E842D469@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
> >> could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
> >> know it, and you won't!
> >
> >Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
>
> Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?
>
> AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
> Techs looking around for a Morse code class!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You are, eh? You're sure? I think there's likely to be a whole lot more
people helping each other out.

Kim W5TIT

3766. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:15:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33326

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/misc/dnh061700.html

>And you hope to accomplish that by characterizing amateur radio operators as
>NOT contributing to advancements?

If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur Radio, it is probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the state of the radio art.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3767. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:15:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c61baca_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33332

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020205225856.17193.00000100@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <kPQ78.70$Bg4.144387@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@tm.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Bill:
> >>
> >> Anyone who wanted to become a ham for the right reasons would
> >> never be discouraged by my opinions. If I have discouraged anyone,
> >> it is mainly those who who are merely seeking refuge from 11 meters,
> >> and have no interest in the true amateur radio experience. I'm sick
> >> and tired of meeting "newcomer" hams who know absolutely nothing
> >> about even the basics of electricity, yet alone have a clue about
> >> how a radio works.
> >>
> >I am asking this sincerely, and not with any malice, but there is no way
> >that a person then could get introduced to ham radio?
>
> Ryan:
>
> Well, since the ARRL, the national organization for amateur radio, does
> nothing to advertise our hobby/service in the major mass media, then I
> guess I see your point -- being "introduced" into the hobby could be a
> challenge! My own curiosity about ham radio was peaked when I saw
> a public service announcement on TV, featuring Dick Van Dyke sitting
> at the operator's position of a ham radio station. I was aware of ham
> radio before then, but that is what really got me interested enough to
> learn more about it, and ultimately get involved. That's not happening
> anymore, because the ARRL thinks it's enough for hams to do their own
> "word of mouth" advertising -- and they're getting what they're paying
> for, IMHO.
>

I think word of mouth does just fine, except we hams don't take the
responsibility enough. I would rather *not* have the HQ of a national
organization be the outreach. They have other more important things to do.
The best use of time is to have all hams on deck for outreach.

> >
> > If that is true, my
> >father cannot become a ham then. Although he is MORE than intelligent to
> >learn the concepts and theories of radio, he does not have much of an
> >understanding of it, aside from the little bits I have shared with him.
>

> I got involved mainly because my own curiosity was peaked by that PSA,
> but the hams I met in person to that date did little, if anything, to
actually
> encourage me.
>

Maybe that was a hint, Larry.

> >
> >What about some of the people I am aware of from a variety of groups like
> >church groups or civic organizations, or technical organizations, who may
> >not have any experience in radio, but other fields. Are they excluded
then
> >also? There are a ton of wonderful candidates, who would add a lot to
the
> >Amateur Radio Service, who do not come from CB or "other detestable
groups,"
> >but are discounted by the above paragraph. I beleive it is our
> >responsibilities, as well as some of our larger organizations to
positively
> >promote the hobby, and to promote it to the proper potential targets.
Not
> >just handing out licenses as some other individuals in this and other
> >newsgroups.
>
> Well, the ARRL would seem to agree with you, but from where I'm sitting,
> it doesn't seem to be working very well. I think that a series of TV
PSA's,
> produced by the ARRL and shown on local TV stations, could do more to
> get people interested in and involved in ham radio than any "word of
> mouth" ever could.
>

I totally disagree for reasons stated above. I don't want my ARRL
membership dues spent for stuff that may be placed in those ads that then
leave me no other option but to talk about or defend when other people ask
questions. Know how long it took to "live down" the movie Frequency? (It
was basically viewed as a bad comedy by people who had learned I was a ham
and would then ask me all about that movie.)

> >
> >I know that ham radio is a learning experience,
> >> but all the hams I knew when I came in already knew the basics
> >> as a result of personal study, experimenting as a general electronics
> >> hobbyist, and SWL'ing.
> >None of that happens anymore. People see
> >> hams talking into a microphone without paying airtime charges, and
> >> they want in on the same -- right now -- without paying any "dues"
> >> as far as learning is concerned. They need to be hand-held through
> >> even the most rudimentary basic operation of their off-the-shelf
> >> appliances, mainly because they can't be bothered to even read

> >> the "Quick Start" instructions. Then they justify their existence by
> >> making a big deal out of carrying an HT at a Walk-A-Thon, and
> >> making it sound like they're FDNY-class heroes while doing so.
>
> >Granted this would happen in other hobbies also I am sure, in different
> >forms. The ones to blame are the licensed persons who did not intercept
> >this behavior to start with. Within a few exceptions, everyone in this
> >category would have had to have had "some" involvement with a ham
somewhere
> >down the line.
>
> Which other hobbies would be affected in the same way?
>
> >> The only people who would be discouraged by my opinions aren't
> >> worth having in this hobby/service. Anyone with a true curiosity
> >> about the technical and operating aspects of ham radio will have the
> >> initiative and ingenuity to pursue it, without worrying about the
> >> fact that people like Dick, Dave, and myself are able to express our
> >> opinion that ham radio is being dumbed-down into irrelevance.
> >
> >Not discouraged at all.... I believe we are looking out the same window,
> >but seeing two different things. The problem comes from existing hams,
not
> >the new ones.
>
> Well, we can agree to disagree, Ryan -- that's perfectly OK.
>
> >73's, the future and present are so bad! :)
>
> I think the future of ham radio is uncertain, to say the least.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, I agree with Ryan. The future of ham radio is quite intact and doing
well.

Kim W5TIT

3768. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:16:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206181619.12301.00001466@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33329

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>The regulatory service under which the hams operated is irrelevant to the
>point that "hams" did indeed help develop the system. It is relevant
>however, to the need and to the regulatory restrictions.

It is more accurate to say that hams helped develop some of the systems.
Perhaps it is more relevant yet that they did so for the use of non hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3769. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:16:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c61b98b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33330

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020205133725.20370.00001467@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0202050115.70b5fd34@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>...
> >>
> >> Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
> >> expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
> >> frequency.
> >> That's what the rules say.
>
> >Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> >problem.
>
> Depending on whether it's DSSS or FHSS it could be a band of freqs
or a set of
> freqs.
> Either way it's a bigger mess than narrowband modes.

I would submit that that's a prejudiced view not based in
technical fact.

> >> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> >> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
> >> systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
> >> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
> >> the channel is occupied by another user.
>
> Nice idea but in the real world it's another story.

In "the real world" it's a reality ... read about CSMA-CA.
Look up how it works in 802.11b and read what the CCA bit
is for ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

```
iQA/AwUBPGG5Vpe+N6+q84HiEQL9iACgtih8+hJlxAHYd7BqhDDvHZzmIjoAoK8I
exZ7eIkIKu8qkbQxQmcuPiy+
=DAbC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3770. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:17:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206181706.12301.00001467@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33327

From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>> W5YI is not anti-ARRL.

>Does Bruce Perens think he is?

I don't know. You would have to ask Bruce.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3771. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:19:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c61bbb7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33333

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C61F25E.A2B094F0@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > > Which is what happens when all there is to ham radio is
"converations"
> > > > You can have them on CB/freeband without a license.
> > >
> > > Makes one wonder what Hell Dick is doing on the ham bands? Eh? If
not
> > > having conversations...then ?
> >
> > If it's in CW, it's a QSO, Kim. When will you ever learn?
>
> Har Har. Leave it to Little Kimshe to define ham radio just like she
would
> CB. Where in Part 97 is conversation mentioned? OF COURSE there are
> conversations. On street corners, TV talk shows
> cellphones, ad infinitum. Even in ham radio. But only the limp lame and
lazy
> could ever see ham radio as ONLY about conversation. But what did we
expect of
> her and Krell?
>

You have it confused, it's Little Dick, Dickie. And, a conversation by any other name is a conversation. You complain of people who use semantics, yet what have you just done. Think about it, it might take some time. Now, if you're not having conversations or QSOs with other people, then what *are* you doing with your radio. Turning it up loud enough to get a vibration?

Kim W5TIT

3772. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:21:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c61bc18_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33334

And, while you guys are busy with waiting for someone to contact you during an emergency or disaster, we'll all be done with cleanup and the party about the time you figure it out that no one went to yours...

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C61F8DD.5E5631F2@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
> > >
> > > Good point, Cecil -- now why didn't I think of that?
> > >
> > > AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
> > > Techs looking around for a Morse code class!
> >
> > What makes you think that No-Code Techs have an HF
> > transceiver?
> >
> > Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
>
> That's total BS. No one can send recognizable code without
> learning how to do it, and that won't happen on the spur of the
> moment. Everyone who trys a key first makes all dits. You have to
> learn the difference and how to form each and to space characters.
> Otherwise nothing intelligible comes out.
>
>
> >
> > Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
> > 4wpm?
>
> Only such as could be recognized as such. Far more likely it would
> be gibberish.
>

3773. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:22:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206182230.12301.00001469@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33331

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>I listen around the frequency. If I don't hear somebody who can hear
>me I've only screwed up a few Khz of the band with a narrow mode. If
>Carl's system screws up similarly it has the obvious potential for
>having a negative impact on many more frequencies (qsos in
>progress)than I do.

Is that not offset by the fact that the spread spectrum system puts less energy into any given narrowband channel than you do when you operate narrow band at the same power level? For the 20 MHz SS devices being discussed here, the ratio is 30 dB for SSB bandwidths.

>Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
>over-the-horizon radar Ed?

Yes, I was. As I recall, they occupied about 10 kHz of spectrum, found for minutes at a time on different parts of the band.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3774. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:30:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33335

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C61A12A.13ACB081@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
>
> Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
> impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
> Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
> Morse code.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yep, you got it. I asked that of Jay here a bit ago. It seems the hate and contempt from people like Larry, Dick, etc., leave one to truly wonder what values they place upon their effort (or not) to help someone.

You're right, Cecil. I get the distinct impression, also, that some would just as soon let others die as acknowledge a signal beneath their expectations. But, it's kind of like when I hear crappy people talking about how *they* went to war for my freedom. I like to remind them that they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With soldiers like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?

Kim W5TIT

3775. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:53:53 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202062353350.25437-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33336

On 5 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
>>Sounds like a packet network that doesn't have to abide by Part 97 data
>>rate limitations.
>
>The data rates on 2.4 GHz are not a limiting factor.
>
>Sounds like a bunch of experimenters that have beaten us to the punch. :-)
>They don't have to be limited by content limitations, though.

But for those who aren't amateur licensees, they do have to be limited in power output.

Time to get a 2.4 amp (and a wireless lan)!

3776. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-06 23:56:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202062356440.25437-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33337

On 5 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>I think that the point here was that all modulated transmissions run on a
>>base
>>(i.e. carrier) frequency, and the modulation therefore makes it a RANGE of
>>frequencies - +/- of the carrier. I agree it was poorly stated.
>
>Is the "base" frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space? SS signal
>occupy a range of frequencies +- of the carrier or the center frequency of the
>occupied channel. A non-SS signal at a data rate equal to the speed of the PN
>encoding would occupy essentially the same bandwidth of the DSSS signal. What
>is the difference?

The base frequency is the carrier, and both mark and space are modulations.

3777. Re: Question re. NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 00:36:09 UTC
From: Jay <spambotsrnot@allfun.com>
Message-ID: <ZZj88.15199$Hb6.1292191@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33338

In article <3c5f24f0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net says...

> > --
> > 6 meters *is* DX for those that haven't upgraded yet
>
> Now, that's what I call going off on another tangent altogether...LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT

Ya live and ya learn. Life's too short to piss and moan continually

Take care

73,

Jay

3778. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 00:57:57 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a3sjel$1vp7$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 33339

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
>>The regulatory service under which the hams operated is irrelevant to the
>>point that "hams" did indeed help develop the system. It is relevant
>>however, to the need and to the regulatory restrictions.
>
>It is more accurate to say that hams helped develop some of the systems.
>Perhaps it is more relevant yet that they did so for the use of non hams.

If hams can't provide voluntary non-commercial communications service
to non-hams then what the heck is 97.1(a) about? It may say "particularly
in emergencies" but it doesn't say "only in emergencies".

Dennis Ferguson

3779. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 01:41:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 33340

In article <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
>a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
>meaningful code testing level.

I disagree.

It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long before the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the majority opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have changed their mind? Nope.

FISTS wisely stayed out of the fracas, knowing that taking a political position

would only divide their membership. Note that FISTS and the ARRL did encourage all to express their opinions direct to the FCC.

FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3780. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 01:41:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020206204108.13187.00000917@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 33341

In article <3C5DC5E3.81589F1D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Bert Craig wrote:
>> I respect your views and generally hold your words in high esteem...but do
>you
>> really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up hating the
>code, I
>> like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of love,"
>> hence work.
>
>The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.

Sure it does.

>The test is about qualifications, not about love.

The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.

Just check your dictionary, Cecil.

>The FCC has decided
>that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.

Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is S25.5.

>If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
>radio operator is qualified without Morse code.

Read the R&O to 98-143. They've already decided. By the look of things,
they decided long ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>As an illustration: If a military special forces person who already
>can do 40wpm Morse code decides to get his General ham license, he
>must pass the 5wpm exam. A "labor of love" would have him passing
>a 50wpm exam. "Labors of love" should be reserved for things like
>frat initiations, not governmental requirements.
>--

3781. Re: CB Outlaws Make ALL Radio Ops Look Bad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 03:53:09 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FSm88.14905$I5.1203798@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It all depends. If you were on 40 meters, you might run into the chucklehead I did some 35 years ago. He built an amplifier from a kit. Left off the tube covers so the tubes would 'run cooler'. Also left the metal cover off the amp so it would 'run cooler'. The real culprit was the speaker leads which ran parallel to the offending dipole in the next yard. I didn't measure them, but they were quite long. About 25 or 30 feet long. Change your frequency and you'll find some other device which picks up the signal. On 40 meters, you probably wouldn't have a problem with your speakers; you might, however, have a problem with a neighbor's sound installation. BTW, I had a 900 MHz spread-spectrum cordless phone which interferred with the doorbell. Replacing it with a 2.4 GHz spred-spectrum cordless phone solved the problem. Doorbell. Go figure.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:4AA653CFC96D40D7.153B242D73265431.7E7D56ED0106298A@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 05 Feb 2002 03:17:37 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
> <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >Some of this electronic gear is not very immune to RF. It
> >can be a crapshot.
>
> Yes, but why are they so fascinated with making amplified computer
> speakers' lead-in cables so perfectly resonant on 2m?
>
> I'd swear my Altec-Lansing speakers pull in more RF than my HT does.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3782. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:04:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63407D.3938B1FF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33343

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Is the base frequency of an FSK signal the mark or the space frequency?
> >
> > For sure it's one of them, isn't it? Commonly known as the resting frequency.
>
> Actually, not for sure it's one of them. My PCT2e generates FSK tones in
> sideband mode where the carrier is suppressed for both mark and space. The
> tone pairs are 1200/1400 Hz and 2300/2100 Hz.

Welp, I guess this means that when Cecil makes a sked he specifies the frequency as "somewhere on the band".

3783. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:06:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6340FD.9DF61BB3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33344

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > DSSS has a center frequency also, Dick, with suppressed carrier.
> > > OOK Morse doesn't occupy a single frequency. Neither does SSB.
> >
> > Aw, gee. Maybe next time you make an SSB sked you should agree to meet
> > between 14.250 and 14.252400 mhz. Or on PSK31 maybe between 14.070 and
> > 14.070031 mhz.
>
> A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.

Yep. So why have you been trying to convince us all there really isn't
one???

3784. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:13:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C61FECC.684817FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33347

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Actually, not for sure it's one of them. My PCT2e generates FSK tones in
> > sideband mode where the carrier is suppressed for both mark and space. The
> > tone pairs are 1200/1400 Hz and 2300/2100 Hz.
>
> Welp, I guess this means that when Cecil makes a sked he specifies the frequency as
> "somewhere on the band".

Frequency, by convention, is specified as the 'mark' frequency even though
the transceiver frequency is 1.4 kHz higher or lower. It doesn't do anyone
any good for me to tell them what frequency my transceiver is on if I don't
also give them give them the offsets for the tones which are programmable.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3785. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:13:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63429E.F381F89@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33345

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> > The hostility I have received from some for even discussing that hams should be
> > doing more such technical experimentation and learning more about these modern
> > radio technologies really suprised me.
>

Nonsense! That is nowhere near what you said! You said hams are not experimenting with digital technolgy. I disagreed with that and noted that even I, an ancient CW supporter, do that most every day. Yesterday it was Hellschreiber. Very interesting mode, even if it is also ancient.

>
> Having to remove one's head from one's posterior can hurt one's eyes.
> --

Since your seems to permanently imbedded you shouldn't have to worry.

3786. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:15:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C634320.E4D77082@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33346

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Cecil did not ask about how many CW operators there were, he asked exactly
> > how many. That is an unanswerable question, which is exactly what he
> > intended.
>
> Actually, Webster says that any answer that is accurate is exact.

Thanks for proving that Webster's is very limited in its own accuracy and thus its usefulness. There are a great many things that are accurate that are not exact.

3787. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:15:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C61FF63.932DCB2A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33349

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.
>
> Yep. So why have you been trying to convince us all there really isn't
> one???

Please quote the posting where I said there is no center frequency for DSSS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3788. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:17:47 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.06.23.17.46.840971.21114@arrl.org>
Source record: 33348

On Wed, 06 Feb 2002 09:37:18 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>1980 393,000 --- ---
>>1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990) 2000 682,000 227,000 34%
>>(1990-2000)
>>
>>Not as impressive as the erroneous numbers,
>
> They are still erroneous, Jon.
>
> The chart should read:
>
> 1980 393,000 --- ---
> 1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990)
> 2000 682,000 173,000 34% (1990-2000)

That's what I get for sloppy cut-'n'-pasting!

>> but still, almost twice as
>>many licenses added in 1990-2000 as in 1980-1990.
>>
> Nope. Only 49% more - 57,000.

"Only" 49%.

>>No accurate compensation is really possible.
>
> But an educated guess is possible. Here's an example:
>
> Suppose that the average amateur "career" is 40 years. That means 2.5%
> of the amateur population
> drops out per year.
> (One ham in 40 goes inactive per year, IOW). At the
> level of 500,000 hams,
> that amounts to 12,500 hams per year dropping out.

There are a lot of "ifs" involved there. IF the 40-year average is
correct and IF hams got their licences at a constant rate. But of course
the growth spurts of the last 20 years bias the population toward those
who have been licensed for far shorter periods of time. So even if your
40-year assumption is correct -- and who knows? -- the 2.5%/year figure
should be lower.

One of the irritating things about trying to do these analyses is that
there are substantial year-to-year variations. They make using
estimates -- averages in particular -- little better than using random
numbers. I stand by my opinion that it's impossible to make a

sufficiently accurate estimate of the 5/10 effect to factor it out of the total number of licensees. It's much better to look at the rate of new licensees.

>>If the "price" stays down, won't "sales" remain stronger?
>
> NO. The market becomes saturated. Look at what happened to computers,
> VCRs, microwave ovens, etc. A point is reached where most "sales" are
> replacements, not
> first-time buyers.

There are no "replacement" licenses. (Well, a few lapses that get relicensed.) All new licensees represent additions to the ARS. If a change makes the license appealing to x% more of the current population, it should also be appealing to x% more of the future members of the population (than it would have been without the change).
That represents a sustained difference.

>>> I doubt that the 1991 or 2000 changes have/will result in longterm
>>> growth changes.
>>
>>Nobody will ever be able to say for sure. It's impossible to isolate all
>>of the factors long-term.
>
> It's possible to see the trends only after long periods of time.

But it's impossible to separate the factors that create the trends. Changes in the licensing system don't occur in a vacuum. Which do you think affected the growth of ham radio more in the past 20 years: A) licensing changes, B) reduction in the amount of leisure time working adults have, C) the Internet, D) cell phones. How do you tell?

>> But the unsurprising pattern that seems
>>to be common across the history of Amateur Radio is that each time it
>>has been made easier to get and retain a license, growth has followed.
>
> Paradoxically, growth has also followed when the requirements were made
> HARDER!!

Not that I'm aware of. Details?

>>It happened in the 50's after the creation of 5-wpm licenses.
>
> The ARS grew from 60,000 to 100,000 in the 5 years between the end of
> WW2 and the 1951
> restructuring - when all licenses required 13 wpm and a General written
> right off the bat.

Yep, in part because a lot of military-trained radio ops got their tickets. Another example of a factor that has nothing to do with licensing muddying the analysis.

> The growth actually started back in the very early 1970s (compare the
> annual totals from 1963 to 1983).
> Oddly enough, growth stalled from 1963 to about 1970, then INCREASED
> after incentive licensing was
> in place (late 1968). Long before Bash, the trend was clear.

Maybe you could cite the numbers you're using? Because that's not what
I've seen. AFAIK growth was flat from the mid 60's to the mid 70's.

> And not all hams used Bash books. I've never even seen one.

Not all, but quite a lot did.

>> It happened in the 90's with no-code.
>
> Maybe. Maybe not. Other factors cloud the issue.

They do, but not so much that the no-code effect can't be seen.

>>There were other factors that played a part, but it's not unreasonable
>>to think the correlation is causal.
>>
>>Here's a table of FH Callbook counts of new licenses issued:
>>
>>1980 32,692
>>1981 34,373
>>1982 40,371
>>1983 30,505
>>1984 27,610
>>1985 31,207
>>1986 25,942
>>1987 41,649
>
> Note the surge due to the change in the rules in 1987 - then the drop
> back to near old levels.
>
>>1988 27,139
>>1989 40,972
>
> Another surge - two years BEFORE nocodetest!

What you are citing are large year-to-year variations. Trying to
assign reasons to them is futile. You have to look longer term.

>>1990 28,667
>>1991 29,300
>>1992 48,700
>>1993 46,806
>>1994 50,316
>>1995 57,154
>>1996 48,727
>>(The 1997 Callbook, giving 1996 licenses issued, is the last one I have
>>handy at the moment.)
>

>>Notice the immediate and sustained increase in growth rate after the
>>1991 no-code changes.
>
> Yes, there's an increase - but is it sustained? Note the drop in 1996.
> What happened in
> following years?

Again, look at the long term. Up to 1991 the growth rates were mostly in the high 20k to low 40k ballpark. After 1991 they were in the high 40's to low 50's for at least 5 years. Even with the significant year-to-year variations there was a clear step up post-1991.

>>And these numbers can be in no way biased by the 5/10 year term change
>>since they are NEW licenses.
>
> Does a vanity license count as a NEW license?

Vanity gate 1 opened in May 1996, so that's a moot point WRT the above table. In any case, no, they aren't new licenses. For example, just to pick one at random:

HARE JR, EDWARD F, W1RFI (Extra)
304 GEORGE WASHINGTON TPKE
BURLINGTON, CT 06013
Previous call sign: KA1CV
Licensee ID: L00144311
FRN: 0003606456
Issue Date: Mar 27, 1997
Expire Date: Mar 27, 2007
Date of last Change: Mar 27, 1997

Note the previous call sign.

> In other words, hams who got nocode tickets are more likely to drop out
> than their predecesors.

No, ALL newbies drop at a higher rate. The first renewal is less likely than the second one. That was just as true for those who got renewable Novice licenses.

>>> Exactly. But we are to believe without challenge claims that code
>>> testing is/was "crippling" amateur radio. Sorry, I don't buy it.
>>
>>Who said that? Not me.
>
> Read Carl's brag signature.

So? He's wrong. Go argue with him about it.

> The point is that the growth has not been very great despite massive
> rules changes.

It has changed, though. Greatly? Perhaps not. The unknown factor is what the growth would have been had those changes not taken place. You assume

it would have been what it was before the changes. That's possible, but it's also possible that growth would have slowed or stopped. Nobody can say for sure. Some of those who argued for those changes did so on the basis that the changes were needed to sustain existing levels, not to increase growth. They'd probably argue that without the changes, ham radio would have undergone negative growth. Of course, they can't prove their case either.

Ideally, of course, changes to the licensing requirements and privileges should be evaluated on the basis of their fitness to purpose, not to establish a growth rate.

Jon

3789. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:22:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6344B9.2598F232@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33350

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
> >
> > That's total BS.
>
> Nope, it's not, Dick. I speak from my Cub Scouts experience. My cousin
> and I made up two charts, one for XMIT (the normal one in the ARRL
> Handbook) and another for receiving which went like:
>
> . E
> .. I
> ... S
> .... H
> 5
> etc.
>
> The lookup chart for receiving is necessarily different indexing
> from the lookup chart for transmitting. I soon learned that I didn't
> have to look at the charts. But my cousin always used the charts.
> He could translate either way at 4wpm.
>
> I hear many CW operators who don't know that a dash is supposed
> to be three times as long as a dot. I hear dashes that are five
> times as long as a dot. It doesn't matter. I can still read it.

I suppose I shouldn't expect you to hold to any accuracy yourself.
You know that anyone who never before sat down to a key will not be able
to form dots and dashes without some minimal training. That means he
couldn't be expected to send message traffic using a lookup table since he
can't even yet form the characters. He'll almost certainly send dit
ditditdit dit dit etc. Just like your examples-not a dah in the lot!
The CW ops you hear on the air certainly have not just sat down to a key
for the first time. They have learned how to form characters.

Your character was formed long ago, and such a poor job of it!

3790. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:23:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C620152.93D39CCB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33351

N2EY wrote:
> The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
> an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
> about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.

Hams are free to love ham radio to their heart's content. But, to the
best of my knowledge, nowhere in part 97 does the word "love" appear.
Love has no place in objective governmental requirements and the FCC
does not love amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3791. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:27:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C634604.BE8C32AD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33352

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > Under the right conditions of social decay, Morse code operation
> > > > could be a valuable skill once again, some day! Guess what -- I'll
> > > > know it, and you won't!
> > >
> > > Guess what -- he can learn it if he ever needs it.
> >
> > Sure, Cecil. But by the time he does it'll be much too late to do him
> > any good.
>
> Why, because you would refuse to respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? 4wpm is easily
> doable with lookup charts, Dick. I speak from experience.

I on the other hand speak from the experience of having taught the code to a number of classes, beginners all, who had no prior experience whatever at sending code. Invariably they would send all dits, trying to space them to form words and not realizing there is two distinct characters, and first had to be carefully taught how to form each character-both dits and dahs.

Your cub scout experience was so long you likely don't recall the specifics. You had to learn the same thing.

3792. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:29:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6202AA.1944BB72@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33353

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So an answer such as greater than one, but less than a million would be
> an exact answer - as far as Webster is concerned. Did you employ
> similar such exactness at Intel?

One day my boss asked me how long a project was going to take. I told
him I had no idea. He said, "I need a number. Give me a number." So I
said, "Seven!" He said, "Hours, days?" I said, "All you requested was
a number. I honored that request and have nothing else to add."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3793. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:34:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gr4y0ik.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33354

On 6 Feb 2002 22:48:05 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>So I'd ask again, why is the fact that a communications channel is
>under a ham's control, is being provided and supported without pecuniary
>interest, and is maintained solely for the self-education of the amateur,
>not sufficient to allow the channel to be run under Part 97? What purpose
>is served by the Part 97 fixation with what the bits being carried mean,
>and whether they are "ham" bits or "not-ham" bits? As far as I can tell
>these rules were instituted mostly to protect the business interests of
>monopoly phone companies and PTTs which are long gone, yet the rules
>remain.

The "monopolistic" companies may no longer exist "out front"
but the industry as a whole does and is very protective of
their position, rights, privileges, and status (read: money)
and if you think for one minute that they are going to yield
any of that to an anarchistic model you are sorely mistaken.
The only thing that keeps them quiet about the Internet as it
exists today is that they charge big bucks for the backbone.

So the problem is Part 97, is it, and the solution is to change Part
97 to allow the "free range" regulatory model that you advocate?

This is the same argument that Stephen Dunifer used in his
defense (see US v Dunifer, N, Dist of Cal, 1996) to run his
pirate FM station as against the regulatory authority of the
FCC, the Communications Act ("free speech means I don't need a
license") and Parts 15 and 73 of the Rules ("if Part 73 doesn't
provide for a license class where I can run the power that I
want, I'll just run my station without FCC oversight"). After
2-1/2 years of testimony, submissions, and agonizing over this,
Judge Wilken finally issued the injunction against his operation.

(I can give you more details of that case than you really want - I
was the FCC's case supervisor and it's burned into my psyche.)

There's more to this issue than the purely technical aspects. What
it boils down to is if one wants to play the game one follows the
rules. All the rules. And the FCC is the rulemaker and the
decider which rules may/must be changed.

I for one have no problem with the control and content rules as
they stand. It DEFINES amateur radio's disctinction from other
services, giving the basis for allowing the experimentation,
not the other way around.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Communications Engineer
Communications Attorney

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

3794. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:40:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6348EE.1620F906@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33355

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6151F8.F030CF31@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > > problem.
> > >
> > > Nothing with modulation runs on *a* frequency, Brian. :-)
> >
> > BS. Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> > frequency. So now start another "rational" arguement.
> >
>
> Dick,
>
> Cecil's point, as written is technically correct ... anything
> that modulates a carrier produces sidebands, thus it
> has bandwidth and runs on more than just "a" frequency.
>
> DSSS signals, which is what we've been talking about
> like SSB, also have a carrier frequency, but like SSB,
> the carrier is suppressed. 802.11b channels are defined
> by that suppressed carrier (or center) frequency.
>

I really hate to tell you, but none of that is news. But your have
yourself noted that each has its base frequency. Cecil would lead the
unknowledgable astray by insisting otherwise by implication. Of course
he'll later deny it all.

>
> Do you operate at all at 2.4 GHz? If not, why do you give
> a crap?

No, I don't and don't plan to. I don't care for talking to myself.
Don't worry too much, you won't be on that band as a ham too much
longer, either, unless the commercials who want it (you?) are generous

enough to allow hams to share it. I doubt it. I *don't* doubt they'll
have it bought sometime in the not too distant future.

>Oh, you're just trying to find someone and some

> excuse to take shots at them because that's become your
> major form of entertainment? (I thought so ...)

Why, of course! I can't resist setting Cecil straight.

3795. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:41:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C620566.631D1DBA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33356

Dick Carroll wrote:
> There are a great many things that are accurate that are not exact.

Webster's says that they are exactly accurate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3796. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:44:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C62062F.9C266D95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33357

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I suppose I shouldn't expect you to hold to any accuracy yourself.
> You know that anyone who never before sat down to a key will not be able
> to form dots and dashes without some minimal training.

I suspect anyone who is capable of tuning up a CW transceiver is
capable of sending dots and dashes. Many kids have played with
MCW using their CB walkie-talkies with the Morse code chart
on the side.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3797. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:50:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6207B2.F1285501@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33358

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I on the other hand speak from the experience of having taught the code to a
> number of classes, beginners all, who had no prior experience whatever at
> sending code. Invariably they would send all dits, trying to space them to
> form words and not realizing there is two distinct characters, and first had
> to be carefully taught how to form each character-both dits and dahs.

Most potential hams already know what ... --- ... sounds like, Dick.
Your basic problem is you believe that everyone is as stupid and ignorant
as you.

> Your cub scout experience was so long you likely don't recall the specifics.
> You had to learn the same thing.

The Scout leader brought a Morse code buzzer to the meeting and taught us
to recognize an 'SOS' in about thirty seconds. "Three shorts, three longs,
and three shorts", sure ain't rocket science (except for you).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3798. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:54:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C620871.A806D3CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33360

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I really hate to tell you, but none of that is news.

It was news to you, Dick. You stated in another posting yesterday
that SS doesn't have a center frequency.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3799. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 04:55:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C634C91.95F35E12@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33359

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/misc/dnh061700.html
>
> >And you hope to accomplish that by characterizing amateur radio operators as
> >NOT contributing to advancements?
>
> If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur Radio, it is
> probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the state of the
> radio art.

Dennis Ferguson was right on.

3800. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 05:45:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C635837.B1214CBB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33361

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I on the other hand speak from the experience of having taught the code to a
> > number of classes, beginners all, who had no prior experience whatever at
> > sending code. Invariably they would send all dits, trying to space them to
> > form words and not realizing there is two distinct characters, and first had
> > to be carefully taught how to form each character-both dits and dahs.
>
> Most potential hams already know what ... --- ... sounds like, Dick.
> Your basic problem is you believe that everyone is as stupid and ignorant
> as you.
>
> > Your cub scout experience was so long you likely don't recall the specifics.
> > You had to learn the same thing.
>
> The Scout leader brought a Morse code buzzer to the meeting and taught us
> to recognize an 'SOS' in about thirty seconds. "Three shorts, three longs,
> and three shorts", sure ain't rocket science (except for you).

Little early stage Alzheimers, Cec? Use the spice tumeric, it cancels out the
protein that causes it.
Larry was right "This isn't about me". It's about all those codehating
pseudohams who you insist will instantly "learn" the code, when they need it.

3801. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 05:47:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6358C0.2A31416C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33362

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I really hate to tell you, but none of that is news.
>
> It was news to you, Dick. You stated in another posting yesterday
> that SS doesn't have a center frequency.

You dumshit, it wasn't news then either. Any radio system has its base frequency. It's gotta spread from some base. And I said no such thing.

3802. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 06:53:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C622479.C8412AF4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33363

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I really hate to tell you, but none of that is news.
> >
> > It was news to you, Dick. You stated in another posting yesterday
> > that SS doesn't have a center frequency.
>
> You dumshit, it wasn't news then either. Any radio system has its
> base frequency. It's gotta spread from some base. And I said no such
> thing.

You're right, you didn't. It was someone else who said it. Sorry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3803. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 06:56:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C622531.734B3676@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33364

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Larry was right "This isn't about me". It's about all those codehating
> pseudohams who you insist will instantly "learn" the code, when they need it.

They won't *instantly* learn it but they will learn it if they need to.
Look at it this way. When we have a nocode general license, there will
be more operators available for emergency HF communications. Some of
them will choose to have CW in their bag of tricks. One doesn't have
to have a license to learn Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3804. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 07:02:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C622680.D7CF1DC6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33365

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Any radio system has its base frequency.

Dick Carroll previously wrote:
> Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> frequency.

--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3805. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 11:19:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <920ece2c.0202070319.285e7631@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33366

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

> Using your "terminology" SSB doesn't run "on a frequency"
> either (which is at least borderline rediculous), since the only
> way it would be on a single frequency would be if only a single
> tone were transmitted and the carrier suppression were infinite.
> The first is of virtually no utility and the second is unachievable.

Nor is the first; there is always some residual AM, FM or PM noise on
any carrier. In practice, either can be achieved to an acceptable
level. Of course, the first is still of very limited utility.

> There are mechanisms for avoiding the "hidden terminal" problem,
> or at least significantly minimizing it ... as has been said before,
> there is no guarantee of absolute freedom from interference from
> ANY other use of the same spectrum ... even from other users of
> "legacy" modes.

Which of the current spate of commercial SS standards contains such
mechanisms such that if I call CQ on a channel in the middle of the SS
channel, my frequency will be clear shortly after I start?

And none of them have any provision for clearing the channel if the
ham who might otherwise answer my CQ hears the SS station, but it
doesn't hear me.

Of course, that problem also exists in narrowband communcations.

> I wasn't saying that we could "mirror" the entire infrastructure ...
> only
> that we can provide local service at high bandwidth and a robust,
> portable capability to provide service within and bridge to the
> outside
> from disaster areas.

Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to and
fro disaster areas. Imagine how way cool it would be if hams could
get those images to other parts of the country quickly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3806. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 11:34:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <920ece2c.0202070334.5316f8a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33367

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> I believe I've mentioned before that I've run the link
> budget calculations for a 6 mile+ path from my home
> to my employer's closest facility and that WITH the
> standard output power of +15 dBm from a standard
> "client" device and 20" grid dishes at both ends of
> the link, I'd have link margin to burn at 11 Mbps ...
> thus assuring execellent reliablilty. If I were willing
> to settle for, say 2 Mbps, I could use smaller, lower
> gain antennas, extend the range, or some combination
> thereof ...

On the ISP-wireless reflector, some of the WISP folks talk about 20+ mile links using Part 15 equipment. In some cases, however, they are talking about using 1 watt of power (legal for up to 6 dBi of antenna gain on 2.4 GHz) and higher gain antennas -- not legal. On 2.4 GHz, the power needs to be reduced by 1 dB for every 3 dB of antenna gain over 6 dBi.

Hams would not have that restriction if they used unmodified Part 15 equipment on the lower part of the Part 15 allocation, entirely within the ham band. At 1 watt, amateur antenna gain is unlimited and power-control of the Amateur station is not needed. If memory serves, hams can amplify that 1W up to 100 W, but over 1 watt, power control is needed to maintain a maximum bit-error-rate.

But under ideal conditions, stock Part 15 equipment is easily capable of communicating for miles.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPGFxJZe+N6+q84HiEQLEtACgsPsmKSC9WBoeHG1GJYU9aFPk+AoAnR5D
> i5Rq9Xg8LVx7+gqqqSNYdOsN
> =j+zE
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3807. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 13:03:54 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202070503.1fef2e0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33368

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C620152.93D39CCB@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
> > an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
> > about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.
>
> Hams are free to love ham radio to their heart's content.

It's about the love of all radio, Cecil.

> But, to the
> best of my knowledge, nowhere in part 97 does the word "love" appear.

Doesn't have to. The word "amateur", being based on the word for love,
says it all.

> Love has no place in objective governmental requirements

"objective governmental regulations" is an oxymoron. You know, like:

tight slacks
nondairy creamer
jumbo shrimp
business ethics

> and the FCC does not love amateur radio.

That last part is obvious.

But if you say love has no place, than you must think the regulations are
based on hate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3808. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 14:44:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6292B6.748D11D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33369

N2EY wrote:
> But if you say love has no place, than you must think the regulations are
> based on hate.

If the regulations are objective, emotions are irrelevant. Love and
hate are imaginary 'j' terms 90 degrees out of phase with objective
regulations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3809. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 15:30:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63E165.4720A036@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33370

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > DSSS has a center frequency also, Dick, with suppressed carrier.
> > > OOK Morse doesn't occupy a single frequency. Neither does SSB.
> >
> > Aw, gee. Maybe next time you make an SSB sked you should agree to meet
> > between 14.250 and 14.252400 mhz. Or on PSK31 maybe between 14.070 and
> > 14.070031 mhz.
>
> A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.

That's what makes it so curious that you would try to insinuate otherwise.
Trolling again, of course. Still.

3810. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 15:33:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63E219.66F956D8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33371

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I really hate to tell you, but none of that is news.
> > >
> > > It was news to you, Dick. You stated in another posting yesterday
> > > that SS doesn't have a center frequency.
> >
> > You dumshit, it wasn't news then either. Any radio system has its
> > base frequency. It's gotta spread from some base. And I said no such
> > thing.
>
> You're right, you didn't. It was someone else who said it. Sorry.

Your apology graciously accepted, and mine offered.

3811. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 15:44:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63E492.EB7AF18F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33372

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll previously wrote:
> > Every non-SS rig has a fixed frequency which is its base
> > frequency.

Since I don't claim to be an expert on all possible versions
of SS radio systems, I'm aware that there may be some Carl
Stevenson brainstorm that uses an entire band of frequencies
equally as its base. I think it's been adequately demonstrated
that there's a few things I don't know. I'm not supposed to
know everything.
How about you?

3812. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 15:59:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C63E814.7BF507C5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33373

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to >and

> from disaster areas.

Well a HT on the belt sure won't do it. You might want to get the no code techs on board.

What ever happened to slow scan TV? I know, relatively poor image quality. But the commercials have already trumped us with the satellite video phones anyway, as shown by news clips from Afghanistan.

> Imagine how way cool it would be if hams could
> get those images to other parts of the country quickly.

That should be a snap. Adapt technologies already in use. Sending a compressed .jpg file from your digital camera using a digital HF mode should be easy enough.
Getting something like that coordinated, up and running is the sort of thing the ARRL should be good at. Why aren't they?

3813. WTB:QUANTUM LOOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 17:27:33 UTC
From: Daniel Simpson <dzan@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <u65e85itp8noa9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.broadcasting,rec.radio.cb

WTB:QUANTUM LOOP

please email me at
dzan@qwest.net

3814. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 17:54:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202070954.569d8606@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33375

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2002.02.06.23.17.46.840971.21114@arrl.org>...
> On Wed, 06 Feb 2002 09:37:18 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >>1980 393,000 --- ---
> >>1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990) 2000 682,000 227,000 34%
> >>(1990-2000)
> >>
> >>Not as impressive as the erroneous numbers,
> >
> > They are still erroneous, Jon.
> >
> > The chart should read:
> >
> > 1980 393,000 --- ---
> > 1990 509,000 116,000 30% (1980-1990)
> > 2000 682,000 173,000 34% (1990-2000)
>
> That's what I get for sloppy cut-'n'-pasting!
>
> >> but still, almost twice as
> >>many licenses added in 1990-2000 as in 1980-1990.
> >>
> > Nope. Only 49% more - 57,000.
>
> "Only" 49%.

Big difference from "almost twice as many".
>
> >>No accurate compensation is really possible.
> >
> > But an educated guess is possible. Here's an example:
> >
> > Suppose that the average amateur "career" is 40 years. That means 2.5%
> > of the amateur population
> > drops out per year.
> > (One ham in 40 goes inactive per year, IOW). At the
> > level of 500,000 hams,
> > that amounts to 12,500 hams per year dropping out.
>
> There are a lot of "ifs" involved there.

Are any of them unreasonable? Sure, some hams are licensed as teenagers
and make it to their 90s. Others lose interest in a license term or two.
The point is that a certain percentage of the amateur population simply
loses interest every year and abandons ham radio, but that loss is not

reflected in the license totals until the license expires or is cancelled.

> IF the 40-year average is
> correct

Yup. 50 year average would be 2%/year.

Better yet, express it as "how many licenses held today will not be renewed?"

> and IF hams got their licences at a constant rate.

Nope. That makes no difference - all that matters is the dropout rate.

One ham has a 70 year "career" and another has a 10 year "career" when their licenses expire. Average is 40 years.

> But of course
> the growth spurts of the last 20 years bias the population toward those
> who have been licensed for far shorter periods of time.

So? All that matters is the droput rate. Note that many new licensees are older folks, who probably won't be hams for 40-50 years, unfortunately.

> So even if your
> 40-year assumption is correct -- and who knows? -- the 2.5%/year figure
> should be lower.

I don't think so. Look at the AH0A expiration data and grace period renewal data.
>
> One of the irritating things about trying to do these analyses is that
> there are substantial year-to-year variations. They make using
> estimates -- averages in particular -- little better than using random
> numbers.

I disagree. If you average over enough years the trend shows up.

> I stand by my opinion that it's impossible to make a
> sufficiently accurate estimate of the 5/10 effect to factor it out of the
> total number of licensees.

It still must be considered. Suppose the dropout rate is just 1.5% per year (average ham "career" 66 years!) - based on 500,000 hams we get 7,500 per year, or 37,500 in 5 years.

> It's much better to look at the rate of new
> licensees.
>
In another post I showed AH0A's data for new licenses from 1998 to 2001. Not pretty.

> >>If the "price" stays down, won't "sales" remain stronger?
> >
> > NO. The market becomes saturated. Look at what happened to computers,
> > VCRs, microwave ovens, etc. A point is reached where most "sales" are

> > replacements, not
> > first-time buyers.
>
> There are no "replacement" licenses. (Well, a few lapses that get
> relicensed.) All new licensees represent additions to the ARS. If a
> change makes the license appealing to x% more of the current population,
> it should also be appealing to x% more of the future members of the
> population (than it would have been without the change).
> That represents a sustained difference.

Let me explain. The following are just my terms, but they should be clear enough.

For any product, there exists a potential market of a certain size. This potential market is the set of everyone who wants the product.

A subset of the potential market is the actual market, which is everyone who will actually buy it at a given price level.

Lowering the price makes the actual market a higher percentage of the potential market.

But there comes a point where the market saturates. For example, consider refrigerators. When they were first introduced, nobody had one, and the market for them was huge. Eventually almost everyone had one, and sales consist mainly of replacements of old refrigerators and population growth.

Lowering the price of a fridge won't increase sales much because most people who want a fridge already have one. Mine is a little over 2 years old, for instance, and I have no need for another, nor any place to put it.

With ham radio licenses, saturation occurs when everyone who wants a license already has one. Lowering the "price" won't have much effect on the numbers.
>
> >>> I doubt that the 1991 or 2000 changes have/will result in longterm
> >>> growth changes.
> >>
> >>Nobody will ever be able to say for sure. It's impossible to isolate all
> >>of the factors long-term.
> >
> > It's possible to see the trends only after long periods of time.
>
> But it's impossible to separate the factors that create the trends.
> Changes in the licensing system don't occur in a vacuum. Which do you
> think affected the growth of ham radio more in the past 20 years: A)
> licensing changes, B) reduction in the amount of leisure time working
> adults have, C) the Internet, D) cell phones. How do you tell?

I agree that it's hard to tell the contributions from each cause. I would also say there are more causes than you list!
>

> >> But the unsurprising pattern that seems
> >>to be common across the history of Amateur Radio is that each time it
> >>has been made easier to get and retain a license, growth has followed.
> >
> > Paradoxically, growth has also followed when the requirements were made
> > HARDER!!
>
> Not that I'm aware of. Details?

The greatest period of growth in US amateur radio was in the Great Depression.

The number of US hams almost TRIPLED from 1929 (~16,000) to 1934 (~46,000) even though the written tests were made tougher and the regulations were much more restrictive (the "1929 regs" required much better signals from ham rigs and narrowed the bands enormously). On top of this was the depression itself.

> >>It happened in the 50's after the creation of 5-wpm licenses.
> >
> > The ARS grew from 60,000 to 100,000 in the 5 years between the end of
> > WW2 and the 1951
> > restructuring - when all licenses required 13 wpm and a General written
> > right off the bat.
>
> Yep, in part because a lot of military-trained radio ops got their
> tickets. Another example of a factor that has nothing to do with
> licensing muddying the analysis.

There was also a housing shortage, a baby boom, and tremendous upheaval in the postwar era. TV, the GI bill, and new careers and families starting up. Yes, some hams came from returning GIs, but many prewar hams lost interest during the 4 year shutdown - or never came back at all.

Point is that the growth before and after the Novice and Tech licenses was not much different. The big change was that new hams were, on average, younger.

> > The growth actually started back in the very early 1970s (compare the
> > annual totals from 1963 to 1983).
> > Oddly enough, growth stalled from 1963 to about 1970, then INCREASED
> > after incentive licensing was
> > in place (late 1968). Long before Bash, the trend was clear.
>
> Maybe you could cite the numbers you're using? Because that's not what
> I've seen. AFAIK growth was flat from the mid 60's to the mid 70's.

I'll have to dig through my QSTs. You've got 'em all up there at HQ, right? ;-)

There was an interesting editorial about 1963 or 64 about the sudden end of growth.

> > And not all hams used Bash books. I've never even seen one.
>
> Not all, but quite a lot did.

How many? When did they appear?

It is interesting that you say they made the writtens easier to pass. Many
here on rrap say publishing the Q&A made no difference.
>
> >> It happened in the 90's with no-code.
> >
> > Maybe. Maybe not. Other factors cloud the issue.
>
> They do, but not so much that the no-code effect can't be seen.

Sure. But is it sustained? The latest AH0A numbers say no.
>
> >>There were other factors that played a part, but it's not unreasonable
> >>to think the correlation is causal.
> >>
> >>Here's a table of FH Callbook counts of new licenses issued:
> >>
> >>1980 32,692
> >>1981 34,373
> >>1982 40,371
> >>1983 30,505
> >>1984 27,610
> >>1985 31,207
> >>1986 25,942
> >>1987 41,649
> >
> > Note the surge due to the change in the rules in 1987 - then the drop
> > back to near old levels.
> >
> >>1988 27,139
> >>1989 40,972
> >
> > Another surge - two years BEFORE nocodetest!
>
> What you are citing are large year-to-year variations. Trying to
> assign reasons to them is futile. You have to look longer term.
>
> >>1990 28,667
> >>1991 29,300
> >>1992 48,700
> >>1993 46,806
> >>1994 50,316
> >>1995 57,154
> >>1996 48,727
> >>(The 1997 Callbook, giving 1996 licenses issued, is the last one I have
> >>handy at the moment.)
>
> >>Notice the immediate and sustained increase in growth rate after the
> >>1991 no-code changes.

Feb 14, 1991 - yet the change doesn't show up until 1992.
> >
> > Yes, there's an increase - but is it sustained? Note the drop in 1996.
> > What happened in
> > following years?
>
> Again, look at the long term. Up to 1991 the growth rates were mostly in the
> high 20k to low 40k ballpark. After 1991 they were in the high 40's to
> low 50's for at least 5 years. Even with the significant year-to-year
> variations there was a clear step up post-1991.

http://www.ah0a.org
>
> >>And these numbers can be in no way biased by the 5/10 year term change
> >>since they are NEW licenses.
> >
> > Does a vanity license count as a NEW license?
>
> Vanity gate 1 opened in May 1996, so that's a moot point WRT the above
> table. In any case, no, they aren't new licenses. For example, just to
> pick one at random:
>
> HARE JR, EDWARD F, W1RFI (Extra)
> 304 GEORGE WASHINGTON TPKE
> BURLINGTON, CT 06013
> Previous call sign: KA1CV
> Licensee ID: L00144311
> FRN: 0003606456
> Issue Date: Mar 27, 1997
> Expire Date: Mar 27, 2007
> Date of last Change: Mar 27, 1997
>
> Note the previous call sign.

Doesn't mean the FH callbook didn't count them as new.
>
> > In other words, hams who got nocode tickets are more likely to drop out
> > than their predecesors.
>
> No, ALL newbies drop at a higher rate. The first renewal is less likely
> than the second one. That was just as true for those who got renewable
> Novice licenses.

There would then be no "pent up expirations", because post 1991 Techs would be
just as likely to drop out as pre 1991 Techs.
>
> >>> Exactly. But we are to believe without challenge claims that code
> >>> testing is/was "crippling" amateur radio. Sorry, I don't buy it.
> >>
> >>Who said that? Not me.
> >
> > Read Carl's brag signature.

>
> So? He's wrong.

I know. But he wants to make policy.

>Go argue with him about it.

I have.
>
> > The point is that the growth has not been very great despite massive
> > rules changes.
>
> It has changed, though. Greatly? Perhaps not. The unknown factor is what
> the growth would have been had those changes not taken place. You assume
> it would have been what it was before the changes. That's possible, but
> it's also possible that growth would have slowed or stopped. Nobody can
> say for sure. Some of those who argued for those changes did so on the
> basis that the changes were needed to sustain existing levels, not to
> increase growth. They'd probably argue that without the changes, ham radio
> would have undergone negative growth. Of course, they can't prove their
> case either.

Which is exactly my point.
>
> Ideally, of course, changes to the licensing requirements and privileges
> should be evaluated on the basis of their fitness to purpose, not to
> establish a growth rate.
>
Tell it to Carl and Bruce and the others who say ham radio is "crippled" and
"dying" and such.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3815. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 17:58:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202070958.4d773c16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33376

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C6292B6.748D11D2@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > But if you say love has no place, than you must think the regulations are
> > based on hate.
>
> If the regulations are objective, emotions are irrelevant.

Emotions are never irrelevant. They are the reason we do things. They are the foundation of all value judgement, which are the most important judgements we make. And the regulations are seldom if ever objective.

> Love and
> hate are imaginary 'j' terms 90 degrees out of phase with objective
> regulations.

They are the driving force, the reason, the cause. The regulations follow them. Otherwise it's cart before the horse.

Better to be driven by love than hate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3816. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 18:22:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C62C5EA.4640897E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33377

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.
>
> That's what makes it so curious that you would try to insinuate otherwise.
> Trolling again, of course. Still.

Please produce the posting where I tried to insinuate otherwise. As
usual, you are pulling stuff out of your posterior.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3817. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 18:26:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C62C6CA.27C18E8F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33378

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > If the regulations are objective, emotions are irrelevant.
>
> Emotions are never irrelevant.

They are where governmental regulations are concerned. Otherwise, we
will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member of the
Royal Family.

The FCC doesn't care if you love or hate amateur radio. If you meet
the requirements, that's all that matters.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3818. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 18:35:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C62C8E7.1B2977D1@uci.edu>
Source record: 33379

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> W5YI is not anti-ARRL.
>
> >Does Bruce Perens think he is?
>
> I don't know. You would have to ask Bruce.

Well to tell you the truth Ed, that's who I was addressing when you
began to answer for him.

3819. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 19:21:34 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.02.07.14.21.31.378104.10278@arrl.org>
Source record: 33380

On Thu, 07 Feb 2002 12:54:59 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>> and IF hams got their licences at a constant rate.
>
> Nope. That makes no difference - all that matters is the dropout rate.

Sure it does. If the average length of term is 40 years but most current hams have been licensed within the last 10 years, there won't be as many dropouts in the near term, all else being equal.

>> But of course
>> the growth spurts of the last 20 years bias the population toward those
>> who have been licensed for far shorter periods of time.
>
> So? All that matters is the droput rate.

The point is that the rate isn't constant. How could the dropout rate be constant when the entry rate isn't? Now, if you're applying the average across a really long term, fine. But you're not.

>> One of the irritating things about trying to do these analyses is that
>> there are substantial year-to-year variations. They make using
>> estimates -- averages in particular -- little better than using random
>> numbers.
>
> I disagree. If you average over enough years the trend shows up.

If you average over enough years multiple trends superimpose on one another and you can't separate them. That's what makes it hard. The short-term changes are highly variable and the long-term changes are due to multiple effects.

> In another post I showed AH0A's data for new licenses from 1998 to 2001.
> Not pretty.

Yep, things have dropped off the past few years. No question about that. Which only shows that the changing licensing terms is no panacea. Other factors are as, of not more, important to growth.

> With ham radio licenses, saturation occurs when everyone who wants a license
> already has one. Lowering the "price" won't have much effect on the numbers.

I've heard it put thusly: "If you walked around Times Square handing out ham tickets, not everyone would take one."

But the question is whether/when that point is reached. Until that point is reached, the effect remains.

>> But it's impossible to separate the factors that create the trends.
>> Changes in the licensing system don't occur in a vacuum. Which do you
>> think affected the growth of ham radio more in the past 20 years: A)
>> licensing changes, B) reduction in the amount of leisure time working
>> adults have, C) the Internet, D) cell phones. How do you tell?
>
> I agree that it's hard to tell the contributions from each cause. I would
> also say there are more causes than you list!

Absolutely, Those four are off the top of my head. But I contend that
each of them is significant enough to muddy up the trend lines.

>> Maybe you could cite the numbers you're using? Because that's not what
>> I've seen. AFAIK growth was flat from the mid 60's to the mid 70's.
>
> I'll have to dig through my QSTs. You've got 'em all up there at HQ, right? ;-)

No, we don't have your QSTs at HQ, we have our own. :-)

> There was an interesting editorial about 1963 or 64 about the sudden end of
growth.

What would that tell us about growth the the late 60's and early 70's?

>> > And not all hams used Bash books. I've never even seen one.
>>
>> Not all, but quite a lot did.
>
> How many? When did they appear?

I don't recall exactly, but many of the folks in the DC area in the late
70's and early 80s, when I lived there, were unabashedly Bash users.
(Sorry about the pun.) And the availability of the Bash books, along with
the FCC's unwillingness to do anything about them, were one of the
motivations for the VEC system that began in '84. That wasn't the only
factor in the growth during that period, though. Another was that the
CB boom brought a lot of people into contact with two-way radio
communication. Naturally, some of them went on to become hams.

> It is interesting that you say they made the writtens easier to pass. Many
> here on rrap say publishing the Q&A made no difference.

Bash was publishing a much smaller pool. Size does matter!

>> >> It happened in the 90's with no-code.
>> >
>> > Maybe. Maybe not. Other factors cloud the issue.
>>
>> They do, but not so much that the no-code effect can't be seen.
>
> Sure. But is it sustained? The latest AH0A numbers say no.

It was sustained for at least 5 years. No question that things have
slowed down of late.

> Doesn't mean the FH callbook didn't count them as new.

Again I say, there were no vanities before 1996.

> I know. But he wants to make policy.

So do you. So what?

>> It has changed, though. Greatly? Perhaps not. The unknown factor is what
>> the growth would have been had those changes not taken place. You assume
>> it would have been what it was before the changes. That's possible, but
>> it's also possible that growth would have slowed or stopped. Nobody can
>> say for sure. Some of those who argued for those changes did so on the
>> basis that the changes were needed to sustain existing levels, not to
>> increase growth. They'd probably argue that without the changes, ham radio
>> would have undergone negative growth. Of course, they can't prove their
>> case either.
>
> Which is exactly my point.

Then say that instead of saying that the available data DISproves their
case.

>> Ideally, of course, changes to the licensing requirements and privileges
>> should be evaluated on the basis of their fitness to purpose, not to
>> establish a growth rate.
>>
> Tell it to Carl and Bruce and the others who say ham radio is "crippled" and
> "dying" and such.

They're welcome to read it here. :-) But I don't think they mean that
solely on the basis of numbers of licensees.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jon

3820. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 19:42:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202071142.410f9afe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33381

"Kim" wrote:

> Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid to
> deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was wrong.
> He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the numbers
> as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).

Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=79668t%24qs4%241%40news1.fast.net&output=gplain

3821. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-07 21:56:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202071356.39cf73bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33382

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61b98b_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020205133725.20370.00001467@mb-mb.aol.com...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0202050115.70b5fd34@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > >>
> > >> Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
> > >> expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
> > >> frequency.
> > >> That's what the rules say.
>
> > >Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > >problem.
> >
> > Depending on whether it's DSSS or FHSS it could be a band of freqs
> or a set of
> > freqs.
> > Either way it's a bigger mess than narrowband modes.
>
> I would submit that that's a prejudiced view not based in
> technical fact.

I submit that it's an accurate description of the situation which
you object to emotionally because of the word "mess" being used.

> > >> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> > >> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
> > >> systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
> > >> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
> > >> the channel is occupied by another user.
> >
> > Nice idea but in the real world it's another story.
>
> In "the real world" it's a reality ...

You misunderstand.

> read about CSMA-CA.
> Look up how it works in 802.11b and read what the CCA bit
> is for ...

A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3822. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 01:10:07 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202080110020.27263-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33383

On Wed, 6 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
>news:a3ptecfpv1@heap.juniper.net...
>> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> I know people from this group, and it is probably worth pointing out
>> that a lot of the "electronics buffs" involved are hams (the geeks
>tend
>> to be of either the ham flavor or the programmer flavor, or both.
>The
>> ones that are hams seem to do a lot nicer outside installation work,
>> given the sample of a half dozen I've seen).
>>
>> I would guess they do this stuff as Part 15 projects rather than
>Part 97
>> because Part 97 content and control restrictions wring almost all
>the joy
>> out of it. Networking infrastructure projects are way more
>interesting if
>> you can get a lot of people to use the infrastructure you build for
>a lot
>> of stuff, rather than a few people doing hardly anything. In a
>strange
>> way this is (non-emergency) public service which is very much in the
>spirit
>> of 97.1(a), not to mention (c) and (d), except it is a service which
>hams
>> aren't allowed to provide as hams.
>>
>> Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather than
>hams
>> themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?
>>
>> Dennis Ferguson
>
>Dennis, et al ...
>
>I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
>control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
>development of high speed computer networking (under
>Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)

>
>However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
>would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
>for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
>nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
>sites could not be accessed.

Porno = commercial? Not if it's FREE. :-)

>However, I also think that limitations our our ability to provide
>a robust backup to the internet access needs of the emergency
>management agencies we serve in times of disaster should
>be eliminated and that the ampr.org domain should become,
>to the degree practical with *reasonable* restrictions, a much
>more viable and vibrant part of the internet.

3823. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 01:22:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C63284D.E750528F@uci.edu>
Source record: 33384

Carl,

The good points you make here, nicely address the issues I was
attempting to raise in my comments. I agree with you.

73, ac6xg

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Dennis, et al ...
>
> I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
> control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
> development of high speed computer networking (under
> Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)
>
> However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
> would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
> for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
> nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
> sites could not be accessed.
>
> However, I also think that limitations our our ability to provide
> a robust backup to the internet access needs of the emergency
> management agencies we serve in times of disaster should
> be eliminated and that the ampr.org domain should become,
> to the degree practical with *reasonable* restrictions, a much
> more viable and vibrant part of the internet.
>
> Carl - wa6vse

3824. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 02:26:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c633934_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33385

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C63E814.7BF507C5@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> >Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to >and
>
> > from disaster areas.
>
> Well a HT on the belt sure won't do it. You might want to get the no code
> techs on board.
>

Sure will. An HT on the belt will work just fine.

>
> What ever happened to slow scan TV? I know, relatively poor image
> quality. But the commercials have already trumped us with the satellite
> video phones anyway, as shown by news clips from Afghanistan.
>
> > Imagine how way cool it would be if hams could
> > get those images to other parts of the country quickly.
>
> That should be a snap. Adapt technologies already in use. Sending a
> compressed .jpg file from your digital camera using a digital HF mode
> should be easy enough.
> Getting something like that coordinated, up and running is the sort of
> thing the ARRL should be good at. Why aren't they?
>

There's an easier way than that.

Kim W5TIT

3825. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 02:30:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c633a2c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33386

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202071142.410f9afe@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" wrote:
>
> > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid
to
> > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was wrong.
> > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the
numbers
> > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
>
> Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=79668t%24qs4%241%40news1.fast.net&outpu
t=gplain

You might need to remind, Jim, of what it is again that *you* think I should be afraid of? Dick's bought into the concept that the end of the ARS was eminent, due to Restructuring (as it's called). I don't know of any particular thing I've bought into on this newsgroup. Do you?

Kim W5TIT

3826. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 02:42:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c633cf0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33387

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c633934_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C63E814.7BF507C5@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> >
> > >Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to >and
> >
> > > from disaster areas.
> >
> > Well a HT on the belt sure won't do it. You might want to get the no
code
> > techs on board.
> >
>
> Sure will. An HT on the belt will work just fine.
>

Whoops, forgot to send the reason why I said an HT will work just fine:

From the Kenwood website (I believe there are even other mfrs. who have equipment with this same capability). Dick, if you'd start having conversations instead of whatever it is you do on ham radio, you might have known this:

PS--Note the last feature at the bottom: "Accepts input from other camera or video devices"

Amateur Radio >> Portables >> VC-H1

Kenwood does it again! The VC-H1 is an all new exciting product to enhance your Amateur radio hobby. Compact and easy to use, the VC-H1 is compatible with all FM VHF/UHF transcievers along with FM and SSB HF modes. Send and receive digital images quick (17 seconds download @9600 baud) and easy anywhere. For camping trips, Field Day, or Disaster Communication teams. Imagine sending images across town or across the world on VHF/UHF or HF. The VC-H1 integrates with your PC to store and label all your favorite images for future transmission with special software.

Small and compact
AA alkaline or 110 volt AC adapter operation
Operates all Slow Scan modes
Callsign superimpose
10 picture memory

Auto Power Off
1.8 inch color display
Built-in speaker and microphone
Transmits to another radio and PC (w/ special software)
Removable head
Accepts input from other camera or video devices

> >
> > What ever happened to slow scan TV? I know, relatively poor image
> > quality. But the commercials have already trumped us with the satellite
> > video phones anyway, as shown by news clips from Afghanistan.
> >
> > > Imagine how way cool it would be if hams could
> > > get those images to other parts of the country quickly.
> >
> > That should be a snap. Adapt technologies already in use. Sending a
> > compressed .jpg file from your digital camera using a digital HF mode
> > should be easy enough.
> > Getting something like that coordinated, up and running is the sort of
> > thing the ARRL should be good at. Why aren't they?
> >
>

The ARRL doesn't have to coordinate and get it up and running, Little Dick.
It's already here.

> There's an easier way than that.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Kim W5TIT, again.

3827. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 03:40:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202071940.7a5d7e61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33388

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61adf9_2@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> > >
> > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > problem.
>
> DSSS runs "on a frequency" in the same way that SSB does ...
> in a good DSSS system, the carrier is suppressed well below
> the modulation content.
>
Yeah, right. 2.1 kHz on one side of the suppressed carrier for ssb and
how many kHz away from it's supressed carrier does SS spit RF did you
say?
>
>
> Using your "terminology" SSB doesn't run "on a frequency"
> either (which is at least borderline rediculous), since the only
> way it would be on a single frequency would be if only a single
> tone were transmitted and the carrier suppression were infinite.
> The first is of virtually no utility and the second is unachievable.
>
>
No kidding . . ?!
>
>
>
> There are mechanisms for avoiding the "hidden terminal" problem,
> or at least significantly minimizing it ... as has been said before,
> there is no guarantee of absolute freedom from interference from
> ANY other use of the same spectrum ... even from other users of
> "legacy" modes.
>
>
Yes there is, let the wideband users have this chunk of spectrum space
and let the narrowband users have this other chunk of space, don't mix
'em, then there is no interference in the context of the extant
discussion and the whole thread becomes moot. And "dynamically
allocate" the sizes of the chunks based on the number of individual
users The System detects at any given point in time. That oughta ring
yer chimes.
>

>
> > Don't be silly.
>
> Who's being silly? I'm making a statement of fact
> in a perfectly serious manner ...
>
>
Behavioral issues are completely off-topic. Kim is the resident guru
in this field, whine at her, don't bore me with it.
>
>
> > There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that any
> > ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the real
> > Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any
> conditions.
>
> You must be assuming the system will/must of necessity operate
> at 2m using the TNC and voice radio paradigm ... that's exactly
> what I'm suggesting we abandon because it doesn't work very
> well.
>
>
No I did NOT make any such assumption. Quit ducking the bullet, I did
not just get off the boat.
>
>
>
> I wasn't saying that we could "mirror" the entire infrastructure ...
> only
> that we can provide local service at high bandwidth and a robust,
> portable capability to provide service within and bridge to the
> outside
> from disaster areas.
>
>
Oh spare me puleeze, here we go again with the freakin' motherhood
"emergency services" crap as an excuse for anything and everything.
Get back to me when there is a documented failure of SOP ham voice
operations to get that job done locally, regionally or globally.
>
> If you don't want to "play," fine ... but why try to "prove" that it's
> impossible ... just to discourage others from getting involved
> and actually doing it???
>
>
Hogwash. Hey Sweetums I got a clue for you: I am very decidely NOT in
opposition to the implementaion of wideband modes in ham radio at all.
In fact I find it a bit appalling that, given the tools and talents we
have today in ham radio it still no wide modes have been implemented
yet in at least in some seminal experimental form or another. I am

however vehemently opposed to your "visons" as they relate to how wide modes should be implemented. And so is everybody else with half a brain and which is what this thread is is all about.
>
>
> Having seen the information on the internet, I find it difficult
> to believe that your mental filtering capacities are seriously
> strained ... if they are, then we have a different problem here
> and probaby shouldn't continue the thread because to do so
> would be futile.
>
>
OK, so you just finally got yer free pass to HF, thus I'm obliged to make some allowances for your lack of experience and yer Coefficent of Stupidity as it relates to packet-assisted HF dxing and dx contesting with or without packet in particular. And how the packet system is integrated into contest logging software and computer-based station contol. And howcum there are only miiliseconds per packet post to do any "mental filtering" of the spots when yer running 150/hr. The Internet spots embody the concept of unmanageable futile data overload and endless searching. The packet spots on the other hand filter the futiles off yer screen by the megabyte and cuts to the quick right here and now, nail that new mult on 15 which shows up in the spots window, smack it with ye mouse, log him and back to yer run on 20 before yer pileup had a clue ya even left 20.
>
>
If perchance you have a problem with any of the above I can point you to several dx contesters who are almost in your back yard who can straighten you right out real quick. They've been doing the whole nine yards for years.
>
>
> So let's talk about actually FIXING it ... rather than putting another
> band-aid on a system that was poorly designed in the first place.
>
>
I know what the fix is and "we" don't have to reinvent the wheel or come up with SS sub-bands to get there. The problem is not the baud rate. The problem is using $100 Radio Slack 2m FM voice xcvrs which distort the hell outta data streams with their mic and speaker-driver circuitry. Boogered waveforms,
the checksums don't add up, "send again", and there goes the throughput rates. I've just now been apprised of the fact that there are current-tech 2m xcvrs starting to show up with "data ports" which jump past the mic circuitry for one and should reduce the number of tries before a handshake happens so given some time those radios oughta goose up the throughputs and fix the problem.
>
>

>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

3828. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:21:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C649601.713112D1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33390

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > A DSSS receiver needs to know the center frequency, Dick, just like SSB.
> >
> > That's what makes it so curious that you would try to insinuate otherwise.
> > Trolling again, of course. Still.
>
> Please produce the posting where I tried to insinuate otherwise. As
> usual, you are pulling stuff out of your posterior.

To state that "Spread spectum doesn't run on a frequency" then state later that it does is to correct your own wrongful insinuation. The readers know. No further quotation necessary.

3829. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:22:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C64964F.4C6A07F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33391

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > If the regulations are objective, emotions are irrelevant.
> >
> > Emotions are never irrelevant.
>
> They are where governmental regulations are concerned. Otherwise, we
> will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member of the
> Royal Family.

Ah, really. And which royal family do you plan to import for the job?

3830. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:30:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C635453.8D2C194D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33396

Dick Carroll wrote:
> To state that "Spread spectum doesn't run on a frequency" then state later that
> it does is to correct your own wrongful insinuation. The readers know. No further
> quotation necessary.

You completely misunderstood the concept, Dick. Only an unmodulated continuous wave runs on a (single) frequency. CW does not run on a single frequency. SSB does not run on a single frequency. SS does not run on a single frequency.

Any signal with modulation information on it runs on a *band* of frequencies, i.e. it occupies a certain *bandwidth*. But most modulation methods use a (single) *reference* frequency including DSSS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3831. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:31:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020207233114.03879.00000051@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 33393

In article <20020206063508.08268.00001144@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>rom: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
>
>Of course it is about you, Larry. Can't you see that?
>

Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3832. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:31:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020207233114.03879.00000050@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 33394

In article <20020206060119.08292.00001228@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>AFTER the earthquake, I'm sure there will be a lot of No-Code
>>Techs looking around for a Morse code class!
>
>No, they probably won't because after all of the other earthquakes, virtually
>none of the emergency communications was handled using Morse code. Of
>course,
>you take is that some future earthquake might result in most of its emergency
>traffic being handled with Morse code. :-)

So, then, you're saying that it is impossible to effectively employ CW during post-disaster emergency communications? Or that it is unlikely that CW would be utilized by hams in a widespread disaster scenario?

My guess is that CW isn't used in emergencies very much because in most ARES/RACES groups, the code-proficient hams are generally displaced by the HT and microphone-slinging Ham Hero types. However, if a situation existed where CW really would be the only way to make contact with the "outside" world, very few hams would have the ability to effectively exploit this mode. Oh, I forgot. There's the "dot and dash" chart on the wall of the ham radio station in the EOC. Never mind.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3833. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:31:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020207233115.03879.00000052@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 33395

In article <20020206063437.08268.00001143@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>The fact that you have to fetch that far to find scenarios that might justify
>the continuation of the CW test does not help your cause.
>
>Unfortunately, that is all you can do at this point, because the mean and
>nasty
>things you have said to "defend" the mode will not work to promote the mode
>on
>the air.

What "mean and nasty" things might that be, Ed? I don't "defend" the CW mode -- I just point out it's benefits and advantages. I also indulge in slam-dunking lazy whiners who want full amateur HF privileges without having to be bothered to learn a practical communications skill.

>I am sure Carl considers you NCI's best friend. :-)

NCI doesn't need me for a friend; there are enough lazy, whining, knuckle-dragging droolers who want to get their hot little hands on an HF microphone to make NCI's job comparatively easy. Uh oh. I guess I just said something "mean and nasty." Sorry if the truth hurts anyone who saw it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3834. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:31:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C649869.375CCA5D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33392

N2EY wrote:

> "Kim" wrote:
>
> > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid to
> > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was wrong.
> > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the numbers
> > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
>
> Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.

What are the indicators that she is intelligent enough to have any?

3835. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:31:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6354AF.6C6E30F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33397

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > They are where governmental regulations are concerned. Otherwise, we
> > will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member of the
> > Royal Family.
>
> Ah, really. And which royal family do you plan to import for the job?

The PCTA tried to achieve Royal Family status and failed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3836. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:38:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C63562F.1EDCCD67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33398

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> NCI doesn't need me for a friend; there are enough lazy, whining,
> knuckle-dragging droolers who want to get their hot little hands on an
> HF microphone to make NCI's job comparatively easy. Uh oh. I
> guess I just said something "mean and nasty." Sorry if the truth
> hurts anyone who saw it.

You are the one who is dragging his knuckles, Larry, continuing to
bitch incessantly about a done deal. You are going to have to get
up off your lazy butt and promote the merits of CW. Do you think
your "mean and nasty" insulting approach will convince a newcomer
to choose to learn Morse code? I don't.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3837. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:39:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C63566F.E0ECCC3E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33399

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.

Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3838. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:41:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C63570D.1968C25F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33400

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> So, then, you're saying that it is impossible to effectively employ CW
> during post-disaster emergency communications?

Not impossible, Larry, just usually ill advised when better solutions
are available.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3839. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:46:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C649BFB.15E2AC45@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33251

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > To state that "Spread spectum doesn't run on a frequency" then state later that
> > it does is to correct your own wrongful insinuation. The readers know. No further
> > quotation necessary.
>
> You completely misunderstood the concept, Dick. Only an unmodulated continuous
> wave runs on a (single) frequency. CW does not run on a single frequency. SSB
> does not run on a single frequency. SS does not run on a single frequency.
>
> Any signal with modulation information on it runs on a *band* of frequencies,
> i.e. it occupies a certain *bandwidth*. But most modulation methods use a
> (single) *reference* frequency including DSSS.

Of course that is all correct, and those of us with professional technical training know it. What about the unknowledgable newcomers you so carelessly mislead?

3840. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 04:47:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C649C2C.E59FB6E2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33252

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > They are where governmental regulations are concerned. Otherwise, we
> > > will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member of the
> > > Royal Family.
> >
> > Ah, really. And which royal family do you plan to import for the job?
>
> The PCTA tried to achieve Royal Family status and failed.

Meanwhile you tried to achieve asshole idiot status and succeeded.

3841. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 05:57:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C64AC80.A0CE531C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33253

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.
>
> Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)

That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
criminal record he is not a criminal!

3842. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 05:58:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C64ACC7.88C0BCB5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33254

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > So, then, you're saying that it is impossible to effectively employ CW
> > during post-disaster emergency communications?
>
> Not impossible, Larry, just usually ill advised when better solutions
> are available.

By jove! Finally something we agree on!

3843. Ham ops report on our Wireless Video Sender/Receivers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 08:48:26 UTC
From: CLOSEOUTS <oshea4@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3vhq2$sj5$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33389

We have been getting many orders the last week from HamTV customers. I am including some reports written by the Ham Ops about
our units. I really do not know anything tech about our units, I have been in busniess since 1975 in Kansas City Missouri,
I am in closeout business. I own 4,000 Startech Video Sender/Receivers $30 + shipping. www.oshealtd.com

> Preliminary report:
> > I received a Star Tech 910XT-XR Video Sender thanks to Bill Houlehan at Oshea Ltd. to take apart and see how best to apply it to ATV. These units are FCC Compliant for license free use on 909.25 MHz and at $30 + shipping are
> well worth it for just that application. For ordering go to the web site:
> > www.oshealtd.com
> >
The transmitter and receiver (actually a crystal controlled downconverter) is designed for plugging in camcorder or VCR composite video and line audio to the AM transmitter (RCA phono jacks) and receiving through the downconverter with the F jack cabled to the antenna jack on a TV set to channel 3.
The system comes with screw in 1/4 wave spike vertical antennas and 12Vdc @ 200 ma wall plug power supplies.
> >
The power supplies actually put out 14 to 15 Vdc. In the transmitter, a 12V regulator IC is used, but in the receiver they just used a series dropping resistor. In either case, 12Vdc battery power could be tapped in on the output side of the regulator and resistor for portable applications, or directly from a car with the engine running.
> >
DX with the FCC Part 15 video devices is only a few hundred feet line of sight. You can't change the antennas or tweak the power for legal license free operation, but if used as a ham for ham purposes, you can repeak
the transmitter, remove the antenna system and connect to beams like the 3318LYARM Loop Yagi and should get about 1/2 mile line of sight. There are many public service events or other applications where this may be all you need. However for higher power a Downeast Microwave amp could be added - they have amps that take 10mw input, but more investigation of the transmitter needs to be done to better match the AM linear input range.
> Bill is trying to get the schematics for me.
> >
I think the best part of the Star Tech system for ham use is the crystal controlled downconverter. The downconverter outputs on channel 3, has a

preamp stage and a total gain of 18 dB. However, for some reason, the
local oscillator is on the high side which inverts the sideband. This is
no problem for simplex but if used to receive an ATV repeater transmitting
VSB, the desired VSB will be attenuated. It looks like just changing
frequency or going to low side injection should be as easy as putting in a
new crystal and repeaking the two triplers -
that is what I will try next. The crystal frequency is input frequency
input minus 61.25 MHz (ch3) all divided by 9. Crystals can be ordered from
KWMfg.
> > (405 567-2285) - specify KW-18 type crystal and the frequency:
> > 910.25 = 94.333 MHz
> > 911.25 = 94.444 MHz
> > 913.25 = 94.667 MHz
> > 919.25 = 95.333 MHz
> > 923.25 = 95.778 MHz
> >
The transmitter puts out -7 dBm pep which is about right for the 50 mW per
meter at 3 meter license free FCC Part 15 limit these units are
certified for. I was able to get about +2 dBm with a little peaking of the
output filter and some of the multiplier stage trimmer caps. However, the
tuning of the multiplier stages greatly affects the video modulation. I
could get +8 dBm if I just peaked for max power, but the modulation was
unuseable. It looks like they modulated the last tripler stage transistors
base. The video also rolls off quite a bit. The modulator is the weak
part of the design.
If I can get a schematic soon, I might be able to find a simple solution.If
not Ill just have to trace it out when I can get time.... and patience.
The sound subcarrier is also down about -25 dBc, which is quite low - it
should be up around -15 to -18 dBc, but this might also be a function of
the modulators video high frequency roll off. There are internal video and
line audio gain pots on the board.
The frequency can also be changed from 909.25 MHz by changing the crystal
and repeaking to the more standard ones used for ATV. The crystal frequency
is
> > times 9 in this circuit and the same type as in the receiver.
> > 910.25 = 101.139 MHz
> > 911.25 = 101.250 MHz
> > 913.25 = 101.472 MHz
> > 919.25 = 102.139 MHz
> > 923.25 = 102.583 MHz
> >
> > Both units are in metal enclosures with the electronics in tin plated
metal cans inside. The cans come out by removing the 8 external screws and
on the receiver, also removing the nut on the F jack. The cover on the can
comes off by prying up the tabs. The antenna assembly can be unsoldered
from the boards and replaced with coax and/or N connector for ham use.
> >
The receiver draws 40 ma and the transmitter 100 ma with 12Vdc applied.
>
> The receiver channel 3 output has a multipole bandpass filter which is

tuned by C20, 21 and 22. For some reason, it was centered on 61 MHz rather than tuned for being flat across channel 3 - 60 to 66 MHz. The high side at 66 MHz was rolled off about 5 dB which would decrease the color and sound subcarriers. A slight decrease in capacity on C20 and 22 brought the passband up to the proper bandwidth and band pass for channel 3. After a little more peaking I was able to increase the total gain to 22 dB.

Below, is another response about article above:

Thank you. Great, he is on the right track and we found all to be as he stated. I will order up a crystal for our desired frequency. Our plan is to operate simplex -- not a problem . Will keep you posted on our findings. Will also check on other hams who are working in The 900 MHZ spectrum.

>
>
>

3844. Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 12:30:32 UTC
From: qrp5@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33255

Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
Respectfully, JJ

3845. Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 13:23:38 UTC
From: qrp5@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <cce22972.0202080523.9f5d776@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33256

Concerning the transmissions of an unlicensed operator, with a properly licensed “control operator” present, we have come to some disagreement. Some say the “guest” may make calls and identify, using the callsign of the control operator. Others say the guest may not INITIATE calls, nor IDENTIFY, using any other person’s callsign. We have looked for specifics on this in Part 97, but haven’t been able to locate it. Does someone familiar with the nuances of the rules point us in the right clause here? Thanks, JJ

3846. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 14:21:21 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jem76u4gc0u7et5dev8b8keimeakgq848t@4ax.com>
Source record: 33257

On 8 Feb 2002 04:30:32 -0800, qrp5@my-deja.com (JJ) wrote:

>Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
>person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
>come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
>the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
>control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
>may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
>looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
>find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
>clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
>Respectfully, JJ

My understanding is that the control operator would have to be present
at all times when an unlicensed person is operating the station - and
that the control operator's callsign would be used.

As far as I'm aware, I know of no regulation prohibiting a guest
operator from initiating contact or from identifying the station using
the control operators call.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3847. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 14:37:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020208093743.05154.00001943@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33259

"Kim" writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Kim" wrote:
>> > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid
>to
>> > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was wrong.
>> > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the
>numbers
>> > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
>>
>> Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=79668t%24qs4%241%40news1.fast.net&out
put=gplain

>You might need to remind, Jim, of what it is again that *you* think I should
>be afraid of?

I don't think *you* *should* be afraid of anything written on this NG, Kim. I simply note that you *are* afraid of some things written here.

You say that Dick is afraid to deal with certain facts. But you are afraid to even look at some things because you are afraid of what you might see.

>Dick's bought into the concept that the end of the ARS was
>eminent, due to Restructuring (as it's called).

So? Maybe he's right. I don't think he's right, but it's way too soon to tell.

> I don't know of any
>particular thing I've bought into on this newsgroup. Do you?

Kim, you are extremely resistant to any and all new information that conflicts with what you believe. Like the bishops who wouldn't look through Galileo's telescope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3848. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 14:37:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020208093743.05154.00001942@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33260

In article <pan.2002.02.07.14.21.31.378104.10278@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Thu, 07 Feb 2002 12:54:59 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>> and IF hams got their licences at a constant rate.
>>
>> Nope. That makes no difference - all that matters is the dropout rate.
>
>Sure it does. If the average length of term is 40 years but most current
>hams have been licensed within the last 10 years, there won't be as many
>dropouts in the near term, all else being equal.

You also say that newcomers are more likely to drop out, so the two trends
oppose each other. 40 years is an educated guess - run the numbers with
50, 60 or 70 years and see how much the numbers change.

There were 500,000 US hams way back about 1989, too.
>
>>> But of course
>>> the growth spurts of the last 20 years bias the population toward those
>>> who have been licensed for far shorter periods of time.
>>
>> So? All that matters is the droput rate.
>
>The point is that the rate isn't constant. How could the dropout rate be
>constant when the entry rate isn't? Now, if you're applying the average
>across a really long term, fine. But you're not.

The effect is the same. See AH0A.

>> In another post I showed AH0A's data for new licenses from 1998 to 2001.
>> Not pretty.
>
>Yep, things have dropped off the past few years. No question about that.
>Which only shows that the changing licensing terms is no panacea. Other
>factors are as, of not more, important to growth.

Agreed.
>
>> With ham radio licenses, saturation occurs when everyone who wants a
>license
>> already has one. Lowering the "price" won't have much effect on the
>numbers.
>
>I've heard it put thusly: "If you walked around Times Square handing out
>ham tickets, not everyone would take one."

That's another way of saying it.
>
>But the question is whether/when that point is reached. Until that point
>is reached, the effect remains.
>
Short term, though.

>>> But it's impossible to separate the factors that create the trends.
>>> Changes in the licensing system don't occur in a vacuum. Which do you
>>> think affected the growth of ham radio more in the past 20 years: A)
>>> licensing changes, B) reduction in the amount of leisure time working
>>> adults have, C) the Internet, D) cell phones. How do you tell?
>>
>> I agree that it's hard to tell the contributions from each cause. I would
>> also say there are more causes than you list!
>
>Absolutely, Those four are off the top of my head. But I contend that
>each of them is significant enough to muddy up the trend lines.

Exactly.
>
>>> Maybe you could cite the numbers you're using? Because that's not what
>>> I've seen. AFAIK growth was flat from the mid 60's to the mid 70's.
>>
>> I'll have to dig through my QSTs. You've got 'em all up there at HQ, right?
>;-)
>
>No, we don't have your QSTs at HQ, we have our own. :-)

Yes, but mine get read ;-)
>
>> There was an interesting editorial about 1963 or 64 about the sudden end of
>growth.
>
>What would that tell us about growth the the late 60's and early 70's?

It explains why the growth stopped in the '60s.
>
>>> > And not all hams used Bash books. I've never even seen one.
>>>
>>> Not all, but quite a lot did.
>>
>> How many? When did they appear?
>
>I don't recall exactly, but many of the folks in the DC area in the late
>70's and early 80s, when I lived there, were unabashedly Bash users.
>(Sorry about the pun.) And the availability of the Bash books, along with
>the FCC's unwillingness to do anything about them, were one of the
>motivations for the VEC system that began in '84.

The real problem was money - FCC could save a bundle by getting
unpaid volunteers to do what they had been paying govt. employees to do.

>That wasn't the only
>factor in the growth during that period, though. Another was that the
>CB boom brought a lot of people into contact with two-way radio
>communication. Naturally, some of them went on to become hams.

Sure - but many didn't. I think the total effect was decidely negative for the ARS.

>> It is interesting that you say they made the writtens easier to pass. Many
>> here on rrap say publishing the Q&A made no difference.
>
>Bash was publishing a much smaller pool. Size does matter!

"Anybody who says size doesn't matter never had a really big one". - Howard Stern doing a radio spot for diamond engagement rings.

>>> Ideally, of course, changes to the licensing requirements and privileges
>>> should be evaluated on the basis of their fitness to purpose, not to
>>> establish a growth rate.
>>>
>> Tell it to Carl and Bruce and the others who say ham radio is "crippled"
>and
>> "dying" and such.
>
>They're welcome to read it here. :-) But I don't think they mean that
>solely on the basis of numbers of licensees.

What else does it mean?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3849. Re: Vote for W4AMP or KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 14:38:06 UTC
From: Gene Nalley <ii912@zyrdanz.com>
Message-ID: <a40nm6$723$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
news:a3so54$q5u$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Frog3" <FrogRemailer@bigfoot.com> wrote in message
> news:AVSU9FBY37293.2219444444@frog.gilgamesh.org...
> > Cast your votes for the most disgusting, sick, filthy,
> >
> > psycho to ever post in this newsgroup. Is it W4AMP
> >
> > or is it KC8JBO ?
>
> Wow! Difficult decision here. Let's see. Disgusting, sick and filthy
> obviously go to Roger hands down. Roger and AMP are tied for the psycho
> part......
> Overall? I'd have to give the Turd Trophy to Roger.
>
>
What is the purpose of this vote?

thanks,

TWD

3850. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 15:44:29 UTC
From: Carl <n7kuw@dropthisnospam.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <xnS88.14817$AV5.136471@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 33261

And the control operator (the licensed ham) must maintain control of the station - i.e., such that the "guest" could not operate illegally, improperly, or whatever. It's pretty much up to the individual control operator as to what he/she must do in order to comply with this requirement.

I have handed my radio to another person, allowed them to operate the PTT and talk, etc., but stayed within reach and hearing range at all times. I could quickly grab the radio back if it were necessary. I have not allowed another person to identify with my call, I always initiate and terminate the QSO. I don't know that there would be a specific requirement for that however, as long as the control operator were truly in control. One of the many many gray areas or fine lines...

Carl.

AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:jem76u4gc0u7et5dev8b8keimeakgq848t@4ax.com...
> On 8 Feb 2002 04:30:32 -0800, qrp5@my-deja.com (JJ) wrote:
>
> >Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> >person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> >come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> >the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> >control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> >may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> >looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> >find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
> >clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> >Respectfully, JJ
>
> My understanding is that the control operator would have to be present
> at all times when an unlicensed person is operating the station - and
> that the control operator's callsign would be used.
>
> As far as I'm aware, I know of no regulation prohibiting a guest
> operator from initiating contact or from identifying the station using
> the control operators call.
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3851. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 16:15:49 UTC
From: k7mem@myrealbox.com
Message-ID: <270a577d.0202080815.6e8c6292@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33262

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C62062F.9C266D95@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I suppose I shouldn't expect you to hold to any accuracy yourself.
> > You know that anyone who never before sat down to a key will not be able
> > to form dots and dashes without some minimal training.
>
> I suspect anyone who is capable of tuning up a CW transceiver is
> capable of sending dots and dashes. Many kids have played with
> MCW using their CB walkie-talkies with the Morse code chart
> on the side.

Well, I have personally come across several operators in the Novice portion of 15 Meters that did not know how to send dashes. It was very difficult to decipher their code. This may come from poor hand/ear coordination or maybe they just don't listen to themselves when they send. I seem to recall that, when I got my Novice license, part of the CW testing included sending. But then, that was a long time ago. :)

After a while of listening to them ,you can pick up a rhythm and pick out their call from their CQ, but I was never able to hold a good QSO with any of them. And they all were able to tune up their transmitter.

--
Martin E. Meserve, K7MEM

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my employer.

3852. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 16:36:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C63FEA7.B686BC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33263

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > To state that "Spread spectum doesn't run on a frequency" then state later that
> > > it does is to correct your own wrongful insinuation. The readers know. No further
> > > quotation necessary.
> >
> > You completely misunderstood the concept, Dick. Only an unmodulated continuous
> > wave runs on a (single) frequency. CW does not run on a single frequency. SSB
> > does not run on a single frequency. SS does not run on a single frequency.
> >
> > Any signal with modulation information on it runs on a *band* of frequencies,
> > i.e. it occupies a certain *bandwidth*. But most modulation methods use a
> > (single) *reference* frequency including DSSS.
>
> Of course that is all correct, and those of us with professional technical training
> know it. What about the unknowledgable newcomers you so carelessly mislead?

When those "newcomers" realize that there are a lot of inside jokes on a
technical newsgroup, they will probably learn something valuable.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3853. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 16:39:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C63FF48.CFC0B2D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33264

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.
> > >
> > > Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)
> >
> > That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
> > requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
> > criminal record he is not a criminal!

Could be he is a criminal who hasn't been caught. Criminal
actions do not require an official criminal history. Is smoking
marijuana a criminal action if one doesn't get caught?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3854. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 17:21:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C654CE8.DC5713ED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33265

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.
> > >
> > > Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)
> >
> > That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
> > requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
> > criminal record he is not a criminal!
>
> Could be he is a criminal who hasn't been caught. Criminal
> actions do not require an official criminal history. Is smoking
> marijuana a criminal action if one doesn't get caught?

So you're admitting that you're a criminal?

3855. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 17:29:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C640AF2.759C0CEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33266

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you're admitting that you're a criminal?

Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3856. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 18:36:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C641AB8.B5A67314@uci.edu>
Source record: 33267

JJ,

Part 97.115.2b specifically states:
"The third party may participate in stating the message where:
(1) The control operator is present at the control point and is
continuously monitoring and supervising the third party's participation;

97.7 states that when transmitting, each amateur station must have a
control operator.

97.105 defines control operator duties are to ensure the immediate
proper operation of station

97.113 discusses prohibited transmissions, but do not include any
reference to station identification by a third party, or any other
specifics pertaining to third party traffic.

I think the burden of proof lies with the side claiming the restrictions
on third party operations. I can't find any.

73 de ac6xg

JJ wrote:
>
> Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
> clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> Respectfully, JJ

3857. subscribe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 19:27:33 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <FEV88.21975$3E5.1772412@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33268

```
subscribe rec.radio.amateur.policy
```

3858. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 20:23:54 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a41ca9$1c31ak$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 33269

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c5c0838_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm
> being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and
this
> area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of the
> 70cm band where you are? Anyone have any thoughts for other ideas on this
> matter to the FCC?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Hi Kim and group,

Historically 70 cm didn't get a lot of use in our area, but that's changing. Thanks to a generous donation by Alabama Power, our local clubs are working to convert several repeaters for use on the 70cm band. We have one new one up already, in north Jefferson county. The Shelby County club is very close to having a second up and running in it's area. Another older Jefferson county 440 repeater was revamped and is running.

Several people are promoting usage, and one fellow (Mark, K4MWN) is conducting weekly nets on one of the repeaters. Usage of the band is definitely growing in this area.

To promote usage, we need to:

1. Educate new hams and existing ones the repeaters are there and open for use.

2. Monitor those freqs as much as possible, and be quick to get on there and talk when someone gets on.

3. Experiment with modes other than voice. As one fellow said, maybe shift APRS here, who knows what else could be done in this band. PSK31 anyone?

73's,

Robert / N4IXT

3859. Re: subscribe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 20:51:41 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C643A5D.3015F21D@psu.edu>
Source record: 33270

No! absolutely not! fuggitaboudit!

Seriously, Ronnie, you don't need to subscribe to this group, just read
it off your newsgroup reader. 8^)

- Mike -

"Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> subscribe rec.radio.amateur.policy

3860. Re: Vote for W4AMP or KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 20:59:58 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a41ia0cpu0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Gene Nalley" <ii912@zyrdanz.com> wrote in message
news:a40nm6$723$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
>
> What is the purpose of this vote?
>
> thanks,
>
> TWD

For some ignorant dumbasses to spew childish insults behind their anonimity. They lack any testicles, except the ones in their mouths...Arf Arf and the other remailer usually spend time downloading kiddie porn. Whorass Grimm makes his own with his own family.

3861. Electronic QSL's are APPROVED for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 21:09:38 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c643e95$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33271
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

A few of us Ham's have been pioneers for some time by offering
electronic QSL card service. Now the ARRL is accepting eQSL's for DXCC
credit.....

http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/DXCCInfo.cfm

I qsl 100% electronically....check my web site for - YOUR - card!

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

3862. Re: Electronic QSL's are APPROVED for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 21:31:58 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c6443d1$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33272
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Yes..one must first register with eQSL (even if you never use their
services) to read about this great eQSL / DXCC news breakthrough....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

3863. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 21:42:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c644789_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Charles Johnston" <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
news:3c643ddd@news.bnb-lp.com...
> Many of us Ham's have been pioneers for some time by offering
electronic
> QSL card service. Now the ARRL is accepting eQSL's for DXCC
credit.....
>
> http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/DXCCInfo.cfm

However, if you read the details, this only seems to apply if you have
eQSL print and mail a physical card to you by postal mail (and only
in the US, at least at this time) at a cost of $1 per card ... this
seems
to defeat the economy of eQSLing compared to "the old way." It also
would seem to put eQSL at an economic disadvantage compared
to the ARRL's proposed "LOTW" ... if I were eQSL I wouldn't be so
happy about this. (I'm not complaining about eQSL's charge for
printing and mailing a card ... that doesn't seem unreasonable for
the service ... I just view the process as an unnecessary step which
adds unnecessary cost ... to the disadvantage of the eQSL folks.)

DISCLAIMER: I am NOT affiliated with eQSL in any way and I'm
not really an awards chaser ... for me, it's just the principle of the
thing, where I see the eQSL folks as having come up with a good
idea that can save hams a great deal of cost on QSLing, and it
appears to me that the ARRL is making things tough for them in
ways that I view as arbitrary and unnecessary.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRGE5e+N6+q84HiEQLWzQCeIOhhQL+Jm+X+825GTr8lUCb3/fQAnRFv
MzKiCFbp3uznISuD0gixgLL5
=OM8g
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3864. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 21:58:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c644b51_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33275

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202071356.39cf73bd@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61b98b_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020205133725.20370.00001467@mb-mb.aol.com...
> > > Either way it's a bigger mess than narrowband modes.
> >
> > I would submit that that's a prejudiced view not based in
> > technical fact.
>
> I submit that it's an accurate description of the situation which
> you object to emotionally because of the word "mess" being used.

No, I maintain that it's a prejudiced view not based in technical
fact.
> > > >> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
> > > >> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed
digital
> > > >> systems should detect the energy of other users, at
reasonable
> > > >> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting
if
> > > >> the channel is occupied by another user.
> > >
> > > Nice idea but in the real world it's another story.
> >
> > In "the real world" it's a reality ...
>
> You misunderstand.
>
> > read about CSMA-CA.
> > Look up how it works in 802.11b and read what the CCA bit
> > is for ...
>
> A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.

I don't recall implying that there was necessarily a direct
relationship, though some techniques could transcend band
choice.
```

Furthermore, the discussion in this thread for MANY days has
been focused on 2.4 GHz and the applicability (or not) of
modern technologies (such as, but not necessarily limited to)
802.11b to ham radio ...

Having said that, many of the underlying principles, like CSMA-CA
or others, that are used in "real world" communications systems
could be applied to amateur digital systems in the HF bands as well.

WADR ...any lack of understanding .. or simple lack of acceptance ...
on your part does not automatically negate the applicability of any
(set of) potential technical solutions to ham radio ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRKA5e+N6+q84HiEQLMaACeMusuKlE/xJci3e7pBclPwXWsi1sAn3zp
GL/RNQV5OM/LKYHKBC0X5/N3
=xDWs
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3865. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:00:09 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c644a68@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello Carl,
This decision and news was just released so there are a few loose-ends yet....soon it will be world-wide. The granting of permission for eQSL - DXCC cards acceptance was for any and all cards. The nice people at eQSL will be adding world wide capability very soon...

DXCC qsl'ing is now -cheaper- and -faster- than ever....a huge and bold step in the right direction.

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

3866. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:02:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c644c4e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33276

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202080110020.27263-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 6 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> >news:a3ptec$fpv$1@heap.juniper.net...
> >> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I know people from this group, and it is probably worth pointing
out
> >> that a lot of the "electronics buffs" involved are hams (the
geeks
> >tend
> >> to be of either the ham flavor or the programmer flavor, or both.
> >The
> >> ones that are hams seem to do a lot nicer outside installation
work,
> >> given the sample of a half dozen I've seen).
> >>
> >> I would guess they do this stuff as Part 15 projects rather than
> >Part 97
> >> because Part 97 content and control restrictions wring almost all
> >the joy
> >> out of it. Networking infrastructure projects are way more
> >interesting if
> >> you can get a lot of people to use the infrastructure you build
for
> >a lot
> >> of stuff, rather than a few people doing hardly anything. In a
> >strange
> >> way this is (non-emergency) public service which is very much in
the
> >spirit
> >> of 97.1(a), not to mention (c) and (d), except it is a service
which
> >hams
> >> aren't allowed to provide as hams.
> >>
> >> Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather
than
> >hams
> >> themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?
```

> >>
> >> Dennis Ferguson
> >
> >Dennis, et al ...
> >
> >I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
> >control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
> >development of high speed computer networking (under
> >Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)
> >
> >However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
> >would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
> >for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
> >nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
> >sites could not be accessed.
>
> Porno = commercial? Not if it's FREE. :-)

While noting the smiley, I feel compelled to point out that
the "preserving the non-commercial nature of ham radio"
and "making sure that things like porno sites could not be
accessed" were clearly intended as separate and equally
important examples of legitimate concerns.

> >However, I also think that limitations our our ability to provide
> >a robust backup to the internet access needs of the emergency
> >management agencies we serve in times of disaster should
> >be eliminated and that the ampr.org domain should become,
> >to the degree practical with *reasonable* restrictions, a much
> >more viable and vibrant part of the internet.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRK7pe+N6+q84HiEQKRVwCdGaYM2amgF3exJLSSySGWYlT1h3gAnRC+
E3XduqX0gsk3cO2umyhYn6OA
=AvaT
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3867. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:05:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c644ce5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33279

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C63284D.E750528F@uci.edu...
> Carl,
>
> The good points you make here, nicely address the issues I was
> attempting to raise in my comments. I agree with you.
>
> 73, ac6xg

Jim ... I can't tell you how gratified I am to have finally said
something with which you can't find fault :-)
(With a smiley, but seriously as well ...)

Carl - wa6vse
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Dennis, et al ...
> >
> > I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
> > control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
> > development of high speed computer networking (under
> > Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)
> >
> > However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
> > would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
> > for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
> > nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
> > sites could not be accessed.
> >
> > However, I also think that limitations our our ability to provide
> > a robust backup to the internet access needs of the emergency
> > management agencies we serve in times of disaster should
> > be eliminated and that the ampr.org domain should become,
> > to the degree practical with *reasonable* restrictions, a much
> > more viable and vibrant part of the internet.
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRLhpe+N6+q84HiEQIDOgCfSyfGLanwjbP3e9ymXKJt0Kr8MvcAn1z5
aDxQiWcFSaNwtUV4F0HqiElV
```

```
=BEQx
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3868. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:11:46 UTC
From: Bill <kf6wxj@cwnet.com>
Message-ID: <3c644cbb_2@news3.cwnet.com>
Source record: 33278

Hello Group,
Just curious if anybody has checked their Repeater books as to how
many 440 machines are closed as compared to open in the Southern
California(L.A., San Diego) area. Absolutely amazing. Bill KF6WXJ
Sacramento
N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a41ca9$1c31ak$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c5c0838_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I note that in the ARRL article below, there is comment made as to 70cm
> > being "one of the most popular of the Amateur Service allocations" and
> this
> > area (I don't think) is no testament to that. How's the popularity of
the
> > 70cm band where you are? Anyone have any thoughts for other ideas on
this
> > matter to the FCC?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Hi Kim and group,
>
> Historically 70 cm didn't get a lot of use in our area, but that's
changing.
> Thanks to a generous donation by Alabama Power, our local clubs are
working
> to convert several repeaters for use on the 70cm band. We have one new one
> up already, in north Jefferson county. The Shelby County club is very
close
> to having a second up and running in it's area. Another older Jefferson
> county 440 repeater was revamped and is running.
>
> Several people are promoting usage, and one fellow (Mark, K4MWN) is
> conducting weekly nets on one of the repeaters. Usage of the band is
> definitely growing in this area.
>
> To promote usage, we need to:
>
> 1. Educate new hams and existing ones the repeaters are there and open for
> use.
>
> 2. Monitor those freqs as much as possible, and be quick to get on there
and

> talk when someone gets on.
>
> 3. Experiment with modes other than voice. As one fellow said, maybe shift
> APRS here, who knows what else could be done in this band. PSK31 anyone?
>
> 73's,
>
> Robert / N4IXT
>
>
>
>
>

3869. Re: Electronic QSL's are APPROVED for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:34:52 UTC
From: xpyttl <xpyttl_nospam@earthling.net>
Message-ID: <u68ktftom67cca@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33280
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Now that is weird. Basically, you need to mail the card to yourself for it
to count. hmmm

..

"Charles Johnston" <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
news:3c643e95$1@news.bnb-lp.com...
> A few of us Ham's have been pioneers for some time by offering
> electronic QSL card service. Now the ARRL is accepting eQSL's for DXCC
> credit.....
>
> http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/DXCCInfo.cfm
>
> I qsl 100% electronically....check my web site for - YOUR - card!
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston
> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com
>
>
>
>

3870. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 22:42:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c64559b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33281

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202071940.7a5d7e61@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61adf9_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > > >
> > > Since when did SS run on "a frequency"? It doesn't which is the
> > > problem.
> >
> > DSSS runs "on a frequency" in the same way that SSB does ...
> > in a good DSSS system, the carrier is suppressed well below
> > the modulation content.
> >
> Yeah, right. 2.1 kHz on one side of the suppressed carrier for ssb
and
> how many kHz away from it's supressed carrier does SS spit RF did
you
> say?

Depends on the "chipping rate" of the PN spreading sequence (for
DSSS), but an important factor you're ignoring is that, for equal
total
transmit power, the DSSS signal will have a proportionally lower
PSD (that's Power Spectral Density) than a narrowband signal and
thus present less interference to any given co-channel narrowband
user than a narrowband signal transmitted from the same location
with the same antenna, power, etc.

> > There are mechanisms for avoiding the "hidden terminal" problem,
> > or at least significantly minimizing it ... as has been said
before,
> > there is no guarantee of absolute freedom from interference from
> > ANY other use of the same spectrum ... even from other users of
> > "legacy" modes.
> >
> >
> Yes there is, let the wideband users have this chunk of spectrum
space
> and let the narrowband users have this other chunk of space, don't
mix
```

> 'em, then there is no interference in the context of the extant
> discussion and the whole thread becomes moot.

There are better ways to manage spectrum utilization than hard
and fast sub-band restrictions on modes ... that is an old paradigm
that will be obsoleted in the near future by SDRs (software-defined
radios) ... read the FCC's recent docket items on SDR ...

Try as you might, you're not going to be able to keep ham radio
stuck in the past forever, and attempting to do so is harmful to
the ARS.

[snip]

> > > There is absolutely no way on the face of God's green earth that
any
> > > ham version of the Internet can even start to compete with the
real
> > > Internet. First the bandwidth simply isn't there under any
> > conditions.
> >
> > You must be assuming the system will/must of necessity operate
> > at 2m using the TNC and voice radio paradigm ... that's exactly
> > what I'm suggesting we abandon because it doesn't work very
> > well.
> >
> >
> No I did NOT make any such assumption. Quit ducking the bullet, I
did
> not just get off the boat.

Then stop acting like it ...

> > I wasn't saying that we could "mirror" the entire infrastructure
...
> > only
> > that we can provide local service at high bandwidth and a robust,
> > portable capability to provide service within and bridge to the
> > outside
> > from disaster areas.
> >
> >
> Oh spare me puleeze, here we go again with the freakin' motherhood
> "emergency services" crap as an excuse for anything and everything.
> Get back to me when there is a documented failure of SOP ham voice
> operations to get that job done locally, regionally or globally.

It's a well-recognized fact that the emergency management folks
would LOVE to have us be able to provide "real" data capabilities
as part of our services to them ...

> > If you don't want to "play," fine ... but why try to "prove" that
it's

> > impossible ... just to discourage others from getting involved
> > and actually doing it???
> >
> >
> Hogwash. Hey Sweetums I got a clue for you: I am very decidely NOT
in
> opposition to the implementaion of wideband modes in ham radio at
all.

- From the tone of your posts ... discounting and disputing anything
that's proposed that's "not as it's always been" you certainly had
me fooled ... and I'm not your "Sweetums" ... while we've never met
in person, I'm QUITE sure you're not my type :-)

> In fact I find it a bit appalling that, given the tools and talents
we
> have today in ham radio it still no wide modes have been implemented
> yet in at least in some seminal experimental form or another. I am
> however vehemently opposed to your "visons" as they relate to how
wide
> modes should be implemented. And so is everybody else with half a
> brain and which is what this thread is is all about.

Please elaborate on EXACTLY what's wrong with things that I've
proposed for consideration. Where are the technical flaws? Why
are they so repugnant to you? After all, they're just concepts being
"floated" for discussion and consideration. Why are you so
"vehemently opposed?"

> > Having seen the information on the internet, I find it difficult
> > to believe that your mental filtering capacities are seriously
> > strained ... if they are, then we have a different problem here
> > and probaby shouldn't continue the thread because to do so
> > would be futile.
> >
> >
> OK, so you just finally got yer free pass to HF

I didn't "get a free pass to HF" ... I took and passed the
required technical test ... had credit for the full General
and 5 wpm as an "old tech" ... I accept no assertion that
I'm not FULLY qualified to hold an Extra Class license,
no matter what prejudices you or others may hold.

>, thus I'm obliged to
> make some allowances for your lack of experience and yer Coefficent
of
> Stupidity as it relates to packet-assisted HF dxing

Having operated digital HF under a legally obtained
license while living in Mexico for several years, as well
as having worked for Rockwell-Collins in designing

military and commercial digital transmission systems
from HF through UHF, I find your assertions that I "lack ...
experience" laughable.

> and dx contesting

How is contesting relevant to this discussion?

> with or without packet in particular. And how the packet system is
> integrated into contest logging software and computer-based station
> contol. And howcum there are only miiliseconds per packet post to do
> any "mental filtering" of the spots when yer running 150/hr. The
> Internet spots embody the concept of unmanageable futile data
overload
> and endless searching. The packet spots on the other hand filter the
> futiles off yer screen by the megabyte and cuts to the quick right
> here and now, nail that new mult on 15 which shows up in the spots
> window, smack it with ye mouse, log him and back to yer run on 20
> before yer pileup had a clue ya even left 20.

Oh, I see ... your (ham) life revolves around contesting and
you can't see the utility of anything outside of that pathetically
limited context ...

It also appears from your comment above that your mental filtering
capacities may indeed be seriously strained, despite my intention
of giving you the benefit of the doubt to the contrary ... I guess we
DO have a different problem here ...

> I know what the fix is and "we" don't have to reinvent the wheel or
> come up with SS sub-bands to get there. The problem is not the baud
> rate. The problem is using $100 Radio Slack 2m FM voice xcvrs which
> distort the hell outta data streams with their mic and
speaker-driver
> circuitry. Boogered waveforms,
> the checksums don't add up, "send again", and there goes the
> throughput rates. I've just now been apprised of the fact that there
> are current-tech 2m xcvrs starting to show up with "data ports"
which
> jump past the mic circuitry for one and should reduce the number of
> tries before a handshake happens so given some time those radios
> oughta goose up the throughputs and fix the problem.

That's basically a "kludge" into a radio that was designed
for voice ... it's still a "narrowband FM" radio and the "data
ports" don't change that ... they simply bypass some of the
bandlimiting in the voice audio path and allow (sort of) rates
up to 9600 bps ... YMMV, depending on which radio.

Again ... bandaids on the voice radio/TNC paradigm are NOT
the answer for the future datacomm needs of the ARS ... what's
needed are radio modems, purpose-designed for transmitting
and receiving data (well).

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRTjpe+N6+q84HiEQJhKQCg+thDAQtGqPwF3VMcDbqlFp780kkAoMSb
W5ScSavbawLSWRGmfvECW6EU
=OsbO
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3871. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 23:06:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202082306160.28924-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33282

```
On Fri, 8 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202080110020.27263-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Wed, 6 Feb 2002, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
>> >news:a3ptec$fpv$1@heap.juniper.net...
>> >> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> I know people from this group, and it is probably worth pointing
>out
>> >> that a lot of the "electronics buffs" involved are hams (the
>geeks
>> >tend
>> >> to be of either the ham flavor or the programmer flavor, or both.
>> >The
>> >> ones that are hams seem to do a lot nicer outside installation
>work,
>> >> given the sample of a half dozen I've seen).
>> >>
>> >> I would guess they do this stuff as Part 15 projects rather than
>> >Part 97
>> >> because Part 97 content and control restrictions wring almost all
>> >the joy
>> >> out of it. Networking infrastructure projects are way more
>> >interesting if
>> >> you can get a lot of people to use the infrastructure you build
>for
>> >a lot
>> >> of stuff, rather than a few people doing hardly anything. In a
>> >strange
>> >> way this is (non-emergency) public service which is very much in
>the
>> >spirit
>> >> of 97.1(a), not to mention (c) and (d), except it is a service
>which
>> >hams
>> >> aren't allowed to provide as hams.
>> >>
>> >> Maybe it is Part 97's content and control restrictions, rather
>than
>> >hams
```

>> >> themselves, which are a little bit obsolete?
>> >>
>> >> Dennis Ferguson
>> >
>> >Dennis, et al ...
>> >
>> >I would agree to some extent that some of the content and
>> >control restrictions have a discouraging effect on ham
>> >development of high speed computer networking (under
>> >Part 97, rather than Part 15 ...)
>> >
>> >However, I also believe that changes in those restrictions
>> >would need to be carefully considered to balance the need
>> >for more flexibility, while still preserving the non-commercial
>> >nature of ham radio and making sure that things like porno
>> >sites could not be accessed.
>>
>> Porno = commercial? Not if it's FREE. :-)
>
>While noting the smiley, I feel compelled to point out that
>the "preserving the non-commercial nature of ham radio"
>and "making sure that things like porno sites could not be
>accessed" were clearly intended as separate and equally
>important examples of legitimate concerns.

All I'm pointing out here is if it's free, where's the commercialism?

3872. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-08 23:14:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C645BDF.CCB9EF49@uci.edu>
Source record: 33283

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Jim ... I can't tell you how gratified I am to have finally said
> something with which you can't find fault :-)
> (With a smiley, but seriously as well ...)
>
> Carl - wa6vse

Roger. Kinda amazin', ain't it. Seriously, I object to the odd word or phrase here and there. But there really isn't such a great philosophical disparity between my views an practically anyone else's here. I always try to find the middle ground. I tend to speak up more when I think somebody is out in left field somewhere - especially when they take an otherwise reasonable position.

Cecil likes to make bombastic sounding statements. His logic is usually impecable, but if I can see a crack in it I like to let him know that I saw it. But I think what it really boils down to is that I like to see amateur radio promoted. I kinda think that it's our job to do that, and when I see some of us denigrating the Service I guess it touches a nerve. Maybe that's why I don't come back to Larry and Dicks bombastic remarks - at least they're coming from a place that is basically pro-amateur radio. Other than that, being pig-headed is a trait that ALL of us here share in common. ;-)

I saw your post to Dennis, et al. which had an entirely constructive tone and just thought I would comment.

73, Jim AC6XG

3873. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:04:20 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020208190420.26923.00000241@mb-ma.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33284

>Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.

A tad more information than any of us needed to know, Cecil. ;-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3874. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:10:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c646abd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33286

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C64AC80.A0CE531C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.
> >
> > Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)
>
> That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
> requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
> criminal record he is not a criminal!
>

Oh, pshaw, Dick. It could mean that he's just never been caught...good
grief.

Kim W5TIT

3875. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:13:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c646b0f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33285

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C649BFB.15E2AC45@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Of course that is all correct, and those of us with professional
> technical training know it.

This insinuation of a high level of "professional technical training",
from
Mr. "The basic, underlying principles of communications theory
are irrelevant to amateur radio." Carroll is REALLY the stuff that
ROTFLMAO is made of ...

>What about the unknowledgable newcomers you so carelessly mislead?

What about those you've mislead (or tried to) into believing that
the most basic principles of communications theory are "irrelevant?"

At least Cecil WAS a technical professional (before he retired),
as I recall, from what you've described Dick, you were, at most,
a technician.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRpnJe+N6+q84HiEQIkbgCfSpZivrmJ1P/hLZSaDyLme2h/+agAn0Xb
kLDNG/IiMMZSZ8+EsZT9KqJ6
=+o1U
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3876. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:20:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c646ca5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33287

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C645BDF.CCB9EF49@uci.edu...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Jim ... I can't tell you how gratified I am to have finally said
> > something with which you can't find fault :-)
> > (With a smiley, but seriously as well ...)
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse
>
> Roger. Kinda amazin', ain't it. Seriously, I object to the odd
word or
> phrase here and there. But there really isn't such a great
> philosophical disparity between my views an practically anyone
else's
> here. I always try to find the middle ground. I tend to speak up
more
> when I think somebody is out in left field somewhere - especially
when
> they take an otherwise reasonable position.
>
> Cecil likes to make bombastic sounding statements. His logic is
usually
> impecable, but if I can see a crack in it I like to let him know
that I
> saw it. But I think what it really boils down to is that I like to
see
> amateur radio promoted. I kinda think that it's our job to do that,
and
> when I see some of us denigrating the Service I guess it touches a
> nerve.

Please try to understand that my intent is not to denigrate
ham radio, but rather to prod it (kicking and screaming,
if necessary) into the present, and ultimately the future,
rather than remaining silent and seeing it fester interminably
somewhere in the distant past.

(I know, you won't like this comment either, but that's
the truth as I see it ...)

I'm pro amateur radio ... otherwise I wouldn't spend any
time on it, let alone the time here or the many hours I

devote to NCI activities.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRrGpe+N6+q84HiEQIF3QCfVBGO/75DVkT2JUi4FnIHeJkaB0wAoPb8
ecuYlzqBuZx4NrQlRMofjQOn
=1/PM
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3877. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:21:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c646d6c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33288

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020208093743.05154.00001943@mb-fm.aol.com...
> "Kim" writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >> "Kim" wrote:
> >> > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's
afraid
> >to
> >> > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was
wrong.
> >> > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the
> >numbers
> >> > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
> >>
> >> Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=79668t%24qs4%241%40news1.fast.net&out
> put=gplain
>
> >You might need to remind, Jim, of what it is again that *you* think I
should
> >be afraid of?
>
> I don't think *you* *should* be afraid of anything written on this NG,
Kim. I
> simply note that you *are* afraid of some things written here.
>

And you'd be quite wrong in your simple notation.

>
> You say that Dick is afraid to deal with certain facts. But you are afraid
to
> even look at some things because you are afraid of what you might see.
>

It sounds to me like you are referring *sigh* again, to the Carl Stevenson issue? Is that right? Look, Jim, I am sorry you have such an issue with Carl Stevenson. The little I've noted and observed during the debate about this whole thing is that, if anything, Carl is nothing but every bit as opinionated as those with whom take issue on some of the ideas he has.

You don't know me well enough, but if you think I'm going to spend any more time on the topic than that, then you're just plain wrong. I don't know

why anyone would?! It is "a thing" in a newsgroup, will never ever have any impact on my life, and doesn't affect me one way or the other. Carl Stevenson, or anyone else for that matter, could be the most horrible tyrant to walk this planet--but if I'm never going to meet him, never going to be impacted by anything he does or says, then *why* would I concern myself with the matter?

> >
> >Dick's bought into the concept that the end of the ARS was
> >eminent, due to Restructuring (as it's called).
>
> So? Maybe he's right. I don't think he's right, but it's way too soon to tell.
>

I doubt he's right, and I have no problem at all stating that I doubt he's right. Especially since, Little Dick and I are diametrically opposed to each other so it is highly unlikely that we would ever see a matter from the same perspective. Ham radio could fill to the brim tomorrow with people who act in manners that Little Dick finds abhorrent and I have absolutely no problem with. To Little Dick, ham radio would then be "dead." To me, it would not.

> >
> > I don't know of any
> >particular thing I've bought into on this newsgroup. Do you?
>
> Kim, you are extremely resistant to any and all new information that
> conflicts with what you believe. Like the bishops who wouldn't look
> through Galileo's telescope.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

As I said, Jim, you don't know me well enough to even come close to trying to figure me out. Secondly, you've always impressed me as a much more logical person than to think that you can surmise a person's id without ever having met them, known them, etc. I stand corrected on my impression of you. Thirdly, I think I've commented enough on the Carl Stevenson issue. I have read some of the debate, have seen some of his responses, seen some of others' responses, and I have decided that your idea of Carl Stevenson is different than mine. I've never been one to let others choose the way I think of other people. Sorry that disturbs you to the degree you display. It will leave me forever puzzled but, believe me, I'll hardly dwell on it...just as I will no longer dwell on the Carl Stevenson matter.

Kim W5TIT

3878. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:25:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c646e3a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33290

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020208190420.26923.00000241@mb-ma.news.cs.com...
> >Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
>
> A tad more information than any of us needed to know, Cecil. ;-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

I kinda thought it was a given... :O

Kim W5TIT

3879. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:28:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c646e9e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33289

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6354AF.6C6E30F@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > They are where governmental regulations are concerned.
Otherwise, we
> > > will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member of
the
> > > Royal Family.
> >
> > Ah, really. And which royal family do you plan to import for the
job?
>
> The PCTA tried to achieve Royal Family status and failed.

Cecil,

That's ABSOLUTELY your best one yet!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRtIpe+N6+q84HiEQIRYwCg8f7shrO33Wdjm8Gx4naocq+uEA4AnRCP
CaEwPdSrjT/B6Q5KSrE2jg/t
=cgeN
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3880. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:29:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c646edf$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33291

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C649C2C.E59FB6E2@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > They are where governmental regulations are concerned.
Otherwise, we
> > > > will revert to having people executed on the whim of a member
of the
> > > > Royal Family.
> > >
> > > Ah, really. And which royal family do you plan to import for
the job?
> >
> > The PCTA tried to achieve Royal Family status and failed.
>
> Meanwhile you tried to achieve asshole idiot status and succeeded.

Pot (Carroll) calls kettle black (again).

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGRtY5e+N6+q84HiEQJ4hgCaA3wcw9b06MNTbFQCX7Zl7OFEviQAn2D6
GSyzBIyaXqLEA6Eu3wxV7jul
=voxO
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3881. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:37:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6470ac_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33292

"JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com...
> Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
> clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> Respectfully, JJ

JJ,

The restrictions against initiating a call or identifying the station
do not appear in Part 97.

Thus, it would seem that a "guest" operating under the continuous
supervision of a properly licensed control operator can do whatever
the control operator is allowed to do, as long as the control operator
permits it and it is otherwise within the rules.

Carl - wa6vse

3882. Re: Vote for W4AMP or KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 00:54:17 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a41rtg$t6u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a41ia0cpu0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Gene Nalley" <ii912@zyrdanz.com> wrote in message
> news:a40nm6$723$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> >
> > What is the purpose of this vote?
> >
> > thanks,
> >
> > TWD
>
> For some ignorant dumbasses to spew childish insults behind their
anonimity.
> They lack any testicles, except the ones in their mouths...Arf Arf and the
> other remailer usually spend time downloading kiddie porn. Whorass Grimm
> makes his own with his own family.
>
>
--
One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
"The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
ad nauseum, ad infinitum."
>
>

3883. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 01:25:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020208202503.07935.00000881@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 33294

In article <pan.2002.02.04.18.26.20.84125.7005@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Sun, 03 Feb 2002 17:37:07 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>> In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.40.58.342978.12485@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>
>>>On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>>> In article <20020201082554.19893.00000546@mb-fx.aol.com>,
>>>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
>>>>
>>>>> What is their applicability to advancing the state of the art
>>>>>outside of amateur radio?
>>>>>
>>>> Why does that matter so much? Does Part 97 specify that an advance
>>>> must have applicability outside amateur radio?
>>>
>>>When the FCC says, "continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
>>>ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art," do you
>>>really think they don't mean the radio art in general, not just its
>>>application within the ARS? If so, why did they use the broad term
>>>"radio art"? Why didn't they just say "continuation and extension of the
>>>amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of his own
>>>art"?
>>>
>> I don't separate what hams do from the rest of radio.
>
>I was asking what you think the FCC's intent was.

I think it was to point out that one of the B&Ps of the ARS is technical
advancement. Which comes in all flavors.

> I'll rephrase the
>question. Do you think the FCC feels that amateurs should be making
>contributions to the state of the art that have applicability to radio
>services other than the ARS?

Sure - they'd like it if hams would invent something new.

But, realistically, how many cutting-edge advances are amateurs who are not
RF engineering professionals going to make in their basement workshops? A
few, sure. But most of the advances are going to be in the form of education,
adaptation, practicality, and simplification.

--

Just a few minutes ago I was reading about the W1JEO SSB exciter. (QST, November, 1950). Used surplus FT-241-A crystals and about 4 tubes to put a few watts of SSB on 75 meters. Was this an "advance in the state of the art"? Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity, economy and adapting of old parts to new uses.

--

I think part of what the FCC is trying to say is that if hams limit themselves to
using only manufactured ham gear, they are not doing the ARS any good. The FCC can't come right out and say we shouldn't be "appliance operators" because it would tick off "Yaecomwood" enormously. But the point is the same: new modes and methods do NOT come about by using only off-the-shelf made-for-ham-radio hardware and software.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3884. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 01:29:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c647d4d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33296

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C649869.375CCA5D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > "Kim" wrote:
> >
> > > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's afraid
to
> > > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was
wrong.
> > > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the
numbers
> > > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
> >
> > Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.
>
> What are the indicators that she is intelligent enough to have any?
>

ROTFLMAO!! This from a man who, on 2/7 posted the following:

Begin copied newsgroup exchange
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C63E814.7BF507C5@worldnet.att.net...
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to >and

> from disaster areas.

Well a HT on the belt sure won't do it. You might want to get the no code
techs on board.

What ever happened to slow scan TV? I know, relatively poor image
quality. But the commercials have already trumped us with the satellite
video phones anyway, as shown by news clips from Afghanistan.

> Imagine how way cool it would be if hams could
> get those images to other parts of the country quickly.

That should be a snap. Adapt technologies already in use. Sending a
compressed .jpg file from your digital camera using a digital HF mode
should be easy enough.
Getting something like that coordinated, up and running is the sort of
thing the ARRL should be good at. Why aren't they?

End copied newsgroup exchange

3885. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 01:31:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202081731.4665cfe3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33295

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61b066_2@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
> > They all have "center freqs". The discussion is about the amount of
> > spectrum space above and below the "carrier freq" the mode uses to
> > carry out it's mission.
>
> I know that Dick Carroll will jump in here and say "It's irrelevant to
> ham radio.", but check out Shannon ... DSSS systems (just one
> form of SS, but they are what we've been mostly talking about
> here in the form of 802.11b as an example useful for high-speed
> networking) trade bandwidth for communications efficiency and
> required SNR ... they have "processing gain".
>
>
Yes, we all know that. Now move on.
>
>
> "Carl's system" (though I'm not taking credit for 802.11b) operates
> in a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes, operates
> at power levels FAR below what I'd be you operate CW at (even if
> you're "running barefoot" ... even if you're "running QRP") and has a
> much lower PSD (Power Spectral Densisty) ... you exaggerate the
> potential for widespread interference.
>
>
HooBoy talk about Turnabouts of Record Proportions! Or is this the
Mother of All Retreats? So when was it anyway, two, three years ago
you were babling on at great lengths here that given your druthers
you'd "layer" SS from the bottom to the top ends of the 20m band and
tough shit about what SS would do to the Luddite narrowband users? Yes
you did din ya? Hmmmm?
>
>
So now you've FINALLY "retreated" into advocating deploying ham SS in
"a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes" vs. yer
former bluster & technoid bully bullshit. I don't buy into The New
Carl at all of course because you're still thumping for the
abolishment of bandplans and mode-specific sub-bands but never mind
that detail. Reteats come one step backward at a time.
>
>
I'm gonna take a giant leap here and take it upon myself to speak for

Carroll, Kelley, Hare, Miccolis, myself and the others in this matter.
Those of us who have been up your butt for eons about implementing SS
the ways you have been postulating for those same eons. Until just
now.
>
>
I submit that there isn't a damned one of us who would have Objection
One IF you fired up SS in some remote and unused ham spectrum space
where SS woouldn't have any particular impact on narrow-mode
operations. There's plenty of that commodity out there isn't there?
And I'll take it a step farther: We'd all SUPPORT that effort too.
>
>
.....

>
> > Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
> > over-the-horizon radar Ed?
>
> What the hell does that have to do with low-powered stuff
> in the upper UHF or low microwave frequency range? I'm
> not talking about stuff that offers world-wide ionospheric
> propagation here .. why do you insist on trying to compare
> apples to oranges?
>
>
Nah, it's apples to apples. The valid analogy being a peek at what we
could expect when "wide modes" are co-mingled with narrow modes on HF.
"Power levels" be damned. Sure, the lights prolly dimmed in the
neighborhood when the Soviets powered up that monsrosity. But then the
thing was thousands of miles from here. But YOU might be on the next
block over with five milliwatts of SS and there goes the whole
freaking band here. Something or another about some Law of Squares or
something . . . what the hell do I know, I still run CW . .
>
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

3886. K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 01:39:38 UTC
From: "ole capt. peckers" <alotradiofun500@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <u5%88.26505$3E5.1834304@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

From the arrl.net webpage in Enforcement actions section:

January 29, 2002

Mr. Glenn A. Baxter
RR1 Box 779
Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

Re: Amateur Radio license K1MAN

Dear Mr. Baxter:

On May 14, 1999, after numerous complaints about your Amateur station regarding broadcasting, deliberate interference, failure to identify, poor signal quality and erratic starting and stopping times, personnel from the Boston office of the Commission monitored your station and attempted to inspect it. There was no one present at your station while it was transmitting on Amateur Service frequencies. The transmissions continued while Commission personnel went to your residence at 1 Long Point Road, but there was no one present there either. Again on May 15 while your station was transmitting, Commission personnel attempted an inspection but there was no one present.

Since the Amateur Radio Service rules require that Amateur stations be under the control of a control operator, and that the control operator must ensure the immediate proper operation of the station, we requested by letter dated June 25, 1999, that you provide information to the Commission, pursuant to Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, regarding the operation of your Amateur station. You responded by letter dated July 25, 1999, but your response failed to provide the information we requested. We notified you of that fact by letter dated August 4, 1999, and detailed the inadequacies of your response.

Specifically, you did not provide the name, address or phone number of the control operator for any of the "broadcasts" or "bulletins" such as prerecorded interviews, transmissions of answering machine responses, live interviews, or live, pre-recorded or automated station

identifications
transmitted by your station. Among other deficiencies of the response, you did not provide dates
and times Amateur station K1MAN transmitted without a control operator.

You also stated in your July 25, 1999 reply that you had not received our June 25 letter by certified mail and that our letter had "misrepresented itself as Certified Mail". We reminded you
that you had signed the certified receipt for that letter, and we provided you with a copy of that
certified receipt.

You responded to our August 4 letter by letter dated August 24, 1999. During our review of the
information you provided, your Amateur station ceased operation. As a result, we held our inquiry
in abeyance. The U.S. District Court in Maine subsequently dismissed your lawsuit against the
Commission, and dismissed your petition for reconsideration of that dismissal as well.

You recently resumed operation of Amateur station K1MAN. In view of that resumption and the resulting complaints we are receiving about deliberate interference, threats against those who do
not relinquish frequencies for your use or who would complain, or who have complained, erratic
operation, broadcasting, unauthorized tape recording and broadcast of telephone conversations,
business use of an Amateur station and lack of station control, we have resumed our inquiry into
the operation of K1MAN.

In reviewing your letter dated August 24, 1999, referenced above, and your actions subsequent to
coming back on Amateur frequencies, it appears that your understanding of certain Amateur Radio
Service rules may be incorrect. We will outline the apparent misunderstandings below.

Amateur Station Control

With regard to control of an Amateur station, your letter of August 24 indicated that the control
device for your station was a "Radio Shack timer", and that the control points for the station
were "the main power switch at the transmitter site" and at the location of the control operator,
wherever that may be". You further stated that on the dates in question, May 14 and 15, 1999, you
were the control operator and were in "both Belgrade Lakes and Augusta in either mobile or portable modes".

Section 97.7 of the Commission's rules states that "when transmitting, each Amateur station must
have a control operator". Section 97.105 states that "the control operator must ensure the

immediate proper operation of the station, regardless of the type of control (emphasis added).
Section 97.109 states that "each Amateur station must have at least one control point", and that
the control operator must be at the control point when the station is locally controlled or remotely controlled.

Section 97.7 further states that a control operator need not be at the control point if a station
is automatically controlled. However, as Section 97.109 also explains, only stations specifically
designated in Part 97, such as a space, repeater, beacon or auxiliary station, may be controlled
automatically. There is no provision in Part 97 that allows an Amateur station transmitting information bulletins to be automatically controlled.

In summary, your control of the station by a "Radio Shack timer" while you are absent from your
Amateur station is a violation of the Commission's Rules. You were not in control of your station
on May 14 and 15, 1999 while you were in "both Belgrade Lakes and Augusta in either mobile or
portable modes". Your statement in your response that "K1MAN has never transmitted during the
current license term without a control operator acting in full compliance with rules 97.105 and
97.109 as well as all other applicable FCC rules" is untrue.

Simply put, to comply with Commission rules, you must be at the transmitter, or at the transmitter
control point, every moment your station is transmitting, when your station is locally or remotely
controlled. If the station is controlled by telecommand from the control point using a radio link,
the frequencies used for telecommand must comply with the Section 97.201 requirements for an
auxiliary station (may transmit only on the 1.25 m and shorter wavelength bands, except 219-220,
222-222.150, 431-433 and 435-438 MHz segments).

Publishing a Transmitting Schedule & Interference

It appears that you may be under the misconception that by publishing a transmitting schedule of
K1MAN, you have certain rights under Commission rules regarding the control operator and frequency
sharing requirements that you would not otherwise have.

With regard to the requirement for a control operator, publishing a schedule does not relieve you
of that requirement in any way whatsoever. Section 97.113(d) of the Amateur Radio rules states

that by publishing a schedule of transmissions at least 30 days in advance, a control operator of
a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the station is transmitting...information bulletins, providing certain additional conditions are met. Publishing
a schedule of proposed transmissions, therefore, relates only to a club station control operator
accepting compensation. We note that this is irrelevant to the operation of K1MAN because K1MAN is
not a club station.

Simply put, to the extent that you start your transmissions on top of ongoing communications of
other amateur service stations, you will be engaging in deliberate interference, in violation of
Section 97.101 of the Commission's rules. No amateur service frequency is assigned for the exclusive use of any station. Your publishing an intended transmission schedule does not exempt
you from that rule.

Threats to Complainants and Other Users

Your sending "Felony Complaint Affidavits" to other Amateur Service licensees who complain or
intend to complain of your operation, or who do not relinquish frequencies to you, was the subject
of a Warning letter to you dated December 11, 2001. You have also been warned about such "Felony
Complaint Affidavits" by the United States Attorney in Maine.

The Commission will view any threats made by telephone, through the U.S. Mail or on radio frequencies to Amateur Radio licensees who file complaints with the Commission, or who do not
relinquish frequencies for your use, as very serious.

Broadcasting

We also note that on your web site and in your radio transmissions, you refer to your transmissions variously as "broadcasts, programs, talk shows, bulletins, pre-recorded interviews"
and so forth. We have received complaints that you have broadcast comedy shows and commercial
messages. We caution you that Section 97.113(b) of the Amateur service rules prohibits amateur
station from engaging in any form of broadcasting. Certain one-way transmissions, such as information bulletins, are allowed as specified in the rules.

Tape Recording and Broadcasting Telephone Conversations

We have received and have under review complaints that you have tape-recorded telephone conversations without the consent of the recorded party and that you have broadcast such tape
recordings. We caution you that such recording without consent may be in violation of state

or
federal law. We will contact you under separate cover regarding those complaints.

In summary, it is very important for you to understand that we will review all valid complaints
concerning the operation of your Amateur station, and that Commission personnel will again inspect
your station. The rules of the Amateur Service are straightforward and easy to understand. To the
extent that you do not comply with Commission rules regarding the Amateur Radio Service, then to
that extent enforcement action will be taken against your licenses. That enforcement action may
include revocation of your station license, suspension of your operator license, a modification
proceeding to restrict your operating privileges, or monetary forfeiture.

It is also important for you to understand that if these matters are not resolved, your
operator/primary station licenses will not be routinely renewed; but instead will be designated
for hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. In such a proceeding, you would have the burden of
proof to show that your licenses should be renewed.

3887. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 01:46:26 UTC
From: "ole capt. peckers" <alotradiofun500@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Sb%88.26676$3E5.1835582@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The Cherokee CM-10 Plus --> IS NOT <-- an FCC type accepted
radio and it is therefore illegal to market for retail or private sale in the
United States, as well as operate within the same. That says it all.

"Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:fbc7a2.0202051229.2e66153b@posting.google.com...
> http://www.wolfleap.com/
>
> This enterprising company sells the "Cherokee 'CM-10 Plus' AM CB
> radio" which boasts "10 bands of 40 channels" for a total coverage of
> "400 channels".
>
> This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to
> *ALL* CB channels".
>
> Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965
> to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part
> of CB now!
>
> -Aaron-
>

3888. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 02:43:17 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u6935g4ih0vcd2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

scarey stuff... interefering via his broadcasts is one thing but taping
phone conversations and then rebroadcasting? what the hell was he thinking?
if anyone tape recorded what he transmitted he could be seriously screwed.

phil :|

3889. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 02:44:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D0C8.397EF359@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33300

Jim Kelley wrote:

> JJ,
>
> Part 97.115.2b specifically states:
> "The third party may participate in stating the message where:
> (1) The control operator is present at the control point and is
> continuously monitoring and supervising the third party's participation;
>
> 97.7 states that when transmitting, each amateur station must have a
> control operator.
>
> 97.105 defines control operator duties are to ensure the immediate
> proper operation of station
>
> 97.113 discusses prohibited transmissions, but do not include any
> reference to station identification by a third party, or any other
> specifics pertaining to third party traffic.
>
> I think the burden of proof lies with the side claiming the restrictions
> on third party operations. I can't find any.

You're right. FCC doesn't spell out what the control operator has to do in detail, he may well be allowing a non-ham to operate who is as familiar with radio as he is, but doesn't have a license. But it's the control operator who is responsible. If the ship hits the sand he is where the buck stops. If he's comfortable with going to sleep while his third party operates under his license that's his business, but he catches any and all flak.

3890. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 02:47:24 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a422hm$em7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"ole capt. peckers" <alotradiofun500@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:u5%88.26505$3E5.1834304@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> From the arrl.net webpage in Enforcement actions section:
>
>
>
>
> January 29, 2002
>
> Mr. Glenn A. Baxter
> RR1 Box 779
> Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918
>
> Re: Amateur Radio license K1MAN
>
> Dear Mr. Baxter:
>
> On May 14, 1999, after numerous complaints about your Amateur station
regarding broadcasting,
> deliberate interference, failure to identify, poor signal quality and
erratic starting and
> stopping times, personnel from the Boston office of the Commission
monitored your station and
> attempted to inspect it. There was no one present at your station while it
was transmitting on
> Amateur Service frequencies. The transmissions continued while Commission
personnel went to your
> residence at 1 Long Point Road, but there was no one present there either.
Again on May 15 while
> your station was transmitting, Commission personnel attempted an
inspection but there was no one
> present.
>
> Since the Amateur Radio Service rules require that Amateur stations be
under the control of a
> control operator, and that the control operator must ensure the immediate
proper operation of the
> station, we requested by letter dated June 25, 1999, that you provide
information to the
> Commission, pursuant to Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934,
as amended, regarding
> the operation of your Amateur station. You responded by letter dated July
25, 1999, but your

> response failed to provide the information we requested. We notified you
of that fact by letter
> dated August 4, 1999, and detailed the inadequacies of your response.
>
> Specifically, you did not provide the name, address or phone number of the
control operator for
> any of the "broadcasts" or "bulletins" such as prerecorded interviews,
transmissions of answering
> machine responses, live interviews, or live, pre-recorded or automated
station identifications
> transmitted by your station. Among other deficiencies of the response, you
did not provide dates
> and times Amateur station K1MAN transmitted without a control operator.
>
> You also stated in your July 25, 1999 reply that you had not received our
June 25 letter by
> certified mail and that our letter had "misrepresented itself as Certified
Mail". We reminded you
> that you had signed the certified receipt for that letter, and we provided
you with a copy of that
> certified receipt.
>
> You responded to our August 4 letter by letter dated August 24, 1999.
During our review of the
> information you provided, your Amateur station ceased operation. As a
result, we held our inquiry
> in abeyance. The U.S. District Court in Maine subsequently dismissed your
lawsuit against the
> Commission, and dismissed your petition for reconsideration of that
dismissal as well.
>
> You recently resumed operation of Amateur station K1MAN. In view of that
resumption and the
> resulting complaints we are receiving about deliberate interference,
threats against those who do
> not relinquish frequencies for your use or who would complain, or who have
complained, erratic
> operation, broadcasting, unauthorized tape recording and broadcast of
telephone conversations,
> business use of an Amateur station and lack of station control, we have
resumed our inquiry into
> the operation of K1MAN.
>
> In reviewing your letter dated August 24, 1999, referenced above, and your
actions subsequent to
> coming back on Amateur frequencies, it appears that your understanding of
certain Amateur Radio
> Service rules may be incorrect. We will outline the apparent
misunderstandings below.
>

> Amateur Station Control
>
> With regard to control of an Amateur station, your letter of August 24
indicated that the control
> device for your station was a "Radio Shack timer", and that the control
points for the station
> were "the main power switch at the transmitter site" and at the location
of the control operator,
> wherever that may be". You further stated that on the dates in question,
May 14 and 15, 1999, you
> were the control operator and were in "both Belgrade Lakes and Augusta in
either mobile or
> portable modes".
>
> Section 97.7 of the Commission's rules states that "when transmitting,
each Amateur station must
> have a control operator". Section 97.105 states that "the control operator
must ensure the
> immediate proper operation of the station, regardless of the type of
control (emphasis added).
> Section 97.109 states that "each Amateur station must have at least one
control point", and that
> the control operator must be at the control point when the station is
locally controlled or
> remotely controlled.
>
> Section 97.7 further states that a control operator need not be at the
control point if a station
> is automatically controlled. However, as Section 97.109 also explains,
only stations specifically
> designated in Part 97, such as a space, repeater, beacon or auxiliary
station, may be controlled
> automatically. There is no provision in Part 97 that allows an Amateur
station transmitting
> information bulletins to be automatically controlled.
>
> In summary, your control of the station by a "Radio Shack timer" while you
are absent from your
> Amateur station is a violation of the Commission's Rules. You were not in
control of your station
> on May 14 and 15, 1999 while you were in "both Belgrade Lakes and Augusta
in either mobile or
> portable modes". Your statement in your response that "K1MAN has never
transmitted during the
> current license term without a control operator acting in full compliance
with rules 97.105 and
> 97.109 as well as all other applicable FCC rules" is untrue.
>
> Simply put, to comply with Commission rules, you must be at the
transmitter, or at the transmitter

> control point, every moment your station is transmitting, when your
station is locally or remotely
> controlled. If the station is controlled by telecommand from the control
point using a radio link,
> the frequencies used for telecommand must comply with the Section 97.201
requirements for an
> auxiliary station (may transmit only on the 1.25 m and shorter wavelength
bands, except 219-220,
> 222-222.150, 431-433 and 435-438 MHz segments).
>
> Publishing a Transmitting Schedule & Interference
>
> It appears that you may be under the misconception that by publishing a
transmitting schedule of
> K1MAN, you have certain rights under Commission rules regarding the
control operator and frequency
> sharing requirements that you would not otherwise have.
>
> With regard to the requirement for a control operator, publishing a
schedule does not relieve you
> of that requirement in any way whatsoever. Section 97.113(d) of the
Amateur Radio rules states
> that by publishing a schedule of transmissions at least 30 days in
advance, a control operator of
> a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the
station is
> transmitting...information bulletins, providing certain additional
conditions are met. Publishing
> a schedule of proposed transmissions, therefore, relates only to a club
station control operator
> accepting compensation. We note that this is irrelevant to the operation
of K1MAN because K1MAN is
> not a club station.
>
> Simply put, to the extent that you start your transmissions on top of
ongoing communications of
> other amateur service stations, you will be engaging in deliberate
interference, in violation of
> Section 97.101 of the Commission's rules. No amateur service frequency is
assigned for the
> exclusive use of any station. Your publishing an intended transmission
schedule does not exempt
> you from that rule.
>
> Threats to Complainants and Other Users
>
> Your sending "Felony Complaint Affidavits" to other Amateur Service
licensees who complain or
> intend to complain of your operation, or who do not relinquish frequencies
to you, was the subject

> of a Warning letter to you dated December 11, 2001. You have also been warned about such "Felony
> Complaint Affidavits" by the United States Attorney in Maine.
>
> The Commission will view any threats made by telephone, through the U.S. Mail or on radio
> frequencies to Amateur Radio licensees who file complaints with the Commission, or who do not
> relinquish frequencies for your use, as very serious.
>
> Broadcasting
>
> We also note that on your web site and in your radio transmissions, you refer to your
> transmissions variously as "broadcasts, programs, talk shows, bulletins, pre-recorded interviews"
> and so forth. We have received complaints that you have broadcast comedy shows and commercial
> messages. We caution you that Section 97.113(b) of the Amateur service rules prohibits amateur
> station from engaging in any form of broadcasting. Certain one-way transmissions, such as
> information bulletins, are allowed as specified in the rules.
>
> Tape Recording and Broadcasting Telephone Conversations
>
> We have received and have under review complaints that you have tape-recorded telephone
> conversations without the consent of the recorded party and that you have broadcast such tape
> recordings. We caution you that such recording without consent may be in violation of state or
> federal law. We will contact you under separate cover regarding those complaints.
>
> In summary, it is very important for you to understand that we will review all valid complaints
> concerning the operation of your Amateur station, and that Commission personnel will again inspect
> your station. The rules of the Amateur Service are straightforward and easy to understand. To the
> extent that you do not comply with Commission rules regarding the Amateur Radio Service, then to
> that extent enforcement action will be taken against your licenses. That enforcement action may
> include revocation of your station license, suspension of your operator license, a modification
> proceeding to restrict your operating privileges, or monetary forfeiture.
>
> It is also important for you to understand that if these matters are not

resolved, your
> operator/primary station licenses will not be routinely renewed; but
instead will be designated
> for hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. In such a proceeding, you
would have the burden of
> proof to show that your licenses should be renewed.
>
Hooray! It's about time! I wonder if he will still continue calling Riley a
"sleazy politician"?
Bye, Bye, Glen!

3891. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 03:05:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D5C0.2F8A395B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33402

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61b066_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> > > They all have "center freqs". The discussion is about the amount of
> > > spectrum space above and below the "carrier freq" the mode uses to
> > > carry out it's mission.
> >
> > I know that Dick Carroll will jump in here and say "It's irrelevant to
> > ham radio.", but check out Shannon ... DSSS systems (just one
> > form of SS, but they are what we've been mostly talking about
> > here in the form of 802.11b as an example useful for high-speed
> > networking) trade bandwidth for communications efficiency and
> > required SNR ... they have "processing gain".
> >
> >
> Yes, we all know that. Now move on.
> >
> >
> > "Carl's system" (though I'm not taking credit for 802.11b) operates
> > in a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes, operates
> > at power levels FAR below what I'd be you operate CW at (even if
> > you're "running barefoot" ... even if you're "running QRP") and has a
> > much lower PSD (Power Spectral Densisty) ... you exaggerate the
> > potential for widespread interference.
> >
> >
> HooBoy talk about Turnabouts of Record Proportions! Or is this the
> Mother of All Retreats? So when was it anyway, two, three years ago
> you were babling on at great lengths here that given your druthers
> you'd "layer" SS from the bottom to the top ends of the 20m band and
> tough shit about what SS would do to the Luddite narrowband users? Yes
> you did din ya? Hmmmm?
> >
> >
> So now you've FINALLY "retreated" into advocating deploying ham SS in
> "a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes" vs. yer
> former bluster & technoid bully bullshit. I don't buy into The New
> Carl at all of course because you're still thumping for the
> abolishment of bandplans and mode-specific sub-bands but never mind
> that detail. Reteats come one step backward at a time.
> >

> >
> I'm gonna take a giant leap here and take it upon myself to speak for
> Carroll, Kelley, Hare, Miccolis, myself and the others in this matter.
> Those of us who have been up your butt for eons about implementing SS
> the ways you have been postulating for those same eons. Until just
> now.
> >
> >
> I submit that there isn't a damned one of us who would have Objection
> One IF you fired up SS in some remote and unused ham spectrum space
> where SS woouldn't have any particular impact on narrow-mode
> operations. There's plenty of that commodity out there isn't there?
> And I'll take it a step farther: We'd all SUPPORT that effort too.
> >
> >
> .....
>
> >
> > > Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
> > > over-the-horizon radar Ed?
> >
> > What the hell does that have to do with low-powered stuff
> > in the upper UHF or low microwave frequency range? I'm
> > not talking about stuff that offers world-wide ionospheric
> > propagation here .. why do you insist on trying to compare
> > apples to oranges?
> >
> >
> Nah, it's apples to apples. The valid analogy being a peek at what we
> could expect when "wide modes" are co-mingled with narrow modes on HF.
> "Power levels" be damned. Sure, the lights prolly dimmed in the
> neighborhood when the Soviets powered up that monsrosity. But then the
> thing was thousands of miles from here. But YOU might be on the next
> block over with five milliwatts of SS and there goes the whole
> freaking band here. Something or another about some Law of Squares or
> something . . . what the hell do I know, I still run CW . .

Brian, that pretty well nails it. While most of us ham away on the bands with all the latest
stuff running the latest as well as the earliest digital modes, Carl yaks away on SSB but hehas BIG
plans for us all. *His* plans for ham radio, all of it, in total. Trust that asshole? Not much.
Change his stripes? Like a leopard.

3892. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 03:11:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D723.6A3CB676@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33403

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>Please try to understand that my intent is not to denigrate

> ham radio, but rather to prod it (kicking and screaming,
> if necessary) into the present, and ultimately the future,
> rather than remaining silent and seeing it fester interminably
> somewhere in the distant past.
>

Yeah we know what your plan is, you laid it out right hear a long time ago. Youre still as much an ignoramous at ever, and your understanding of the amateur radio service is as lame as ever and will clearly never improve. Dumshit is a term that leaps to mind.

3893. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 03:59:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65E286.AA94AAC6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33404

Jim Kelley wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Jim ... I can't tell you how gratified I am to have finally said
> > something with which you can't find fault :-)
> > (With a smiley, but seriously as well ...)
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse
>
> Roger. Kinda amazin', ain't it

Sure is. Anytime Carl the Dip says something that *anyone* agrees is a red letter day.

3894. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 04:27:19 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c64a6e5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33405

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202081731.4665cfe3@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c61b066_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> > > They all have "center freqs". The discussion is about the amount
of
> > > spectrum space above and below the "carrier freq" the mode uses
to
> > > carry out it's mission.
> >
> > I know that Dick Carroll will jump in here and say "It's
irrelevant to
> > ham radio.", but check out Shannon ... DSSS systems (just one
> > form of SS, but they are what we've been mostly talking about
> > here in the form of 802.11b as an example useful for high-speed
> > networking) trade bandwidth for communications efficiency and
> > required SNR ... they have "processing gain".
> >
> >
> Yes, we all know that. Now move on.
> >
> >
> > "Carl's system" (though I'm not taking credit for 802.11b)
operates
> > in a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes,
operates
> > at power levels FAR below what I'd be you operate CW at (even if
> > you're "running barefoot" ... even if you're "running QRP") and
has a
> > much lower PSD (Power Spectral Densisty) ... you exaggerate the
> > potential for widespread interference.
> >
> >
> HooBoy talk about Turnabouts of Record Proportions! Or is this the
> Mother of All Retreats? So when was it anyway, two, three years ago
> you were babling on at great lengths here that given your druthers
> you'd "layer" SS from the bottom to the top ends of the 20m band

That's not what I said ... Gary Coffman and I both proposed
"strawman designs" for systems that in the space of the 20m
```

"CW band" (14.000-14.150) could support literally 10's of
thousands of simultaneous "20 wpm CW equivalent" QSOs
with virtually no interference or appearance of congestion.

As far as I recall the details, Gary's system wasn't SS and
I know mine wasn't ...

> and
> tough shit about what SS would do to the Luddite narrowband users?
Yes
> you did din ya?

NO, I didn't say anything of that sort either ...

I have stated the view that, under certain conditions, in some
bands, SS could be "overlaid" on existing uses without causing
harmful interference. I continue to hold that view.

Let's get one thing clear ... your failure to understand what
I say doesn't change its meaning (or make it wrong for that
matter ...)

> So now you've FINALLY "retreated" into advocating deploying ham SS
in
> "a band where there is negligible use of narrowband modes"

I haven't "retreated" into anything ... I merely stated the context
of the current conversation accurately in response to *your*
INaccurate characterization of it ...

> vs. yer former bluster & technoid bully bullshit.

Which is a figment of your imagination (too bad you don't
seem to have one when it comes to the possibilities of
technical advances in ham radio ....)

> I don't buy into The New Carl at all of course

There is no "new Carl" ... my views on technical issues
haven't changed substantively at all.

> because you're still thumping for the
> abolishment of bandplans and mode-specific sub-bands

I stated, and stand by, the idea that "cast in concrete"
spectral usage results in poor spectral utilization and
that more intelligent means of allocating the use of
spectrum improves spectral utilization. That's a technical
issue ... don't try to make it a political/religious one ...

> Reteats come one step backward at a time.

The only thing backward in this exchange is your
perspective ...

> I'm gonna take a giant leap here and take it upon myself to speak
for
> Carroll, Kelley, Hare, Miccolis, myself and the others in this
matter.
> Those of us who have been up your butt for eons about implementing
SS
> the ways you have been postulating for those same eons. Until just
> now.
> >
> >
> I submit that there isn't a damned one of us who would have
Objection
> One IF you fired up SS in some remote and unused ham spectrum space
> where SS woouldn't have any particular impact on narrow-mode
> operations. There's plenty of that commodity out there isn't there?
> And I'll take it a step farther: We'd all SUPPORT that effort too.
> >

Excuse my scepticism at your claim that you'd be so
magnanamous ... I'm sure you'd find something to bitch
about no matter what I did or said.

> > > Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
> > > over-the-horizon radar Ed?
> >
> > What the hell does that have to do with low-powered stuff
> > in the upper UHF or low microwave frequency range? I'm
> > not talking about stuff that offers world-wide ionospheric
> > propagation here .. why do you insist on trying to compare
> > apples to oranges?
> >
> >
> Nah, it's apples to apples. The valid analogy being a peek at what
we
> could expect when "wide modes" are co-mingled with narrow modes on
HF.
> "Power levels" be damned. Sure, the lights prolly dimmed in the
> neighborhood when the Soviets powered up that monsrosity. But then
the
> thing was thousands of miles from here. But YOU might be on the next
> block over with five milliwatts of SS and there goes the whole
> freaking band here.

If the old saying "ignorance is bliss" is true, you must be one
happy camper.

> Something or another about some Law of Squares or
> something . . . what the hell do I know, I still run CW . .

Yup ... that last part sounds about right ...

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

```
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGSkjJe+N6+q84HiEQI7AgCcCRaDGYrh7W2UQvEqz758KfS8UlcAnAvL
FNdV5QOO8kn94r+cpsR+awP+
=2LKq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3895. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 04:50:56 UTC
From: Rollo&#65533; <Rollo_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <a429rg01131@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <u5%88.26505$3E5.1834304@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "ole says...
>
>From the arrl.net webpage in Enforcement actions section:
>
<snip>

About freakin time, too, arrogant scofflaw b*st*rd that he is. Somehow I don't think he'll be following the rules anytime soon, though.

I was gonna post that letter myself this morning, but didn't want to start another 195 post thread, LOL.

I notice he hasn't been on the air lately.

I taped his "show" a few times two weeks ago, figured I could at least contribute enough to get him on the failure to ID thing. But I see there's no need to send them in.

I happened to hear one of the other incidents on today's enforcement page too. Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight with his girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour. Embarrassing as THAT was, turns out the guy was a Technician class and not authorized to use the frequency at all, LOL. Sometimes you just have a bad day...

3896. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:26:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a42c1hrdo1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33407

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
> >a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
> >meaningful code testing level.
>
> I disagree.
>
> It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long
before
> the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
> reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the majority
> opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have
changed
> their mind? Nope.

Guess I missed the vote to establish "the majority opinion".
When and how was it taken?

> FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.

Pretty slow progress for the entity that has always had the final
say in such matters.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3897. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003324.07648.00000011@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33413

In article <cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com>, qrp5@my-deja.com (JJ) writes:

>
>Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
>person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
>come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
>the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
>control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
>may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
>looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
>find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
>clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
>Respectfully, JJ

I have had this issue cleared up by direct inquiry to the FCC many years ago. The third-party operator can initiate QSO's, do all the hands-on station operation, and send the call sign of the control operator or club station, as long as a properly licensed control operator is present, and the operation does not exceed the control operator's privileges, or otherwise violate FCC rules. There is no requirement for the control operator to initiate the contact and "hand off" to the third-party operator.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3898. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003324.07648.00000010@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33415

In article <xnS88.14817$AV5.136471@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Carl"
<n7kuw@dropthisnospam.attbi.com> writes:

>I have handed my radio to another person, allowed them to operate the PTT
>and talk, etc., but stayed within reach and hearing range at all times. I
>could quickly grab the radio back if it were necessary. I have not allowed
>another person to identify with my call, I always initiate and terminate the
>QSO. I don't know that there would be a specific requirement for that
>however, as long as the control operator were truly in control. One of the
>many many gray areas or fine lines...
>
>Carl.

Carl:

"Hand-off" operation such as you describe is not necessary, as long
as you, as the licensed control operator, are physically present when
the operation takes place and are able to suspend or terminate the
operation if the third-party operator attempts to exceed your privileges
or cause a violation of FCC rules. All this means is that you must
keep an eye on the frequency display and power levels, and make
sure the 3rd party operator doesn't start causing deliberate QRM or
using foul language, etc. The only time you need to physically take
control is to "pull the plug," if need be. If you step out of the room,
the Field Day tent, or get beyond arm's reach of the HT user, or
in any way become physically incapable of intervening in the third
party operation, then the third party operation must be suspended
until you regain your span of control. Any violative activity identified
with your call sign is *your* responsibility...therefore you should
not permit anyone who may tend to be a "loose cannon" on-the-air
to operate unless and until he/she understands that he/she may
be pushing the buttons, but *you're* pulling the strings!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3899. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003325.07648.00000012@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33418

In article <3c644789_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>However, if you read the details, this only seems to apply if you have
>eQSL print and mail a physical card to you by postal mail (and only
>in the US, at least at this time) at a cost of $1 per card ... this
>seems
>to defeat the economy of eQSLing compared to "the old way." It also
>would seem to put eQSL at an economic disadvantage compared
>to the ARRL's proposed "LOTW" ... if I were eQSL I wouldn't be so
>happy about this. (I'm not complaining about eQSL's charge for
>printing and mailing a card ... that doesn't seem unreasonable for
>the service ... I just view the process as an unnecessary step which
>adds unnecessary cost ... to the disadvantage of the eQSL folks.)
>
>DISCLAIMER: I am NOT affiliated with eQSL in any way and I'm
>not really an awards chaser ... for me, it's just the principle of the
>thing, where I see the eQSL folks as having come up with a good
>idea that can save hams a great deal of cost on QSLing, and it
>appears to me that the ARRL is making things tough for them in
>ways that I view as arbitrary and unnecessary.
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Carl:

Don't look now, but I can print my eQSL's from the web site. Why
wouldn't the ARRL accept these printed cards from on my own
laser printer as opposed to those mailed by eQSL? It would be
a lot easier for me to make the contacts on-the-air and send/receive
hard copy QSL cards via direct mail and the QSL bureaus, than
it would be for me to fake the computer-generated eQSL's. And
the validity of my eQSL's can be verified by the ARRL by making
an inquiry directly to them, if they have any doubt. I can see no
reason for having cards mailed BY eQSL, in order to claim awards
credit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3900. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003326.07648.00000013@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33416

In article <3C63562F.1EDCCD67@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> NCI doesn't need me for a friend; there are enough lazy, whining,
>> knuckle-dragging droolers who want to get their hot little hands on an
>> HF microphone to make NCI's job comparatively easy. Uh oh. I
>> guess I just said something "mean and nasty." Sorry if the truth
>> hurts anyone who saw it.
>
>You are the one who is dragging his knuckles, Larry, continuing to
>bitch incessantly about a done deal. You are going to have to get
>up off your lazy butt and promote the merits of CW. Do you think
>your "mean and nasty" insulting approach will convince a newcomer
>to choose to learn Morse code? I don't.

Cecil:

I am personally incapable of convincing any amateur radio newcomer
to choose to learn Morse code. That is something they need to
decide for themselves, for they alone must expend the effort required
to succeed. I can't do it for them, I am not the "Elmer" type. I
received very little "Elmering" when I was getting involved in ham
radio, so I have no role model to emulate. I became a ham on the
basis of my own internal curiosity, enthusiasm, and willingness to
research the answers to my own questions. I had the initiative and
ingenuity to learn what I needed to know to pass my tests, usually
with perfect scores, and get on-the-air in spite of challenging
operating conditons. Most of the ham "newcomers" I meet want to
avoid the learning process and go directly to the point where they
can make their PTT buttons work. I took a much longer and more
challenging road to my success as a ham, and I cannot impart my
experience upon anyone else, other than to advise them as to what
they need to do. But I cannot do it for them, which is what the
majority of ham newcomers seem to want these days.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3901. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003327.07648.00000015@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33409

In article <3C64AC80.A0CE531C@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > Obviously not. I'm not an Illegal CB'er or a criminal.
>>
>> Prove that you are not a criminal. :-) :-) :-)
>
> That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
>requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
>criminal record he is not a criminal!

Dick:

I am not a criminal because I haven't committed any crimes. I'm
sure there are plenty of criminals who don't have criminal records.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3902. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003327.07648.00000014@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33410

In article <3C63570D.1968C25F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> So, then, you're saying that it is impossible to effectively employ CW
>> during post-disaster emergency communications?
>
>Not impossible, Larry, just usually ill advised when better solutions
>are available.

And I do not disagree with you on that point, Cecil. See my response
to the same issue in another posting.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3903. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003328.07648.00000016@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33408

In article <3C64ACC7.88C0BCB5@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > So, then, you're saying that it is impossible to effectively employ CW
>> > during post-disaster emergency communications?
>>
>> Not impossible, Larry, just usually ill advised when better solutions
>> are available.
>
> By jove! Finally something we agree on!

Guess what? It wouldn't be *my* first choice, either. I'd prefer an
error-correcting digital mode, capable of passing large volumes of
message traffic with maximum speed and complete accuracy, as
long as I had the equipment, power, and operating location capable
of supporting the use of such a mode. Under more austere
conditions, however, Morse/CW would be a very practical choice
if my goal were to conserve electrical power, or I was faced with
poor band conditions. I'm just glad I have the option to use either,
or both -- as conditions should warrant.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3904. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003328.07648.00000017@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33412

In article <3C63FF48.CFC0B2D8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> That may well be the easiest proof yet. A criminal history,
>> requested by Larry himself, could handle that. If he has no
>> criminal record he is not a criminal!
>
>Could be he is a criminal who hasn't been caught. Criminal
>actions do not require an official criminal history. Is smoking
>marijuana a criminal action if one doesn't get caught?

Cecil:

I'll tell you what. You pay for the best possible lie detector exam available, arrange for me to take it right here in Dover, and we'll see if I have EVER smoked marijuana. I'll bet you $1,000 and a lobster dinner that the result will be negative. A disinterested third party gets to choose the consultant who gives the test. Are you willing to put your money where your mouth is?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3905. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003329.07648.00000018@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33414

In article <3C61A12A.13ACB081@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Not if you have your way. However, when the code requirement is
>dropped, those same havenot techs may indeed have an HF transceiver
>and be able to participate in emergency communications. From what
>you've said, you would rather nocode techs be deprived of an HF
>transceiver during and emergency. That is right, isn't it?

Cecil:

Not at all, they can have all the HF transceivers they want. And I
think YOU should buy them all for them, since you are all in favor
of a Welfare State for radio amateurs.

>> >Anyone with a lookup chart can send/receive 4wpm, Larry.
>>
>> Only if they've had previous off-the-air practice, Cecil.
>
>When in cub scouts, my cousin and I started communicating right
>away at about 4wpm using send/receive charts. It ain't rocket
>science. At 4wpm, one can write down dots and dashes and translate
>them later.
>
>> >Would you respond to a 4wpm 'SOS'? Would you respond at
>> >4wpm?
>>
>> Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
>
>Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
>impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
>Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
>Morse code.

Exactly when did I say that, Cecil? Please provide the quote,
or you're just lying -- again!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3906. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003330.07648.00000020@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33411

In article <3c61bc18_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>And, while you guys are busy with waiting for someone to contact you during
>an emergency or disaster, we'll all be done with cleanup and the party about
>the time you figure it out that no one went to yours...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

While you and your fellow codeless minions are stuffing yourselves with
pizza and beer at the post-cleanup party, the REAL emergency communicators
will still be sending/receiving piles of Health and Welfare traffic using CW
and the digital modes. Of course, you will not be involved in this, the real
"emergency" communications effort, since you choose not to gain the skills
necessary to do so. If, God forbid, a widespread emergency should ever
visit the area you live in, it would interesting to see exactly how you would
personally contribute to the disaster relief effort as a radio amateur. Just
what is your own personal view of your potential contribution?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3907. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003330.07648.00000019@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33420

In article <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> >
>> > Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
>>
>> Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
>> impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
>> Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
>> Morse code.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Yep, you got it. I asked that of Jay here a bit ago. It seems the hate and
>contempt from people like Larry, Dick, etc., leave one to truly wonder what
>values they place upon their effort (or not) to help someone.

Kim:

As an amateur radio operator, I have a significant ability to assist others
who may be able to gain aid or comfort as a result of my communications
capabilities. The way I "value" my abilities is very realistically -- I could
do a lot better under some circumstances, but I could do no worse than
the majority of hams under most circumstances. I really don't expend as
much effort placing a "value" on myself as an emergency communicator
as you obviously do -- simply because I prefer to quietly continue to gain
and refine my operating skills, while others (like you) prefer to brag about
what you can do -- without ever really being put to a test.

>You're right, Cecil. I get the distinct impression, also, that some would
>just as soon let others die as acknowledge a signal beneath their
>expectations.

Hmmm -- I see. So now, I'm being accused of letting some LID die because
I can't decipher what he's trying to send -- therefore, it's MY fault if he
does
die! Right. So now, in the eyes of Kim Walker, W5TIT, Judge and Jury, I
am a murderer! And all because I advocate the continuance of a requirement
for hams to know and be tested on a valuable communications skill. Kim,
you've really got some weird mojo working on you!

>But, it's kind of like when I hear crappy people talking
>about how *they* went to war for my freedom.

I think your last statement has just given us a perfect example of a "crappy" person.

>I like to remind them that
>they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they
>could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With soldiers
>like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?

Don't look now, Kim, but American soldiers don't fight for the right to tyrannize the population. They fight for the right for all Americans to retain their freedom and democratic society, and to liberate others from oppressive regimes. Among other things American Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines have fought and died for over the years, is your right to make a perfect idiot of yourself every time you click on "Send."

You owe an apology to each and every veteran in this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3908. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003331.07648.00000021@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33417

In article <3C622531.734B3676@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Larry was right "This isn't about me". It's about all those codehating
>> pseudohams who you insist will instantly "learn" the code, when they need
>it.
>
>They won't *instantly* learn it but they will learn it if they need to.
>Look at it this way. When we have a nocode general license, there will
>be more operators available for emergency HF communications. Some of
>them will choose to have CW in their bag of tricks. One doesn't have
>to have a license to learn Morse code.

Cecil:

When we do get to a No-Code General (and Extra) license, we *will*
see an end to the growth in the numbers of hams who have CW in
their "bag of tricks." I am already seeing that now. The "newcomers"
I've seen in the post-Restructuring era are not making any effort
whatsoever to learn the code, beyond passing the 5 WPM test to
attain HF voice privileges. They are definitely not getting on-the-air
with CW. There are occasional exceptions, like my friend Bert, but
he is a lonely standout in a very large crowd of new hams who will
never know the value, and the fun, of Morse code proficiency.

The code testing requirements have been largely voted out of
existence by lazy, indifferent people who seek only the immediate
power of HF voice privileges, without the effort required to learn
a valuable communications skill. This will ruin the ARS as we know
it, by eliminating it's role as a means of training well-balanced,
knowledgeable communicators, and replacing them with technically
uninvolved, marginally capable appliance operators who will not
have enduring value in challenging communications conditions.
Moreover, they will not value their easily-acquired privileges, and
their interest will wane quickly, once they are faced with the chaos
that will be created on the HF bands by their fellow indolents.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3909. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:33:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020209003332.07648.00000022@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33419

In article <20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>>A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
>>a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
>>meaningful code testing level.
>
>I disagree.
>
>It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long before
>the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
>reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the majority
>opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have changed
>their mind? Nope.

Jim:

I respectfully disagree with your disagreement, and your self-answered question. I believe that if FISTS had organized the same type of campaign against a significant reduction of code testing requirements, that the FCC would have had no choice but to pay attention to their position on the matter. If double the number of comments had been received by the FCC, the clear majority in favor of either the status quo in code testing, or a workable compromise (like 12-13 WPM), then the FCC would have been very hard pressed to act against such overwhelming advocacy.

>FISTS wisely stayed out of the fracas, knowing that taking a political
>position would only divide their membership.

Why should that be? FISTS is called "The International Morse Preservation Society." What do those words mean? That we'll keep Morse code alive as long as there are a bunch of withered old codgers around, exchanging numbers on the air in run-together CW using mal-adjusted bugs, or that we'll support the retention of Morse code proficiency in the ARS through continuation of code testing as a requirement for maximum HF operating privileges? Remember, many workable compromises were totally ignored -- including the removal of the code testing burden from the FCC by having the ARRL do all the test scoring, record keeping, and updating of the amateur licensee database.

>Note that FISTS and the ARRL
>did encourage all to express their opinions direct to the FCC.

Well, that was mighty nice of them to encourage us to do something we all had the right to do anyway.

>FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.

And it seems as though they'll soon get their wish. However, as a person interested in the "preservation" of the Morse code, and a FISTS member, I would have preferred it if more of an effort had been made to get the FISTS organization to live up to it's title.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3910. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 05:37:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a42dq3$kj5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33421

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020206204108.13187.00000917@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3C5DC5E3.81589F1D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Bert Craig wrote:
> >> I respect your views and generally hold your words in high esteem...but
do
> >> you really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up
> >> hating the code, I
> >> like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of
love,"
> >> hence work.
> >
> >The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
>
> Sure it does.

On what basis should ANY government requirement be based
on the concept of "labor of love?"

> >The test is about qualifications, not about love.
>
> The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
> an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
> about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.
> Just check your dictionary, Cecil.

Good grief, not another dictionary exercise.
Regardless, the ability to "test" for such love on its
own is NOT and should NOT be part of the requirements.

> >The FCC has decided
> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
>
> Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is S25.5.

Agreed...and when the FCC first introduced the Novice at 5 wpm
some 50 years ago, they had at that time determined 5 wpm
met the treaty requirement.

> >If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
> >radio operator is qualified without Morse code.
>
> Read the R&O to 98-143. They've already decided. By the look of things,
> they decided long ago.

Agree again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3911. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 06:02:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a42e4roka1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33422

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020208202503.07935.00000881@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2002.02.04.18.26.20.84125.7005@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
> > I'll rephrase the
> >question. Do you think the FCC feels that amateurs should be making
> >contributions to the state of the art that have applicability to radio
> >services other than the ARS?
>
> Sure - they'd like it if hams would invent something new.

I think also, that the FCC has also had hopes that amateur radio
can be a stepping stone for youth towards becoming engineering
proffesionals, etc.

> But, realistically, how many cutting-edge advances are amateurs who are
not
> RF engineering professionals going to make in their basement workshops? A
> few, sure. But most of the advances are going to be in the form of
education,
> adaptation, practicality, and simplification.

That, unfortunately, is more a function of the significant advances
in technology itself, microchips, etc. Thosse advances make "basement"
development somewhat difficult in many areas.

> Just a few minutes ago I was reading about the W1JEO SSB exciter. (QST,
> November, 1950). Used surplus FT-241-A crystals and about 4 tubes to put a
> few watts of SSB on 75 meters. Was this an "advance in the state of the
art"?
> Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
> for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity, economy
> and adapting of old parts to new uses.

Remember too, that was during a time when the typical receiver of
any consequence was probably the dollar equivalent of well over $500
in today;s dollars. Many "do-it-yourself" articles then were targeted
at inexpensive way to get on the air...in terms of typical incomes
of the 50's.

> I think part of what the FCC is trying to say is that if hams limit
themselves
> to
> using only manufactured ham gear, they are not doing the ARS any good. The
> FCC can't come right out and say we shouldn't be "appliance operators"
because

> it would tick off "Yaecomwood" enormously. But the point is the same: new
modes
> and methods do NOT come about by using only off-the-shelf
made-for-ham-radio
> hardware and software.

I disagree. The issue is more the need to focus on where the more likly
areas are that "home experimentation" can truly lead to something new.
Repackaging old parts when there's a host of inexpensive, quality
commercial gear available isn't likly to result in any real new
advances (IMHO). More likly advances can be done in software
for equipment too.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3912. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 06:09:06 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u69f7counfai8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33423
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Rollo&#65533;:

when i listened to K1MAN he seemed to have an air about him like he's going
to do whatever he wants no matter how many people he interrupted.

might want to keep your tapes if they have aired phone calls on them... they
could be used as evidence he transmitted such informationn.

> Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight
with his
> girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour.

damn, that must have been pretty funny... better than listening to pirates!

phil :)

3913. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 07:00:19 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a42hbrmt0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"phil" <phil@phil.com> wrote in message
news:u69f7counfai8e@corp.supernews.com...
> Rollo&#65533;:
>
> when i listened to K1MAN he seemed to have an air about him like he's
going
> to do whatever he wants no matter how many people he interrupted.
>
> might want to keep your tapes if they have aired phone calls on them...
they
> could be used as evidence he transmitted such informationn.
>
> > Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight
> with his
> > girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour.
>
> damn, that must have been pretty funny... better than listening to
pirates!
>
> phil :)
>
Baxter's days are numbered. He has been warned and warned and warned yet he
refuses to abide by the rules. He will not be missed.
There is something severely amiss with that man and one must wonder why he
has gotten away with so much for as long as he has.
The dummy is looking at a LOT of potential charges, yet he has not the sense
to shut up and go away while the getting is good.
He asked for it.

3914. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 07:03:56 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a42hkk$1c2d5n$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 33425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rollo" <Rollo_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a429rg01131@drn.newsguy.com...

> I happened to hear one of the other incidents on today's enforcement page too.
> Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight with his
> girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour. Embarrassing as THAT was, turns
> out the guy was a Technician class and not authorized to use the frequency at
> all, LOL. Sometimes you just have a bad day...
>

I got one better than that... back when I was in England, a ham friend of mine told me of another ham (never heard exactly where he was from) who had a radio at his bedside. Well one night he left the VOX on when he and his wife got intimate...

Must have been REALLY entertaining.

Tom

3915. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 10:23:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C663C87.E764CEB8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33426

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
> >>
> >> Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
> >> impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
> >> Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
> >> Morse code.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Yep, you got it. I asked that of Jay here a bit ago. It seems the hate and
> >contempt from people like Larry, Dick, etc., leave one to truly wonder what
> >values they place upon their effort (or not) to help someone.
>
> Kim:
>
> As an amateur radio operator, I have a significant ability to assist others
> who may be able to gain aid or comfort as a result of my communications
> capabilities. The way I "value" my abilities is very realistically -- I could
> do a lot better under some circumstances, but I could do no worse than
> the majority of hams under most circumstances. I really don't expend as
> much effort placing a "value" on myself as an emergency communicator
> as you obviously do -- simply because I prefer to quietly continue to gain
> and refine my operating skills, while others (like you) prefer to brag about
> what you can do -- without ever really being put to a test.
>
> >You're right, Cecil. I get the distinct impression, also, that some would
> >just as soon let others die as acknowledge a signal beneath their
> >expectations.
>
> Hmmm -- I see. So now, I'm being accused of letting some LID die because
> I can't decipher what he's trying to send -- therefore, it's MY fault if he
> *does*
> die! Right. So now, in the eyes of Kim Walker, W5TIT, Judge and Jury, I
> am a murderer! And all because I advocate the continuance of a requirement
> for hams to know and be tested on a valuable communications skill. Kim,
> you've really got some weird mojo working on you!
>

> >But, it's kind of like when I hear crappy people talking
> >about how *they* went to war for my freedom.
>
> I think your last statement has just given us a perfect example of a
> "crappy" person.
>
> >I like to remind them that
> >they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they
> >could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With soldiers
> >like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but American soldiers don't fight for the right to
> tyrannize the population. They fight for the right for all Americans to
> retain their freedom and democratic society, and to liberate others from
> oppressive regimes. Among other things American Soldiers, Sailors,
> Airmen, and Marines have fought and died for over the years, is your right
> to make a perfect idiot of yourself every time you click on "Send."
>
> You owe an apology to each and every veteran in this newsgroup.

Every time it seems certain that she has reached the limit of stupidity she
manages to stretch it even further.

3916. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 11:21:03 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.m@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <73FE5FE14E181B22.EF5F93005A92A392.0E8E6D0F3FE42CB5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 8 Feb 2002 20:50:56 -0800, Rolloï¿½ <Rollo_member@newsguy.com> wrote:

>I happened to hear one of the other incidents on today's enforcement page too.
>Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight with his
>girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour. Embarrassing as THAT was, turns
>out the guy was a Technician class and not authorized to use the frequency at
>all, LOL. Sometimes you just have a bad day...

WHOOPS!!! That should've been on six meters...must've left the wrong
crystals in :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3917. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:32:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209083242.26473.00000347@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33428

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Was this <tube SSB transceiver> an "advance in the state of the art"?
>Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
>for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity,
>economy and adapting of old parts to new uses.

SSB was the radio art of the day. What similar advances in simplicity and
economy have hams done to the state of today's radio art?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3918. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:43:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209084329.26473.00000348@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33429

From: "Carl" n7kuw@dropthisnospam.attbi.com

>I have handed my radio to another person, allowed them to operate the PTT
>and talk, etc., but stayed within reach and hearing range at all times. I
>could quickly grab the radio back if it were necessary. I have not allowed
>another person to identify with my call, I always initiate and terminate the
>QSO. I don't know that there would be a specific requirement for that
>however, as long as the control operator were truly in control. One of the
>many many gray areas or fine lines...

And I have allowed unlicensed third parties to operate my station and initiate calls and identify my station.

I once saw an FCC official speak at a hamfest. He talked about rules. He held up a copy of the ARRL's FCC Rule Book and opened it to the Part 97 text in the back. He then asked hams to do the FCC a favor if they had a question about the rules and first open the book to the rule the ham would like the FCC to read to them.

It seems to me that the rules permit unlicensed people to participate in the operation of an amateur station. The rules specifically outline some restrictions on that, such as the prohibition about having that third party communicate with hams in those nations with whom the US does not have a 3rd party agreement. If the FCC wanted to prohibit the third party from identifying the station or initiating calls, the rules could easily have done so.

It seems to me that the rules require that the control operator retain control over the station and what communications issue from that station. In general, it is up to the control operator how he or she will do that. If I am letting a trusted friend with some radio knowledge and experience be a third party participant in my station, I will use a different degree of control than I will if I allow a total stranger to use my station at a field event.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3919. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:49:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209084904.26473.00000349@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33430

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> Meanwhile you tried to achieve asshole idiot status and succeeded.

>Pot (Carroll) calls kettle black (again).

And all the time he picks on you for being mean to other hams in your posts.
:-)

Is this one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3920. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:50:01 UTC
From: mankind@aol.com
Message-ID: <91B05BDB4mankindaolcom@68.39.105.157>
Source record: 33431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
>> Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming
>> fight
>with his
>> girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour.
>
>damn, that must have been pretty funny... better than listening to
>pirates!

ALmost like listening to cell phones, or better still, baby monitors ;)

--
73 !

John :)
```

3921. Where are you.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:51:56 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209085156.07209.00000169@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 33432

You Pot Bellied, Sawed Off, Drunken, Lying Asshole???

One thing is certain, you aren't transmitting anymore lies on your wireless.

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

3922. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:53:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209085330.26473.00000350@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33433

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.

Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

3923. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:55:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209085542.26473.00000351@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33435

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>If hams can't provide voluntary non-commercial communications service
>to non-hams then what the heck is 97.1(a) about? It may say "particularly
>in emergencies" but it doesn't say "only in emergencies".

These systems are not being designed or operated under Part 97. Some of those developing them are hams, from what I read, most are not. Some of those using them are hams, most are not. They operate without a control operator and can be accessed by non hams at will.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3924. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:56:25 UTC
From: Web <WebFx27@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <dU998.29664$th4.9549739@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 33434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I doubt that happened ....Hams can only get a hard on from viewing a stacked yagi and a kilowatt amp

Web

"Tom Sevart" <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:a42hkk$1c2d5n$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "Rollo" <Rollo_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> news:a429rg01131@drn.newsguy.com...
>
> >
> > I happened to hear one of the other incidents on today's enforcement page
> too.
> > Guy accidentally left his mike keyed and had a colossal screaming fight
> with his
> > girlfriend--live on the air for over an hour. Embarrassing as THAT was,
> turns
> > out the guy was a Technician class and not authorized to use the frequency
> at
> > all, LOL. Sometimes you just have a bad day...
> >
>
> I got one better than that... back when I was in England, a ham friend of
> mine told me of another ham (never heard exactly where he was from) who had
> a radio at his bedside. Well one night he left the VOX on when he and his
> wife got intimate...
>
> Must have been REALLY entertaining.
>
> Tom
>
>

3925. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 13:57:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209085753.26473.00000352@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33436

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> I don't know. You would have to ask Bruce.
>
>Well to tell you the truth Ed, that's who I was addressing when you
>began to answer for him.

If he was reading your posts, which is unlikely, he could have answered them. I didn't see that you had cc'ed him byemail so I thought that the subject was open for public discussion on the NG.

I was speaking for myself, not for Bruce. If I had thought there was any possibility that someone would have misunderstood and thought I was answering for Bruce, I would have made that clear.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3926. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:01:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209090156.17936.00000317@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33437

>Subject: Re: K1MAN gets another letter
>From: "Arf! Arf!" DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz
>Date: 2/9/2002 1:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a42hbrmt0@dosa.alt.net>

>....and one must wonder why he
>has gotten away with so much for as long as he has.

Liberals. They want to "rehabilitate".

I say we sniper his ~!@ and be done with it.

Steve

3927. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:03:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209090300.26473.00000354@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33438

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>But for those who aren't amateur licensees, they do have to be limited in
>power output.

>Time to get a 2.4 amp (and a wireless lan)!

The Part 15 devices on 2.4 GHz are limited to 1 watt and a 6 dBi gain antenna, with a provision that a higher gain antenna can be used if the power is reduced by 1 dB for every 3 dB increase in antenna gain *for point-to-point* operation (not point-to-multipoint).

One could use a 36 dBi gain dish with a 20 dBm output transmitter, under Part 15.

Under Part 97, one can use up to 100 watts, with unlimited antenna gain, with the further provision that automatic power control must be used if the power exceeds 1 watt. In practice, with adapted Part 15 devices, 1 watt will be the practical limit, because to my knowledge, the present spate of Part 15 devices do not operate under automatic power control. I believe their internal programmability does give access to power output, but that function does not exist in the applications software or perhaps even the driver. I have my calls in to low friends in high places in the industry to find out how much of that info about programmability can be put into the public domain.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3928. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:04:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209090426.17936.00000319@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33439

>Subject: Re: K1MAN gets another letter
>From: "Tom Sevart" n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/9/2002 1:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a42hkk$1c2d5n$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>

>Well one night he left the VOX on when he and his
>wife got intimate...

Yours truly and a female companion got snuggly in the front seat of my car
in PA many years ago and earned a round of applause at the next club meeting.

3929. Re: Electronic QSL's are APPROVED for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:06:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209090619.17936.00000321@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33440

>Subject: Electronic QSL's are APPROVED for DXCC
>From: "Charles Johnston" ctj92@cableone.net
>Date: 2/8/2002 3:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c643e95$1@news.bnb-lp.com>

>I qsl 100% electronically....check my web site for - YOUR - card!

That's because you don't want anyone to know that you never got beyond
crayons.

3930. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:09:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209090928.17936.00000326@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33441

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 2/8/2002 3:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c644789_1@news7.fast.net>

>
>However, if you read the details, this only seems to apply if you have
>eQSL print and mail a physical card to you by postal mail (and only
>in the US, at least at this time) at a cost of $1 per card

Musta been a Fred Maia or Gordon West idea.

3931. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:11:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209091147.17936.00000327@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33442

>Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
>From: AB2HR ab2hr@arrl.net
>Date: 2/8/2002 8:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <jem76u4gc0u7et5dev8b8keimeakgq848t@4ax.com>

>As far as I'm aware, I know of no regulation prohibiting a guest
>operator from initiating contact or from identifying the station using
>the control operators call.

If it were any other way, there would be no Field Day...Either that, or
everyone would be using their own callsign.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3932. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:14:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209091427.17936.00000328@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33443

>Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
>From: "Carl" n7kuw@dropthisnospam.attbi.com
>Date: 2/8/2002 9:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <xnS88.14817$AV5.136471@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>

> I have not allowed
>another person to identify with my call, I always initiate and terminate the
>QSO. I don't know that there would be a specific requirement for that
>however, as long as the control operator were truly in control.

If my XYL is out-and-about, I will allow the 10 year old to answer her
call. However I take the mike at some point and state "This is K4YZ, control
op present".

When she does get a call of her own, she won't balk on the mike.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3933. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:17:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209091703.26473.00000356@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33445

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>but they are what we've been mostly talking about
>here in the form of 802.11b as an example useful for high-speed
>networking) trade bandwidth for communications efficiency and
>required SNR ... they have "processing gain".

Yes, but do be clear that under theoretical conditions, process gain gets one up to 1.8 dB of "efficiency" in terms of improvement to SNR. In practice, because of phase jitter and the like, it would be less, and might even be less.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a lot of misunderstanding about "process gain." If one has 60 dB of process gain, one does not get to run 60 dB less power to communicate the same data at the same speed as one could do it using a narrowband mode.

And lets face it, the process gain of Part 15 SS systems is just enough to meet the rules that let the manufacturers use high power.

And, don't forget that one of the rulemaking changes on the plate is to eliminate process gain altogether, the idea being that if a high-speed PN code is going to have a certain effect on other users, the effect would be the same as if the data being sent was sent at the same rate, without spread spectrum.

In both cases, what counts to the narrowband users is PSD - power spectral density -- the amount of power in each unit of bandwidth. It is almost always specified in Hz.

As a first approximation, a 1 watt SS signal spreading over 20 MHz is going to have an average PSD of -43 dBm/Hz, or 0.05 microwatts in every Hz of that bandwidth.

>you exaggerate the potential for widespread interference.

Perhaps, but I have seen that potential trivailized, too. Do the math for that 1 watt SS station with 6 dBi of gain at a prime microwave propagation location and tell me what the received power level will be 1 km away. A good way to look at it is that the 20 MHz spread signal has 40 dB less interference potential to an SSB bandwidth, 30 dB less to an FM bandwidth and 46 dB less to a CW bandwidth than would a 1-watt station operating with all of its power contained within the above mentioned bandwidths. Helpful, but considering that a nearby SS station could be tens of dB over S9, to use signal levels that most hams will be familiar with, 30 to 46 db is not going to eliminate interference.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3934. Re: Vote for W4AMP or KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:19:07 UTC
From: Doug <Doug@AlwaysOn14313.net>
Message-ID: <a43av3$3j1$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

> One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
> "The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
> began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
> ad nauseum, ad infinitum."
> >

Very true! Whoever wrote that knew Roger for sure. We
hear KC8JBO is back jamming unidentified again on 14313 and
3901. No doubt Riley will revoke his license this time!
A compulsive jammer for sure!

3935. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:20:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209092001.26473.00000357@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33446

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Sounds fantastic. Guess it didn't work out for them though.

I don't understand. What didn't work out for whom? The number of these ad hoc networks appears to be increasing, not decreasing.

Did you understand that these networks are hobbyists cobbing together Part 15 devices, not commercial ventures?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3936. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:22:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209092255.17936.00000333@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33447

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 2/7/2002 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0202071142.410f9afe@posting.google.com>

>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=79668t%24qs4%241%40news1.fast.net&ou
tput=gplain

Jim, what does WA6VSE railing against me have to do with the alleged
impending failure of Amateur radio....?!?!

>>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
>>Subject: Sick and tired of petty, whining, >>cheapskate hams like Steve
>>Date: 1999/02/02

That letter was dated only 90 days before my daughter died...the reason
(in those days) that $15 in discretionary cash wasn't easy to come by....

73

Steve, K4YZ

3937. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:37:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209093743.02772.00000364@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 33448

In article <20020209085330.26473.00000350@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
>
>Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
>
I know. But some would change that, and disregard its effect on others who use the band.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3938. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:37:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209093743.02772.00000363@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 33449

In article <20020209084904.26473.00000349@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>> Meanwhile you tried to achieve asshole idiot status and succeeded.
>
>>Pot (Carroll) calls kettle black (again).
>
>And all the time he picks on you for being mean to other hams in your posts.
>:-)
>
>Is this one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?
>
Seems like a double standard to me. One person is criticized for calling another terms like the above, but another person receives no criticism for calling fellow amateurs the very same things, and others:

"lazy mooch"
"twits"
"olde fartz"
"brainwashed"

Neither justifies the other.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3939. Re: Vote for W4AMP or KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 14:55:12 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a43et6$2j0$6@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

TexASS TURD?
"Dicksucking Douggie" <Doug@AlwaysOn14313.net> wrote in message
news:a43av3$3j1$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Very true! Whoever wrote that knew Roger for sure. We

"We", who's we< Dicksucking Douggie, you and that gerbil up your rectum, you perverted kiddie porn downloader?

> hear KC8JBO is back jamming unidentified again on 14313 and
> 3901. No doubt Riley will revoke his license this time!
> A compulsive jammer for sure!

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.Says Douggie, QRMing HF unidentified and with only a Technician license. BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..And has been DFed by the Laurel monitoring station..better go ahead and sell that CHEAP-ASS equipment NOW, Dicksucking Douggie.

3940. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 15:32:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c654602_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33451

Little Dick: I owe no apology to anyone in this newsgroup, nor to any veterans. Their are fine, fine ex-soldiers who have the same exact opinion as I, so it is not unique at all.

My response that was written was to the observation by Cecil that he has seen Larry say things such as noted (that CW from less-than-maxed-speed-operators would be ignored/fall on deaf ears/whatever you want to call it. I believe I have heard Larry mention sentiments like that a few times. Whether he is *serious* or not, you'd have to ask him. I believe that his voraciousness and stated subjugations against other people makes it highly likely he *is* serious. In any case, I would hope never to be under the cause and effects of Larry Roll were a disaster situation to arise around me.

And, I believe that anyone who expresses such hate and determination against other people, whether it for their color, religion, sex preference, or CW preference, went to war for the wrong reasons. They *didn't* go to war to gain a license to come home and denigrate all over people for the way they think, Dick. It's as I've always said: you can dislike me as a person, but to express disdain over the way I think as a person is another matter entirely. We can disagree about CW, I am fine with your love of it. I am fine with your hate of my dislike for it. But, when you start calling me dumb or stupid or fat or ugly or whatever, using the basis that I don't like CW or think the way you do...well, that goes way beyond your welcome. I consider people like that an *enemy* to our country and way of life. Not someone to thank.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C663C87.E764CEB8@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
> > >>
> > >> Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
> > >> impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
> > >> Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know

> > >> Morse code.
> > >> --
> > >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >Yep, you got it. I asked that of Jay here a bit ago. It seems the
hate and
> > >contempt from people like Larry, Dick, etc., leave one to truly wonder
what
> > >values they place upon their effort (or not) to help someone.
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > As an amateur radio operator, I have a significant ability to assist
others
> > who may be able to gain aid or comfort as a result of my communications
> > capabilities. The way I "value" my abilities is very realistically -- I
could
> > do a lot better under some circumstances, but I could do no worse than
> > the majority of hams under most circumstances. I really don't expend as
> > much effort placing a "value" on myself as an emergency communicator
> > as you obviously do -- simply because I prefer to quietly continue to
gain
> > and refine my operating skills, while others (like you) prefer to brag
about
> > what you can do -- without ever really being put to a test.
> >
> > >You're right, Cecil. I get the distinct impression, also, that some
would
> > >just as soon let others die as acknowledge a signal beneath their
> > >expectations.
> >
> > Hmmm -- I see. So now, I'm being accused of letting some LID die
because
> > I can't decipher what he's trying to send -- therefore, it's MY fault if
he
> > *does*
> > die! Right. So now, in the eyes of Kim Walker, W5TIT, Judge and Jury,
I
> > am a murderer! And all because I advocate the continuance of a
requirement
> > for hams to know and be tested on a valuable communications skill. Kim,
> > you've really got some weird mojo working on you!
> >
> > >But, it's kind of like when I hear crappy people talking
> > >about how *they* went to war for my freedom.
> >
> > I think your last statement has just given us a perfect example of a
> > "crappy" person.
> >
> > >I like to remind them that

> > >they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they
> > >could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With
soldiers
> > >like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?
> >
> > Don't look now, Kim, but American soldiers don't fight for the right to
> > tyrannize the population. They fight for the right for all Americans to
> > retain their freedom and democratic society, and to liberate others from
> > oppressive regimes. Among other things American Soldiers, Sailors,
> > Airmen, and Marines have fought and died for over the years, is your
right
> > to make a perfect idiot of yourself every time you click on "Send."
> >
> > You owe an apology to each and every veteran in this newsgroup.
>
> Every time it seems certain that she has reached the limit of stupidity
she
> manages to stretch it even further.
>

3941. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:02:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654803.14C3056C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33452

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
>
> Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.

An interesting question is, how would anybody know it was there?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3942. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:12:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c654c6c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33456

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020209003330.07648.00000020@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c61bc18_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >And, while you guys are busy with waiting for someone to contact you
during
> >an emergency or disaster, we'll all be done with cleanup and the party
about
> >the time you figure it out that no one went to yours...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> While you and your fellow codeless minions are stuffing yourselves with
> pizza and beer at the post-cleanup party, the REAL emergency communicators
> will still be sending/receiving piles of Health and Welfare traffic using
CW
> and the digital modes. Of course, you will not be involved in this, the
real
> "emergency" communications effort, since you choose not to gain the skills
> necessary to do so. If, God forbid, a widespread emergency should ever
> visit the area you live in, it would interesting to see exactly how you
would
> personally contribute to the disaster relief effort as a radio amateur.
Just
> what is your own personal view of your potential contribution?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Hey, Mr. I'm-Smarter-Than-Everyone-Else: First I have no "fellow" codeless minions since I am a coded ham radio operator. And, with all the emergency communication I have been a part of, from learning to training, I have never seen a focus on CW operations. I just haven't. In the event a widespread emergency happens in this area, we'll be fine and you be sure to stay away, PUHLEEZE! What do you mean what is my "own personal view" of my potential contribution? Is that you wanting me to gloat? I don't act like you, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

3943. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:13:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654AA5.4088A928@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33453

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I am personally incapable of convincing any amateur radio newcomer
> to choose to learn Morse code.

I believe that to be true presently but a change in attitude would
turn things around. You would attract a lot more flies with honey
rather than vinegar.

> I am not the "Elmer" type.

You can easily choose to change that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3944. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:16:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654B6C.EC27DA80@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33454

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'll tell you what. You pay for the best possible lie detector
> exam available, arrange for me to take it right here in Dover,
> and we'll see if I have EVER smoked marijuana. I'll bet you
> $1,000 and a lobster dinner that the result will be negative.

Lie detector exams are notoriously flawed. A polished liar can
defeat them. A nervous truth-teller can confuse them. That's why
they are not admissible in court. The fact is that you cannot
prove that you have never smoked marijuana.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3945. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:17:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654BB7.9A58E65@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33455

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm sure there are plenty of criminals who don't have criminal records.

Yep, and you can't prove that you are not one of them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3946. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:22:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654CC5.4170A469@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33457

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Exactly when did I say that, Cecil?

Does "St. Valentine's Day Massacre" ring a bell?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3947. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:24:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654D3D.22945064@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33458

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm just glad I have the option to use either,
> or both -- as conditions should warrant.

I'm glad you're glad, Larry, but it has nothing to do with
governmental requirements and everything to do with choices
made by individual hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3948. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:29:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654E53.113D9215@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33459

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> When we do get to a No-Code General (and Extra) license, we *will*
> see an end to the growth in the numbers of hams who have CW in
> their "bag of tricks."

The newcomers are naturally attracted to SSB. After the new wears
off, some will choose to try CW/digital modes. What you don't
seem to realize is that many OT's don't have CW in their bag
of tricks. Many, many hams took the Morse code exam and promptly
forgot everything they knew about CW.

> The code testing requirements have been largely voted out of
> existence by lazy, indifferent people who seek only the immediate
> power of HF voice privileges, without the effort required to learn
> a valuable communications skill.

When was that vote taken, Larry. I missed it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3949. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 16:33:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C654F46.F9987195@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Tom Sevart wrote:
> I got one better than that... back when I was in England, a ham friend of
> mine told me of another ham (never heard exactly where he was from) who had
> a radio at his bedside. Well one night he left the VOX on when he and his
> wife got intimate...

Did he ID every ten minutes?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3950. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:14:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a43kvf$s74$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33461

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020209085542.26473.00000351@mb-fx.aol.com...
> Some of those
> developing them are hams, from what I read, most are not. Some of those
using
> them are hams, most are not.

Some engineers are hams, most are not. Some people are hams, most are not.

3951. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:22:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a43lg6saj1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33462

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C5E0074.63FCA85@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of course, when some special interest group
> > such as you and NCI gets to certain key personnel, and gains sympathy
for their
> > point, they can change their own procedures at will.
>
> Wow! I didn't realize that the NCI folk had such power over the FCC. Maybe
we
> should get NCI to force the FCC to quickly do something about the 40m
mess.

I don't think they're interested in the 40 meter mess. It's not a civil
rights issue.

3952. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:24:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c655b1f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33464

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020209003330.07648.00000019@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Yes on both counts; but this isn't about me.
> >>
> >> Of course it's about you, Larry. You have previously given the
> >> impression that a 4wpm 'SOS' would fall upon your deaf ears.
> >> Something like, they deserve to die because they don't know
> >> Morse code.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Yep, you got it. I asked that of Jay here a bit ago. It seems the hate
and
> >contempt from people like Larry, Dick, etc., leave one to truly wonder
what
> >values they place upon their effort (or not) to help someone.
>
> Kim:
>
> As an amateur radio operator, I have a significant ability to assist
others
> who may be able to gain aid or comfort as a result of my communications
> capabilities. The way I "value" my abilities is very realistically -- I
could
> do a lot better under some circumstances, but I could do no worse than
> the majority of hams under most circumstances.
>

Exactly the same here, and exactly the same for nearly everyone who has
communication capability, Larry.

>
> I really don't expend as
> much effort placing a "value" on myself as an emergency communicator
> as you obviously do -- simply because I prefer to quietly continue to gain
> and refine my operating skills, while others (like you) prefer to brag
about
> what you can do -- without ever really being put to a test.
>

Show me the bragging, Larry. Show me.

> >
> >You're right, Cecil. I get the distinct impression, also, that some
would
> >just as soon let others die as acknowledge a signal beneath their
> >expectations.
>
> Hmmm -- I see. So now, I'm being accused of letting some LID die because
> I can't decipher what he's trying to send -- therefore, it's MY fault if
he
> *does*
> die!
>

So, now someone who has a signal beneath your expectations is LID, eh? I am not surprised at all to see that from you, Larry Roll. Typical of what I believe your character and nature are. By the way, just so you'll know: there are no "LIDS" in a disaster--there's likely to be anyone (licensed or not) on any radio asking for help.

>
> Right. So now, in the eyes of Kim Walker, W5TIT, Judge and Jury, I
> am a murderer! And all because I advocate the continuance of a
requirement
> for hams to know and be tested on a valuable communications skill. Kim,
> you've really got some weird mojo working on you!
>

I didn't necessarily say that, Larry. I *did* say that I get the *distinct impression* that you--and others like you--*would* let someone die if they had a signal beneath your expectations. I was clear, concise and deliberate in my characterization. Then, in your first response related to that, you call the person who may be incapable of your superior operating, a LID. Hey, if the shoe fits wear it. If not, then simply state otherwise. You didn't state otherwise, I see.

> >
> >But, it's kind of like when I hear crappy people talking
> >about how *they* went to war for my freedom.
>
> I think your last statement has just given us a perfect example of a
> "crappy" person.
>

Hmmm, I'd be trying to help, whether someone had a signal or not. In fact, it's my guess that in the immediate aftermath, radio is the last thing I'd be thinking about, Larry. I'd be out moving rocks if I had to.

> >
> >I like to remind them that
> >they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they
> >could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With

soldiers
> >like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but American soldiers don't fight for the right to
> tyrannize the population.
>

Of course they didn't. Not all. However, when I hear someone using extreme prejudice against another because of the things they believe or the way they think, then what other conclusion is there but the idea that leaves one wondering if that person was *really* defending everyone.

>
> They fight for the right for all Americans to
> retain their freedom and democratic society, and to liberate others from
> oppressive regimes. Among other things American Soldiers, Sailors,
> Airmen, and Marines have fought and died for over the years, is your right
> to make a perfect idiot of yourself every time you click on "Send."
>

Larry, you describe the true soldier above. You describe the person who truly believes in all freedom and who would be the least likely to express prejudice against another. Some soldiers are *not* as you describe above. I know black ex-soldiers who would just as soon every whitey on Earth would be smitten; likewise I know white ex-soldiers who feel the same about blacks--and many other races. Both will swear to you that "the time is coming" when a huge Civil War will be the time they pick up arms and "finish what they were fighting for." Their words not mine. And, while it's a broad broom to push, I believe there's people on this newsgroup who are so filled with disdain and contempt against others that there'd not be a single flinch of emotion over the death of some they've expressed such disdain toward.

>
> You owe an apology to each and every veteran in this newsgroup.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No, I don't. Like I said, if the shoe fits, wear it. If it doesn't fit, then what I said should be of little concern. There's no denying there are people such as I describe. I *don't* condone their thoughts and behavior. I do believe there are soldiers who have served without honor. I've known some of them.

Kim W5TIT

3953. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:29:58 UTC
From: "ole capt. peckers" <alotradiofun500@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <q0d98.22000$Hb6.2008740@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"phil" <phil@phil.com> wrote in message news:u6935g4ih0vcd2@corp.supernews.com...
> scarey stuff... interefering via his broadcasts is one thing but taping
> phone conversations and then rebroadcasting? what the hell was he thinking?
> if anyone tape recorded what he transmitted he could be seriously screwed.
>
> phil :|

I wonder if after all of this is done
and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
or whatever the heck he calls it will still
retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
status...? Methinks not.

3954. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:52:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66A5B3.DC4C9F0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33466

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Was this <tube SSB transceiver> an "advance in the state of the art"?
> >Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
> >for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity,
> >economy and adapting of old parts to new uses.
>
> SSB was the radio art of the day. What similar advances in simplicity and
> economy have hams done to the state of today's radio art?

Must you ask? All the raving about "software defined radios" and you completely overlook all the "software defined modes"!

I, for one of many, no longer need that mechanical monstrosity that was a Model 19 that took up half my shack and smelled like a rusting Diesel to work RTTY and a dozen other modes. Just click the mouse on my choice and go to it......

3955. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:53:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a43n8p$t41$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33465

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com...
> If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur Radio, it
is
> probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the state of
the
> radio art.

I think it does, to the extent it can. Does the Part 15 Radio Service
advance the state of the art, or do companys do it? Hams are at least as
involved in radio development as any other demographic. Don't you think?

3956. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:57:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66A6D1.15793037@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33467

W1RFI wrote:

> Is this one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

I've said it many times, but here it is again- I turned the other cheek early in the game, and it got smacked just as the first. Slam me once, shame on you, twice, shame on me. There will be no third time for free. Stenson obviously cancelled one of his posts before I could respond, and that was perhaps wise of him, but I could give a response anyway. He's not worth time. He doesn't even know that it's HE that is the technician and I am a longtime Extra.

3957. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:58:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a43nii$30$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33470

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C65D0C8.397EF359@worldnet.att.net...

> You're right. FCC doesn't spell out what the control operator has to do
in
> detail, he may well be allowing a non-ham to operate who is as familiar
with
> radio as he is, but doesn't have a license. But it's the control operator
> who is responsible. If the ship hits the sand he is where the buck stops.
If
> he's comfortable with going to sleep while his third party operates under
> his license that's his business, but he catches any and all flak.

Maybe you're referring to K1MAN. Yes, the FCC expliciting wrote that the
control operator must be monitoring and in immediate control. He can't do
that while he's asleep. But they don't say he has to be the one who talks
on the microphone.

I think JJ was asking for specific FCC rules. He already seemed to have
plenty of anecdotal input.

3958. Re: Where are you.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:58:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66A726.1F33E12C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33468

Uh, Stevenson was the name.....

Ed Norton wrote:

> You Pot Bellied, Sawed Off, Drunken, Lying Asshole???
>
> One thing is certain, you aren't transmitting anymore lies on your wireless.
>
> "Something Stinks"
> Ed Norton Sewer Expert

3959. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 17:59:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66A749.F3A7247A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33469

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
>
> Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.

Not yet.

3960. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:14:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66AADD.39C0687C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33471

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
> >
> > Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
>
> An interesting question is, how would anybody know it was there?

There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of time watching a spectral display. It shows as short bursts of radio energy that is definite intended radio signals and not random noise, although there's plenty of that, too. Of course I don't know the source. But I can recognize intended radiators as opposed to randon noise generators. I have no idea of tghe source nor the characteristics. I imagine its some governmental or military signals.

3961. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:16:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C656799.FCB5E571@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33472

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
> >
> > Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
>
> Not yet.

Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
offer much of an advantage?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3962. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:17:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6567CE.46D2AC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33473

Jim Kelley wrote:
> I don't think they're interested in the 40 meter mess. It's not a civil
> rights issue.

I think those foreign broadcasters are downright uncivil.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3963. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:27:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66ADDE.D92F86D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33474

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20020209084904.26473.00000349@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> >>> Meanwhile you tried to achieve asshole idiot status and succeeded.
> >
> >>Pot (Carroll) calls kettle black (again).
> >
> >And all the time he picks on you for being mean to other hams in your posts.
> >:-)
> >
> >Is this one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?
> >
> Seems like a double standard to me. One person is criticized for calling
> another terms like the above, but another person receives no criticism
> for calling fellow amateurs the very same things, and others:
>
> "lazy mooch"
> "twits"
> "olde fartz"
> "brainwashed"
>

That's on his GOOD days.

>
> Neither justifies the other.
>

Such stuff never does. So it becomes a matter of what you want to let
"illegitimate children" like him get away with unchallenged...

3964. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:30:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66AE8D.9125B6E7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33475

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I am personally incapable of convincing any amateur radio newcomer
> > to choose to learn Morse code.
>
> I believe that to be true presently but a change in attitude would
> turn things around. You would attract a lot more flies with honey
> rather than vinegar.

That was the attitude I brought first to rrap and for my trouble I was immediately set upon by the codehating jackals as the primary reason for their personal failures. and that attitude persists in people like Stevenson to this day. It appears only the undertaker can help him solve it.

3965. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:30:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209133044.26452.00000298@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33476

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.

>I know. But some would change that, and disregard its effect on others
>who use the band.

That same some wanted to change the SS rules for VHF and up, too. The FCC limited SS to UHF and chose to have a rule that unconditionally makes the operator of an SS station responsible for harmful interference to narrowband users.

If I got everything I want in life, I probably wouldn't enjoy life all that much. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3966. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:32:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209133206.26452.00000299@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33477

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.

>An interesting question is, how would anybody know it was there?

Probably by all the little pops and burps that amateur SS would make if heard on HF. One would probably have to do a slow hopper to have the SS signal confined to the Amateur band.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3967. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:33:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209133326.26452.00000300@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33478

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the
>amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of
>time watching a spectral display.

If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can coexist
with narrowband operation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3968. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:40:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209134024.26452.00000301@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33479

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>Imagine how cool it would be if hams could easily send images to >and

>> from disaster areas.

>Well a HT on the belt sure won't do it. You might want to get the no code
>techs on board.

Technicians have priveleges that would let them send images.

> Getting something like that coordinated, up and running is the sort of
>thing the ARRL should be good at. Why aren't they?

I have asked that very question, but in places more effective than rrap. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3969. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 18:56:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66B4C8.70CEFDEF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33480

Jim Kelley wrote:

> W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur Radio, it
> is
> > probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the state of
> the
> > radio art.
>
> I think it does, to the extent it can. Does the Part 15 Radio Service
> advance the state of the art, or do companys do it? Hams are at least as
> involved in radio development as any other demographic. Don't you think?

Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies, ranging from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson. They just can't understand that ham radio has always been about doing things within it that the participants find a personal interest in doing. That pool of participants has always -and hopefully will always, the likes of W5TIT aside- contain that same percentage of persons licensed as hams who have as a primary interest, the search for new and better ways to do things.

I submit that such an attitude as demonstrated by Ed's posts does more to slow the very phonomena he professes to promote than it does to actually promote it. Absolute assholes like Stevenson damage it severely. People get fed up with such nonsense. There WILL BE NO large percentage of hams who do research on the leading edge of communications, just as there has never been. That research is mostly done by hams who are also employed in the same field that results in their leading edge innovations that affect ham radio. Most of us eagerly use the product of that research to improve our stations and abilities. I have not seen that change at all in over 45 years as a licensed ham.
Most ordinary hams (save the Kim , W5TIT type which unfortunately is the fastest growing segment of ham radio operators due to easy licensing - her description of the process, not just mine, tho I saw it up close and personal co ntinuously during the years I served as a VE)- most hams are innovators who can take the output of the techies, experiment with and adapt it, and use it to full advantage in their daily activities within ham radio, as so many are now doing. That's the way it has always been, and the way it will be until the ARS is overwhelmed with W5TIT's.

Ed -among many others who have jumped onto that sinking ship- should be ashamed of himself for spreading so much absolutely WRONG information about our service. It is simply incorrect, save, of course, the many and growing number of W5TIT's among us. That attitude is far more destructive than any other I see today, except again, the "I just want my license to talk and am not in the least

interested in anything whatever that is in any way technical" attitude exhibited by, again, W5TIT.

We're still waiting for Stevenson to relate what digital modes he use to work those 70 DX countries when he finally, after a lifetime of moaning about his fate, reached full HF access. I suspect we'll be waiting a long time.
He's as phony as a fourteen dollar bill, for he cast aside all that digital dogma in favor of stuffing a microphone in his face. I for one am not the least bit surprised.

3970. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:01:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66B5EF.5CE5359D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33481

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >
> > > >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
> > >
> > > Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
> >
> > Not yet.
>
> Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
> offer much of an advantage?

Unless Stevenson doesn't mean what he says. Or more likely he doesn't
have a clue.

3971. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:09:22 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

hello ole capt. peckers:

> I wonder if after all of this is done
> and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
> or whatever the heck he calls it will still
> retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
> status...? Methinks not.

i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have someone take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there are so many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the wrong way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought that equipment.

phil :)

3972. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:11:19 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u6at208843ikdd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

CAM:

> Did he ID every ten minutes?

LOL!!! his wife ID'd for him... he must have been Irish, the name was O'God Givitome.

phil :p

3973. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:14:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c657643_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33486

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C66B4C8.70CEFDEF@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > > If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur
Radio, it
> > is
> > > probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the
state of
> > the
> > > radio art.
> > >
> > I think it does, to the extent it can. Does the Part 15 Radio Service
> > advance the state of the art, or do companys do it? Hams are at least
as
> > involved in radio development as any other demographic. Don't you
think?
>
> Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies,
ranging
> from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson. They just can't
> understand that ham radio has always been about doing things within it
that the
> participants find a personal interest in doing. That pool of participants
has
> always -and hopefully will always, the likes of W5TIT aside- contain that
same
> percentage of persons licensed as hams who have as a primary interest, the
> search for new and better ways to do things.
>

Wow, <snicker>...you're kinda stuck on me, eh?

>
> I submit that such an attitude as demonstrated by Ed's posts does more to
slow
> the very phonomena he professes to promote than it does to actually
promote it.
> Absolute assholes like Stevenson damage it severely. People get fed up
with such
> nonsense. There WILL BE NO large percentage of hams who do research on the

> leading edge of communications, just as there has never been. That
research is
> mostly done by hams who are also employed in the same field that results
in
> their leading edge innovations that affect ham radio. Most of us eagerly
use the
> product of that research to improve our stations and abilities. I have not
seen
> that change at all in over 45 years as a licensed ham.
> Most ordinary hams (save the Kim , W5TIT type which unfortunately is the
> fastest growing segment of ham radio operators due to easy licensing - her
> description of the process, not just mine, tho I saw it up close and
personal co
> ntinuously during the years I served as a VE)- most hams are innovators
who can
> take the output of the techies, experiment with and adapt it, and use it
to full
> advantage in their daily activities within ham radio, as so many are now
doing.
> That's the way it has always been, and the way it will be until the ARS is
> overwhelmed with W5TIT's.
>

Little Dick, *you're* the one who most recently asked the question about when hams could/would have the technological capability to transmite images, even down to HF, from disaster situations--when the technology is already here and surrounds you. My description of the process is that CW is not required to produce a technological ham--in fact has nothing to do with it. My description of the process is that, since ham radio began, there have been technical hams and non-technical hams.

Now, it's your turn to try and look intelligent. In what way do I not use experimentation to its full advantage in my daily activities with ham radio? Huh? Why don't you just try to answer that one. OH, OH, OH...you mean *I* am not the one doing the experimenting?! Ah, so now if one isn't doing the experimenting, they also don't use ham radio to its fullest advantage? I beg to differ. I take full advantage of experimentation, every time I spend money on another new radio. You might say my kind is the kind that keeps manufacturers interested in that experimenting and in producing great products for our hobby, hmmm? Didn't look at it from *that* perspective, did you? However, I doubt you appreciate that perspective either. You know? Carl Stevenson sounds far more intelligent than you and I bet he experiments a lot more than you--based on how intelligent he sounds vs. how, well...non-intelligent you sound.

>
> Ed -among many others who have jumped onto that sinking ship- should be
ashamed
> of himself for spreading so much absolutely WRONG information about our
service.
> It is simply incorrect, save, of course, the many and growing number of

W5TIT's
> among us. That attitude is far more destructive than any other I see
today,
> except again, the "I just want my license to talk and am not in the least
> interested in anything whatever that is in any way technical" attitude
exhibited
> by, again, W5TIT.
>

Wow, you're as stuck on me as good 'ol Larry!

>
> We're still waiting for Stevenson to relate what digital modes he use to
work
> those 70 DX countries when he finally, after a lifetime of moaning about
his
> fate, reached full HF access. I suspect we'll be waiting a long time.
> He's as phony as a fourteen dollar bill, for he cast aside all that
digital
> dogma in favor of stuffing a microphone in his face. I for one am not the
least
> bit surprised.
>

I'm still waiting for one of your posts to sound even the slighest as
technical as one of Carl's. While he speaks way above my head, even if he's
full of shit--it sounds better than anything I've ever seen from you. Hell,
the stuff I've posted at times is better than anything you've ever posted.
At least I knew that imagery transmission capability has arrived on the
scene *and* can be done from the talkie of an operator at that!

Kim W5TIT

3974. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:19:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c657649_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33485

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C66B5EF.5CE5359D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > >
> > > > >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
> > > >
> > > > Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
> > >
> > > Not yet.
> >
> > Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
> > offer much of an advantage?
>
> Unless Stevenson doesn't mean what he says. Or more likely he doesn't
> have a clue.
>

Tell ya what, Mr Intelligent Little Dick. Why don't you 'splain it to us?
Can't? Awwwwwwwww.... Maybe you're not what you think you are. (By the
way, I bet you're pretty much the *only* one who thinks it, too).

Oh, no, I wouldn't understand your explanation. However, I wonder if you
can even begin to make it sound as intellectual as Carl can and, in the
event that you may be right, I'm sure there's folks on this newsgroup who'd
know whether you were right or not.

So, humor us. Why don't you give it a shot, hotshot?

Kim W5TIT

3975. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:20:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C66BA4D.E3AAE9F8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33484

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the
> >amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of time
> watching a spectral display.
>
> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can coexist
> with narrowband operation.

Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it? The stuff I see has far too much of that to coexist with anything, it blanks out normal activity on the band. It is strong enough to wipe out weak PSK and other amateur signals.
I know, it's not "conventional" spread spectrum such as is being discussed here. I have no idea what it is or where it comes from, but it sure isn't random noise. And my spectral display is only <3khz wide (digipan), so I have no way of measuring the frequency spread. But I know if that sort of signal becomes a regular and frequent occupant of the 20 meter band it will soon become useless for amateur radio use. So far it has been in infrequent short bursts
BTW, these observations were made at the edge of a metropolitian area of some 3 million residents.

3976. Take the CBer Identification exam!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:23:58 UTC
From: Realham <drwellnd@srynet.com>
Message-ID: <3C65774E.E8EA4358@srynet.com>
Source record: 33499

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

Did you moan or scoff? YOU'RE A CBer!!

3977. N O C O D E = N O H A M .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:26:47 UTC
From: Realham <drwellnd@srynet.com>
Message-ID: <3C6577F7.A152D89B@srynet.com>
Source record: 33498

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

Moan CBers moan.

3978. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 19:50:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a43u6k$39b$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33487

Thanks for your reply Dick. But don't you think you could have made your point without perpetuating the enmity between hams here? If we could separate the lambasting (on both sides) from the issues, I think we'd actually see more agreement in goals. What kind of response do you expect to receive to your ideas when you expend so much verbiage calling people names? You discredit your own point of view. You negate the validity of the point of your argument. If you want to shoot down someones argument, do that. But calling them names doesn't work. It's not a valid counterargument. Who wants to listen to an angry namecaller?

I don't know what you hope to accomplish by talking about "tired refrains from techies". What do you call the guys who have always experimented with radio? Weren't the guys who developed SSB and RTTY the 'techies' of their era?

Cecil and Carl know they can say anything they want to you, Dick, because they know you don't argue effectively or rationally against them. I think you can, but as often as not, you dilute it with a bunch of namecalling. Try editing out all the personal stuff before you send. You might find you'll see less of it in their replies to you. On the other hand, maybe that's what floats your boat. I don't know.

Best 73, and I look forward to the next RRAP CW net.

Jim AC6XG

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C66B4C8.70CEFDEF@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > > If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur Radio, it
> > is
> > > probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the state of
> > the
> > > radio art.
> >
> > I think it does, to the extent it can. Does the Part 15 Radio Service
> > advance the state of the art, or do companys do it? Hams are at least as
> > involved in radio development as any other demographic. Don't you

think?

> Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies,
ranging
> from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson. They just can't
> understand that ham radio has always been about doing things within it
that the
> participants find a personal interest in doing. That pool of participants
has
> always -and hopefully will always, the likes of W5TIT aside- contain that
same
> percentage of persons licensed as hams who have as a primary interest, the
> search for new and better ways to do things.
>
> I submit that such an attitude as demonstrated by Ed's posts does more to
slow
> the very phonomena he professes to promote than it does to actually
promote it.
> Absolute assholes like Stevenson damage it severely. People get fed up
with such
> nonsense. There WILL BE NO large percentage of hams who do research on the
> leading edge of communications, just as there has never been. That
research is
> mostly done by hams who are also employed in the same field that results
in
> their leading edge innovations that affect ham radio. Most of us eagerly
use the
> product of that research to improve our stations and abilities. I have not
seen
> that change at all in over 45 years as a licensed ham.
> Most ordinary hams (save the Kim , W5TIT type which unfortunately is the
> fastest growing segment of ham radio operators due to easy licensing - her
> description of the process, not just mine, tho I saw it up close and
personal co
> ntinuously during the years I served as a VE)- most hams are innovators
who can
> take the output of the techies, experiment with and adapt it, and use it
to full
> advantage in their daily activities within ham radio, as so many are now
doing.
> That's the way it has always been, and the way it will be until the ARS is
> overwhelmed with W5TIT's.
>
> Ed -among many others who have jumped onto that sinking ship- should be
ashamed
> of himself for spreading so much absolutely WRONG information about our
service.
> It is simply incorrect, save, of course, the many and growing number of
W5TIT's
> among us. That attitude is far more destructive than any other I see

today,
> except again, the "I just want my license to talk and am not in the least
> interested in anything whatever that is in any way technical" attitude
exhibited
> by, again, W5TIT.
>
> We're still waiting for Stevenson to relate what digital modes he use to
work
> those 70 DX countries when he finally, after a lifetime of moaning about
his
> fate, reached full HF access. I suspect we'll be waiting a long time.
> He's as phony as a fourteen dollar bill, for he cast aside all that
digital
> dogma in favor of stuffing a microphone in his face. I for one am not the
least
> bit surprised.
>

3979. suggestions for 6m ssb, and 2m ssb rigs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 20:31:53 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c658723.3451779@news.bright.net>
Source record: 33488

I took, and passed my technicians license exam this morning, and now I am ready to shop for a decent rig or two, So far most of the mobile rigs I have seen do not have SSB. I have a HT I was given for a x-mas gift, and am looking now for a rig for my vehicle, and for my home.

Any advice would be most welcome.

Keith Hosman
Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

3980. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 20:37:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209153725.26452.00000817@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 33489

"Kim" writes:
>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Kim" writes:
>> >"N2EY" wrote:
>> >> "Kim" wrote:
>> >> > Jim/N2EY, now I see what you mean by that "fear" thing. Dick's
>afraid
>> >to
>> >> > deal with the fact that the prediction of the end of the ARS was
>wrong.
>> >> > He's got to come up with some other totally off-base reason for the
>> >numbers
>> >> > as he sees them (note I said as *he* sees them).
>> >>
>> >> Before you point at another, deal with your own fear, Kim.

>> >You might need to remind, Jim, of what it is again that *you* think I
>should
>> >be afraid of?
>>
>> I don't think *you* *should* be afraid of anything written on this NG,
>Kim. I
>> simply note that you *are* afraid of some things written here.
>
>And you'd be quite wrong in your simple notation.

Why? You are behaving in a way that clearly indicates you do not
want to deal with new (to you) information. How is that any different
from what you say W0EX is doing?

>> You say that Dick is afraid to deal with certain facts. But you are afraid
>to
>> even look at some things because you are afraid of what you might see.

>It sounds to me like you are referring *sigh* again, to the Carl Stevenson
>issue? Is that right?

Click the link and see - if you are not afraid.

> Look, Jim, I am sorry you have such an issue with
>Carl Stevenson.

I don't have "such an issue" with anybody. You seem to have quite an issue
with W0EX.

>The little I've noted and observed during the debate about
>this whole thing is that, if anything, Carl is nothing but every bit as

>opinionated as those with whom take issue on some of the ideas he has.

Nothing wrong with having opinions. How they are expressed is another matter.

>You don't know me well enough, but if you think I'm going to spend any more
>time on the topic than that, then you're just plain wrong.

All I know of you is what I read here.

>I don't know
>*why* anyone would?! It is "a thing" in a newsgroup, will never ever have
>any impact on my life, and doesn't affect me one way or the other. Carl
>Stevenson, or anyone else for that matter, could be the most horrible tyrant
>to walk this planet--but if I'm never going to meet him, never going to be
>impacted by anything he does or says, then *why* would I concern myself with
>the matter?

A lot of words devoted to something you say you don't care about. Why are you
not so tolerant and unconcerned about W0EX?
>> >
>> >Dick's bought into the concept that the end of the ARS was
>> >eminent, due to Restructuring (as it's called).
>>
>> So? Maybe he's right. I don't think he's right, but it's way too soon to
>tell.
>
>I doubt he's right, and I have no problem at all stating that I doubt he's
>right.

So what's the beef?

>Especially since,

W0EX

>and I are diametrically opposed to
>each other so it is highly unlikely that we would ever see a matter from the
>same perspective.

It is "a thing" in a newsgroup, will never ever have any impact on your life,
and doesn't affect me one way or the other. W0EX, or anyone else for that
matter, could be the nicest person to walk this planet--but if you're never
going
to meet him, never going to be impacted by anything he does or says, then
why would you concern yourself with the matter?

>Ham radio could fill to the brim tomorrow with people who
>act in manners that

W0EX

> finds abhorrent and I have absolutely no
>problem with.

>To

W0EX

> ham radio would then be "dead." To me, it
>would not.

Sure. It could also fill up with people who act in manners that you find abhorrent.

>> > I don't know of any
>> >particular thing I've bought into on this newsgroup. Do you?
>>
>> Kim, you are extremely resistant to any and all new information that
>> conflicts with what you believe. Like the bishops who wouldn't look
>> through Galileo's telescope.
>
>As I said, Jim, you don't know me well enough to even come close to trying
>to figure me out.

All I know of you is what you write here and perhaps a few old emails. What you write indicates who you are, like it or not.

>Secondly, you've always impressed me as a much more
>logical person than to think that you can surmise a person's id without ever
>having met them, known them, etc.

I don't know if you mean "id" in the psychological sense or "ID" in the identification sense. I think it's the former.

> I stand corrected on my impression of
>you.

Why? All I'm doing is making a logical conclusion based on your behavior. You are VERY resistant to new information that disturbs your view of the world. So resistant that you spend much time and effort avoiding such information. I see nothing to contradict that conclusion.

> Thirdly, I think I've commented enough on the Carl Stevenson issue. I
>have read some of the debate, have seen some of his responses, seen some of
>others' responses, and I have decided that your idea of Carl Stevenson is
>different than mine.

Sure. I have more information. But I don't think you even know what my idea is.

> I've never been one to let others choose the way I
>think of other people.

Who is trying to do that? Not me.

>Sorry that disturbs you to the degree you display.
>It will leave me forever puzzled but, believe me, I'll hardly dwell on
>it...just as I will no longer dwell on the Carl Stevenson matter.

Doesn't bother me at all. Tells me a bit more about you, though. Like the way you resort to nasty plays on people's names, a'la a certain other poster here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3981. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 21:08:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209160819.18938.00000268@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33490

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the
>> >amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of time
>> watching a spectral display.

>> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can
>coexist
>> with narrowband operation.

> Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it? The
>stuff I see has far too much of that to coexist with anything, it blanks out
normal
>activity on the band. It is strong enough to wipe out weak PSK and other
>amateur signals.

Then why did you say that you won't see it on the band unless you look for it
with a spectrum analyzer.

> I know, it's not "conventional" spread spectrum such as is being discussed
>here.
>I have no idea what it is or where it comes from, but it sure isn't random
>noise.

If spread spectrum, it would do one of two things -- occupy a large chunk of
spectrum simultaneously, using a PN code, with a slower data stream
superimposed over that code. (DSSS).

It could also be frequency hopping. If it were hopping pretty slow, you would
see it show up as pips on the analyzer display, at various places on the band,
probably spread out a bit due to the data being modulated onto the signal. If
it were fast hopping, it might appear pretty much like the DSSS signal I
described above.

If it is spread spectrum on 20 meters, it would probably be a slow hopper.

> Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it?

What PSD did you measure at the input to the analyzer?

>And my spectral display is only <3khz wide (digipan), so I have no way of
>measuring the frequency spread. But I know if that sort of signal becomes a
>regular and frequent occupant of the 20 meter band it will soon become
>useless for
>amateur radio use.

It very well be amateur use. In some nations of the world, the regulations essentially say "this is your band -- stay within it.) If you are using a digipan to record the signal, there is no way to know if it is an SS signal or not, although the short nature of the bursts do suggest a hopper. I have heard similar signals on 40 meters, sounds like about a second or two of "brrrrp" every few minutes. I have wondered whether it was amateur or an intruder.

> BTW, these observations were made at the edge of a metropolitian area of
>some 3 million residents.

It could also be radiation from any of a number of digital devices, some of which may be in your very home. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3982. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 22:02:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209170219.11764.00001247@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 33492

In article <20020209003330.07648.00000019@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3c61be45$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim" ><seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>>I like to remind them that
>>they went to war to win freedom for people who think like them, so they
>>could come back home and tell everyone how they should think. With soldiers
>>like that fighting "for me" who needs the enemy?
>
>Don't look now, Kim, but American soldiers don't fight for the right to
>tyrannize the population. They fight for the right for all Americans to
>retain their freedom and democratic society, and to liberate others from
>oppressive regimes. Among other things American Soldiers, Sailors,
>Airmen, and Marines have fought and died for over the years, is your right
>to make a perfect idiot of yourself every time you click on "Send."
>
>You owe an apology to each and every veteran in this newsgroup.

NO.

Roll, that self-important, self-indulgent once-wore-bus-driver-blue and now drives a bus ("paratransit operator") after bragging summa-cum-laude high grades in "human resources management" should not attempt wrapping himself in the American Flag to win Message Points.

What a shameful INSULT to all of US veterans for him to proclaim himself as "spokesman" for ANY veterans. Disgraceful. Conduct unbecoming. He isn't worth the saliva to spit on...

And Roll is a self-proclaimed moral arbiter on "what should be" in US amateur radio regulations?

Not on this planet, only in another dimension, a dimension of sight and sound in his own imaginary Twilight Zone.

Leonard H. Anderson
ex RA 16408336, U.S. Army (1952-1960)

3983. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 22:02:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209170222.11764.00001248@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 33491

In article <20020209003331.07648.00000021@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3C622531.734B3676@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>> Larry was right "This isn't about me". It's about all those codehating
>>> pseudohams who you insist will instantly "learn" the code, when they need
>>it.
>>
>>They won't *instantly* learn it but they will learn it if they need to.
>>Look at it this way. When we have a nocode general license, there will
>>be more operators available for emergency HF communications. Some of
>>them will choose to have CW in their bag of tricks. One doesn't have
>>to have a license to learn Morse code.
>
>Cecil:
>
>When we do get to a No-Code General (and Extra) license, we *will*
>see an end to the growth in the numbers of hams who have CW in
>their "bag of tricks." I am already seeing that now.

Roll should go have a talk with Miccolis on what is being "seen."
According to Miccolis all the numbers point to "increases in
numbers of code-tested licensees."

It is very confusing to others to have one individual insist something is
one way while another says it is completely opposite.

>The "newcomers"
>I've seen in the post-Restructuring era are not making any effort
>whatsoever to learn the code, beyond passing the 5 WPM test to
>attain HF voice privileges.

Why should anyone bother to increase their morse skill beyond the
regulations? Roll has shown no sign that he has increased his
radio technical skill other than occasionally buying some ready-
built equipment.

>They are definitely not getting on-the-air with CW.

Again, there is no reason to...other than the jabbering of some
self-promotional control-freaks who demand that newcomers do
exactly as they did and "demonstrate their worthiness" to be in
the company of such noble, glorious elite gods of radio.

>The code testing requirements have been largely voted out of
>existence by lazy, indifferent people who seek only the immediate
>power of HF voice privileges, without the effort required to learn
>a valuable communications skill.

Among all those "lazy, indifferent people" are almost the ENTIRE
radio world outside of amateur radio in-group who are fanatics and
devotees of 1930s operating standards.

The label "valuable communications skill" is false...applicable only
to those who have some terrible need to regress to the 1930s and
remain there...or to those selfish and self-glorifying "better-than-you"
idiots who have a terrible need to elevate their importance far beyond
anything reasonable.

>This will ruin the ARS as we know
>it, by eliminating it's role as a means of training well-balanced,
>knowledgeable communicators, and replacing them with technically
>uninvolved, marginally capable appliance operators who will not
>have enduring value in challenging communications conditions.

That may ruin the ARS as Roll and his ilk "know it" but Roll and his
ilk should realize that they do not regulate or control any radio
service based on their own personal accomplishments.

One can picture the "highly-skilled" morse operator sitting in
front of his ready-built, top-of-the-line "appliance," never
venturing behind the front panel. If they did, it would forever
destroy their self-esteem to reveal they are, as a general rule,
technical morons, brag queens who can barely do a simple
Ohm's law calculation on a DC circuit.

How does morse have "enduring value in challenging
communications environments?!?" Perhaps in 1930 but NOT
in the new millenium. The rest of the radio world has GIVEN
UP on morse methods. Its only "enduring value" lies in
bragging rights for those who once passed a morse test.

Opinion given with the kindest regards,
Len

3984. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 22:02:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209170225.11764.00001249@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 33493

In article <20020209083242.26473.00000347@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Was this <tube SSB transceiver> an "advance in the state of the art"?
>>Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
>>for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity,
>>economy and adapting of old parts to new uses.
>
>SSB was the radio art of the day. What similar advances in simplicity and
>economy have hams done to the state of today's radio art?

Hi Ed,

It is always good to see long-timers' comments on the halcyon days of amateur SSB, especially so from those who had first-hand, hands-on, practical experience in the 1950s. Praise aside, I'll make some comments on the "state of today's (or last week's) radio art."

SSB was already proven as a minimal bandwidth form of AM in landline telephony (frequency-multiplexed "carrier" equipment) prior to 1930, then during the 1930s in HF radio for radio-telecommunications carriers. The adaptation of SSB techniques to single-user, single-channel radiotelephony was probably hampered more by quartz crystal manufacturing technology prior to WW2 than anything else. Post-WW2 quartz availability was sponsored in part by military needs for FM radio, not SSB.

Early single-channel FM radio was more PM than direct FM, a phase-modulated crystal oscillator multiplied in frequency (over 50 times) such that the final signal was indistinguishable from FM. Quartz crystals were needed both for final carrier stability and for rapid QSY in vehicles (tanks) in motion. Single-channel SSB needs even tighter frequency stability for HF as compared to FM/PM on low VHF. Since long-haul military communications on HF was already using commercial (12 KHz wide) SSB carrier equipment at the entry of the USA to WW2, radio developments favored quartz crystal production, first for the "channelized" push-button-QSY vehicle radios then the VHF field radio relay sets. The ubiquitous "FT-241" crystals on the surplus market in the 50s and 60s were the left-overs of military FM set production.

Post-WW2 quartz crystal technology developed crystal-growth techniques to increase quartz availability and purity. That

technique was a sibling of crystal growth that had begun for producing germanium and silicon crystals for semiconductors. In addition there was an emphasis of general L-C oscillator design for frequency stability in harsh environments in that same period at frequencies ranging from MF to UHF. That happened in the entire "radio world" for many radio services in the immediate post-WW2 era.

Contrary to popular ham mythology, single-channel SSB was not "invented" by Collins Radio nor by "the amateur community" but rather a need by the USAF Strategic Air Command for a long-distance HF aircraft communications method at the start of the Cold War. The first Collins sets for SAC utilized a combination of stable L-C and quartz crystal oscillators to insure being able to listen as well as transmit on correct frequencies. It also gave Collins an outlet for their "mechanical" IF bandpass filters that were originally intended for the long-distance telephony carrier market (but did not fare well up against the growing digital multichannel telephony carrier equipment).

Some "true" innovation in ham radio technology can be said to occur first in the UK and Europe during the beginning of the 1970s. The "Zero-IF" or "direct conversion" receiver begins that era, something that had almost become a ham fad in that region at that time (see various issues of Radio Communications for many examples). The next might be the Gingell polyphase network written up several times: Mike Gingell's description in Radio Communications in 1973, then G3PLX's experimental SSB phasing modulator described in Radio Communications in 1975. Gingell's PhD dissertation (Univ. of London, 1975) is further proof as well as several articles in IEEE Transactions on Communications during the 1970s.

A second area of technology is the extension of quartz crystal ladder filter design from being a mystery within a sealed metal can, information held as proprietary to the crystal manufacturers, to assemblies of individual, matched crystals on a PCB. This was in the 1980s and included several articles in QST and QEX that was sure to have promoted more work in that area. It is worth it to note that the Stoner Goral Company (SGC) used that form of individual quartz units as a SSB filter in their maritime-amatuer market SSB transceiver. That appeared in several other company designs in both kit form and in ready-built transceivers.

The Numerical Electromagnetic Code (NEC) was released in the 1980s but lingered in limbo before being adapted by a few for more widespread use in modeling antennas. Roy Lewallen should get more credit for his initial work in reprogramming and making it available as a relatively easy-to-use antenna analysis tool (ELNEC and EZNEC). Credit should also go to L.B. Cebik for his promotion of NEC methods for antenna design and analysis.

[no one except Cecil seems to look in on www.antennex...?]

Some [Gary Coffman, et al] have promoted APRS as an innovative adaptation of GPRS although that is questionable as a true innovation. Automatic position location and reporting was already in the NAVSTAR planning in the early 1970s; NAVSTAR was the precursor to GPRS. A number of corporations were already at work on position location and reporting of vehicles of all kinds in the 1970s using systems not based on satellites (Minneapolis-Honeywell, RCA Corporation, Bendix, Sperry, etc.).

Store-and-forward message relay in amateur radio satellites might be an amateur radio innovation except for it being an extreme specialty application and a satellite becoming an extension of an "external infrastructure" that does not fit the "acceptible" criterion of individual, personal communications methods as described by J. Herman.

The burning question in my mind now is "when is the next regenerative or super-regenerative receiver article going to appear in QST or QEX?" I am always eager to see innovation in simplicity and economy in new radio technology. :-)

With all kind regards,
Len

3985. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 22:59:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209175922.18921.00000365@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33494

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies, ranging
>from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson.

We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
existance.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3986. Re: suggestions for 6m ssb, and 2m ssb rigs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 23:49:49 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209184949.23877.00001239@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33495

>I took, and passed my technicians license exam this morning

Hi Keith,

Congratulations on passing your exam and gaining your new privies.

>I
>am ready to shop for a decent rig or two, So far most of the mobile
>rigs I have seen do not have SSB.

Most mobile rigs offered by "the big three" are of the narrow FM variety since the majority of folks on 2m seem to prefer repeater work. There are some all-mode base rigs that incorporate 2m along with HF, but they command a hefty price tag. You can use a transverter with a 10m rig. As for 6m, the new RCI-5054 seems to be the logical choice for a mobile. Again congrats. Take care and 73.

Mark

3987. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-09 23:57:14 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209185714.23877.00001244@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33496

>>This enterprising company sells the "Cherokee 'CM-10 Plus' AM CB
>>radio" which boasts "10 bands of 40 channels" for a total coverage of
>>"400 channels".
>>
>>This company further says it offers the CB'er "Complete access to
>>*ALL* CB channels".
>>
>>Do the math: 10 bands x 40 channels each, (the legal 40 covers 26.965
>>to 27.405) that's....uh...wow, I didn't know 10 and 12 meters was part
>>of CB now!
>>
>>-Aaron-
>
>Old news, Aaron. Some of us actually use these as mobiles on, ready?...10 &
>12-meters.
>
>=================
>0 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
>||||||||||||||||
>=================
>
>Digital Troll-O-Meter
>
>73 de Bert
>KC2HMN

Hi Bert,

Normally, I "got your back." But the big A might have a point on this one. It's an AM only rig. Not too useful. The troll-o-meter movement still stands though...based on the "boy who cried troll" principle. Take care and 73.

Mark

3988. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 00:08:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gra9us1.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33497

On Sat, 9 Feb 2002 00:37:03 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Thus, it would seem that a "guest" operating under the continuous
>supervision of a properly licensed control operator can do whatever
>the control operator is allowed to do, as long as the control operator
>permits it and it is otherwise within the rules.
>
That's the way the FCC interpreted it when I was at the agency.

Don't look for problems when they do not exist.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3989. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 00:28:47 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209192847.23877.00001257@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33500

>> Thomas Jefferson said: "The government that
>> governs least governs best." Don't take my
>> word for that ... go visit his tomb .. its engraved
>> in stone on the walls in HUGE block letters so that
>> even twits like Bert might stand a chance of being
>> able to read it.
>
>Well, well, Carl. We've finally arrived at the end of our discussion.
>Sadly, you've conceded...and likely without even realizing it. And
>thus the first name is hurled. Funny, although I disagree with your
>position...I never had you pegged as someone who'd descend to the
>level of name-calling. Take it easy, Carl.

Whoa, what have I been missing here?! This sorta reminds me of the TV series about the hospital with Mandy Patinkin. I don't remember the actual name of the show. Mandy Patinkin's character gets into an argument with another doctor until finally the other doctor reaches out and shoves Mandy Patinkin. Game, set, and match to Mandy Patinken's character. Thanks for the entertainment, guys. Take care and 73.

Mark

3990. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 00:35:14 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209193514.23877.00001259@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33551

>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>>
>> Given that, can you explain rationally (I don't think so)
>> "Why are Bert's privileges "earned" and mine constitute
>> some form of "giveway?"
>>
>
> I'd be very pleased to do so. Bert met the requirements in place at the
>time, you very definitely did not, preferering to whine about them
>instead. So keep on, whine away.

Wow, what a setup! Carl, I can't believe you put on a hat of antlers while out in the woods...during deer season. Did you really not see the answer to this question?

Mark

3991. Re: Take the CBer Identification exam!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 00:57:52 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209195752.23877.00001262@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33552

>NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
>Did you moan or scoff? YOU'RE A CBer!!

What about the folks that work CW on 27.125Mhz? There's even a 7-wpm 20 milliwatt beacon coming out of CA. They're CBers.

Mark

3992. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 01:29:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gracwk2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33553

On Sat, 09 Feb 2002 02:44:05 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> You're right. FCC doesn't spell out what the control operator has to do in
>detail, he may well be allowing a non-ham to operate who is as familiar with
>radio as he is, but doesn't have a license. But it's the control operator
>who is responsible. If the ship hits the sand he is where the buck stops. If
>he's comfortable with going to sleep while his third party operates under
>his license that's his business, but he catches any and all flak.

It has long been established that an operator at any class of
station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3993. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 01:44:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C67145D.3FB9102F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33554

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> > There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the
> >> >amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of time
> >> watching a spectral display.
>
> >> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can
> >coexist
> >> with narrowband operation.
>
> > Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it? The
> >stuff I see has far too much of that to coexist with anything, it blanks out
> normal
> >activity on the band. It is strong enough to wipe out weak PSK and other
> >amateur signals.
>
> Then why did you say that you won't see it on the band unless you look for it
> with a spectrum analyzer.

Well, why would you be looking on a band without a spectrum analyzer? The point
was that you wouldn't know as much about it's
characteristics by just hearing it. This thing LOOKED like a data signal , you know
how a signal that is modulated shows the modulation as alterations to the displayed
RF, and the amplitide appeared constant accross the entire display and presumably
well beyond. Wish I had had a real specgtrum analyzer looking at it at the time.
One can't predict this sort of occurance.

>
> > I know, it's not "conventional" spread spectrum such as is being discussed
> >here.
> >I have no idea what it is or where it comes from, but it sure isn't random
> >noise.
>
> If spread spectrum, it would do one of two things -- occupy a large chunk of
> spectrum simultaneously, using a PN code, with a slower data stream
> superimposed over that code. (DSSS).

Looks like DSSS, it has no pips as FHSS, but shows characteristics of data
modulation, probably highly compressed, and sent at high
speed in a few short bursts which do not repeat.

>
>
> It could also be frequency hopping. If it were hopping pretty slow, you would
> see it show up as pips on the analyzer display, at various places on the band,
> probably spread out a bit due to the data being modulated onto the signal. If
> it were fast hopping, it might appear pretty much like the DSSS signal I
> described above.
>
> If it is spread spectrum on 20 meters, it would probably be a slow hopper.
>

Of course I don't know what it was, nor the source. But it appeared to be a wideband data stream in a short series of bursts that completely filled the ~3khz spectral display. I'm fairly familiar with noise sources, and it was once a part of my job to find and deal with them. I'm aware there's a lot of new ones, and some of them are RF based, as I believe this one to be. Note that it showed up, did it's thing in a very few short bursts, departed and stayed gone. The signal showed the sort of data characteristics seen in modulated signals, from alterations of the RF signal displayed. Of course it could be the result of an intermod, but across a broad spectrum? I doubt it. It sure isn't one of the usual nose suspects that come and go, and are easy to spot. Of course there are plenty of those, too.

>
> > Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it?
>
> What PSD did you measure at the input to the analyzer?
>

??? As I noted the spectral display was the digipan "waterfall display". It was equal in strength to most of the PSK31 signals being displayed. It instantly filled the display with raspy sounding signal that appeared to have contained high speed probably compressed data. One does wonder at the source of such stuff.

> It very well be amateur use.

To me it looked more like some highspeed compressed data signal that passes a lot of data at very high speed. Could be military. I don't know what sort of use is made of that sort of thing under Part 15 these days in metro areas, but nothing would be much of a surprise anymore. FCC opened a real can of worms with that NPRM. It was the only time I ever wrote my congressman over a pending FCC action. Evidently they convinced him there was no problem. Who is to say there is, when you can't ID such signals? When their duration is so short term maybe there really is no problem, just a curiousity.

> In some nations of the world, the regulations
> essentially say "this is your band -- stay within it.) If you are using a digipan
> to record the signal, there is no way to know if it is an SS signal or
> not, although the short nature of the bursts do suggest a hopper. I have heard
> similar signals on 40 meters, sounds like about a second or two of "brrrrp"
> every few minutes. I have wondered whether it was amateur or an intruder.
>

I doubt we'll ever know. So much for "our" bands.

>
> > BTW, these observations were made at the edge of a metropolitian area of
> >some 3 million residents.
>
> It could also be radiation from any of a number of digital devices, some of
> which may be in your very home. :-)
>

Don't think so, I've seen enough of that sort of stuff to get a pretty good feel
for it. Some of these signals are different. My bet is that this one was intended.

3994. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 01:48:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C67152B.F3C990CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33555

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies, ranging
> >from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson.
>
> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
> existance.

So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should strive to become a digital-mode designer? Look at the history of the ARS - Invariably advances in technology are never adopted on a sudden basis. It sometimes looks like the people who do all the complaining about hams never turn on a rig and thus have no idea what actually goes on.

3995. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 01:55:33 UTC
From: Adam MAURER <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Gnk98.4130$BE4.11235@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>
Source record: 33556
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
request for a good ol QSL card.

I hope you advocates of e-QSLing have already worked the rare ones on all
band/mode combos, coz it'll be a different ball game now.

Adam, VK4CP

Website: http://www.qsl.net/vk4cp/

Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
news:3c644a68@news.bnb-lp.com...
> Hello Carl,
> This decision and news was just released so there are a few loose-ends
> yet....soon it will be world-wide. The granting of permission for eQSL -
> DXCC cards acceptance was for any and all cards. The nice people at eQSL
> will be adding world wide capability very soon...
>
> DXCC qsl'ing is now -cheaper- and -faster- than ever....a huge and
> bold step in the right direction.
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston
> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com
>
>
>
>

3996. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:04:55 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D50B.51EC5540@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33557

Hi,

I just ran into an old acquaintance and fellow ham who has developed a (commercial, not amateur) wireless internet system (WAN?) with multi-thousand subscribers. He had some interesting comments to make about his system during my interview such as:

1. most subscribers are stationary (ie. point to point) with gain antennas.
2. he does not worry about such things as keeping the power down to milliwatts.
3. he operates in the gigahertz hinterlands.
4. he uses good stuff (some of it mfg'd by Carl's old employer).
5. he provides 100's of Kb bandwidth per customer.
6. he is not too concerned about privacy, because of SS and other encoding technique
7. he does not spend on advertisement but is selling subscriptions like hotcakes.
8. says he is eaten up with computer gear managing T3 heads to the backbone.

I am sure he would be glad to discuss the characteristics of his system further if any would be interested.

Considering his system, it seems to me that the subscribers are those who desire high bandwidth, and cannot get it anyother practical way (no DSL or two way cable in their area?). His coverage area seems to be operated like a mondo-cellular system (lots of power, big towers, little overlap), with microwave interlinks.

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> These systems are not being designed or operated under Part 97. Some of those
> developing them are hams, from what I read, most are not. Some of those using
> them are hams, most are not. They operate without a control operator and can
> be accessed by non hams at will.

To access my friend's system, they have to pay.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3997. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:10:36 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D660.E31F34AD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33558

The main thing that protects K1MAN is that W1AW does the
same thing. As to the tape recording, those being
interviewed by K1MAN know that they are going on the air.

73,
Clay N4AOX

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: K1MAN gets another letter
> >From: "Arf! Arf!" DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz
> >Date: 2/9/2002 1:00 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a42hbrmt0@dosa.alt.net>
>
> >....and one must wonder why he
> >has gotten away with so much for as long as he has.
>
> Liberals. They want to "rehabilitate".
>
> I say we sniper his ~!@ and be done with it.
>
> Steve

3998. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:15:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C65D7D0.425961A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33560

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Best 73, and I look forward to the next RRAP CW net.

I've been practicing on the electronic keyer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3999. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:16:26 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D7BE.224CC68@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33559

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20020209085330.26473.00000350@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> >>A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
> >
> >Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
> >
> I know. But some would change that, and disregard its effect on others
> who use the band.

Unfortunately for amateur radio, that probably would not be
a current concern for 20 Meters if HF access policy had
maintained the CW requirements, diluted, and effectively
dismissed on April 1.

73,
Clay N4AOX

4000. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:19:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C65D8B0.79A40DD4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33562

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it? The stuff
> I see has far too much of that to coexist with anything, it blanks out normal
> activity on the band. It is strong enough to wipe out weak PSK and other amateur
> signals.
> I know, it's not "conventional" spread spectrum such as is being discussed here.
> I have no idea what it is or where it comes from, ...

Methinks you might have discovered a solar flare, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4001. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:20:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gragq05.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33561

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 02:04:55 GMT, Clay N4AOX wrote:

>Considering his system, it seems to me that the subscribers
>are those who desire high bandwidth, and cannot get it
>anyother practical way (no DSL or two way cable in their
>area?). His coverage area seems to be operated like a
>mondo-cellular system (lots of power, big towers, little
>overlap), with microwave interlinks.

What area does he serve? Who is his ISP?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4002. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:24:02 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65D987.C4A9C958@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33563

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > There *is* occasional short term spread spectrum activity on the
> >amateur 20 meter band, stuff you won't see unless you spend a lot of
> >time watching a spectral display.
>
> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can coexist
> with narrowband operation.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Is this the conclusion of your "future modes and future
deployments" committee?

73,
Clay N4AOX

4003. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:32:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C65DBCA.D63F892@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33565

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I am personally incapable of convincing any amateur radio newcomer
> > > to choose to learn Morse code.
> >
> > I believe that to be true presently but a change in attitude would
> > turn things around. You would attract a lot more flies with honey
> > rather than vinegar.
>
> That was the attitude I brought first to rrap and for my trouble I was
> immediately set upon by the codehating jackals as the primary reason for
> their personal failures.

If I remember right, what you brought to rrap was, "CW gets through when
no other mode will." But it doesn't on 10m at night at the low of the
sunspot cycle. I believe if you had uttered reality based statements,
instead of PCTA bromides, nobody would have jumped on you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4004. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:33:58 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C65DBDA.7F348152@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33564

It could also be UWB. Here is another techie system that
has purpose and utility in the ether world. It is a good
way to communicate to minimize those pilotless
hunter-killers getting a fix and sending a hellfire missle
down your antenna.

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> > BTW, these observations were made at the edge of a metropolitian area of
> >some 3 million residents.
>
> It could also be radiation from any of a number of digital devices, some of
> which may be in your very home. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4005. Re: suggestions for 6m ssb, and 2m ssb rigs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:38:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C65DD29.B233354C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33566

REACT of Henry County / Henry County Chapter American Red Cross wrote:
>
> I took, and passed my technicians license exam this morning, and now I
> am ready to shop for a decent rig or two, So far most of the mobile
> rigs I have seen do not have SSB. I have a HT I was given for a x-mas
> gift, and am looking now for a rig for my vehicle, and for my home.
>
> Any advice would be most welcome.
>
> Keith Hosman
> Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
> Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
> American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

I sure like my IC-706 MKII for mobile work. The 'G' version has
70cm also.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4006. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 02:47:42 UTC
From: ik7565@erols.com
Message-ID: <3C65DF4E.6B299C9A@erols.com>
Source record: 33567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If the DXpeditions don't upload their logbooks then we can always go
direct.

73 de Ian
N8IK

Adam MAURER wrote:
>
> Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> request for a good ol QSL card.
>
> I hope you advocates of e-QSLing have already worked the rare ones on all
> band/mode combos, coz it'll be a different ball game now.
>
> Adam, VK4CP
>
> Website: http://www.qsl.net/vk4cp/
>
> Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
> news:3c644a68@news.bnb-lp.com...
> > Hello Carl,
> > This decision and news was just released so there are a few loose-ends
> > yet....soon it will be world-wide. The granting of permission for eQSL -
> > DXCC cards acceptance was for any and all cards. The nice people at eQSL
> > will be adding world wide capability very soon...
> >
> > DXCC qsl'ing is now -cheaper- and -faster- than ever....a huge and
> > bold step in the right direction.
> >
> > --
> >
> > 73 / DX
> >
> > Charles T Johnston
> > Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> > charles@ab7sl.com
> >
> > AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> > Official W9INN Antennas Page
> > www.ab7sl.com
> >
> >
> >

> >

4007. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 03:00:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202091900.30e06b2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33568

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c64559b_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message

> > Yeah, right. 2.1 kHz on one side of the suppressed carrier for ssb
> and
> > how many kHz away from it's supressed carrier does SS spit RF did
> you
> > say?
>
> Depends on the "chipping rate" of the PN spreading sequence (for
> DSSS), but an important factor you're ignoring is that, for equal
> total
> transmit power, the DSSS signal will have a proportionally lower
> PSD (that's Power Spectral Density) than a narrowband signal and
> thus present less interference to any given co-channel narrowband
> user than a narrowband signal transmitted from the same location
> with the same antenna, power, etc.
>
>
Horsepucky, yeah, SS won't booger a narowband guy as much as will
another thumping narrowband transmission right next to the first guy.
Instead SS spanks some beaucoup number frequecies equally which narrow
modes do not. It's called SS trashing the whole band between it's
lower and upper spread limits with noise.
>
>
Yeah, I understand all of it. PSK31 can dig maybe 10dB deeper into the
noise level than I can with my ears when running CW. Plus PSK31 is a
narrower mode than even CW is at useful speeds. So why bother with SS
if the really big deal is minimal co-channel interference given the
fact that PSK31 is already out there?
>
>
But ya can't toss .jpgs around on 20 with PSK31 huh?
>
>
> There are better ways to manage spectrum utilization than hard
> and fast sub-band restrictions on modes ... that is an old paradigm
> that will be obsoleted in the near future by SDRs (software-defined
> radios)

>
>
Heh. Depends on how you define "near future". There is absolutely no
question in my mind that, for instance, SDRs will become a major
player in ham radio. The big unknown is WHEN and your crystal ball is
no less fuzzy than is my crystal ball. The difference between thee and
me is that I long ago bought into the much bigger "paradigm". Which is
the blatently obvious fact that the general nature of ham radio in
this regard is it's ungodly slow rate of acceptance of all new
technologies and/or spectrum-management schemes on broad scales. Those
who don't pay attention to the lessons of history are doomed to heaps
of frustration and repeating bad history. You're a current-tech
iteration of Cervante's Don Quixote is what you are good buddy. Go for
it, oughta be entertaining as hell.
>
>
I venture to guess that in fact I've used more current-tech equipment
on the HF bands than you have. Hmm? I spent a whole evening surfing 40
cw with a Kachina operating into a three-element yagi at 150 feet. The
Kachina is certainly not an SDR but it was a great lesson in the
foibles of I.F & audio DSP as it exists today. The selectivity SUCKS
in critical ops like chasing the weak ones on 40 cw. Art Collins'
1950s 500Hz mechanical marvels kick the Kachina's butt in a huge way
given the same mission. Ditto the whizzy "40-bit DSP processing" or
whtever the hell it is in the I.F. stages of my own JRC NRD 545 rcvr.
>
>
If "you people" can't even beat what Art did in the 50s yet just at
the I.F. level make a rough guess how long it's gonna take to have
decent DSP front ends . .
>
>
>
>... read the FCC's recent docket items on SDR ...
>
>
That's old hat, gimmee a break. Has nothing to do with ham radio, we
don't need to apply for "dynamically-issued permission slips" from the
FCC to change operating freqs or modes, we don't use commercial
type-accepted radios.
>
>
> Try as you might, you're not going to be able to keep ham radio
> stuck in the past forever, and attempting to do so is harmful to
> the ARS.
>
>
Sure, as if I'm having any impact at all on ham radio. Like you have
any impact on ham radio. I have no interest in "keeping ham radio in
the past" at all. I'm just realistic enough to understand how long it

takes for the past to go away via mechanisms neither thee or me can do
a damned thing about.
>
>
>
> It's a well-recognized fact that the emergency management folks
> would LOVE to have us be able to provide "real" data capabilities
> as part of our services to them ...
>
>
Is RTTY not "real data comms"? Ham RTTY was out there in volume back
when I was wearing corduroy knickers. OK, so thoses were Model 59 and
big tube radio days and RTTY was not a practical consideration for
onsite emergency ops. RTTY is still out there in volume and all ya
need to run it today is highly portable equipment like a little
solid-state xcvrs and a laptops with sound cards. RTTY is a crude mode
by today's standards but to the best of my knowledge not even RTTY has
been deployed into emergency comms to any recognizable extent. You
tell me why not, beats the hell outta me.
>
>

>
> - From the tone of your posts ... discounting and disputing anything
> that's proposed that's "not as it's always been" you certainly had
> me fooled ... and I'm not your "Sweetums" ... while we've never met
> in person, I'm QUITE sure you're not my type :-)
>
>
Put that in the bank right now!
>
>
> Please elaborate on EXACTLY what's wrong with things that I've
> proposed for consideration. Where are the technical flaws? Why
> are they so repugnant to you? After all, they're just concepts being
> "floated" for discussion and consideration. Why are you so
> "vehemently opposed?"
>
>
I have yet to bitch on the technical characteristics of any mode wide
or narrow just like I'm not stupid enough to argue with physics. My
ONLY bitch is on your oft-repeated concept of "layering" SS over
spectrum space known to be commonly used for narrowband operations. If
there's a "technical flaw" around here it's your contention that SS
will not significantly degrade the noise floor for narrow mode users
in spectrum space "shared" with SS. That is not a flaw in SS
technology, that is a flaw in your HEAD.
>
>
> > >

> > OK, so you just finally got yer free pass to HF
>
> I didn't "get a free pass to HF" ... I took and passed the
> required technical test ... had credit for the full General
> and 5 wpm as an "old tech" ... I accept no assertion that
> I'm not FULLY qualified to hold an Extra Class license,
> no matter what prejudices you or others may hold.
>
>
I figgered that would get yer attention.
>
>
> >, thus I'm obliged to
> > make some allowances for your lack of experience and yer Coefficent
> of
> > Stupidity as it relates to packet-assisted HF dxing
>
> Having operated digital HF under a legally obtained
> license while living in Mexico for several years, as well
> as having worked for Rockwell-Collins in designing
> military and commercial digital transmission systems
> from HF through UHF, I find your assertions that I "lack ...
> experience" laughable.
>
>
You copy-pasted that one from one of Lenny's posts dinya?
>
>
Has absolutely precisely NOTHING to do with ham HF cw and phone dx
contesting and the related VHF ham packet comms, I'll stick.
>
>
> How is contesting relevant to this discussion?
>
>
You lost the thread AGAIN or what?? The topic was the dx spots system
and the use of that system in dxing and dx contesting and the
throughput problem with the system and nothing more.
>
>
> > window, smack it with ye mouse, log him and back to yer run on 20
> > before yer pileup had a clue ya even left 20.
>
> Oh, I see ... your (ham) life revolves around contesting and
> you can't see the utility of anything outside of that pathetically
> limited context ...
>
>
Not at all, this USED to be a discussion about packet technical and
operating issues until you decided to "take it elsewhere".

>
>
> It also appears from your comment above that your mental filtering
> capacities may indeed be seriously strained, despite my intention
> of giving you the benefit of the doubt to the contrary ... I guess we
> DO have a different problem here ...
>
>
You bet we have a different problem here, it's in the simple fact thet
you've never run in a dx contest so you've never used the spots system
in a dx contest, therefore you don't have clue one on a hands-on
basis. But you still know all about it of course. Lenny East plus a
lite license.
>
>

> > jump past the mic circuitry for one and should reduce the number of
> > tries before a handshake happens so given some time those radios
> > oughta goose up the throughputs and fix the problem.
>
>
> That's basically a "kludge" into a radio that was designed
> for voice ... it's still a "narrowband FM" radio and the "data
> ports" don't change that ... they simply bypass some of the
> bandlimiting in the voice audio path and allow (sort of) rates
> up to 9600 bps ... YMMV, depending on which radio.
>
>
Absolutely, not even a discussion.
>
>
> Again ... bandaids on the voice radio/TNC paradigm are NOT
> the answer for the future datacomm needs of the ARS ...
>
>
I didn't say it was any "paradigm for the future of the ARS". It's
straight-up late 70s stuff implemented to take advantage of early
desktop computers and it hasn't budged very far away from that
"paradigm" since. I essentially said that the newer 2m FM mobile rigs
with data ports are an enroute "band-aid" for the current 2m dx spots
system. Period. Which system is only one weenie little very
specialized corner of ham radio. We don't generally consider packet to
be "real ham comms", it's just an old taken-for-granted utility sorta
no brainer no-counter thing. Jesus Carl, get yer blood pressure down
before you explode.
>
>
> what's
> needed are radio modems, purpose-designed for transmitting
> and receiving data (well).

>
>
I'll vote for that. And they are out there. We have ONE quasi-9600bps
70cm link in the whole NE corridor spots system. It does not run at
"9600", not even close and those modems are expensive, too expansive
for Joe the dxers to be bothered with, they'd all rather endure a
system crash once in awhile than pop for retooling the whole system.
'Nother lesson in reality.
>
>
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

4008. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 03:04:53 UTC
From: Bob <kilo5107@flashmail.com>
Message-ID: <prl98.30774$3E5.2145911@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33569

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C65D660.E31F34AD@worldnet.att.net...
> The main thing that protects K1MAN is that W1AW does the
> same thing. As to the tape recording, those being
> interviewed by K1MAN know that they are going on the air.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

There's just a few other aspects about K1MAN's
operation that need to be known Clay;

1) K1MAN is not a legitmate bulletin station per-se.
He may say he is, but until he produces a Notarized
Charter or Mission Statement. ARRL on the other hand
can produce legal, court admissible documents which
can attest to their status as a Legal, non-profit, N.G.O.

2) Try telephoning his number sometime. At *no point* in the
recording did I hear any verbal indication that any
and/or all callers comments are subject to airtime.
It's just an answering machine with the usual "leave a message"
greeting.

4009. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 03:17:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a44otsdip1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33570

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C66B4C8.70CEFDEF@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020206181510.12301.00001465@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > > If what he said is an accurate view of how the FCC views Amateur
Radio, it
> > is
> > > probably time for Amateur Radio to make more contributions to the
state of
> > the
> > > radio art.
> > >
> > I think it does, to the extent it can. Does the Part 15 Radio Service
> > advance the state of the art, or do companys do it? Hams are at least
as
> > involved in radio development as any other demographic. Don't you
think?
>
> Jim it's the same old tired refrain that eminates from the Techies,
ranging
> from Dale Hatfield on down to the lowly Carl Stevenson. They just can't
> understand that ham radio has always been about doing things within it
that the
> participants find a personal interest in doing. That pool of participants
has
> always -and hopefully will always, the likes of W5TIT aside- contain that
same
> percentage of persons licensed as hams who have as a primary interest, the
> search for new and better ways to do things.

And what would that percentage have been (IYHO) back in the
50's, 60's, 70's, etc.?

> I submit that such an attitude as demonstrated by Ed's posts does more to
slow
> the very phonomena he professes to promote than it does to actually
promote it.
> Absolute assholes like Stevenson damage it severely. People get fed up
with such
> nonsense. There WILL BE NO large percentage of hams who do research on the
> leading edge of communications, just as there has never been.

I agree...so what's your expectation then regarding the percentage
of hams who have as a primary interest, the search
for new and better ways to do things?

> That research is
> mostly done by hams who are also employed in the same field that results
in
> their leading edge innovations that affect ham radio. Most of us eagerly
use the
> product of that research to improve our stations and abilities.

For example?

I'd venture most of such new product ends up in the latest
Icom/Kenwood/Yasea
box for most hams.

> I have not seen
> that change at all in over 45 years as a licensed ham.
> Most ordinary hams (save the Kim , W5TIT type which unfortunately is the
> fastest growing segment of ham radio operators due to easy licensing

And you know this based on what?

> - her
> description of the process, not just mine, tho I saw it up close and
personal co
> ntinuously during the years I served as a VE)- most hams are innovators
who can
> take the output of the techies, experiment with and adapt it, and use it
to full
> advantage in their daily activities within ham radio, as so many are now
doing.
> That's the way it has always been, and the way it will be until the ARS is
> overwhelmed with W5TIT's.

If all of ham radio was populated with people like Kim who
have spent considerable time engaged in emergency
operations support (Races, etc.), why would that be a bad thing?

> Ed -among many others who have jumped onto that sinking ship- should be
ashamed
> of himself for spreading so much absolutely WRONG information about our
service.

What wrong information has Ed spread?

> It is simply incorrect, save, of course, the many and growing number of
W5TIT's
> among us. That attitude is far more destructive than any other I see
today,
> except again, the "I just want my license to talk and am not in the least
> interested in anything whatever that is in any way technical" attitude
exhibited

> by, again, W5TIT.

Same old, same old.

> We're still waiting for Stevenson to relate what digital modes he use to
work
> those 70 DX countries when he finally, after a lifetime of moaning about
his
> fate, reached full HF access. I suspect we'll be waiting a long time.
> He's as phony as a fourteen dollar bill, for he cast aside all that
digital
> dogma in favor of stuffing a microphone in his face. I for one am not the
least
> bit surprised.

More same old, same old.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4010. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 04:20:35 UTC
From: n7ws@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c65f39a.17201995@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 33571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 11:55:33 +1000, "Adam MAURER" <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM>
wrote:

|Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
|DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
|request for a good ol QSL card.

Nah. They'll just require a "donation" via Paypal before your call shows up on
eQSL's "service."

Just think... you not only need a rig and antenna, you'll need Mastercard too
<g>.

I think I'll stick to green stamps and mail. I like getting 'real' QSLs and I
give the incoming DX stamps to the neighbor girl for her collection.

Wes N7WS

4011. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 04:24:19 UTC
From: "Randal T. Flegenschweiter" <rtf@flegenschweiterindustriesinc.org>
Message-ID: <a44sg9$9si$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33572

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >
> It has long been established that an operator at any class of
> station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
> station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
No, your reading of that is incorrect. No such long
established past practice existed, now or then. Apnea is a
common condition and was recognized when the regulation
was written.

Best Wishes,

Randal

4012. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 04:27:36 UTC
From: "Randal T. Flegenschweiter" <rtf@flegenschweiterindustriesinc.org>
Message-ID: <a44smd$a7b$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33573

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message > >
> That's the way the FCC interpreted it when I was at the agency.
> > Don't look for problems when they do not exist.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

No no no, that's not true at all! The agency can't interpret it.
Preventative maintenance has always been a recognized procedure
to prevent problems, even when they don't exist. As I always
tell my students, vigilance vigilance vigelance, it pays!

Best Wishes,

Randal

4013. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 04:36:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020209233656.05154.00002002@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33574

In article <20020209083242.26473.00000347@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Was this <tube SSB transceiver>

I wrote "exciter". It was not a transceiver. Heterodyne transceivers came a little
later.

>> an "advance in the state of the art"?
>>Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
>>for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity,
>>economy and adapting of old parts to new uses.
>
>SSB was the radio art of the day.

Actually, it was quite "old radio technology" by 1950.

AT&T's LF transatlantic
telephone system was SSB from its very start in the 1920s (antenna bandwidth at 55 kHz, among other things). Some hams were on the air with SSB in the early 1930s (W6DEI and others). Commercial HF SSB was being used for telephone service in the 1930s also.

W1JEO's exciter was used MOBILE, by the way. I don't know if any other service was running mobile SSB in 1950 - I don't think so. Almost a decade later,
manufacturers like Collins offered hams "mobile SSB transceivers" like the KWM-1.

My point in mentioning that exciter was not to claim that hams invented SSB but simply to point out that the advances were in the form of simplification and
economy. I don't think any commercial outfit or manufacturer had a mobile HF SSB exciter using only 4 tubes - at least not in 1950.

>What similar advances in simplicity and
>economy have hams done to the state of today's radio art?
>
Well, there's APRS, and PSK31, and satellite communications with relatively simple gear, to name just a few. Last year, if I recall correctly, there was a 24
GHz amateur EME QSO using relatively low power (well under 100 W) and small dishes. (2 meter diameter?).

That's just the stuff I can think of right away. There's lots more, of course.

Back in those days there was a regular column in QST called "On The Air With Single Sideband", too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4014. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 05:24:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C674804.8EFC517B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33575

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Sat, 09 Feb 2002 02:44:05 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > You're right. FCC doesn't spell out what the control operator has to do in
> >detail, he may well be allowing a non-ham to operate who is as familiar with
> >radio as he is, but doesn't have a license. But it's the control operator
> >who is responsible. If the ship hits the sand he is where the buck stops. If
> >he's comfortable with going to sleep while his third party operates under
> >his license that's his business, but he catches any and all flak.
>
> It has long been established that an operator at any class of
> station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
> station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.

Yea, Phil, but who's going to know as long as the Third Party doesn't screw up?
:-)

I know, they looked at a case like that not long ago.

4015. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 05:34:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C674A35.B1246BC8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33576

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of course that would depend on the spectral power density, wouldn't it? The stuff
> > I see has far too much of that to coexist with anything, it blanks out normal
> > activity on the band. It is strong enough to wipe out weak PSK and other amateur
> > signals.
> > I know, it's not "conventional" spread spectrum such as is being discussed here.
> > I have no idea what it is or where it comes from, ...
>
> Methinks you might have discovered a solar flare, Dick.

With that rise and decay time.....I sure didn't think so. Ol Sol surely doesn't turn them on and off that fast.

4016. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 05:37:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C674AE8.D81095D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33577

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> It could also be UWB. Here is another techie system that
> has purpose and utility in the ether world. It is a good
> way to communicate to minimize those pilotless
> hunter-killers getting a fix and sending a hellfire missle
> down your antenna.

Yeah, we know there's a LOT of comm systems out there that we haven't been told about. I suspect it may be something like that.

4017. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 05:43:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C674C42.C4DCFD97@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33578

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > I am personally incapable of convincing any amateur radio newcomer
> > > > to choose to learn Morse code.
> > >
> > > I believe that to be true presently but a change in attitude would
> > > turn things around. You would attract a lot more flies with honey
> > > rather than vinegar.
> >
> > That was the attitude I brought first to rrap and for my trouble I was
> > immediately set upon by the codehating jackals as the primary reason for
> > their personal failures.
>
> If I remember right, what you brought to rrap was, "CW gets through when
> no other mode will." But it doesn't on 10m at night at the low of the
> sunspot cycle. I believe if you had uttered reality based statements,
> instead of PCTA bromides, nobody would have jumped on you.

You may be right. From long experience I knew that CW would indeed be able to get through after all the other modes commonly in use -you know, (and knew then) SSB, AM, FM etc. have faded into the noise. I know that from doing it with CW, not from some "bromide" I swallowed. I guess that can't mean anything to those who can't have had that experience. But it wasn't that fact, it was the response of those who simply refused to accept things as they are and instead substituted their own "bromides".

4018. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 06:09:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grar7f7.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33579

On Sat, 9 Feb 2002 23:24:19 -0500, Randal T. Flegenschweiter wrote:

>> It has long been established that an operator at any class of
>> station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
>> station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.
>>
> No, your reading of that is incorrect. No such long
>established past practice existed, now or then. Apnea is a
>common condition and was recognized when the regulation
>was written.
>
My "reading" --- you are certainly making the jests, senor.

When I was routinely inspecting mountaintop TV transmitters which
were required to have an operator on duty at the transmitter in
those days, within a two year period I caught three operators
asleep, and heard much better excuses than that. Alas, it did them
no good and I cited both the station and the operator for the
violation.

>> That's the way the FCC interpreted it when I was at the agency.
>> Don't look for problems when they do not exist.>

> No no no, that's not true at all! The agency can't interpret it.
>Preventative maintenance has always been a recognized procedure
>to prevent problems, even when they don't exist. As I always
>tell my students, vigilance vigilance vigelance, it pays!

Sick......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4019. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 07:26:29 UTC
From: mike II <ohmwork@spots.ca>
Message-ID: <3C6620A5.E8520796@spots.ca>
Source record: 33580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:

> WHOOPS!!! That should've been on six meters...must've left the wrong
> crystals in :)

Crystals? Are they like family jewels?

mike II

--

__ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
/ /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /
/ /\ \/ /\ \/ohmwork@spots.ab.ca/\ \/ /\ \/ /
/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/

4020. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 09:03:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202100103.18b76e02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33581

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020206182230.12301.00001469@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >I listen around the frequency. If I don't hear somebody who can hear
> >me I've only screwed up a few Khz of the band with a narrow mode. If
> >Carl's system screws up similarly it has the obvious potential for
> >having a negative impact on many more frequencies (qsos in
> >progress)than I do.
>
> Is that not offset by the fact that the spread spectrum system puts less energy
> into any given narrowband channel than you do when you operate narrow band at
> the same power level?
>
>
No. I can tune less than 5 kHz away from an s9+20 ssb signal on 20 and
all traces of that signal are gone. It's the "gone" that matters, not
just 30db down, GONE or he's no better than some dork shipping key
clicks. An offense for which you can get cited.
>
>
> For the 20 MHz SS devices being discussed here, the
> ratio is 30 dB for SSB bandwidths.
>
>
How wide is an SS signal and how many individual SS "non-colliding"
qsos in progress does it take for SS to occupy the entire 20m band?
>
>
> >Were you on 20 when the Soviets were experimenting with HF
> >over-the-horizon radar Ed?
>
> Yes, I was. As I recall, they occupied about 10 kHz of spectrum, found for
> minutes at a time on different parts of the band.
>
>
They continuously swept huge chunks of spectrum space around 20m for
hours on end. Conjurs up visions of Carl gone berserk . . .
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

w3rv

4021. Re: suggestions for 6m ssb, and 2m ssb rigs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 10:06:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202100206.a07a041@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33582

arcweb@bnnorth.net (REACT of Henry County / Henry County Chapter American Red Cross) wrote in message news:<3c658723.3451779@news.bright.net>...
> I took, and passed my technicians license exam this morning,
>
>
Good show - Welcome aboard!
>
>
> and now I
> am ready to shop for a decent rig or two, So far most of the mobile
> rigs I have seen do not have SSB. I have a HT I was given for a x-mas
> gift, and am looking now for a rig for my vehicle, and for my home.
>
> Any advice would be most welcome.
>
>
This is a shot in the dark but it looks like your primary interest is emergency comms. SSB in the vhf/uhf bands is generally used for weak-signal dxing on those bands, not for emergency work. I don't know of any organized emergency comms around here which use six meters at all. Most emergency comms and recreational yakfests are carried out with FM on 2m.
>
>
But to specifically answer your question on the home station side of the coin there are at least two multimode rigs out there which will operate ssb on both six and 2m. On the high end there is the Kenwood TS-2000X which provides the ability to run cw, ssb, am, fsk (data) and FM voice & data in the HF, 6, 2, 70cm and 23cm ham bands. It can get you on 10m with a Tech license plus it's a good swl rcvr. For over $2,000.
>
>
A much less expensive possible solution for getting on both ssb and FM on both six and two meters is the $700 20w Ten-Tec 6N2 which can be used to run cw, ssb and FM.
>
>
But for a couple hundred more bucks the Icom 706 does it all as Cecil indicated and with decent power output on six and two meters. If I was a Tech and not particularly interested in weak signal ssb work on the vhf/uhf bands I think my choice would be one 706 for the vehicle and another one for the home station.
>

>
One of the best websites for easy access to good descriptions of just
about all the mainstream ham equipement out there is the Universal
Radio site.
>
>
http://www.universal-radio.com/
>
>
> Keith Hosman
>
>
w3rv

4022. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 11:26:32 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <INs98.4282$421.359408@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33583

Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in
news:3C65D660.E31F34AD@worldnet.att.net:

> The main thing that protects K1MAN is that W1AW does the
> same thing.

... except that W1AW does not do the same thing. W1AW doesn't have a talk show. W1AW has a control operator present at the control point. W1AW doesn't send out "Felony Complaint Affadavits" to hams who complain about its transmissions.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4023. Repeater Jammer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 11:55:02 UTC
From: Sabrina_Frederick@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <23e8cbcf.0202100355.54e3ef6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33584

Does anyone remember who was jamming the Cornelia, GA repeater about a year ago? We seem to be having the same problem again and for the life of me I can't find my notes on who it was. I recall someone actually DF'd him and put his name out for everyone. I'm pretty sure it was a KE4 call but I'm not sure. Anyone help? Please post either to the group or send me an email.

4024. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 11:55:38 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210065538.18261.00000463@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33585

>But the big A might have a point on this one. It's
>an AM only rig.

Gadzooks, AM only...ugh! I stand humbly corrected.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4025. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 11:57:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210065732.18938.00000345@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33586

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>SSB was the radio art of the day.

>Actually, it was quite "old radio technology" by 1950.

What voice mode had replaced it in widespread use by 1950?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4026. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 11:59:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210065945.18938.00000346@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33587

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>You're a current-tech
>iteration of Cervante's Don Quixote is what you are good buddy. Go for
>it, oughta be entertaining as hell.

Yeah, we don't need no steenking new modes in ham radio!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4027. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 12:00:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210070058.18938.00000347@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33588

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can
>coexist
>> with narrowband operation.

>Is this the conclusion of your "future modes and future
>deployments" committee?

What ARE you babbling about? I don't have a future deployments committee. My
wife won't let me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4028. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 12:02:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210070218.18938.00000348@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33589

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can
>coexist
>> with narrowband operation.

>Is this the conclusion of your "future modes and future
>deployments" committee?

Oh, I get it now, you thought that I was making an ARRL policy announcement in
a thread on rec.radio.amateur.policy.

That was a pretty illogical conclusion for you to reach.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4029. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 12:05:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210070510.18938.00000349@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33590

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> If this is really detectable only with a spectral display, then it can
>coexist
>> with narrowband operation.

>Is this the conclusion of your "future modes and future
>deployments" committee?

And, to address the technical aspect of your "conclusion," I would say that if one cannot hear a signal but can only see it on a spectral display, then it could co-exist with narrowband operation, wouldn't'cha say, Clay?

Of course, the original premise was flawed -- a signal that can be seen on the crude spectrum analyzer he was using WOULD be audible, but that subtle point seemed to have eluded you. Of course, that wasn't said by someone you feel represents ARRL policy, so you wouldn't have attacked it anyway. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
Speaking personally, of course, for the benefit of those who are easily confused -- or want to be easily confused...

4030. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 12:16:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210071641.18938.00000350@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33591

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
>> existance.

> So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
>strive
>to become a digital-mode designer?

I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible interpretation
of everything said to you.

It sure makes rational conversation difficult. Can you try to be a bit more
reasoned?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4031. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 14:09:54 UTC
From: "Randal T. Flegenschweiter" <rtf@flegenschzweiterindustrieincnet.org>
Message-ID: <a45ur3fis0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33592

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> >> It has long been established that an operator at any class of
> >> station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
> >> station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.
> >>
> My "reading" --- you are certainly making the jests, senor.
>
No No, you still not get point and to jest is not necessary.
The mountaintop TV transmitter can jest self, so, you still are
reading regulation incorrectly!

> When I was routinely inspecting mountaintop TV transmitters which
> were required to have an operator on duty at the transmitter in
> those days, within a two year period I caught three operators
> asleep, and heard much better excuses than that. Alas, it did them
> no good and I cited both the station and the operator for the
> violation.

You climb mountaintop I think you frustrated with not
understanding rule & regulation and you cannot catch people sleep
as they already in imobile horizontal postion. You really need to
study your regulations better before you try to make statement about
them!

> Sick......

As I tell you before, if operator sick then that mean regulation is
Ok. You are still reading regulation wrong, not interpreting it
correctly and then you make crazy statement all wrong. I always tell
my students to research very carefully before making statement about
rule & regulation. You make wild incorrect statement!

Best Wishes,

Randall

4032. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 15:19:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c66914c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33594

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020210071641.18938.00000350@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
> >> existance.
>
> > So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
> >strive
> >to become a digital-mode designer?
>
> I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible
interpretation
> of everything said to you.
>
> It sure makes rational conversation difficult. Can you try to be a bit
more
> reasoned?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

ppppppfffffttttttttttt. Don't think that's gonna happen any time soon. Dick seems to have lost all reasoning ability. He's replaced it with being rabid.

Kim W5TIT

4033. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 15:21:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6691a3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33595

heh heh heh, I gotta see this.... go for it, Phil! ;)

Kim W5TIT

"Randal T. Flegenschweiter" <rtf@flegenschzweiterindustrieincnet.org> wrote
in message news:a45ur3fis0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> > >> It has long been established that an operator at any class of
> > >> station in any service who is asleep is not in control of that
> > >> station, regardless of where the sleep is taking place.
> > >>
> > My "reading" --- you are certainly making the jests, senor.
> >
> No No, you still not get point and to jest is not necessary.
> The mountaintop TV transmitter can jest self, so, you still are
> reading regulation incorrectly!
>
> > When I was routinely inspecting mountaintop TV transmitters which
> > were required to have an operator on duty at the transmitter in
> > those days, within a two year period I caught three operators
> > asleep, and heard much better excuses than that. Alas, it did them
> > no good and I cited both the station and the operator for the
> > violation.
>
> You climb mountaintop I think you frustrated with not
> understanding rule & regulation and you cannot catch people sleep
> as they already in imobile horizontal postion. You really need to
> study your regulations better before you try to make statement about
> them!
>
> > Sick......
>
> As I tell you before, if operator sick then that mean regulation is
> Ok. You are still reading regulation wrong, not interpreting it
> correctly and then you make crazy statement all wrong. I always tell
> my students to research very carefully before making statement about
> rule & regulation. You make wild incorrect statement!
>
>
> Best Wishes,
>
> Randall
>
>

4034. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 15:31:14 UTC
From: Hamaholic <middlefinger4@home.coma>
Message-ID: <6nw98.36282$X64.12632301@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 33593

Bert, In your zeal to prove Aaron wrong you jumped the gun, so who are all the guys using these rigs on 10 and 12 the freebanders? Surely they are not hams are they?

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020210065538.18261.00000463@mb-bk.news.cs.com...
> >But the big A might have a point on this one. It's
> >an AM only rig.
>
> Gadzooks, AM only...ugh! I stand humbly corrected.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

4035. Re: suggestions for 6m ssb, and 2m ssb rigs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 16:02:09 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c669843.2903535@news.bright.net>
Source record: 33596

Thanks to everyone who has offered advice. While I am into emergency comms, I am also a radio hobbyist. I started out on CB and fell in love with working SSB, I am also very interested in low power work, I know most QRP is done in CW thats one thing thats pushing me to go with lewarning code and getting my general ticket, that and as has been pointed out, code will punch through when nothing else will.

Keith Hosman
Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4036. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 16:36:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210113648.06877.00002263@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 33597

In article <a42e4roka1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020208202503.07935.00000881@mb-mw.aol.com...
>> In article <pan.2002.02.04.18.26.20.84125.7005@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>> > I'll rephrase the
>> >question. Do you think the FCC feels that amateurs should be making
>> >contributions to the state of the art that have applicability to radio
>> >services other than the ARS?
>>
>> Sure - they'd like it if hams would invent something new.
>
>I think also, that the FCC has also had hopes that amateur radio
>can be a stepping stone for youth towards becoming engineering
>proffesionals, etc.

That's what happened to me ;-)

At first I thought that Bill's statement couldbe lumped under "education",
but now I see that it stands on its own.

I would add that the stepping stone doesn't have to be into radio engineering,
either. Or even EE in general.
>
>> But, realistically, how many cutting-edge advances are amateurs who are
>not
>> RF engineering professionals going to make in their basement workshops? A
>> few, sure. But most of the advances are going to be in the form of
>education,
>> adaptation, practicality, and simplification.
>
>That, unfortunately, is more a function of the significant advances
>in technology itself, microchips, etc. Thosse advances make "basement"
>development somewhat difficult in many areas.

Exactly! The advances are more in the application area.
>
>> Just a few minutes ago I was reading about the W1JEO SSB exciter. (QST,
>> November, 1950). Used surplus FT-241-A crystals and about 4 tubes to put a
>> few watts of SSB on 75 meters. Was this an "advance in the state of the
>art"?
>> Not in terms of doing something radically new, because SSB had been around
>> for more than 20 years by then. The advance was in the simplicity, economy
>> and adapting of old parts to new uses.

>
>Remember too, that was during a time when the typical receiver of
>any consequence was probably the dollar equivalent of well over $500
>in today;s dollars.

It wasn't a receiver. Just a low-power transmitter. W1JEO actually used it
mobile, feeding a pair of 807s in the trunk.

The cost factor is an important one. On the one hand, modified surplus and
homebrew gear could get a ham on the air for a few bucks. Manufactured
receivers started at around $50 and a decent new rx was in the $150-200
range. Inflate those numbers to today's prices and $500 is about right. Just
for
a receiver!

>Many "do-it-yourself" articles then were targeted
>at inexpensive way to get on the air...in terms of typical incomes
>of the 50's.

However, the economy of building one's own back then was driven mainly by the
availability of parts at less-than-net prices, and the elimination of the
hand-wiring
labor cost. In many cases a manufacturer could make a piece of ham gear
cheaper than it could be homebrewed with all new parts.

Kit rigs appeared in a big way in the early '50s and proved the point
decisively.

>> I think part of what the FCC is trying to say is that if hams limit
>themselves
>> to
>> using only manufactured ham gear, they are not doing the ARS any good. The
>> FCC can't come right out and say we shouldn't be "appliance operators"
>because
>> it would tick off "Yaecomwood" enormously. But the point is the same: new
>modes
>> and methods do NOT come about by using only off-the-shelf
>made-for-ham-radio
>> hardware and software.
>
>I disagree.

I don't understand. The FCC wants us to use appliances on the air?

>The issue is more the need to focus on where the more likly
>areas are that "home experimentation" can truly lead to something new.

Which is where?

>Repackaging old parts when there's a host of inexpensive, quality
>commercial gear available isn't likly to result in any real new
>advances (IMHO). More likly advances can be done in software
>for equipment too.

But most hams aren't going to start at the cutting edge, or anywhere near it.
Most
will start with something basic and work up to more advanced stuff. What's
needed are projects at ALL levels.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4037. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 16:40:52 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210114052.12742.00000278@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33598

>Bert, In your zeal to prove Aaron wrong you jumped the gun, so who are all
>the guys using these rigs on 10 and 12 the freebanders? Surely they are not
>hams are they?

Hi George,

Yeah, I did kinda jump the gun. I do use a President Lincoln (Uniden HR-2510)
with a Ten-Tec transverter for 2m SSB. I'm also using an AR-3500 as my interim
10m rig until the FT-840 finds its way out of the carton and into the shack
this spring. Take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4038. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 18:37:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210133701.16311.00000933@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 33599

In article <3C656799.FCB5E571@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> >
>> > >A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
>> >
>> > Amateur spread spectrum is not permitted on 20 meters.
>>
>> Not yet.
>
>Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
>offer much of an advantage?

Depends on hoe you define "advantage".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4039. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 18:37:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210133701.16311.00000932@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 33600

In article <3c644b51_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0202071356.39cf73bd@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c61b98b_1@news7.fast.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20020205133725.20370.00001467@mb-mb.aol.com...
>> > > Either way it's a bigger mess than narrowband modes.
>> >
>> > I would submit that that's a prejudiced view not based in
>> > technical fact.
>>
>> I submit that it's an accurate description of the situation which
>> you object to emotionally because of the word "mess" being used.
>
>No, I maintain that it's a prejudiced view not based in technical
>fact.

But you don't say WHY.

>> > > >> However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
>> > > >> without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed
>digital
>> > > >> systems should detect the energy of other users, at
>reasonable
>> > > >> levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting
>if
>> > > >> the channel is occupied by another user.
>> > >
>> > > Nice idea but in the real world it's another story.
>> >
>> > In "the real world" it's a reality ...
>>
>> You misunderstand.
>>
>> > read about CSMA-CA.
>> > Look up how it works in 802.11b and read what the CCA bit
>> > is for ...
>>
>> A 2.4 GHz DSSS wireless LAN is not the same thing as 20 meters.
>
>I don't recall implying that there was necessarily a direct
>relationship, though some techniques could transcend band

>choice.

I recall exchanges where you discussed putting SS on amateur HF and VHF
over top of existing users, but discounted the idea that narrowband users would
be adversely affected. In other posts you expounded the opinion that if they
were adversely affected they should simply abandon those old "legacy modes".
>
>Furthermore, the discussion in this thread for MANY days has
>been focused on 2.4 GHz and the applicability (or not) of
>modern technologies (such as, but not necessarily limited to)
>802.11b to ham radio ...
>
It hasn't been specifically limited there, though.

Let me make it clear that I am all FOR amateurs making more use of their
alloctaions, particularly the ones like 2.4 GHz that are currently far
underused
by hams. I think an amateur DSSS network on 2.4 GHz, probably based on
802.11b would be a GREAT thing - a giant leap over current packet stuff.

>Having said that, many of the underlying principles, like CSMA-CA
>or others, that are used in "real world" communications systems
>could be applied to amateur digital systems in the HF bands as well.

Maybe. The devil is in the details. For example:

One of my current HF transceivers is rated to have a 20 kHz blocking dynamic
range of 136 dB on 20 meters. In plain language that means I can be working
an S1 station while a local who is pounding in more than 60 dB over S9 is just
20 kHz away. Its 5 kHz BDR is almost as good, btw.

In practice this means that co-channel interference from strong signals is only
a
problem within a very few kHz, or when the strong signal gets REALLY strong.
(0dBm
neighborhood). The S9+40dB local a few kHz away simply doesn't cause a problem.

Suppose that S9+40 dB local is running 100 W of SSB and his signal is 2 kHz
wide. He's putting
50 watts per kHz into the ether, IOW. Suppose he switches to an SS mode that
spreads those
100 watts evenly over 200 kHz of 20 meters. Now the power density is down to
0.5 watt per kHz -
20 dB below what it was before.

But to a narrowband receiver, what has happened is that a single S9+40 dB
signal that used up a few kHz
of the band changed into an S9 +20 dB noise level over 200 kHz of the band.

Even if the SS station reduces power to 1 watt (20 dB reduction), the result is
a noise level of S9 for
anyone who previously experienced that station as S9+40 dB when narrowband.

Yes, this is a simplified example, but the PRINCIPLE is the same.

>
>WADR ..

I have no idea what "WADR" means. Explain?

>.any lack of understanding .. or simple lack of acceptance ...

I have neither of those lacks.

>on your part does not automatically negate the applicability of any
>(set of) potential technical solutions to ham radio ...

Never said it did. You misunderstood, that's all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

4040. Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 18:58:07 UTC
From: GR <greinsch@charter.net>
Message-ID: <u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33651

What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?

Will I have to take the CW again?

Gary
KC5WSR

4041. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:43:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210144324.16072.00001030@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33652

In article <3C5DC935.A1AA32A0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Bert Craig wrote:
>> Should Juan's vote count any less that John's despite the fact that John
>was
>> born in the USA 50 yrs. ago and Juan was naturalized last year?
>
>Should Juan's vote and John's vote count any less than yours? The FCC
>must consider what is best for the country, not what is best for the
>members of the ARS.

And they do that by allowing anyone interested to "vote" in the form of comments. Anyone can comment on any NPRM, no license needed. In fact I don't think one needs to even be a citizen.

>
>> The anti-code folks might have a point if they needed 20-wpm for HF
>> privies, but 5-wpm? C'mon Cecil.
>
>I'm perfectly satisfied with the present requirements, Bert. My
>satisfaction and two bucks will get me a decent cup of coffee.

>The question is: Will the FCC be satisfied with the present
>requirements when and if S25.5 is repealed?

The answer should be obvious: The FCC will drop Element 1 like a hot potato ASAP. IOW, as soon as S25.5 goes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4042. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:43:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33653

In article <a42c1hrdo1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
>> >a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
>> >meaningful code testing level.
>>
>> I disagree.
>>
>> It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long
>before
>> the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
>> reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the majority
>> opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have
>changed
>> their mind? Nope.
>
>Guess I missed the vote to establish "the majority opinion".
>When and how was it taken?

An NCI member read the comments and categorized them. Results
were posted here. The majority clearly wanted at least two test speeds.

That means most commenters were not only FOR code testing, they were
FOR more than the bare minimum 5 wpm.

FCC decided not to go with the majority, that's all.

>> FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.
>
>Pretty slow progress for the entity that has always had the final
>say in such matters.

Not really. Only took them 15 years from first proposing the idea to
reality.

Here's one for the alternate-history buffs:

In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on 220).

But
another reason was to put a service intended to be for local communication on VHF instead of HF.

Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.

One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack, such as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4043. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:43:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210144326.16072.00001032@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33656

In article <20020209003332.07648.00000022@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:

>>>A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
>>>a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
>>>meaningful code testing level.
>>
>>I disagree.
>>
>>It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long before
>>the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
>>reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the majority
>>opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have changed
>>their mind? Nope.
>
>Jim:
>
>I respectfully disagree with your disagreement, and your self-answered
>question. I believe that if FISTS had organized the same type of campaign
>against a significant reduction of code testing requirements, that the FCC
>would have had no choice but to pay attention to their position on the
>matter. If double the number of comments had been received by the FCC,
>the clear majority in favor of either the status quo in code testing, or a
>workable compromise (like 12-13 WPM), then the FCC would have been
>very hard pressed to act against such overwhelming advocacy.

As it was, the majority (57%) favored at least two code test speeds, according
to
a tabulation of comments by an NCI member who read all the comments and
categorized them. His honesty in presenting the data even when it clearly
showed
the nocodetest/minimum code test position to be a minority one is to be
commended.
>

>>FISTS wisely stayed out of the fracas, knowing that taking a political
>>position would only divide their membership.
>
>Why should that be? FISTS is called "The International Morse
>Preservation Society." What do those words mean?

It means we work to keep the mode alive and healthy, with or without tests.

>That we'll keep
>Morse code alive as long as there are a bunch of withered old codgers
>around, exchanging numbers on the air in run-together CW using
>mal-adjusted bugs, or that we'll support the retention of Morse code
>proficiency in the ARS through continuation of code testing as a
>requirement for maximum HF operating privileges? Remember,
>many workable compromises were totally ignored -- including the
>removal of the code testing burden from the FCC by having the ARRL
>do all the test scoring, record keeping, and updating of the amateur
>licensee database.

Yup - but the FCC doesn't care about that. They have other fish to fry.

Consider the medical waiver thing. FCC has to handle all of those because who
got a medical waiver is NOT in the public database. FCC just wanted out of it.
>
>>Note that FISTS and the ARRL
>>did encourage all to express their opinions direct to the FCC.
>
>Well, that was mighty nice of them to encourage us to do something
>we all had the right to do anyway.

But did we do it? I know you did (very well, I might add) and so did I, but
where
was everyone else?
>
>>FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.
>
>And it seems as though they'll soon get their wish. However, as a
>person interested in the "preservation" of the Morse code, and a
>FISTS member, I would have preferred it if more of an effort had
>been made to get the FISTS organization to live up to it's title.

Doing so would have opened up a whole can of worms best avoided.

--

I think there's another motive that the FCC is acting on. One of their
biggest problems is pirate stations - bootleggers, freebanders, whatever.
FCC figures that the code test is what keeps a lot of these folks out of
ham radio, so by eliminating it and simplifying the writtens there will
be more hams and fewer pirates.

Remember that it's much easier to do enforcement action against a
licensee than against a totally unlicensed person. You know where the
licensee is and who he/she is, for one thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4044. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:43:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210144327.16072.00001034@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33654

In article <20020210065732.18938.00000345@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>SSB was the radio art of the day.
>
>>Actually, it was quite "old radio technology" by 1950.
>
>What voice mode had replaced it in widespread use by 1950?
>
In what service?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4045. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:43:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210144327.16072.00001033@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33655

In article <a42dq3$kj5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020206204108.13187.00000917@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3C5DC5E3.81589F1D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Bert Craig wrote:
>> >> I respect your views and generally hold your words in high esteem...but
>do
>> >> you really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up
>> >> hating the code, I
>> >> like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of
>love,"
>> >> hence work.
>> >
>> >The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental requirement.
>>
>> Sure it does.
>
>On what basis should ANY government requirement be based
>on the concept of "labor of love?"

Since the whole service is based on "love of radio", it's logical that the
requirements should have some connection to it.
>
>> >The test is about qualifications, not about love.
>>
>> The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
>> an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
>> about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.
>> Just check your dictionary, Cecil.
>
>Good grief, not another dictionary exercise.

Why not? Is there a double standard where some people get to haul out
Webster's but I don't?

>Regardless, the ability to "test" for such love on its
>own is NOT and should NOT be part of the requirements.

Should folks who have no love of radio be licensed to use a service that
is fundamentally based on love of radio? I think not.
>
>> >The FCC has decided

>> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
>>
>> Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is S25.5.
>
>Agreed...and when the FCC first introduced the Novice at 5 wpm
>some 50 years ago, they had at that time determined 5 wpm
>met the treaty requirement.

More importantly, it was NEVER challenged.

For the first 25 or so years of its existence the Novice was a short-term one-shot
"learner's permit" that was not intended to be a permanent license. The real proof
of Bill's claim is the Technician, which was also introduced in 1951.

>> >If S25.5 is repealed, the FCC will have to decide if an amateur
>> >radio operator is qualified without Morse code.
>>
>> Read the R&O to 98-143. They've already decided. By the look of things,
>> they decided long ago.
>
>Agree again.

I would say that the defining moment was in 1975, when the FCC (not hams or would-be hams) proposed a nocodetest ham license. The fact that the FCC would suggest such a thing on their own initiative indicates they had already decided

what the future path would be. 1983, 1990 and 1991 only reinforced that path.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4046. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 19:56:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mfA98.6865$9%6.1244123@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33657

"GR" <greinsch@charter.net> wrote in message
news:u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com...
> What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?
>
> Will I have to take the CW again?
>
> Gary
> KC5WSR
>
>

1. You will have to prove that you have a Plus, they are renewed as Techs so photocopy the old license. This will give you code credit. You are and will be on the data base as a plus until 2006.

2. Depending on when you got it, you may or may not have to take Element 3. If you had it from the days when Techs took the same Element 3 as the General, you need only do the paperwork. From the callsign, I doubt this is the case so plan on two writtens.

3. Sample exams at http://www.qrz.com or get the whole verstunken question pool from http://www.arrl.org

4. Bring your old license and a photocopy, a picture identification, and your checkbook.

You might want to check with the local VEs but in the Cities area, you should have exams on a weekly basis.

Dick NBK

3. While you are at it, take Element 4.

4047. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 20:49:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202102050110.32350-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33658

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>"GR" <greinsch@charter.net> wrote in message
>news:u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com...
>> What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?
>>
>> Will I have to take the CW again?
>>
>> Gary
>> KC5WSR
>>
>>
>
>1. You will have to prove that you have a Plus, they are renewed as Techs
>so photocopy the old license. This will give you code credit. You are
>and will be on the data base as a plus until 2006.
>
>2. Depending on when you got it, you may or may not have to take Element
>3. If you had it from the days when Techs took the same Element 3 as the
>General, you need only do the paperwork. From the callsign, I doubt this
>is the case so plan on two writtens.

Two writtens? Element 3, and what?

>3. Sample exams at http://www.qrz.com or get the whole verstunken question
>pool from http://www.arrl.org
>
>4. Bring your old license and a photocopy, a picture identification, and
>your checkbook.
>
>You might want to check with the local VEs but in the Cities area, you
>should have exams on a weekly basis.
>
>Dick NØBK
>
>3. While you are at it, take Element 4.
>
>
>

4048. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 20:54:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210155426.22158.00000894@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33660

In article <3c5e992f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020204053713.13187.00000805@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3c5dc195_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:d22b54c3.0202021643.2a195e07@posting.google.com...
>> >> >
>> >> One rub comes if those comms interfere in a big way with MY
>analog
>> >> comms one way or another if I don't opt to use some high-speed
>> >digital
>> >> system operating in a band I use. This fundamental objection to
>your
>> >> postulations has been floating around this NG for years and I
>have
>> >yet
>> >> to see you even acknowledge let alone address this concern.
>> >
>> >Amateurs are required to share the frequencies and have no
>> >expectation of, or right to, exclusive use of any particular
>> >frequency.
>> >That's what the rules say.
>>
>> Not entirely true.
>>
>> Coordinated repeater pairs have precedence over other users. If you
>> don't believe me, check FCC enforcement letters. Same for operation
>> in conformity with bandplans vs. not in conformity.
>
>I believe you will find that such FCC rulings don't PRECLUDE
>another repeater on the same pair as a coordinated one,
>but simply place the burden of resolving any resulting harmful
>interference on the uncoordinated one ...

Sounds just like "ownership".

Repeater A is coordinated, but Repeater B is not. Repeater B
is allowed to use the same pair as Repeater A ONLY IF Repeater
A doesn't experience interference from Repeater B.

If interference ocurs, B must resolve it, which usually means going
silent. If no interference occurs, A doesn't even know B exists.
>
>However, it still remains that no ham "owns" any particular
>frequency to the total exclusion of others. Again, read what
>it says on your license near where you sign ...

The effect is the same.

Here's another example: Stations A and B are having a contact. Stations
C and D show up and begin having a contact on the same frequency, even
though all stations can hear each other. Except in an emergency, do C and D
have the same claim to the frequency as A and B? I don't think so, and neither
does the FCC.
>
>Please don't try to twist this into some sort of statement
>that I am advocating chaos and don't give a damn about
>interference to others ... that would simply be false.

I hope that's the case. Some of your statements in the past can
give one pause, however.
>
>> >However, that doesn't mean that hams should just blast away
>> >without regard for other users ... decent, well-designed digital
>> >systems should detect the energy of other users, at reasonable
>> >levels, in channels the intend to use, and avoid transmitting if
>> >the channel is occupied by another user.
>>
>> Sounds nice but it doesn't necessarily work that way. If the digital
>> system cannot hear all users on a given frequency it will think the
>frequency
>> is not in use.
>
>Depends on system design ... well engineered systems and
>good protocols, along with some common sense WRT other
>local uses, can avoid the vast majority of issues.

I repeat: If the system cannot hear all users on a given frequency it
will think that frequency is not in use - unless it can determine from
the content of the transmissions it can hear what the situation is.
>
>Is it possible that interference could occur in some situations?
>Of course. Responsible hams will work together cooperatively
>to resolve it in a way that satisfies the needs of both sides.

See "ABCD" example, above.
>
>> >However the same goes for "analog" systems ... in other
>> >words, there is no excuse for the CW operators who key
>> >down intentionally on top of an ongoing digital mode QSO.
>>
>> No, there isn't any excuse. Do you have any real-world examples of
>> where that has happened to you?

>
>Yes, I've had it happen on packet and amtor ... and the
>relative signal strengths of all stations were such that I've
>virtually no doubt that the offending station could hear
>the ongoing digital QSO. (The "swishing" of the carrier
>back and forth during times when the digital systems
>were transmitting and the quiet periods when they weren't
>also would seem to be a fairly good indication that the
>interference ... or attempt thereat ... was deliberate.)

Dates? Times? Frequencies? Report to Riley?
>
>> And what about the digital or SSB system that chews up the CW QSO?
>> Happens all the time.
>
>I'm talking about intentional interference or interference caused
>by an "I don't care." attitude ... THAT is unacceptable behavior
>from any operator using any mode. Do we agree on that?

Sure. That attitude exists among digital and SSB users, too.
>
>> >> Networking on the ham bands vs. the Internet has already been
>> >> demonstrated as a resounding dud thus the jaundiced posts you
>> >> attract.
>> >
>> >Yes, "networking" at 1200 or even 9600 baud is a dud ... I won't
>> >dispute that ... that's why, when someone floated a "Request
>> >for comment on a new TNC design" (at 4800 bps) I asked "Why
>> >would anyone want to waste their time on such a project???"
>>
>> Simple - it works with existing rigs.
>
>So??? I don't see that as a compelling reason to cling to
>antiquated technology that won't be of much interest or provide
>much improvement over what's already (by our mutual agreement)
>proven to be "a dud."

You missed the point, Carl.

Given the choice between using a system based on existing rigs and one that
requires building all new rigs, most people choose the former. 'Specially when
they have limited time, money and resources, and success is not guaranteed.

First step is to get hams in the habit of actually building radio sets from the

ground up, or adapting available equipment to new uses. How ya gonna do that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4049. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 20:54:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210155427.22158.00000895@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33659

In article <20020203164753.28685.00001031@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
>>100% conjecture with no supporting data at all one way or another
>>formal or informal.
>
>Of course it is conjecture. The only supporting data is that when the world
>has built better roads, better tools, or better anything, doing so has
>significantly increased useage.

Often at a tremendous price. Look at all of the deadend stuff in the home electronics area - remember the original video discs, Beta format videotapes, etc.? Look what happened to the Iridium system.

In the case of roads, the effects of better roads have not all been positive.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4050. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 20:54:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210155428.22158.00000896@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33661

In article <u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com>, "GR" <greinsch@charter.net>
writes:

>What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?

That depends on when you took the test for Tech.

If you took the Tech before March 21, 1987, all you need to do is
got to a VE session, pay the fee and present your documentation
and you'll get a General.

If you took the Tech after March 21, 1987, you need to pass Element
3 (the new General written). Go to a VE session, pay the fee, pass the
test and present your documentation and you'll get a General. The
question/answer pool is on the web at several locations - just check
your favorite search engine.
>
>Will I have to take the CW again?

Only if you let your license expire for more than two years. Otherwise
you have code test credit for ALL license classes that require it.

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4051. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 21:51:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210165132.05154.00002028@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33662

In article <pan.2002.02.01.17.42.03.916764.12485@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 01 Feb 2002 13:36:44 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>> In article <59348b59.0202010030.7b61747a@posting.google.com>,
>> bruce@perens.com (Bruce Perens) writes:
>>
>>>The battle then moves on to the national front, or should I say 204
>>>national fronts. But this might not be much of a fight.
>>
>> Why must it be a "fight", Bruce? Why use the words of violence? If it's
>> the "end game", why talk as if you want to kill off those who disagree
>> with you?
>
>It's a metaphor, Jim. Geez!
>
There are better ones, Jon.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4052. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 22:44:04 UTC
From: Hamaholic <hamaholic@msn.comm>
Message-ID: <UIC98.36872$X64.12969881@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 33663

Bert, you know I couldn't pass up the opportunity to say hello. Get the rig out of the box and let's get crakin. If it was me I wouldnt have made it home with it in the box.

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020210114052.12742.00000278@mb-bd.news.cs.com...
> >Bert, In your zeal to prove Aaron wrong you jumped the gun, so who are all
> >the guys using these rigs on 10 and 12 the freebanders? Surely they are not
> >hams are they?
>
> Hi George,
>
> Yeah, I did kinda jump the gun. I do use a President Lincoln (Uniden HR-2510)
> with a Ten-Tec transverter for 2m SSB. I'm also using an AR-3500 as my interim
> 10m rig until the FT-840 finds its way out of the carton and into the shack
> this spring. Take it easy.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

4053. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:08:46 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4D8B96B081CF65E0.8C038DE93101F8C4.089E6A1BA13B1ADD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33664

On Tue, 5 Feb 2002 18:03:51 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>The DARC 440 machine is usually used by the "upper echelon" of the club, and
>it used to be that you'd hear them joking about the folks on the 2M club
>repeater. I think the DARC has gotten a little more friendly recently, so
>that may not be the case any more. Len/K4IWL (new President) and I have had
>a few discussions about that.

Well, I've heard some pretty normal conversations on there lately, but
I still have to wonder what goes on on the 220 machine. :)

>Irony, eh? I absolutely enjoy simplex operation--and few people really ever
>experiment with it. I love it when I can get 2-3 people out on simplex when
>we're all mobile and we are still talking to each other at 50 miles apart.
>They are genuinely surprised! Then, they have all kinds of fun with
>relaying messages when some begin moving out of range.

I tend to watch the simplex frequencies when I'm in a good spot. The
problem is that my QTH and its parking lot are riddled with lousy
spots. (As in, I can hit the 145.19 repeater with an HT and ducky
while I'm sitting on the hood of the car. Meanwhile, 50W into a
halfwave on the car roof is unreadable. Move the car three feet, and
it works fine all the way down to 5W.)

When the YL and I are running separate errands, we use simplex as much
as possible, since there's no way her 200mW HT is going to get into
many repeaters, and trying to coordinate which one to switch to if she
loses the one we're on is too much of a pain. OTOH, I've been really
impressed with the range it gets from a little $10 telescoping
antenna.

>Very unpopular opinion...;) But, I wholeheartedly agree. In my order of
>disdain:
>
>1) Closed Repeater Systems
>2) Closed Repeaters
>3) Repeater pairs that have been silent 95% or more of the time for a period
>of one year or more
>
>On #3, I think the pair should go back into the pool. If someone wants to
>go out an spend loads of money on a system, get a pair, then have the system
>down 95% or more of the time, that's *their* problem, not mine. And, if
>it's a club repeater and they can't keep it supported with membership
>dues...too bad, maybe they need to revamp the way their club operates.

IMO, if they'd clear out the repeater subband, they could shrink it
quite a bit without actually reducing the activity level, and give us
more space for other things. (FM Simplex, ATV, SSTV, packet,
whatever)

>> Actually, I worded the original kind of badly; I'd rather see a 70cm
>> frequency designated, used, and gatewayed to/from the existing 2m and
>> 10m APRS frequencies. That way, everybody has a choice, existing rigs
>> aren't made obsolete, and we can have the best of all three worlds.
>>
>
>Yeah, there ya go. Hmmmm, you know what? I didn't even realize there are
>10M APRS freqs! Shows how long it's been since I was paying attention.
>That's pretty kewl. Are they within the Tech+ area, or outside that range?
>Maybe I'll have to upgrade...LOL

Well, IE keeps crashing on me, so I can't look it up until I restart,
but I'd guess they're most likely up in the FM portion of the band.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4054. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:28:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210182838.26448.00000551@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33665

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>In the case of roads, the effects of better roads have not all been positive.

Agreed. But I bet the world continues to build better roads.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4055. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:31:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210183149.26448.00000552@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33666

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Consider the medical waiver thing. FCC has to handle all of those because who
>got a medical waiver is NOT in the public database. FCC just wanted out of
>it.

Actually, the VECs handled the medical waivers. The FCC handled all of the complaints about real and perceived abuse of the medical waiver process.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4056. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:37:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210183756.22360.00001102@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33668

In article <d22b54c3.0202091900.30e06b2a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c64559b_1@news7.fast.net>...
>> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>> Hash: SHA1
>>
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message

>I have yet to bitch on the technical characteristics of any mode wide
>or narrow just like I'm not stupid enough to argue with physics.

Bluster and claims of knowledge not backed up with any hint of knowing technical aspects of a subject are questionable "credentials." :-)

>My
>ONLY bitch is on your oft-repeated concept of "layering" SS over
>spectrum space known to be commonly used for narrowband operations. If
>there's a "technical flaw" around here it's your contention that SS
>will not significantly degrade the noise floor for narrow mode users
>in spectrum space "shared" with SS. That is not a flaw in SS
>technology, that is a flaw in your HEAD.

[we are not here to discuss Kelly's lobotomy...]

FHSS will work just fine in relatively narrow bandspaces. Hundreds of users can coexist that way. Hundreds of DSSS users in the same bandspace would indeed raise the local geographical noise floor. To properly discuss spread spectrum one needs to specify the TYPE of SS.

>> >, thus I'm obliged to
>> > make some allowances for your lack of experience and yer Coefficent
>> > of Stupidity as it relates to packet-assisted HF dxing
>>
>> Having operated digital HF under a legally obtained
>> license while living in Mexico for several years, as well
>> as having worked for Rockwell-Collins in designing
>> military and commercial digital transmission systems
>> from HF through UHF, I find your assertions that I "lack ...
>> experience" laughable.
>>
>You copy-pasted that one from one of Lenny's posts dinya?

Impossible. I've never operated anything but a car radio (receiver) in Mexico. I've worked for the Rocketdyne division

of Rockwell International, NOT the Collins Radio division of
Rockwell International.

The misdirection that Kelly attempts is visible as follows -

>Has absolutely precisely NOTHING to do with ham HF cw and phone dx
>contesting and the related VHF ham packet comms, I'll stick.
>>
>> How is contesting relevant to this discussion?
>>
>You lost the thread AGAIN or what?? The topic was the dx spots system
>and the use of that system in dxing and dx contesting and the
>throughput problem with the system and nothing more.
>>
>> > window, smack it with ye mouse, log him and back to yer run on 20
>> > before yer pileup had a clue ya even left 20.
>>
>> Oh, I see ... your (ham) life revolves around contesting and
>> you can't see the utility of anything outside of that pathetically
>> limited context ...
>>
>Not at all, this USED to be a discussion about packet technical and
>operating issues until you decided to "take it elsewhere".

The subject header line still reads "Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was
Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal)"

Stevenson has been STAYING with the subject although Kelly has
been jumping to other misdirections in an attempt to win message
points. No points have been awarded to Kelly.

>You bet we have a different problem here, it's in the simple fact thet
>you've never run in a dx contest so you've never used the spots system
>in a dx contest, therefore you don't have clue one on a hands-on
>basis. But you still know all about it of course. Lenny East plus a
>lite license.

Is the future of US amateur radio to be predicated solely on the desires
of DX-chasing and contesting?!?

Apparently so. Kelly has "established turf" and seeks to defend the
turf of his personal opinions, thus imposing his will on a half million plus
other licensees. Those who disagree or have disagreed with Kelly are
"discussed" with disparaging and denigrating commentary.

What does Kelly know of HF radio OTHER than the amateur bands?
How many modes and modulations has he "worked" OTHER than
those allocated to amateurs? What does Kelly know of the OTHER
EM spectra, in particular the US amateur bands above 30 MHz?

Nothing but CB on 11 meters? Oh, too bad. Kelly just doesn't
have a clue of OTHER RADIO.

Everything must remain just as Kelly desires it. No change. Nothing new. Nobody can change anything according to another part of this same post. RIP.

Deus ex machina in his Kachina. :-)

With all kindest regards,
Len (West)

4057. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:37:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210183757.22360.00001103@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33667

In article <d22b54c3.0202091900.30e06b2a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c64559b_1@news7.fast.net>...
>> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>> Hash: SHA1
>>
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message

>>... read the FCC's recent docket items on SDR ...
>>
>That's old hat, gimmee a break.

Kelly does not get a "break." The use of "break, break" in amateur radio communications is considered a violation punishable by threats of excommunication and no 599 report.

>Has nothing to do with ham radio, we
>don't need to apply for "dynamically-issued permission slips" from the
>FCC to change operating freqs or modes, we don't use commercial
>type-accepted radios.

Kelly does not seem to understand the nature of Software Defined Radio as an architecture within the radio system. It is not a mode in and of itself but CAN be used to generate any mode.

Under the present rules of US amateur radio there is absolutely nothing forbidding anyone to use an SDR radio on any band, by any class of licensee, at any time. None. Zip. Nada. All US radio amateurs, any class, must follow the regulations in regards to the allocated modes.

The concern of the FCC is with OTHER radio services and the regulations thereto. At present OTHER radio services have regulations that imply conventional hardware-defined modulations and modes. Since SDR can be configured to generate almost any mode, it would be any easy task for any SDR user to operate in an unallocated mode in one of those OTHER radio services.

Have you understood this as has been explained to you, Miranda?

>Sure, as if I'm having any impact at all on ham radio. Like you have
>any impact on ham radio. I have no interest in "keeping ham radio in
>the past" at all. I'm just realistic enough to understand how long it
>takes for the past to go away via mechanisms neither thee or me can do
>a damned thing about.

In the United States of America, the "mechanism" is built-in to the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. [in case that wasn't understood, some who prefer "turf rules" and "fraternal membership rules" do not like such freedoms...]

One can cite the recent Commentary on NPRM 98-143. Over 2800 separate submissions on US Amateur radio restructuring which were ALL made public. The power of the special interest group can no longer cow dissidents into submission.

There is NO excuse for APATHY in making one's feelings known to one's government. NONE.

With kindest regards,
Len

4058. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-10 23:38:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210183800.22360.00001104@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33669

In article <d22b54c3.0202091900.30e06b2a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c64559b_1@news7.fast.net>...
>> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>> Hash: SHA1
>>
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>
>> > Yeah, right. 2.1 kHz on one side of the suppressed carrier for ssb and
>> > how many kHz away from it's supressed carrier does SS spit RF did you
>> > say?
>>
>> Depends on the "chipping rate" of the PN spreading sequence (for
>> DSSS), but an important factor you're ignoring is that, for equal total
>> transmit power, the DSSS signal will have a proportionally lower
>> PSD (that's Power Spectral Density) than a narrowband signal and
>> thus present less interference to any given co-channel narrowband
>> user than a narrowband signal transmitted from the same location
>> with the same antenna, power, etc.
>>
>Horsepucky, yeah, SS won't booger a narowband guy as much as will
>another thumping narrowband transmission right next to the first guy.
>Instead SS spanks some beaucoup number frequecies equally which narrow
>modes do not. It's called SS trashing the whole band between it's
>lower and upper spread limits with noise.

That SS is only for direct-sequence spread spectrum. Kelly tries to argue that present-day DSSS is "unsuitable for HF" without realizing what Stevenson said about chipping rate or that such a rate can be changed. Kelly does not acknowledge frequency-hopping SS at all.

>Yeah, I understand all of it. PSK31 can dig maybe 10dB deeper into the
>noise level than I can with my ears when running CW. Plus PSK31 is a
>narrower mode than even CW is at useful speeds. So why bother with SS
>if the really big deal is minimal co-channel interference given the
>fact that PSK31 is already out there?

Why bother with anything new that might upset Kelly? :-)

>But ya can't toss .jpgs around on 20 with PSK31 huh?

Non-argument misdirection. First, no one has remarked about images on 20 meters. Second, PSK31 is tailored to characters not images. Please try to study the origin and total system

concept of the mode before smarting-off with wisecracks.

Nonetheless, I've seen TTY character image pictures transmitted
by ham packet. Copies of what had already been circulating on
BBS nets. [sent via amateur radio they attain a special divine
status? :-)]

>> There are better ways to manage spectrum utilization than hard
>> and fast sub-band restrictions on modes ... that is an old paradigm
>> that will be obsoleted in the near future by SDRs (software-defined
>> radios)
>>
>Heh. Depends on how you define "near future". There is absolutely no
>question in my mind that, for instance, SDRs will become a major
>player in ham radio. The big unknown is WHEN and your crystal ball is
>no less fuzzy than is my crystal ball.

Go to www.harris.com and see the "Falcon II" series of military radios
designed, in production, and on the way to the UK. SDR from 1.6 MHz
to 512 MHz, COMMSEC capability. See also the PRC-117.

>The difference between thee and
>me is that I long ago bought into the much bigger "paradigm". Which is
>the blatently obvious fact that the general nature of ham radio in
>this regard is it's ungodly slow rate of acceptance of all new
>technologies and/or spectrum-management schemes on broad scales.

Why is Kelly so proud to be part of the problem?

>Those
>who don't pay attention to the lessons of history are doomed to heaps
>of frustration and repeating bad history.

The lessons of history in the entire world of radio are that it is still
evolving and will continue to evolve. New technology abounds in
radio...now. The information is out there now. The unwillingness of
so many long-time hams to keep up with evolution is remarkable.

Those whose only "education" about radio is limited to amateur radio
technology are doomed to heaps of frustration...and venting that
frustration and ignorance on others in an effort to make themselves
appear as "superior." Their superiority is only virtual, within their own
minds, limited to boundaries set long ago but other "superiors" of an
earlier era.

>You're a current-tech
>iteration of Cervante's Don Quixote is what you are good buddy. Go for
>it, oughta be entertaining as hell.

Kelly appears to be looking in a mirror again. That erstwhile PA Sancho
Panza needs to park his mule and observe that those "windmills"
are only virtual constructs in the individual minds of the set-in-their-
ways, don-bodda-me-wid-whizzy-new-stuf long-timers. Windmills

are powered by air, something plentiful among the "CW gets through when nothing else will!" long-timers.

The rest of the radio world hasn't bought into those windmills yet. Not even maritime radio, perhaps the last holdout of "CW is the king of radio modes" aging champions.

>I venture to guess that in fact I've used more current-tech equipment
>on the HF bands than you have. Hmm?

Ordinarily I would rise to take that sucker bet. Kelly doesn't have the life experience to point to anything but the narrow spectra of amateur bands on HF. The rest of the radio world includes ALL of HF as well as decades of spectrum above and below HF.

> I spent a whole evening surfing 40
>cw with a Kachina operating into a three-element yagi at 150 feet.

The Kachina has been out of production for months...

>The
>Kachina is certainly not an SDR but it was a great lesson in the
>foibles of I.F & audio DSP as it exists today.

I would be interested in Kelly's even semi-objective technical data showing the above statement equivalent to "foibles." The Kachina was designed by other radio amateurs.

>The selectivity SUCKS
>in critical ops like chasing the weak ones on 40 cw. Art Collins'
>1950s 500Hz mechanical marvels kick the Kachina's butt in a huge way
>given the same mission. Ditto the whizzy "40-bit DSP processing" or
>whtever the hell it is in the I.F. stages of my own JRC NRD 545 rcvr.

Art Collins is dead. So is Bill Halligan. I doubt that Art Collins had any personal involvement in the design of the R-390 military receiver that began the legends concerning the over-priced Collins goods.

While digital signal processing may be "whizzy" to long-timers who know little of anything digital, they all work as designed if but only if they are CONTROLLED PROPERLY. A filter is a filter. There is nothing magic about the Collins "mechanical" filters nor about crystal filters that have sharper skirts. Extreme subjectivity is not a valid technical comparison.

>If "you people" can't even beat what Art did in the 50s yet just at
>the I.F. level make a rough guess how long it's gonna take to have
>decent DSP front ends . .

I doubt that ANY group can convince Kelly of anything once Kelly has his mind made up. :-)

DSP is ALREADY HERE. It exists, working every day in other radio services. No magic required. It just hasn't gotten down in the price

range of one-ninety-eight that some long-time hams feel "they deserve"
(for being so good and superior at morsemanship).

With kindest regards,
Len

4059. Re: Latest CB's cover 10 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:04:28 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210190428.12725.00000506@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 33670

That's ok, but I'd made a promise to myself. I wasn't licensed when I got the rig and I promised myself the rig would remain "in-box" until I had the appropriate privileges. Then I lost my den to my newborn boy. I'v been "allocated" a corner of the master bedroom to set up my shack. This happens to be the last room in which we have to finish the <wood> floor and paint. I have a temp setup for 10-meters as well as a 2m h/t that serves as a paperweight. (I checked out the 2m repeater scene and didn't like what I heard...so it's not my bag.) I should have the whole shebang up and running by summertime. Take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

>Bert, you know I couldn't pass up the opportunity to say hello. Get the rig
>out of the box and let's get crakin. If it was me I wouldnt have made it
>home with it in the box.
>
>
>"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020210114052.12742.00000278@mb-bd.news.cs.com...
>> >Bert, In your zeal to prove Aaron wrong you jumped the gun, so who are
>all
>> >the guys using these rigs on 10 and 12 the freebanders? Surely they are
>not
>> >hams are they?
>>
>> Hi George,
>>
>> Yeah, I did kinda jump the gun. I do use a President Lincoln (Uniden
>HR-2510)
>> with a Ten-Tec transverter for 2m SSB. I'm also using an AR-3500 as my
>interim
>> 10m rig until the FT-840 finds its way out of the carton and into the
>shack
>> this spring. Take it easy.
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> KC2HMN

4060. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:04:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c670a7c$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33671

Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year. If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to take the CW test again.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020210155428.22158.00000896@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com>, "GR" <greinsch@charter.net>
> writes:
>
> >What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?
>
> That depends on when you took the test for Tech.
>
> If you took the Tech before March 21, 1987, all you need to do is
> got to a VE session, pay the fee and present your documentation
> and you'll get a General.
>
> If you took the Tech after March 21, 1987, you need to pass Element
> 3 (the new General written). Go to a VE session, pay the fee, pass the
> test and present your documentation and you'll get a General. The
> question/answer pool is on the web at several locations - just check
> your favorite search engine.
> >
> >Will I have to take the CW again?
>
> Only if you let your license expire for more than two years. Otherwise
> you have code test credit for ALL license classes that require it.
>
> Good luck!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

4061. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:16:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c670d45_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33673

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:4D8B96B081CF65E0.8C038DE93101F8C4.089E6A1BA13B1ADD@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 5 Feb 2002 18:03:51 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >The DARC 440 machine is usually used by the "upper echelon" of the club,
and
> >it used to be that you'd hear them joking about the folks on the 2M club
> >repeater. I think the DARC has gotten a little more friendly recently,
so
> >that may not be the case any more. Len/K4IWL (new President) and I have
had
> >a few discussions about that.
>
> Well, I've heard some pretty normal conversations on there lately, but
> I still have to wonder what goes on on the 220 machine. :)
>

heh heh heh, or the 1.2G? I have a scanner that will monitor those areas,
but never hear a thing (don't listen that often, either--I get very little
time to play with my scanner any more).

>
> I tend to watch the simplex frequencies when I'm in a good spot. The
> problem is that my QTH and its parking lot are riddled with lousy
> spots. (As in, I can hit the 145.19 repeater with an HT and ducky
> while I'm sitting on the hood of the car. Meanwhile, 50W into a
> halfwave on the car roof is unreadable. Move the car three feet, and
> it works fine all the way down to 5W.)
>

145.190 is my "home" on 2M. I've been with Billy's machine nearly since
becoming a ham. You'll never hear anyone tell you what you can/can't talk
about on that repeater. If they do, they ain't been there very long! It's
an excellent machine with excellent range. It's up on top of the "curved
roof building" in downtown Dallas.

>
> When the YL and I are running separate errands, we use simplex as much
> as possible, since there's no way her 200mW HT is going to get into
> many repeaters, and trying to coordinate which one to switch to if she
> loses the one we're on is too much of a pain. OTOH, I've been really
> impressed with the range it gets from a little $10 telescoping
> antenna.
>

Same here. Most of my 2M operation here in the last six months or so has been on rare occasions when my husband and I are traveling to meet for dinner and then on the way home. We'll used simplex.

>
> >> Actually, I worded the original kind of badly; I'd rather see a 70cm
> >> frequency designated, used, and gatewayed to/from the existing 2m and
> >> 10m APRS frequencies. That way, everybody has a choice, existing rigs
> >> aren't made obsolete, and we can have the best of all three worlds.
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, there ya go. Hmmmm, you know what? I didn't even realize there
are
> >10M APRS freqs! Shows how long it's been since I was paying attention.
> >That's pretty kewl. Are they within the Tech+ area, or outside that
range?
> >Maybe I'll have to upgrade...LOL
>
> Well, IE keeps crashing on me, so I can't look it up until I restart,
> but I'd guess they're most likely up in the FM portion of the band.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Speaking of 10M, I went out today to visit with my parents. Mom and I had gotten my dad a Radio Shack 10M rig for Christmas and he is blind, so could not figure out all the buttons, etc. I sat down with him and taught him all the buttons, gave him some pointers on SSB operation and suddenly heard a Icelandic station on 28.360!!!! TH____ (forget now). WOW, I couldn't believe it. I have heard 10M lately and couldn't believe I was hearing Iceland. I got to show my dad the example of longpath (didn't work) propagation vs. direct/short. He is a retired Chief Radioman in the Navy, so it's beginning to all come back to him. I don't know if he'll ever get to "chasing DX" or not, but I had him sit down and run the ship for a few before I left. You shoulda seen him catching signals and clarifying them in real quick...LOL

Kim W5TIT

4062. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:18:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grc50h0.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33672

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 09:09:54 -0500, Randal T. Flegenschweiter wrote:

>You are still reading regulation wrong, not interpreting it
>correctly and then you make crazy statement all wrong. I always tell
>my students to research very carefully before making statement about
>rule & regulation. You make wild incorrect statement!

What do you teach, chaos or craziness?

I earned my living interpreting FCC regulations correctly and
teaching communications law...I even participated in writing
them and the enforcement procedures for them while I was on the
FCC's staff for three decades. I have no problem reading and
interpreting FCC rules correctly.

Keep it up, fella, your unfamiliarity with proper FCC Rule
interpretations and expressing yourself clearly are giving us
a good laugh.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4063. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:28:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210192838.19000.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33674

>Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5
>Proposal
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/10/2002 5:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020210183757.22360.00001103@mb-mm.aol.com>

>There is NO excuse for APATHY in making one's feelings known to
>one's government. NONE.

The same could be said for obtaining a license.

But then you knew that.

SR

4064. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:33:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210193330.19000.00000526@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33675

>Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5
>Proposal
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/10/2002 5:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020210183756.22360.00001102@mb-mm.aol.com>

>Apparently so. Kelly has "established turf" and seeks to defend the
>turf of his personal opinions, thus imposing his will on a half million plus
>other licensees.

At least he is licensed and has some PRACTICAL experience in Amateur Radio
matters.

>Those who disagree or have disagreed with Kelly are
>"discussed" with disparaging and denigrating commentary.

And the difference between him and you is...?!?!?

>What does Kelly know of HF radio OTHER than the amateur bands?
>How many modes and modulations has he "worked" OTHER than
>those allocated to amateurs? What does Kelly know of the OTHER
>EM spectra, in particular the US amateur bands above 30 MHz?

So far, more than you. You ahve demonstrated your ignorance of such
matters in this forum on occassion too numerous to count....

Of course, we ARE discussing post-Korean War-era radio...Hate to wake you
out of your coma, Lennie.

SR

4065. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:35:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210193549.19000.00000527@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33676

>Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5
>Proposal
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/10/2002 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020210183800.22360.00001104@mb-mm.aol.com>

>Please try to study the origin and total system
>concept of the mode before smarting-off with wisecracks.

And what ever stopped YOU from leading off with one, Your Unlicensedness?

4066. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:40:13 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a473sv$1d8pr4$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 33677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C654F46.F9987195@IEEE.org...
> Tom Sevart wrote:
> > I got one better than that... back when I was in England, a ham friend
of
> > mine told me of another ham (never heard exactly where he was from) who
had
> > a radio at his bedside. Well one night he left the VOX on when he and
his
> > wife got intimate...
>
> Did he ID every ten minutes?

Maybe his wife cried out his callsign?

Tom

4067. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:50:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210195013.14709.00001235@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 33678

In article <20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Here's one for the alternate-history buffs:
>
>In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
>service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
>everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on 220).
>But another reason was to put a service intended to be for local communication
on
>VHF instead of HF.

Out of curiosity, just where was this "proposal" publicized OUTSIDE of amateur radio? There is a lot of seeming "spin" on that description.

The first CB "classes" (A and B) were up just above the amateur 3/4 m band. There was never a big demand for those even if they were begun early, in 1957. But, by 1975, there were plenty of bands on VHF and UHF for what is now the PLMRS group.

The Electronic Industries Alliance is basically an association of electronic systems, devices, and components manufacturers. Being in business, they are oriented towards making a profit.

>Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped
>the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.

Has there been a poll taken on dental problems and chipped nails in the "amateur community?" :-)

>One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack, such
>as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.

One thinks that the bitchers and moaners in the ham community were just passing the baton to the next generation on the complaints about "stealing 11 meters." While not being able to read minds or divine thoughts of the FCC of 1975, this one can only imagine that the FCC would look at 10 meters and see that radio amateurs had 1700 kilocycle/KiloHertz of bandspace from 28.0 to 29.7 just as open and UNSTOLEN then as earlier and still there today UNSTOLEN. Just how much bandspace of this precious 11 m band were "stolen" originally? :-)

On the other hand, I know that a large number of southwestern hams were busy making the gigantic repeater chain that stretches from north of San Francisco south through California and into

Arizona. Would they have agreed to "give up" 220 just to please some easterners who don't really acknowledge westerners? Look up Condor Net and check their history. Lots of innovation in that net, up and running, tone-controlled and path-guided without a single microprocessor in the beginning.

With best regards,
Len

4068. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 00:59:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67175D.9D017960@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33679

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
> >> existance.
>
> > So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
> >strive
> >to become a digital-mode designer?
>
> I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible interpretation
> of everything said to you.
>
> It sure makes rational conversation difficult. Can you try to be a bit more
> reasoned?

Well, I'll bet Dick is smart enough to get a DSP eval board running and roll
some software of his own. 'Course, he can't do that while resting on his
laurels.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4069. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:01:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6717EF.78DFE99A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33680

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Methinks you might have discovered a solar flare, Dick.
>
> With that rise and decay time.....I sure didn't think so. Ol Sol surely doesn't turn
> them on and off that fast.

Pulsar?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4070. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:03:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C671876.7F2CFD43@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33681

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
> >offer much of an advantage?
>
> Depends on hoe you define "advantage".

Are you saying that hoe's spread?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4071. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:05:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6718DE.608E1B12@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33682

Brian Kelly wrote:
> How wide is an SS signal and how many individual SS "non-colliding"
> qsos in progress does it take for SS to occupy the entire 20m band?

Consider this, Brian. A super DSP noise eliminator that decodes all
SS signals and filters them out. Why not?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4072. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:07:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C671958.1154FE19@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33683

N2EY wrote:
> FCC decided not to go with the majority, that's all.

The Republic strikes again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4073. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:15:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C671B44.FD0FAE35@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33684

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You may be right. From long experience I knew that CW would indeed be able to
> get through after all the other modes commonly in use -you know, (and knew
> then) SSB, AM, FM etc. have faded into the noise. I know that from doing it
> with CW, not from some "bromide" I swallowed. I guess that can't mean anything
> to those who can't have had that experience. But it wasn't that fact, it was
> the response of those who simply refused to accept things as they are and
> instead substituted their own "bromides".

That may be true but the fact remains that CW doesn't get through when the
band is absolutely dead. CW does NOT have supernatural powers. CW is, however,
one of the best QRP modes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4074. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:26:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C671DC4.63B76979@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Tom Sevart wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Did he ID every ten minutes?
>
> Maybe his wife cried out his callsign?

Oscar, Oh G O D ?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4075. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 01:44:20 UTC
From: "Randal T. Flegenschweiter" <rtf@flegenschzzweiterindustriencnet.org>
Message-ID: <a477hfpqt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33686

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.grc50h0.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 09:09:54 -0500, Randal T. Flegenschweiter wrote:

> What do you teach, chaos or craziness?

No I not teach class on chaos or craziness. My class teach
about quality of greatest men of world. It called Humility. Sometime
call "ability to laugh at one-self." Men who see self as pump up full
of self-importance and all knowledge full, do lack Humility. Sorry,
you not qualify as guest lecturer in my classroom.

Best Wishes,

Randal

4076. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:10:48 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net>
Source record: 33687

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
>only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
>If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
>take the CW test again.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
(codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
class license in order to use these privelidges"

Keith Hosman
Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4077. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:20:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF13228.179FAAC5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33688

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>SSB was the radio art of the day.
>
> >Actually, it was quite "old radio technology" by 1950.
>
> What voice mode had replaced it in widespread use by 1950?

But Ed! That's saying that spread spectrum isn't a current mode because
it hasn't replaced other modes in common widespread use!

4078. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:22:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF132D1.1B010CEB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33689

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
> >> existance.
>
> > So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
> >strive
> >to become a digital-mode designer?
>
> I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible interpretation
> of everything said to you.

I beg your Pardone, Sire, but that surely is Carl Stevenson's and Cecil
Moore's attitude, if not the FCC's.

4079. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:40:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF136FE.D5994C0F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33690

N2EY wrote:

>
> First step is to get hams in the habit of actually building radio sets from the
>
> ground up, or adapting available equipment to new uses. How ya gonna do that?

Simple, Jim. Berate them all, call everyone who has been around over 5 years and actually uses CW on the air a dinosaur Luddite. Works every time.

4080. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:44:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF137F7.F5E620@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33691

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> We can safely ignore Carl. But the FCC's view is central to our very
> > >> existance.
> >
> > > So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
> > >strive
> > >to become a digital-mode designer?
> >
> > I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible interpretation
> > of everything said to you.
> >
> > It sure makes rational conversation difficult. Can you try to be a bit more
> > reasoned?
>
> Well, I'll bet Dick is smart enough to get a DSP eval board running and roll
> some software of his own. 'Course, he can't do that while resting on his
> laurels.

And just what was it that kept you from Extra class until dumbdown time? You just didn't see the need. Yeah, right.

4081. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:49:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF138F4.380B72D7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33692

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You may be right. From long experience I knew that CW would indeed be able to
> > get through after all the other modes commonly in use -you know, (and knew
> > then) SSB, AM, FM etc. have faded into the noise. I know that from doing it
> > with CW, not from some "bromide" I swallowed. I guess that can't mean anything
> > to those who can't have had that experience. But it wasn't that fact, it was
> > the response of those who simply refused to accept things as they are and
> > instead substituted their own "bromides".
>
> That may be true but the fact remains that CW doesn't get through when the
> band is absolutely dead.

You'd be surprised how many times a band seems dead that isn't really "absoulutely dead" at all. If you don't believe it, try calling CQ several times on a 'dead' band and see what happens. You'll probably need to make several calls, but as often as not someone will hear you and answer. He'll probably be weak, maybe very weak, but he'll prove the band isn't really dead after all.

> CW does NOT have supernatural powers. CW is, however,
> one of the best QRP modes.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4082. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:50:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58!@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF13942.AA583975@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33693

"Randal T. Flegenschweiter" wrote:

> you not qualify as guest lecturer in my classroom.

I certainly hope not.

4083. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:51:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210215107.24230.00000089@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33695

In article <3C654BB7.9A58E65@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I'm sure there are plenty of criminals who don't have criminal records.
>
>Yep, and you can't prove that you are not one of them.

Cecil:

I gues snot. But I'll bet you can.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4084. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:51:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210215107.24230.00000088@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33696

In article <20020209091427.17936.00000328@mb-dd.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>> I have not allowed
>>another person to identify with my call, I always initiate and terminate the
>>QSO. I don't know that there would be a specific requirement for that
>>however, as long as the control operator were truly in control.
>
> If my XYL is out-and-about, I will allow the 10 year old to answer her
>call. However I take the mike at some point and state "This is K4YZ, control
>op present".

Steve:

That is completely unnecessary. All you have to do is actually *be*
present. The 10-year old can say your call sign just as well as you
can. It doesn't matter who's voice is used to give the call sign, as long
as the station is correctly identified at the required intervals. Your
"control op present" announcement may make you feel good, but it
doesn't matter whatsoever to anyone else...including any FCC
monitoring personnel, OO's, etc.

> When she does get a call of her own, she won't balk on the mike.

I would hope not.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4085. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:51:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210215108.24230.00000091@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33694

In article <3C654CC5.4170A469@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Exactly when did I say that, Cecil?
>
>Does "St. Valentine's Day Massacre" ring a bell?

Cecil:

Sure. Was there anything untruthful about that? The ARS has been degenerating into a dumbed-down shell of it's former self ever since that day.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4086. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 02:51:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210215108.24230.00000090@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33697

In article <3c654c6c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Hey, Mr. I'm-Smarter-Than-Everyone-Else: First I have no "fellow" codeless
>minions since I am a coded ham radio operator.

Kim:

OIC -- you managed to struggle through and pass a brutal, challenging,
brow-sweating 5 WPM code test. How many 5 WPM CW QSO's have
you had on-the-air?

>And, with all the emergency
>communication I have been a part of, from learning to training, I have never
>seen a focus on CW operations. I just haven't.

Of course not, because you and your codeless minions can't be bothered
to attain useful proficiency in the Morse/CW mode.

>In the event a widespread
>emergency happens in this area, we'll be fine and you be sure to stay away,
>PUHLEEZE!

You're in Texas; I'm in Delaware. I'm not likely to darken your corner
during an emergency, or any other time -- at least until my post-retirement
tour of the country!

>What do you mean what is my "own personal view" of my potential
>contribution? Is that you wanting me to gloat? I don't act like you,
>Larry.

Just give us a run-down on some of your emergency communications
accomplishments, what bands/equipment used, volume of traffic
handled, etc. Gloating optional, though I'm not specifically expecting
any.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4087. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:21:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210222138.17389.00000694@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33698

>Subject: Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/10/2002 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020210195013.14709.00001235@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Out of curiosity, just where was this "proposal" publicized OUTSIDE
>of amateur radio? There is a lot of seeming "spin" on that
>description.

The Atlanta Constitution-Journal, for one. It received rather liberal attention since CB was pretty big stuff there.

I was stationed there at the time.

>One thinks that the bitchers and moaners in the ham community
>were just passing the baton to the next generation on the
>complaints about "stealing 11 meters."

So far YOU are the only one I see who constantly refers to 11 meters as being "stolen". Where, INCLUDING the Amateur media, is 11 meters so perpetually refered to as "stolen"...?!?

>Would they have agreed to "give up" 220 just to please
>some easterners who don't really acknowledge westerners?

Geez, Lennie. Your creepiness just get's worse by the minute. You can't find a valid argument, so you are bound and determined to create a fight.

WHERE, in ANY of the foregoing, was anything of the like mentioned, EXCEPT in your failing imagination?

>Look
>up Condor Net and check their history. Lots of innovation in that
>net, up and running, tone-controlled and path-guided without a
>single microprocessor in the beginning.

I'd ask you to please explain your logic in going from a proposal to reallocate VHF spectrum for CB to the lack of microprocessors in the early Condor Net, but I know you won't ansert that, either.

Losers never do.

SR

4088. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:25:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210222501.17389.00000695@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33699

>Subject: Re: Tech Plus to General Class
>From: arcweb@bnnorth.net (Keith Hosman)
>Date: 2/10/2002 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net>

Keith,

>umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
>successful completion it says....(SNIP)

In this case the lady's right, Keith. As permission to operate as a "coded" Technician, you may do so indefinately. However as a "CSCE" for an upgrade, it's only good for one year.

Don't ask me why...That's the FCC...Go figure!

73 and welcome aboard

Steve, K4YZ

4089. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:28:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210222817.17389.00000696@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33700

>Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 2/10/2002 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020210215107.24230.00000088@mb-ba.aol.com>

>That is completely unnecessary. All you have to do is actually *be*
>present.

Hey Larry....yeah, I know, but I just avoid any opprotunity for someone to question her operation...Especially on the local repeater.

>The 10-year old can say your call sign just as well as you can.

Sure can, the little wench!

73

SR/K4YZ

4090. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:36:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c673dec$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33502

Well, you're right. If you were a Tech+ to begin with, then always a Tech+ you will be (unless you upgrade). However, according to discussion on our repeater, Bart Jhanke(sp?) with the ARRL confirmed that new Techs (post-Restructuring Techs) who get their 5wpm CW test under their belt *must* upgrade to General within a year after passing the CW test, or they must take another one.

This made sense to me, because otherwise, why not leave the license class Tech+? Now, I did not see the communication from Bart, it was relayed from a VE to the rest of us on the repeater. Does anyone else understand this differently?

Kim W5TIT

"Keith Hosman" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message news:3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net...
> On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
> >only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
> >If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
> >take the CW test again.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
> successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
> (codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
> indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
> hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
> rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
> class license in order to use these privelidges"
>
>
> Keith Hosman
> Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
> Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
> American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4091. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:43:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c673f98_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33503

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020210215108.24230.00000090@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3c654c6c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Hey, Mr. I'm-Smarter-Than-Everyone-Else: First I have no "fellow"
codeless
> >minions since I am a coded ham radio operator.
>
> Kim:
>
> OIC -- you managed to struggle through and pass a brutal, challenging,
> brow-sweating 5 WPM code test. How many 5 WPM CW QSO's have
> you had on-the-air?
>

I've been a Tech+ for a number of years now, Larry. I figured with your
cough intelligence, you'd know that already.

> >
> >And, with all the emergency
> >communication I have been a part of, from learning to training, I have
never
> >seen a focus on CW operations. I just haven't.
>
> Of course not, because you and your codeless minions can't be bothered
> to attain useful proficiency in the Morse/CW mode.
>

That's such a worn out piece of crap I won't even bother to respond. Keep
hanging on by a thread, Larry. Maybe someday you can convince someone else
besides yourself and few others that CW is all that.

> >
> >In the event a widespread
> >emergency happens in this area, we'll be fine and you be sure to stay
away,
> >PUHLEEZE!
>
> You're in Texas; I'm in Delaware. I'm not likely to darken your corner
> during an emergency, or any other time -- at least until my
post-retirement
> tour of the country!
>

Thank goodness.

> >
> >What do you mean what is my "own personal view" of my potential
> >contribution? Is that you wanting me to gloat? I don't act like you,
> >Larry.
>
> Just give us a run-down on some of your emergency communications
> accomplishments, what bands/equipment used, volume of traffic
> handled, etc. Gloating optional, though I'm not specifically expecting
> any.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Been through it plenty of times, Larry. You must not pay all the attention you say you do. Just do one of those Jim/N2EY thingies and lookup the posts.

Kim W5TIT

4092. Cell Phone: Are they Safe? - My Research

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 03:45:15 UTC
From: cellphoneemf@aol.com
Message-ID: <ee430f43.0202101945.715d7f00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33501

I'm a graduate student at UConn, and I've done some research on the safety of cell phones. You can view my article at http://members.aol.com/cellphoneemf/. I'd love to get feedback. Thanks.

Article Abstract
There is discussion in both the media and public health arena in regards to the safety of cellular telephones. This is of grave concern given the popularity of cell phones. According to USA Today (8/2/2001), there are now 120 million cell phone users. This means that most adults living in this country use cell phones. Furthermore, the average subscriber spends 150 minutes a month talking on their cell phone, and this number will, most likely, increase as more people forgo their land-line phone for the better rates now being offered by the wireless providers. This paper explores the potential brain cancer risk of cell phones by analyzing the most recent epidemiological and animal studies. It also tracks brain tumor rates in the USA, comments on the political climate surrounding wireless technology and offers an introduction to electrical sensitivity.

4093. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:13:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6746aa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33504

OK, here is the text of the area of Part 97 which I believe addresses this situation and, indeed, confirms that a CW test is only good for one year. See (b), below. Anyone read it differently?

By the way, not to start an all-out war here ;), but I think this "little point" is either unknown or often missed by the disgruntled who didn't like the Restructuring rules. It was much easier (at least as far as I am concerned) to advance to General Class prior to the Restructuring date, as any amount of time could go by after passing any of the tests. Now, any written test and the CW test is only good for upgrade for one year. Anyone who took and passed the CW test after the Restructuring date, has one year from that date to pass a written test for General--or they lose credit for the CW test. The same for the written. If you've passed the written test, you have one year to pass CW and upgrade to General--or you lose credit for the written.

I think it was a nice compromise.

Kim W5TIT

[Code of Federal Regulations]
[Title 47, Volume 5]
[Revised as of October 1, 2001]
From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access
[CITE: 47CFR97.9]

[Page 581]

TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

CHAPTER I--FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents

Subpart A--General Provisions

Sec. 97.9 Operator license grant.

(a) The classes of amateur operator license grants are: Novice, Technician, Technician Plus (until such licenses expire, a Technical Class license granted before February 14, 1991, is considered a Technician Plus Class license), General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra. The person named in the operator license grant is authorized to be the control operator of an amateur station with the privileges authorized to the operator class specified on the license grant.
(b) The person named in an operator license grant of Novice, Technician, Technician Plus, General or Advanced Class, who has properly

submitted to the administering VEs a FCC Form 605 document requesting examination for an operator license grant of a higher class, and who holds a CSCE indicating that the person has completed the necessary examinations within the previous 365 days, is authorized to exercise the rights and privileges of the higher operator class until final disposition of the application or until 365 days following the passing of the examination, whichever comes first.

Kim W5TIT

"Keith Hosman" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message news:3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net...
> On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
> >only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
> >If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
> >take the CW test again.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
> successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
> (codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
> indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
> hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
> rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
> class license in order to use these privelidges"
>
>
> Keith Hosman
> Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
> Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
> American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4094. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:19:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a47h29ngv1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33505

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <a42c1hrdo1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >>
> >> >A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
> >> >a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
> >> >meaningful code testing level.
> >>
> >> I disagree.
> >>
> >> It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long
> >before
> >> the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
> >> reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the
majority
> >> opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have
> >changed
> >> their mind? Nope.
> >
> >Guess I missed the vote to establish "the majority opinion".
> >When and how was it taken?
>
> An NCI member read the comments and categorized them. Results
> were posted here. The majority clearly wanted at least two test speeds.
>
> That means most commenters were not only FOR code testing, they were
> FOR more than the bare minimum 5 wpm.
>
> FCC decided not to go with the majority, that's all.

Two points:
(1) Those that actually file ocomments are NOT
the only individuals that count, so any "majority" so determined
by only counting opinions in comments is of no real value.
(2) If I recall, the "majority" so determined was opposed
to any test other than 5 wpm to satisfy the treaty.

> >> FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.
> >
> >Pretty slow progress for the entity that has always had the final
> >say in such matters.
>
> Not really. Only took them 15 years from first proposing the idea to
> reality.

Even for the government that is slow.

> Here's one for the alternate-history buffs:
>
> In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
> service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
> everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on
220).
> But another reason was to put a service intended to be for local
> communication on VHF instead of HF.
>
> Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped
> the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.

The relavence of that is?
Seems to me that not too long ago the FCC did take
part of 220 even though the overwhelming majority
of amateur commentors were opposed.

> One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack,
such
> as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.

Illogical. To do that, the FCC would have had to make
illegal all those 23 channel CBs that had already been sold.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4095. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:30:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a47hg8$d3m$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33506

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020210144327.16072.00001033@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <a42dq3$kj5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020206204108.13187.00000917@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article <3C5DC5E3.81589F1D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >Bert Craig wrote:
> >> >> I respect your views and generally hold your words in high
esteem...but
> >do
> >> >> you really want to play a game of semantics? Even if I ended up
> >> >> hating the code, I
> >> >> like amateur radio enough to consider passing the 5-wpm a "labor of
> >love,"
> >> >> hence work.
> >> >
> >> >The "labor of love" concept has no place in a governmental
requirement.
> >>
> >> Sure it does.
> >
> >On what basis should ANY government requirement be based
> >on the concept of "labor of love?"
>
> Since the whole service is based on "love of radio", it's logical that the
> requirements should have some connection to it.
> >
> >> >The test is about qualifications, not about love.
> >>
> >> The word "amateur" derives from the Latin word meaning "love". To be
> >> an amateur is to do something for the love of it. Amateur radio is all
> >> about love, so it's logically part of the test requirements.
> >> Just check your dictionary, Cecil.
> >
> >Good grief, not another dictionary exercise.
>
> Why not? Is there a double standard where some people get to haul out
> Webster's but I don't?
>
> >Regardless, the ability to "test" for such love on its

> >own is NOT and should NOT be part of the requirements.
>
> Should folks who have no love of radio be licensed to use a service that
> is fundamentally based on love of radio? I think not.

The point is that there simply is no way to assess the "love
quotient" in the first place.

> >> >The FCC has decided
> >> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
> >>
> >> Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is S25.5.
> >
> >Agreed...and when the FCC first introduced the Novice at 5 wpm
> >some 50 years ago, they had at that time determined 5 wpm
> >met the treaty requirement.
>
> More importantly, it was NEVER challenged.

Your point? Are you suggesting the FCC was inviolation
of the treaty? If yes, please explain.

> For the first 25 or so years of its existence the Novice was a short-term
> one-shot
> "learner's permit" that was not intended to be a permanent license. The
real
> proof
> of Bill's claim is the Technician, which was also introduced in 1951.

Another good example. Same question as before.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4096. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:37:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210233701.02772.00000412@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 33507

In article <20020210183149.26448.00000552@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Consider the medical waiver thing. FCC has to handle all of those because
>who
>>got a medical waiver is NOT in the public database. FCC just wanted out of
>>it.
>
>Actually, the VECs handled the medical waivers.

Weren't they all reviewed by the FCC and filed by them?

>The FCC handled all of the
>complaints about real and perceived abuse of the medical waiver process.

Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4097. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:37:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210233702.02772.00000413@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 33508

In article <3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net>, arcweb@bnnorth.net (Keith Hosman) writes:

>On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
>>Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
>>only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
>>If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
>>take the CW test again.

This also applies to upgrading to Extra.
>>
>umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
>successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
>(codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
>indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
>hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
>rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
>class license in order to use these privelidges"

No, Kim is correct. The CSCE is only good for upgrading for 365 days (not 1 year, btw - watch out for leap years!) The holder of a CSCE must use it to upgrade before it expires or it is useless for upgrading.

It's an oddity of the restructuring. A Tech with a CSCE for Element 1 (code test)
has Novice/Tech Plus operating privieges for as long as the license is held, but
loses upgrade credit when the CSCE expires. Yes, it's a contradiction to give HF
privs (which, by the FCC's own rules, indicates successful code testing) but to deny code test credit, but them's the rules. I think the idea is that the FCC wants
to encourage Tech Pluses to upgrade to General or Extra, but at the same time doesn't want to take operating privs away.

Anybody with a pre-restructuring Tech Plus doesn;t have to retest for code, though.

Here's another odd one: If a person can show that they ever held a Novice class license, they get Element 1 credit. Doesn't matter how long ago the Novice license expired, or whether other license were held. But ONLY the Novice gets this credit! Go figure.

Use your CSCE before 365 days or you'll have to take the element over again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4098. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234145.21287.00000080@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33509

In article <u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com>, "GR" <greinsch@charter.net>
writes:

>
>What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?

Nowadays, not too terribly much, I'm afraid.

>Will I have to take the CW again?

Probably not, which will come as a great relief to you, I'm sure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4099. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234146.21287.00000082@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33510

In article <3C640AF2.759C0CEF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> So you're admitting that you're a criminal?
>
>Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.

Cecil:

Does your XYL know you are sharing such intimate personal
information with a bunch of strangers (to her) in a Usenet
newsgroup? If I were you, I'd duck -- I can visualize her iron
skillet heading right toward your head!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4100. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234146.21287.00000081@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33511

In article <a45ur3fis0@dosa.alt.net>, "Randal T. Flegenschweiter"
<rtf@flegenschzweiterindustrieincnet.org> writes:

>
> As I tell you before, if operator sick then that mean regulation is
>Ok. You are still reading regulation wrong, not interpreting it
>correctly and then you make crazy statement all wrong. I always tell
>my students to research very carefully before making statement about
>rule & regulation. You make wild incorrect statement!

Randal:

I don't know what subject you're teaching to these "students"
of yours, but I certainly hope it isn't English!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4101. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234147.21287.00000084@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33512

In article <20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
>service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
>everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on 220).
>But
>another reason was to put a service intended to be for local communication on
>
>VHF instead of HF.
>
>Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped
>the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.
>
>One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack, such
>as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

I'll tell you what would have happened. We would have lost a little-used and essentially redundant VHF band, and a lot of pressure would have been taken off of the ARS for low-code/no-code licensing. The short-sightedness and selfishness of spectrum-hogging hams is what put us in this mess, when a very acceptable and virtually painless solution was readily to hand. Can you say FUBAR?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4102. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234147.21287.00000083@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33513

In article <3C671B44.FD0FAE35@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You may be right. From long experience I knew that CW would indeed be able
>to
>> get through after all the other modes commonly in use -you know, (and knew
>> then) SSB, AM, FM etc. have faded into the noise. I know that from doing
>it
>> with CW, not from some "bromide" I swallowed. I guess that can't mean
>anything
>> to those who can't have had that experience. But it wasn't that fact, it
>was
>> the response of those who simply refused to accept things as they are and
>> instead substituted their own "bromides".
>
>That may be true but the fact remains that CW doesn't get through when the
>band is absolutely dead.

Cecil:

Don't look now, but neither does PACTOR, PACTOR II, PSK-31, MFSK-16,
or any other digital mode. However, I've communicated via direct-wave
propagation a lot farther using CW on a "dead" band than I have with any
of the above mentioned modes, but hardly at all with SSB, AM, or FM.

>CW does NOT have supernatural powers.

Only God has supernatural powers, Cecil -- but here, we're talking about
modes of radio communication.

>CW is, however, one of the best QRP modes.

Glad to see you acknowledge this fact. However, with the reduction
and eventual elimination of code testing, far fewer hams will be using
CW on QRP, or at any other power level.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4103. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:41:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020210234149.21287.00000085@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 33514

In article <20020210144326.16072.00001032@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>Jim:
>>
>>I respectfully disagree with your disagreement, and your self-answered
>>question. I believe that if FISTS had organized the same type of campaign
>>against a significant reduction of code testing requirements, that the FCC
>>would have had no choice but to pay attention to their position on the
>>matter. If double the number of comments had been received by the FCC,
>>the clear majority in favor of either the status quo in code testing, or a
>>workable compromise (like 12-13 WPM), then the FCC would have been
>>very hard pressed to act against such overwhelming advocacy.
>
>As it was, the majority (57%) favored at least two code test speeds,
>according to a tabulation of comments by an NCI member who read all the
>comments and categorized them. His honesty in presenting the data even
>when it clearly showed the nocodetest/minimum code test position to be a
>minority one is to be commended.

Jim:

Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the
FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think. Nothing
new here.

>>>FISTS wisely stayed out of the fracas, knowing that taking a political
>>>position would only divide their membership.
>>
>>Why should that be? FISTS is called "The International Morse
>>Preservation Society." What do those words mean?
>
>It means we work to keep the mode alive and healthy, with or without tests.

Considering the increasingly deplorable quality of sending I'm hearing
coming from FISTS members, I'm not sure how they plan to accomplish
that goal. ThelastfewQSO'sI'vehadwithFISTSmembershassounded
basicallylikethis,onlythisprobablyismuchbetterspacedthanthoseFISTS'
sendingwas.

>>That we'll keep
>>Morse code alive as long as there are a bunch of withered old codgers
>>around, exchanging numbers on the air in run-together CW using
>>mal-adjusted bugs, or that we'll support the retention of Morse code
>>proficiency in the ARS through continuation of code testing as a
>>requirement for maximum HF operating privileges? Remember,

>>many workable compromises were totally ignored -- including the
>>removal of the code testing burden from the FCC by having the ARRL
>>do all the test scoring, record keeping, and updating of the amateur
>>licensee database.
>
>Yup - but the FCC doesn't care about that. They have other fish to fry.

Well, "frying" those fish is Riley Hollingsworth's job, but maintaining
licensing standards could have made his job much easier, IMHO.

>Consider the medical waiver thing. FCC has to handle all of those because who
>got a medical waiver is NOT in the public database. FCC just wanted out of
>it.

The medical waiver fiasco is an atrocity inflicted upon us by the improper
wielding of political influence by the late JY1, and the complicity of
former President Bush's State Department. It began with the whining of
another codeless ham who, if the truth be told, should have simply been
politely informed by JY1 that this was not an appropriate matter for him
to address through diplomatic channels. The entire thing was badly
botched on all three sides -- again, IMHO. It's just too bad that someone
at the FCC couldn't see the problems a "medical waiver" would cause
for them, from an administrative point-of-view, and send the proposal
back to the State Department with that very point driven home in the
clearest terms. The whole thing was just an exercise in political
ass-kissing all around, to the discredit of all involved. And that's not
just IMHO, that's a natural fact.

>>>Note that FISTS and the ARRL
>>>did encourage all to express their opinions direct to the FCC.
>>
>>Well, that was mighty nice of them to encourage us to do something
>>we all had the right to do anyway.
>
>But did we do it? I know you did (very well, I might add) and so did I, but
>where was everyone else?

Your acknowledgement is very kind, considering the quality of your own
comments to the FCC. As to everyone else, I think that what we've seen
is the total disbelief in the title of the FISTS organization, "The
International Morse Preservation Society." If more FISTS members took
that high-sounding title to heart, perhaps they would have sent in
enough comments to make a difference. However, that didn't happen.
Now, we're stuck with the result -- which will inevitably a conversion
of CW bandwidth to phone usage.

>>>FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.
>>
>>And it seems as though they'll soon get their wish. However, as a
>>person interested in the "preservation" of the Morse code, and a
>>FISTS member, I would have preferred it if more of an effort had
>>been made to get the FISTS organization to live up to it's title.

>
>Doing so would have opened up a whole can of worms best avoided.

I really don't see how bad opening that particular can of worms could
have been, but we'll never know. All we have to look forward to now
is the "refarming" of the Novice/Tech+ CW subbands, and probably
a good bit of the General-and-above CW subbands, to use by the
mic jockeys.

>--

>I think there's another motive that the FCC is acting on. One of their
>biggest problems is pirate stations - bootleggers, freebanders, whatever.
>FCC figures that the code test is what keeps a lot of these folks out of
>ham radio, so by eliminating it and simplifying the writtens there will
>be more hams and fewer pirates.
>
>Remember that it's much easier to do enforcement action against a
>licensee than against a totally unlicensed person. You know where the
>licensee is and who he/she is, for one thing.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Sort of like, "If you can't beat 'em, let 'em join -- then work on them
from the inside out. Funny, that concept would never have occurred
to me. Once again, IMHO, that sounds like a lazy man's way out.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4104. ARNewsline 1278 - Feb 8 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 04:46:08 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020210234608.02012.00001024@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 33515

Amateur Radio Newsline Report 1278 – February 8, 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1278 with a release date of Friday, February 8th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Another Anthrax scare halts mail to the FCC in D.C. and ham radio growth may not be as good as it seemed. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1278 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: FCC STOPS D.C.MAIL DELIVERY DUE TO NEW ANTHRAX SCARE

The Federal Communications Commission says that it will not accept paper mail in the Washington D.C. area until further notice. This, after a trace amount of the Anthrax virus was found during a routine test. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Paul Courson, WA3VJB, is in the nations capitol with the details
--

The scant amount of anthrax contamination found at a Federal Communications Commission mail facility in Maryland last week was consistent with cross-contamination of mail. At least that’s what the result of tests conducted by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention showed.

The FCC's mail processing facility in Capitol Heights Maryland, outside Washington, was tested about a week and a half ago as a routine precaution. One sample taken tested positive for Anthrax. The C-D-C blames the problem on cross contamination of mail. This means one or more pieces of mail from another facility may have inadvertently brought the contaminant to the Maryland site.

The agency is arranging for the facility to be decontaminated and re-tested. Mail deliveries, which have been halted, will not resume until the area is found to be anthrax-free. For ham radio, this only affects such things as requesting or commenting on rules change requests.

The FCC said it would also test the mail room at its Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, facility to make sure that it is Anthrax free. Gettysburg is where most Amateur Radio related mail including license applications and renewals are sent and is not affected by this latest paper mail suspension order. At least not so far.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Paul Courson WA3VJB in Washington.

--

Late last year five people, including two postal workers, died of the inhalation form of anthrax and more than a dozen were infected in a series of attacks that followed the terrorist raids on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. So far no arrests have been made in that case. (Published news reports)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: ON-ORBIT COMPUTER FAILURE CAUSES ISS OUTAGE

Ham radio was there but it was not needed. That’s the basic wrap up after a computer failure aboard the International Space Station sent the 17-story complex into a slow drift for a few hours on Monday February 4th.

The temporary outage also disrupted voice communications with the ground using normal channels. It also brought science research to a halt. But NASA officials said that neither the station nor its crew ever were in any danger.

The station drift was halted about 17:00 GMT. That enabled the crew to begin the job of re-orienting the stations solar panel arrays. Once normal power levels were restored, systems and experiments that had been shut down were brought back on line.

The computer shutdown was eventually traced to a defective hard drive. James Hartsfield, a spokesman for NASA's Johnson Space Center in Houston said that the three ham crew was never in any danger as a result of the failure. He termed it nothing more than an interruption to their normal work day.

Launched last December 5th on board the shuttle Endevour, Russian cosmonaut Yuri Onufrienko RK3DUO and U.S. astronauts Daniel Bursch KD5PNU and Carl Walz KC5TIE are the forth crew to inhabit the I-S-S. In addition to all of the high tech communications gear the crew also has ARISS - the ham radio station on board the International Space Station as backup voice and data communications. It was available, albeit not needed this time around. (ARNewsline(tm) from NASA Release)

**

HAM RADIO GROWTH: CENSUS REDUX

Some dark news following the good news on ham radio growth patterns. The numbers may not be as good as we reported two weeks ago. So says Fred Maia, W5YI, who follows growth trends in ham radio. And Fred says that the numbers we presented are overly optimistic:

--
Fred Maia:

“The FCC database is a database of all amateurs who have been licensed for twelve years. Thats ten years for the license term and an additional two. The reason it stays in the database for the additional two is so that it can be renewed diring the grace period. Thefefore, the licenses in the database are two years more thanthe ten year term or twenty percent inflated.”

--

In our story we used statistics from several sources including QRZ, W5YI and others. But Fred says that there are more recent numbers that show things may not be as good as they may seem on the surface.

According to Fred, as of January 15th 2002 there are actually only 98,030 holders of the Extra class license, 86,425 legacy Advanced, 138,546 Generals, 318,603 Technicians and legacy Tech plus and only 39,972 Novice class. The total is 681,576. That is considerably lower than the 720,194 in the latest QRZ census and 10,424 lower than the adjusted 692,000 we believed to be accurate.

The bottom line. Once you take away the expired licenses that are in their grace renewal period, the club and military recreation stations and the like the numbers tell a different story. One thats not nearly as rosy as we and others thought only two weeks ago. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

WINTER OLYMPICS 2002: COMMEMORATIVE STATION ON THE AIR

The Winter Olympics are in Salt Lake City Utah and ham radio is helping to celebrate the games with a special events station. Linda Reader, N7HVF, has more:

--
“Its going to start on Thursday at 5 PM Mountain Standard Time and it will go until the 25th of February. It will be available on all bands, so people will only need to listen around. The station call will be W7U and the trustee is W7EO.”
--

Again, listen for W7U celebrating the 2002 Winter Olympics through February, 25th. (N7HVF)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WB2FKZ repeater serving West Babylon New York.

(5 sec pause here)

**

SPECTRUM: WHITE HOUSE PROPOSES PAYOUT TO CHANGE FREQUENCIES

The Bush administration says that it will propose setting up a $715 million fund to reimburse federal agencies that relocate their RF operations. This, for moving away from spectrum that has already been auctioned to commercial service providers.

In the past, federal agencies have had to negotiate with the winning bidders to cover relocation costs. In fact, following the September 11th terror attacks the Pentagon said it would not move off bands that it uses for military training and other purposes without sufficient funds to pay for relocating.

This created a stalemate over making available airwaves hotly desired by mobile telephone companies like Verizon Wireless. Now, in his budget just sent to congress, President Bush proposes setting up a fund to streamline the reimbursement process. Auction receipts to cover agency's relocation costs would be paid into the fund and federal agencies would be reimbursed for their relocation costs out of the proceeds.

What does this mean for Amateur Radio you ask? Simply that more spectrum that hams share with the government and military could be up for grabs sooner than most thought it might happen. But even with the subsidy some analysts of military communications say that it still could take several years before you see any spectrum moves take place. (Published reports)

**

FCC: OLYMPICS CAN USE 2300 MHZ HAM BAND FOR OLYMPICS

Broadcasters at the 2002 Winter Olympics have been granted a Special Temporary Authority from the FCC to use a ham band for their coverage of the Salt Lake City games. The S-T-A was made available at the request of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee R-F coordination group to use 2300 to 2305 and 2390 through 2450 MHz for remote pick-ups at various Olympic venues.

Unlike Australia two years ago, this FCC action does not take hams off the air nor does it forbid amateur use of the band during the period of the S-T-A. Instead it took action reminiscent of one that helped to establish ham radio’s “National Frequency Coordination Council.” The agency told all spectrum users that it had designated the Salt Lake Organizing Committee is the single point of contact or “SPOC” in regard to all Olympics radio frequency requirements. This delegated authority continues with the committee through March 31st. (FCC, Broadcasting & Cable, ARNewsline(tm))

**

PUBLIC SERVICE: HAM RADIO AT THE SUPERBOWL

Last week’s Super Bowl played in New Orleans between the St. Louis Rams and the New England Patriots was a squeaker to the very last play. With the game tied at 17 to 17, in the 4th quarter, New England opted for a Field Goal that brought them victory in the very last seconds of normal play. It was a game seen by millions, but what t-v viewers did not see was the work of a group of New Orleans area hams who were a part of the behind the scenes communications effort for the game. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, lives in the Big Easy and has this look at the role that ham radio played:

--
While thousands cheered on the Rams and Patriots inside the Superdome and millions watched on television around the world, a handful of New Orleans hams were busy outside in the streets of the Crescent City.

--
“K5OEP go ahead.” “Checking in, nothing to report. Everything’s normal. WA5RT 2104 aaah, Poydras and South Claiborne.” “K5OEP roger, 2218. Other station?”
--

K5OEP is the call sign of Southeast Louisiana ARES. New Orleans area hams assisted the American Red Cross as they provided tracking for those sent to area shelters or hospitals should the unthinkable occur. Several Emergency Response Vehicles were in use feeding the workers and standing by in reserve should they be needed in an emergency. The ERV’s had a staff of 2 plus a ham with voice capability and APRS tracking. There were “Action Teams” standing by with a ham and a dual band HT. Hams also manned a command post trailer at City Hall as well as the Red Cross operations center on Canal Street and another Red Cross office in suburban Metairie. The communications operations began on Friday, February 1st and continued Saturday as well as Super Bowl Sunday. Tom Miller, AC5TM, ARRL Louisiana Section Emergency Coordinator and Keith Barnes, W5KB of the Red Cross were instrumental in putting the effort together. The local CBS affiliate, WWL-TV channel 4 did a lengthy report on the Red Cross, of which about a minute was focused on the hams. Several hams were featured on camera in the piece. Thankfully, this is representative of most of the radio traffic.
--
“K5OEP this is W5GAD.” “W5GAD, K5OEP go ahead.” “Just checking in Josh and, um, if it’s possible could we get a cup of coffee next time the truck comes down this direction?” “This is KC5BCR, we’re gonna take care of that coffee request.”
--

Only three things occurred that could be considered out of the ordinary... a semi-nude escapee jumped off a bridge to evade capture, a Rolodex in the Superdome caught fire from being too close to a light and the New England Patriots finally won the big game. And isn't it fitting that an underdog team called the Patriots would be victorious on this first Superbowl since September 11th. Next on the agenda for the city... Mardi Gras on Tuesday, February 12th. From Party Central in New Orleans, Louisiana, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA.

--

Before we leave this one we have some interesting statistics. According to the Broadcasting and Cable newsletter, Super Bowl 36 delivered the Fox Television Network a 42.5 rating and 61 share in what are called the metered Nielson overnight market ratings. This means that about 67 percent of United States households with television sets had them tuned to the game at some point during the telecast. (ARNewsline(tm) - Produced by KC5MFA with sound provided by KD5BLV)

**
RESCUE RADIO: HAMS ASSIST FOLLOWING QUAKE IN TURKEY

Amateur Radio operators in Turkey were among the first to respond in the wake of a earthquake that rocked the province of Afyon on Sunday February 3rd. More than forty were killed and at least 170 were injured injuries were reported in

the aftermath of the 6 point zero tembler. Structures were destroyed and lines of communications were cut. Enter Amateur Radio.

According to an ARRL bulletin members of Turkey's Civil Defense Search and Rescue Team responded following the quake. The bulletin quotes Aziz Sasa, TA1E, the president of the Turkish national Amateur Radio society as saying that S-A-R communicated with it's headquarters in Ankara and within the affected area. This was because ham radio was the only long and medium-range communication resource available until normal lines of communications were restored. Most ham radio communications was on VHF using a system of linked repeaters. (ARRL)

**

RESCUE RADIO: AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS HELP SAILBOAT IN DISTRESS

The ARRL Letter says that Amateur Radio played a role in the rescue of two people aboard the sailing vessel Antigone. This, after it ran aground off Honduras on Thursday, January 24th.

Ed Petzolt, K1LNC, of Hobe Sound, Florida, told the Letter that, despite some apparently deliberate interference, members of the Intercontinental Net on 14.300 MHz helped relay communications from the vessel, which was equipped with an High Frequency marine radio.

David Walz, AG4LI/HR6, in Honduras was in contact with the boat and passed traffic from the stranded mariners to the Net. Petzolt said he was able to patch the US Coast Guard in Miami through to Walz, so the Coast Guard could obtain additional information and coordinate with Honduran authorities.

Petzolt said the two passengers aboard the 40-foot vessel were safe, and the boat was on the beach. The FCC is reportedly investigating the interference issue. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO SCHOLARSHIPS: QUARTER CENTURY WIRELESS ASSOCIATION

The Quarter Century Wireless Association has announced its funding several scholarship for 2002. There are eleven QCWA scholarships valued at $1000 each and five valued at $1500 each to be awarded later this year. Hams interested in applying for the QCWA Scholarships should contact the Foundation for Amateur Radio. The Foundation administers the scholarships sponsored by the QCWA. Additional information and an application form may be requested by letter or QSL card to the FAR Scholarships, Post Office Box 831, Riverdale, Maryland, 20738. (QCWA)

**

HAMFESTS: LIMARC N.Y. FEBRUARY 24TH

LIMARC -- New York's Long Island Mobile Amateur Radio Club will hold its annual indoor Ham Radio flea-market On Sunday, February 24th. Location is the Levittown Hall beginning at 9 a-m. More information is on the web

www.limarc.org. (N2DO)

**

THE HANDI-HAMS: 2002 CALIFORNIA CAMP FULL

The Minnesota based Handi Hams say that their California Radio camp is now full. This year, campers will be treated to presentations by Jeff Reinhardt, AA6JR, for Alinco, and everybodys favorite ham radio instructor Gordon West, WB6NOA. The dates for the 2002 Handi Ham California Camp are March 3rd to the 10th at Camp Joan Mier in Malibu. More is in cyberspace at www.mtn.org/handiham/workshop.html. (HandiHams)

**

BREAK 2

Here when you need us 52 weeks a year. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SUPER NET HAS ARRIVED

Australia’s new super-net has had its first successful demonstration, proving it can carry an enormous amount of data between two locations. In fact, its not just fast. It is virtual reality come to life. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has a look at what super net can do:

--
In its 'maiden voyage,' the new high speed networking technology --10 Gigabit per second Ethernet -- ran a revolutionary combination of technology that allowed two people, in different locations, to work together on a virtual 3D object, each being able to feel the object and see what the other person was doing to it. At the same time they could use a studio quality video link to communicate.

These two functions were tested in a situation where they had to compete against a volume of network traffic equivalent to Sydney's telephone system at peak levels.

The demonstration involved networking a virtual environment from two separate sites, CSIRO's Virtual Environments laboratory at the Australian National University and CSIRO's corporate headquarters several kilometres away.

--

According to Graham, networks such as this will allow users in several locations to feel computer generated objects such as body organs. Among other things, this tactile ability means a surgeon could train many students in different cities at the same time. (Q-News)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: CENTRAL STATES VHF SOCIETY CALL FOR PAPERS

The Central States VHF Society will be holding it's 36th Annual Conference later this year. The dates are July 26th to the 28th at the Sheraton Four Points Hotel in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

And now comes an invitation to those interested in making presentations at this event. You are invited to submit an outline to Marc Holdwick, N8KWX, who is this years Technical Program Cairman.

Holdwick says that any topic related to weak-signal VHF operation is welcome and can be submitted in either paper or electronic format. But says N8KWX, those submitting will be required to have the finished work in his hands by May 5th to be included in the printed Proceedings.

If you are interested in taking part, you can contact Mark Holdwick by e-mail n8kwx@csvhfs.org. His snail-mail address is PO Box 6051, Buffalo Grove, Illinois, 60089. More information is on the web at www.csvhfs.org/CSVHF02.HTML (CSVHFS)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: RF CONTROL OF BIOMOLICULES

Scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Media Lab report that they can now control biomolecules with radio frequency energy. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reports:

--
Biomolecules such as proteins and nucleic acids are basic building blocks in nature. They carry out a wide variety of nano-scale functions, many of which have proven useful in drug discovery, drug delivery, biocatalysis, and bio-materials. But to optimally exploit these capabilities, researchers must be able to rapidly control their activity.

Now in the paper, titled "Remote Electronic Control of D-N-A Hybridization Through Inductive Coupling to an Attached Metal Nanocrystal Antenna, researchers describe a unique method to do this. One that employs the phenomenon of inductive coupling to metallic nanoparticles by radio frequency energy to specifically and remotely control DNA molecules. And they say, it works.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW.

--

Their paper was published in the January 10th issue of the journal Nature. More information is available at www.engeneos.com. (Technology Today)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: NEW RSGB PRESIDENT

The Radio Society of Great Britain has a new President. As of January 1st, Bob Whelan, G3PJT, has taken up the leadership position at the United Kingdom’s national ham radio society.

Whelan says that he is looking forward to the challenges ahead in raising the awareness of the value of Amateur Radio as a way of interesting the next generation of radio engineers and scientists. He will serve a two year term leading the RSGB. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL – SOUTH AFRICA: NEW SHORTWAVE GUIDE

Media Network reports that a new comprehensive country-by-country guide to domestic and external shortwave broadcasts from sub-Saharan Africa, including opposition broadcasts to the African continent, has been added to the British DX Club web site. The guide, compiled by BDXC editor Tony Rogers and fully updated for the winter schedule period, is available in by-country and by-frequency versions. It can be found on the Articles index page of the web site at www.bdxc.org.uk. (Media Network)

**

CONTESTS: GREAT LAKES QSO PARTY

The Great Lakes QSO Party will begin on Saturday, March 9th at 17:00 UTC and run through Sunday March 10th at 04:00 UTC. The object of this contest is to work as many Great Lakes States as well as VE3 and VE4 Canadian provinces as possible during the allotted time. C-W and SSB are the only modes permitted and operation is on all bands except for WARC. Logs must be submitted by mail before April 25th to the address listed at the contest website. Look for more information at www.geocities.com/mdxa1/qsoparty.html. (E-mail)

**

DX

In DX, the Trindade 2002 PWØT team reports that several major sponsors have come forward providing vital support for the upcoming DXpedition. ICOM America will be providing a number of ICOM IC-756 PRO II transceivers. ICOM will also be sending along an IC-910H for satellite operation. Possibly the first-ever satellite activity from Trindade.

But that’s not all. Electril, a Brazilian manufacturer, has begun shipping antennas to the team staging area and Bob Heil, K9EID, of Heil Sound has personally made arrangements to insure that the DX’ers will have new reliable headsets. Meantime, JA1FGI and JA1WSK have covered the cost of purchasing and shipping a complete RTTY, PSK-31 and SSTV equipment package. Lastly, its reported that the Six Meter Amateur Radio Klub and the Chiltern DX Club are the first organizations to provide the D-Xpedition with financial support.

The operators will leave Rio de Janero on February 15th for Trindade. More information is at the DXpedition website located in cyberspace at www.trindade2002.com (PW0T release)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE SWOOPER

And finally this week, a loud buzzing noise being heard in the international shortwave band is apparently a new RADAR system used to measure wave height. According to Mark Fine, the system is located at Barnegat Bay New Jersey and transmits a one megahertz wide signal in varying five megahertz wide segments. Take a listen:

---
swooper audio here
--

Fine tells Amateur Radio Newsline that he made that recording on 4.795 MHz at 1850 UTC on February 5th. He was listening on a Drake R 8 A receiver set to upper sideband and a 2.3 kHz bandwidth. He says that during the evenings this beast takes over a whole band and is heard as far away as Europe and South America.

Already, some SWL’s have nick-named the noise a "swooper" because it sweeps quite fast making a "swoop" noise as it goes by in SSB. Others have called it the Windshield Wiper Network, which they say is very apropos. (DXLD, CGC Communicator with “Swooper” audio provided by Mark Fine).

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Roy Neal, K6DUE, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

4105. Re: 70cm Band Threat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 05:45:49 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <78E5EF32F27C1535.641403B2E19DC0B1.C907CC53E689F34E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33516

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:16:34 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>heh heh heh, or the 1.2G? I have a scanner that will monitor those areas,
>but never hear a thing (don't listen that often, either--I get very little
>time to play with my scanner any more).

Well, IIRC, 220 is open to Novices...maybe we just need more Novices
:)

>145.190 is my "home" on 2M. I've been with Billy's machine nearly since
>becoming a ham. You'll never hear anyone tell you what you can/can't talk
>about on that repeater. If they do, they ain't been there very long! It's
>an excellent machine with excellent range.

I've hit it solid from 95mi out with a mobile dualband, so it's pretty
good when it's cooperating. I guess they've got the problems worked
out now, though, since we haven't had the vile cracklings all over the
late traffic net lately. 2m FM just shouldn't sound like 160m QRP AM
during a thunderstorm.

>Same here. Most of my 2M operation here in the last six months or so has
>been on rare occasions when my husband and I are traveling to meet for
>dinner and then on the way home. We'll used simplex.

Well, I'm still pretty active on the late traffic net, but for the
most part, I'm either listening to the IRLP node, or just playing
memory channel roulette.

>Speaking of 10M, I went out today to visit with my parents. Mom and I had
>gotten my dad a Radio Shack 10M rig for Christmas and he is blind, so could
>not figure out all the buttons, etc. I sat down with him and taught him all
>the buttons, gave him some pointers on SSB operation and suddenly heard a
>Icelandic station on 28.360!!!! TH____ (forget now).

Propagation has been interesting lately. I was playing with an 11m HT
(mostly pondering the potential uses of its innards, since it was on
closeout at RS right next to the 49MHz radio I'm planning to move to
6m) and was hearing quite a lot from a normally lousy spot, on
something that should be about as insensitive as a pile of rocks.

>WOW, I couldn't
>believe it. I have heard 10M lately and couldn't believe I was hearing
>Iceland. I got to show my dad the example of longpath (didn't work)
>propagation vs. direct/short. He is a retired Chief Radioman in the Navy,
>so it's beginning to all come back to him. I don't know if he'll ever get
>to "chasing DX" or not, but I had him sit down and run the ship for a few

>before I left. You shoulda seen him catching signals and clarifying them in
>real quick...LOL

I'll have to rearrange some of the extra wire laying around here and
see what I can pull in. My BCB listening hasn't been all that great,
but it's entirely possible that somebody got my connection to the
raingutters tangled up in the weed whacker again.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4106. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 05:51:44 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <42FF327B5C6113A9.D1F3B0530049A2B5.D4B1CD44ED9F3909@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33517

On 09 Feb 2002 14:14:27 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

> If my XYL is out-and-about, I will allow the 10 year old to answer her
>call. However I take the mike at some point and state "This is K4YZ, control
>op present".

Why not just teach her the theory, and take her to the next VE
session; not only do you simplify matters on your end, but you help to
bring the number of licenses up, and the average age of licensees
down.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4107. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 06:00:03 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <DF2A97D02234EB4D.3BF46EA367F48969.A2BAF227F9C5D195@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33518

On 11 Feb 2002 04:37:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Here's another odd one: If a person can show that they ever held a Novice class
>license, they get Element 1 credit. Doesn't matter how long ago the Novice
>license expired, or whether other license were held. But ONLY the Novice gets
>this credit! Go figure.

Probably aimed at dragging back those who passed Novice, but lost
interest some time in the past.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4108. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 07:00:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211020033.17982.00000782@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33519

>Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>Date: 2/10/2002 11:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id:
><42FF327B5C6113A9.D1F3B0530049A2B5.D4B1CD44ED9F3909@lp.airnews.net>

>Why not just teach her the theory, and take her to the next VE
>session; not only do you simplify matters on your end, but you help to
>bring the number of licenses up, and the average age of licensees
>down.

Already ahead of ya! She's got the Code down already and is fumbling a
bit on theory, but she'll be there soon!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4109. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 07:23:18 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202110721000.807-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33520

No, she isn't incorrect. The code element granted via a CSCE is good forever with regard to operating privileges, but only valid for 365 days for upgrade purposes (to general or extra, currently). If one does not UPGRADE within 365 days to general (or extra), one loses the code credit and must retake element 1. However, one can continue to operate on the "novice HF bands" even if the retaken element is failed!

On Mon, 11 Feb 2002, Keith Hosman wrote:
>On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
>>Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
>>only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
>>If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
>>take the CW test again.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
>successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
>(codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
>indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
>hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
>rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
>class license in order to use these privelidges"
>
>
>Keith Hosman
>Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
>Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
>American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist
>

4110. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 08:27:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C68C44C.4125A1D5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33521

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Thanks for your reply Dick. But don't you think you could have made your
> point without perpetuating the enmity between hams here?

Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all the "other side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir and stir and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the knaves but the good guys too? What is it about being a pugnacions louts like Carl and Cecil that get them a pass for all the damaging assertions, accusations and downright lies, while mainstreamers like you turn the heat on those of us who defend ourselves? Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade? I'll say it again- I showed up here a few years ahead of you with a helpful attitude, and what happened immediatly, almost instantly, dismayed me, sae me back on my heels in disbelief. And these characters seem to hold some sort of hammer over many of you middle-roaders, ARRL and even the FCC. It's nothing short of amazing!

If we could

> separate the lambasting (on both sides) from the issues, I think we'd
> actually see more agreement in goals.

I don't doubt that at all. So why don't we see someone taking Stevenson and Moore to task in kind, perhaps with an eye to a little more civility and less rancor? We all know the code test is a done deal, awaiting the calendar, for whatever time that may take. That changes nothing about the FACT that radiotelegraphy remains one of the most universal tools a ham has available, if only he is intelligent enough to use it. Maybe that fact is what sticks in Stevenson's craw
and causes him so much reflux. If so, there's a simple solution to it all- he can merely recognize and admit that it is fact, and stop his belligerance toward CW and everyone who is able to use it, just as we have certainly adknowledged the fact that modern modes HAVE found a and continue to find acceptance within ham radio I'm a very active user), and we can all get on with life. Instead, he slams around like a loose cannon chasing a bull in a china shop, and somewhere along the way, someone is gonna take potshots at him. Ite's inevitable, as long as he keep on that track, and it seems no one can do a derail job on him.

> What kind of response do you expect
> to receive to your ideas when you expend so much verbiage calling people
> names?

I'll say it one more time- I turned the other cheek and it got whacked right off, and I'm tired of it. Don't to that anymore.

> You discredit your own point of view. You negate the validity of
> the point of your argument. If you want to shoot down someones argument, do
> that.

You find a way to call off the dogs, and I'll be pleased to stop stomping 'em.

> But calling them names doesn't work. It's not a valid
> counterargument. Who wants to listen to an angry namecaller?I don't know what
> you hope to accomplish by talking about "tired refrains from techies". What
> do you call the guys who have always experimented with radio? Weren't the
> guys who developed SSB and RTTY the 'techies' of their era?

I think you misread the term as it was not intended to be derogatory, rather as
an abbreviation. Even the geeks of today call themselves geeks. It's language in
transition. I used 'techies' to keep from having to use half a sentence to
otherwise describe them. Do you think Doug Smith considers himself a techie> I
have no doubt he does, and from all accounts he's all that Stevenson and Moore
are not, a really nice fellow.

>
> Cecil and Carl know they can say anything they want to you, Dick, because
> they know you don't argue effectively or rationally against them.

So when they feel like being called assholes, all they gotta do
is provoke me, right? So what they claim is so much vapor designed
solely to make me angry? So why aren't they being called to task for it?

> I think
> you can, but as often as not, you dilute it with a bunch of namecalling.

Reality doesn't seem to mean much to them. When it comes to actually
DOING ham radio with digital modes, I KNOW I've exceeded the
both of them by a fair margin. Maybe that's their problem -Their
rantings are from a position of theory and talking, for the most part,
and not that much on-air HF time. Cecil says he loves CW, and maybe
he does. Sometimes love doesn't amount to much to some folks. As for Carl,
he wouldn't be caught with a J-38 on his premises.
So Stevenson designs cordless telephones. Magnificant. As far as
I can determine, the both of them are full of hot air or worse.

>
> Try editing out all the personal stuff before you send. You might find
> you'll see less of it in their replies to you.

Yep, just let the slams come on long enough and I imagine they will
eventually believe their own nonsense. And who knows about all the
bewildered newcomers? THEY are the main reason for all this, you
know. Cecil does.

> On the other hand, maybe
> that's what floats your boat. I don't know.
>

Don't own a boat, Jim. I guess I'm getting a bit on the intolerant side
in my old age. I just don't suffer fools and jackasses near so easily as

I once did, even those who claim to be geniuses.

>
> Best 73, and I look forward to the next RRAP CW net.

Got it.

4111. Re: Cell Phone: Are they Safe? - My Research

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 11:40:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211064047.17949.00000704@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33522

From: cellphoneemf@aol.com (McNeil)

>I'm a graduate student at UConn, and I've done some research on the
>safety of cell phones. You can view my article at
>http://members.aol.com/cellphoneemf/. I'd love to get feedback.
>Thanks.

Interesting work. I scanned it briefly, and did note a few details that missed the mark.

For example:

"The animal studies also cast doubt on the safety of cellular phones and other low-level radiation sources. It is confusing as to why the Toler study(20) chose to expose the mice to 435 MHz as opposed to 2450 MHz since it duplicated the Chou (21) experiment in every other aspect."

On what basis did you feel the choice of frequency "cast doubt?" If one wants to do an animal study that has a reasonable relationship with possible human effects, one would choose a frequency that is not close to the resonant frequency of the animal. Your "cast doubt" conclusion missed the mark.

Other choices of words, IMHO, show that there is a significant bias to the study and its conclusions. I am sure your research found that groups like the World Health Organization, Committee for Man and Radiation, etc., have made statements that is no substantive evidence that exposure to RF at the levels of the current standards pose a known human health risk. They then go on to discuss the unknowns, the ongoing studies and the need for same. Translating that to "grave concern" is, IMHO, not accurate and shows bias.

Just a very fast take.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4112. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 11:43:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211064355.17949.00000706@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33523

From: Dick Carroll dickc58!@worldnet.att.net

>> First step is to get hams in the habit of actually building radio sets from
>the
>>
>> ground up, or adapting available equipment to new uses. How ya gonna do
>that?

> Simple, Jim. Berate them all, call everyone who has been around over 5
>years and
>actually uses CW on the air a dinosaur Luddite. Works every time.

No, no, Dick. You are on the right track, but you have it wrong. You should call them "lazy" and "wannabe." Following the fine example you have set wrt Morse code, THAT should make them want to build...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4113. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 11:49:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211064931.17949.00000707@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33524

From: Dick Carroll dickc58!@worldnet.att.net

>> > So what is it that suggests to them that each and every one of us should
>> >strive
>> >to become a digital-mode designer?

>> I guess you have a need to always take the most extreme-possible
>interpretation
>> of everything said to you.

> I beg your Pardone, Sire, but that surely is Carl Stevenson's and Cecil
>Moore's attitude, if not the FCC's.

Nonsense, again. If the FCC wanted to see very single ham be a digital
designer, they could make a rules change that requires same.

I have ready Stevenson's and Moore's words and did not get the impression that
they want every single ham to be a digital designer.

Let's ask them. Carl and Cecil, do you believe that every single ham should be
a digital designer, or do you believe that Dick has taken the most extreme
possible interpretation of a selected part of the posts you have made?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4114. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 11:53:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211065326.17949.00000708@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33525

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Actually, the VECs handled the medical waivers.

>Weren't they all reviewed by the FCC and filed by them?

I may be in a bit over my head on this one, but to my understanding, any FCC review of the waivers was no more extensive than any other application matter. I have cc'ed my low friend in high places in the ARRL VEC to ensure that I am correct. If he tells me I am wrong, I will post his response.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4115. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 11:58:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211065849.17949.00000710@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33526

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all the
>"other
>side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir and stir
>and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the knaves but
>the good guys too?

When I get trashed by someone I consider to be one of the good guys, I think
long and hard about what they have to say.

>Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in
>kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade?

Of course you have a choice, Dick, and you make that choice the same way nearly
every time...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4116. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 12:05:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211070506.17580.00001058@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33529

In article <a47hg8$d3m$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >> >The FCC has decided
>> >> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification presently.
>> >>
>> >> Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is S25.5.
>> >
>> >Agreed...and when the FCC first introduced the Novice at 5 wpm
>> >some 50 years ago, they had at that time determined 5 wpm
>> >met the treaty requirement.
>>
>> More importantly, it was NEVER challenged.
>
>Your point? Are you suggesting the FCC was inviolation
>of the treaty?

No, just the opposite.

>If yes, please explain.
>
>> For the first 25 or so years of its existence the Novice was a short-term
>> one-shot
>> "learner's permit" that was not intended to be a permanent license. The
>real
>> proof
>> of Bill's claim is the Technician, which was also introduced in 1951.
>
>Another good example. Same question as before.

Same answer.

One could claim that the Novice was not absolute proof of 5 wpm being in
accord with the treaty because of the characteristics of the original Novice
license. The same cannot be said of the Tech license.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

4117. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 12:05:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211070507.17580.00001059@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33530

In article <a47h29ngv1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <a42c1hrdo1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020206204108.13187.00000918@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> >> In article <20020205225856.17193.00000102@mb-cu.aol.com>,
>> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >A concerted effort by FISTS could have resulted in
>> >> >a compromise of 12 or 13 WPM, which would have still been a
>> >> >meaningful code testing level.
>> >>
>> >> I disagree.
>> >>
>> >> It's clear that the FCC had already decided against code testing long
>> >before
>> >> the NPRM was issued. The medical waiver headaches alone were enough
>> >> reason for them to eliminate all but the minimum. FCC ignored the
>majority
>> >> opinion as if it were not there. Would having a larger majority have
>> >changed
>> >> their mind? Nope.
>> >
>> >Guess I missed the vote to establish "the majority opinion".
>> >When and how was it taken?
>>
>> An NCI member read the comments and categorized them. Results
>> were posted here. The majority clearly wanted at least two test speeds.
>>
>> That means most commenters were not only FOR code testing, they were
>> FOR more than the bare minimum 5 wpm.
>>
>> FCC decided not to go with the majority, that's all.
>
>Two points:
>(1) Those that actually file ocomments are NOT
>the only individuals that count, so any "majority" so determined
>by only counting opinions in comments is of no real value.

Since any interested party may file comments, why should the opinions
of all those who commented be discounted?

>(2) If I recall, the "majority" so determined was opposed
>to any test other than 5 wpm to satisfy the treaty.

Nope. Not true.The majority wanted either two test speeds or three test speeds.
5 & 12/13 and 5, 12/13 & 20
were the most common choices.

You can look it up in the archives.

Of course the FCC is not required to go with majority opinion on any
issue. But it is interesting to note what the majority opinion actually
was.

>> >> FCC has been pushing for the end of code testing since 1975.

>> >Pretty slow progress for the entity that has always had the final
>> >say in such matters.
>>
>> Not really. Only took them 15 years from first proposing the idea to
>> reality.
>
>Even for the government that is slow.

HAW!! That's a good one!
>
>> Here's one for the alternate-history buffs:
>>
>> In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
>> service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
>> everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on
>220).
>> But another reason was to put a service intended to be for local
>> communication on VHF instead of HF.
>>
>> Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped
>> the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.
>
>The relavence of that is?

The effect of 27 MHz cb on the ARS, for one.

>Seems to me that not too long ago the FCC did take
>part of 220 even though the overwhelming majority
>of amateur commentors were opposed.

Exactly! But it was not given to cb users.

>> One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack,
>such
>> as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.
>
>Illogical.

Are you saying everything govt. does is logical?

> To do that, the FCC would have had to make
>illegal all those 23 channel CBs that had already been sold.
>
They did, as I recall. Not to use, but to sell. New cb sets had to
be 40 channel. I don't know about resale of existing 23 channel sets.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4118. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 12:05:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211070508.17580.00001061@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33527

In article <DF2A97D02234EB4D.3BF46EA367F48969.A2BAF227F9C5D195@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 11 Feb 2002 04:37:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Here's another odd one: If a person can show that they ever held a Novice
>class
>>license, they get Element 1 credit. Doesn't matter how long ago the Novice
>>license expired, or whether other license were held. But ONLY the Novice
>gets
>>this credit! Go figure.
>
>Probably aimed at dragging back those who passed Novice, but lost
>interest some time in the past.
>
Yup, and not a bad idea. Trouble is, if somebody skipped the Novice step
they don't get the credit. Doesn't make sense.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4119. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 12:05:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211070508.17580.00001060@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33528

In article <20020210234147.21287.00000084@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020210144325.16072.00001031@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>In 1975 the EIA wanted the FCC to reallocate 220-225 to a new "Class E" CB
>>service. Part of the reason for this proposal was to sell new sets (almost
>>everything sold to cb users up to that time would have been useless on 220).
>>But
>>another reason was to put a service intended to be for local communication
>on
>>VHF instead of HF.
>>
>>Of course hams fought it tooth and nail and eventually the FCC dropped
>>the idea, and instead expanded 27 MHz CB to 40 channels.
>>
>>One wonders what would have happened if hams had taken a different tack,
>such
>>as "OK, take 220 but give us back 11 meters" or some such.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>I'll tell you what would have happened. We would have lost a little-used
>and essentially redundant VHF band, and a lot of pressure would have
>been taken off of the ARS for low-code/no-code licensing. The short-
>sightedness and selfishness of spectrum-hogging hams is what put us
>in this mess, when a very acceptable and virtually painless solution was
>readily to hand. Can you say FUBAR?

Larry:

That's one possibility. As I recall, though, many cb users were also against
it,
because:

- much less dx potential on 220
- have to buy all new rigs and antennas
- existing equipment would be almost worthless

I doubt it would have eased the pressure on license tests, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4120. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 12:36:57 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c67ba9b.1945683@news.bright.net>
Source record: 33531

On 11 Feb 2002 04:37:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3c67271e.1266572@news.bright.net>, arcweb@bnnorth.net (Keith
>Hosman) writes:
>
>>On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "Kim"
>><seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it is
>>>only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one year.
>>>If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
>>>take the CW test again.
>
>This also applies to upgrading to Extra.
>>>
>>umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
>>successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
>>(codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
>>indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
>>hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
>>rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
>>class license in order to use these privelidges"
>
>No, Kim is correct. The CSCE is only good for upgrading for 365 days (not
>1 year, btw - watch out for leap years!) The holder of a CSCE must use it to
>upgrade before it expires or it is useless for upgrading.
>
>It's an oddity of the restructuring. A Tech with a CSCE for Element 1 (code
>test)
>has Novice/Tech Plus operating privieges for as long as the license is held,
>but
>loses upgrade credit when the CSCE expires. Yes, it's a contradiction to give
>HF
>privs (which, by the FCC's own rules, indicates successful code testing) but to
>deny code test credit, but them's the rules. I think the idea is that the FCC
>wants
>to encourage Tech Pluses to upgrade to General or Extra, but at the same time
>doesn't want to take operating privs away.
>
>Anybody with a pre-restructuring Tech Plus doesn;t have to retest for code,
>though.
>
>Here's another odd one: If a person can show that they ever held a Novice class
>license, they get Element 1 credit. Doesn't matter how long ago the Novice

>license expired, or whether other license were held. But ONLY the Novice gets
>this credit! Go figure.
>
>Use your CSCE before 365 days or you'll have to take the element over again.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

heh Ok, I stand corrected, and wish to thank everyone for politely
letting me know. Just goes to show that you learn something every day.

Keith Hosman (waiting eagerly for my call)
Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4121. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 13:58:16 UTC
From: Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
Message-ID: <3C67CDF8.E65BD1EB@umich.edu>
Source record: 33532
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Charles Johnston wrote:
>
> DXCC qsl'ing is now -cheaper- and -faster- than ever....a huge and
> bold step in the right direction.

Yeah, I suppose it's inevitable, but I for one will not appreciate an electronic QSL as much as I do the old-style postcard kind. I like seeing the pictures chosen by the DX, I like it when I get a card with a hand-written message on it (yeah, that's pretty rare) and I like getting stamps from the DX country on their envelope.

Sure, lots of people now just print out a stick-on label for their card. Lots of people just use those generic callsign-and-qso-info cards. Lots of cards don't come with exotic stamps, since they arrived via the manager, or were metered instead of stamped. Still, I come home every day and the first thing I do is check the mailbox for QSL cards. The electronic ones just won't have the same thrill.

73 de Bob, KI8AB

4122. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:03:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67CF2C.8BB51D89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33533

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What is it about being a pugnacions louts like Carl and Cecil
> that get them a pass for all the damaging assertions, accusations and downright
> lies, while mainstreamers like you turn the heat on those of us who defend
> ourselves?

One man's lie is another man's truth, Dick. Gentlemen can disagree without
being disagreeable. I treat you the way you treat me.

> That changes nothing about the FACT that
> radiotelegraphy remains one of the most universal tools a ham has available, if
> only he is intelligent enough to use it.

Not "intelligent", Dick, rather "skillful". The great majority of the most
intelligent people in the world do not know Morse code. The FCC says that
Morse code skill is uncorrelated to intelligence. Skills may be useful
but are hard to learn for many people. Can you dunk a basketball?

> So when they feel like being called assholes, all they gotta do
> is provoke me, right? So what they claim is so much vapor designed
> solely to make me angry? So why aren't they being called to task for it?

If you allow yourself to be provoked to anger, what you have to say
while you are angry is irrelevant. Therefore, anyone who can provoke
you to anger wins the argument by default.

> I KNOW I've exceeded the both of them by a fair margin.

Oh, you have a DSP eval board with which you do DSP experimentation?
What board is it, Dick. Maybe we can exchange some software.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4123. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:06:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67CFC8.AAC6D6D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33534

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Well, I'll bet Dick is smart enough to get a DSP eval board running and roll
> > some software of his own. 'Course, he can't do that while resting on his
> > laurels.
>
> And just what was it that kept you from Extra class until dumbdown time? You just
> didn't see the need. Yeah, right.

Please explain how upgrading from Advanced to Extra dumbed me down, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4124. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:10:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D0D3.4CF01402@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33535

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58!@worldnet.att.net
> > I beg your Pardone, Sire, but that surely is Carl Stevenson's and Cecil
> >Moore's attitude, if not the FCC's.
>
> Nonsense, again. If the FCC wanted to see very single ham be a digital
> designer, they could make a rules change that requires same.

Have you noticed that everyone who disagrees with Dick, including the FCC,
have some deep, evil, ulterior motive?

> I have ready Stevenson's and Moore's words and did not get the impression that
> they want every single ham to be a digital designer.
>
> Let's ask them. Carl and Cecil, do you believe that every single ham should be
> a digital designer, or do you believe that Dick has taken the most extreme
> possible interpretation of a selected part of the posts you have made?

Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
eval board and get to experimenting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4125. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:17:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D28C.8C8AE17A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33536

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the
> FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think.

Nope, what we learned was that we still live in a Republic where the
FCC is supposed to do what is best for all citizens, not just what
is best for hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4126. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:23:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D3F5.FD15A9B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33537

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That may be true but the fact remains that CW doesn't get through when the
> > band is absolutely dead.
>
> You'd be surprised how many times a band seems dead that isn't really
> "absoulutely dead" at all.

I'm not talking about non-dead bands, Dick. "CW gets through when no
other mode will" is simply a false statement. No mode gets through
"when the band is absolutely dead".

There is a window when CW gets through and SSB fails. On one side
of that window, both SSB and CW get through. On the other side
of that window, neither SSB nor CW get through.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4127. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:26:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D48C.C5228EE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33538

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >That may be true but the fact remains that CW doesn't get through when the
> >band is absolutely dead.
>
> Don't look now, but neither does PACTOR, PACTOR II, PSK-31, MFSK-16,
> or any other digital mode.

AND nobody has said that any of those modes "gets through when
no other mode will", which of course, would be a lie just as "CW
gets through when no other mode will" is a lie.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4128. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:28:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D500.8384340F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33539

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
>
> Does your XYL know you are sharing such intimate personal
> information with a bunch of strangers (to her) in a Usenet
> newsgroup?

Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.

4129. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:31:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D5B6.415B3F82@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33540

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C654BB7.9A58E65@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> I'm sure there are plenty of criminals who don't have criminal records.
> > >
> > >Yep, and you can't prove that you are not one of them.
>
> I gues snot. But I'll bet you can.

You still just don't get it, Larry. Nobody, including me, can prove that
he/she is not a criminal. That's why we have the "innocent until proven
guilty" concept in this country. The Salem "witches" were asked to prove
that they were not witches. They couldn't so they died. You and I also
cannot prove that we are not witches.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4130. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:32:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D610.E08AD546@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33541

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C654CC5.4170A469@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> Exactly when did I say that, Cecil?
> > >
> > >Does "St. Valentine's Day Massacre" ring a bell?
> >
> > Sure. Was there anything untruthful about that?

The St. Valentine's Day Massacre had nothing to do with ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4131. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 14:37:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C67D72A.8F7F7A81@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33542

"D. Stussy" wrote:
> No, she isn't incorrect.

I don't think that's not the truth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4132. A Break In The Dull, Routine And Mundane

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 16:14:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211111407.18942.00000607@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33543

2001 Darwin Award Winners

Remember all the stories below are true!

THESE FOLKS ARE NOT THE SHARPEST TOOLS IN THE SHED

1.WILL THE REAL DUMMY PLEASE STAND UP?
AT&T FIRED President John Walter after nine months, saying he lacked intellectual leadership." He received a $26 million severance package. Perhaps it's not Walter who's lacking intelligence.

2. WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM OUR FRIENDS:
Police in Oakland, California spent two hours attempting to subdue a Gunman who had barricaded himself inside his home. After firing ten tear gas canisters, officers discovered that the man was standing beside them in the police line, shouting, "Please come out and give yourself up."

3.WHAT WAS PLAN B???
An Illinois man, pretending to have a gun, kidnapped a motorist and forced him to drive to two different automated teller machines, wherein the kidnapper proceeded to withdraw money From his own bank accounts.

4. THE GETAWAY!
A man walked into a Topeka, Kansas Kwik Stop, and asked for all the money in the cash drawer. Apparently, the take was too small, so he tied up the store clerk and worked the counter himself for three hours until police showed up and grabbed him.

5. DID I SAY THAT???
Police in Los Angeles had good luck with a robbery suspect who just couldn't control himself during a line-up. When detectives asked each man in the line-up to repeat the words, "Give me all your money or I'll shoot," the man shouted, "That's not what I said!"

6. ARE WE COMMUNICATING??
A man spoke frantically into the phone, "My wife is pregnant and her contractions are only two minutes apart!" "Is this her first child?" the doctor asked. "No!" the man shouted, "This is her husband!"

7. NOT THE SHARPEST TOOL IN THE SHED!!
In Modesto California, a man tried to hold up a Bank of America branch without a weapon. He used a thumb and a finger to simulate a gun, but unfortunately, he failed to keep his hand in his pocket.(hellllllooooooo!)

8. THE GRAND FINALE
Last summer, down on Lake Isabella, located in the high desert, an hour east of Bakersfield, California, some folks, new to boating, were having a problem. No

matter how hard they tried, they couldn't get their brand new 22ft Bay liner to perform. It wouldn't get on a plane at all, and it was very sluggish in almost every maneuver, no matter how much power was applied. After about an hour of trying to make it go, they putted to a nearby marina, thinking someone there could tell them what was wrong. A thorough topside check revealed everything in perfect working condition. The engine ran fine, the out drive went up and down, and the prop was the
correct size and pitch. So, one of the marina guys jumped in the water to check underneath. He came up choking on water, he was laughing so hard.NOW REMEMBER THIS IS TRUE....
Under the boat, still strapped securely in place, was the trailer.....

4133. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:00:24 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0202110900.3664d921@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33544

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c5e992f_2@news7.fast.net>...
> However, it still remains that no ham "owns" any particular
> frequency to the total exclusion of others. Again, read what
> it says on your license near where you sign ...

It says "Not Transferable".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4134. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:01:31 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C67F8E2.D63C7A68@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33545

N2EY wrote:
>
> etc.? Look what happened to the Iridium system.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Hey, it is still kicking. They did not dump it in the ocean
after all. The ARRL really fouled up a golden opportunity.
They could have bought when it was on the chopping block at
pennies on the dollar and had the robust worldwide
communication system that the membership wants.

73,
Clay N4AOX

4135. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:04:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C693DA2.F7821732@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33546

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Well, I'll bet Dick is smart enough to get a DSP eval board running and roll
> > > some software of his own. 'Course, he can't do that while resting on his
> > > laurels.
> >
> > And just what was it that kept you from Extra class until dumbdown time? You just
> > didn't see the need. Yeah, right.
>
> Please explain how upgrading from Advanced to Extra dumbed me down, Dick.

You can ignore it all you wish, but you didn't move up to the tests, the tests moved down to you.

4136. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:18:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a48tunldh1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33547

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C65D7D0.425961A2@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Best 73, and I look forward to the next RRAP CW net.
>
> I've been practicing on the electronic keyer.

I use one because it requires LESS practice. :-)

4137. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:24:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C69422C.597BFA2A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33548

CAM wrote:

>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams >experimenting

> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
> 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
> eval board and get to experimenting.

Well, there you have it. You don't even know what you're saying.
Your "experimenting" is all done with digital theory and writing software, forget actually putting a rig on the air (save for your 'favorite' mode, CW). Mine is USING digital modes on the air to compare and see what each will actually do in various condions.
Probably the clearest demonstration of our differences goes back the flap over PSK31 where I could copy the CWID but not the PSK on that group of weaksignal Europeans on a near-dead 20 meter band.
You said one must compare modes in a 31 hz bandpass and I said nonsense, in an operational situation you compare under the conditions you use. Theory vs practice. Digital engineering vs ham radio on the air.

So what in the world makes you think the ARS would "benefit" from every ham designing his own discrete digital mode? Should we all just talk to ourselves? The software MIXwin contains some 13 digital modes in a single menu, selectable by a click of the mouse.
How many more would you like to add, or more to the point, how much dissipation do we need? No, I don't advocate stopping where we are. I DO advocate that new digital mode development will NOT be enhanced by each novice digidesigner flooding the ARS with his own novice output. After all, we have the likes of Peter Martinez working for us.

Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to learn the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a evaluation board. LOTS of time. But wait- they didn't have time to learn Morse code, which would take far less than learning DSP.
Looks like you're out of luck Cecil.

4138. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:30:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C694384.E998474@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33549

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58!@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> First step is to get hams in the habit of actually building radio sets from
> >the
> >>
> >> ground up, or adapting available equipment to new uses. How ya gonna do
> >that?
>
> > Simple, Jim. Berate them all, call everyone who has been around over 5
> >years and
> >actually uses CW on the air a dinosaur Luddite. Works every time.
>
> No, no, Dick. You are on the right track, but you have it wrong. You should
> call them "lazy" and "wannabe." Following the fine example you have set wrt
> Morse code, THAT should make them want to build...
>

BIG difference, Ed. I have actually built a considerable amount of ham gear. On the other hand, how much CW has Carl actually worked? Any at all? Not enough to gain a HF license prior to you know what.

4139. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 17:52:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6948DD.69121F23@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33550

W1RFI wrote:

>I would say that if

> one cannot hear a signal but can only see it on a spectral display, then it
> could co-exist with narrowband operation, wouldn't'cha say, Clay?
>
> Of course, the original premise was flawed -- a signal that can be seen on the
> crude spectrum analyzer he was using WOULD be audible

Ed, have you spent any serious amount of time with the DIGIPAN
display? For sure you can adjust things to show signals you can't hear. It's a
matter of careful adjustment of receiver RF gain more than anything else. At the
point where you drop out virtually all the noise very weak signals show up that
will be masked by just a small amount of ambient band noise. (Signal, and noise,
levels are displayed as brightness levels). Usually the very weak signals are too
weak to lock, in PSK31 mode, but sometimes they surprise you. It's equally good at
evaluating other modes.
The waterfall is really a quite flexible spectral display when you get familiar
it. MIXwin version of Digipan also has a 'oscilloscope' type vertical amplitude
spectral display option (of the receiver's bandpass) which I haven't used that
much, but which also looks interesting.

I really doubt that such weak signals could universally coexist with SS as if SS
was not present. Of course they may not do too well at coexisting with other less
obvious signal presence, ie part 15 and
non-intentional radiators such as computer equipment.

4140. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:00:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C694A91.4DFE3CE5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33601

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20020203164753.28685.00001031@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> >>100% conjecture with no supporting data at all one way or another
> >>formal or informal.
> >
> >Of course it is conjecture. The only supporting data is that when the world
> >has built better roads, better tools, or better anything, doing so has
> >significantly increased useage.
>
> Often at a tremendous price. Look at all of the deadend stuff in the home
> electronics area - remember the original video discs, Beta format videotapes,
> etc.? Look what happened to the Iridium system.
>
> In the case of roads, the effects of better roads have not all been positive.

Yep. It's a certainty that not every brainstorm is viable. Even many which prove to be are later radically changed to reflect drastic changes caused by ongoing experience and the realaities of the marketplace. Yes, ham radio IS a marketplace. What can't be sold to hams on a longterm basis won't survive.

4141. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:03:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C694B4D.6BF10C4D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33602

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Methinks you might have discovered a solar flare, Dick.
> >
> > With that rise and decay time.....I sure didn't think so. Ol Sol surely doesn't turn
> > them on and off that fast.
>
> Pulsar?

I'm not that familiar with pulsars, but assume from the name they "pulse" as this signal did not. It was like it was fast-burst sending message traffic, with a couple repeats, then it was gone.

4142. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:04:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C694BA5.F034FE06@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33603

CAM wrote:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > How wide is an SS signal and how many individual SS "non-colliding"
> > qsos in progress does it take for SS to occupy the entire 20m band?
>
> Consider this, Brian. A super DSP noise eliminator that decodes all
> SS signals and filters them out. Why not?
> --

Have you purchased your ticket on the next train to Mars? That's
possible, too.

4143. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:20:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C694F65.57F8492F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33604

N2EY wrote:

> > To do that, the FCC would have had to make
> >illegal all those 23 channel CBs that had already been sold.
> >
> They did, as I recall. Not to use, but to sell. New cb sets had to
> be 40 channel. I don't know about resale of existing 23 channel sets.

As I recall there was a cutoff date after which the 23 channel sets were illegal to use. I don't remember the exact particulars. I don't think it was ever enforced (was anything about CB enforced?)

4144. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:25:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C695069.D80F8F09@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33605

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What is it about being a pugnacions louts like Carl and Cecil
> > that get them a pass for all the damaging assertions, accusations and downright
> > lies, while mainstreamers like you turn the heat on those of us who defend
> > ourselves?
>
> One man's lie is another man's truth, Dick. Gentlemen can disagree without
> being disagreeable. I treat you the way you treat me.

I see. So if I just ignored your denigritory stupidity you'd stop? Nope, I already tried that and it didn't work, you just HAD to start it all up again, and again, and again...

>
>
> > That changes nothing about the FACT that
> > radiotelegraphy remains one of the most universal tools a ham has available, if
> > only he is intelligent enough to use it.

No, Cecil, intgelligent enough in the first instance to realize that radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radiocommunications mode, and to act accordingly. Insisting on overlooking that basic fact displays a notable lack of intelligence. Or some other more personal Agenda.

4145. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:25:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211132511.28299.00005194@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 33606

In article <3C671876.7F2CFD43@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Does spreading a signal from 14.15 MHz to 14.35 MHz
>> >offer much of an advantage?
>>
>> Depends on hoe you define "advantage".
>
>Are you saying that hoe's spread?

Hoe, hoe, hoe! (and a Merry Christmas...) :-)

4146. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:25:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211132515.28299.00005195@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 33607

In article <3BF136FE.D5994C0F@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58!@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>
>> First step is to get hams in the habit of actually building radio sets from
the
>> ground up, or adapting available equipment to new uses. How ya gonna do
>> that?
>
> Simple, Jim. Berate them all, call everyone who has been around over 5
>years and
>actually uses CW on the air a dinosaur Luddite. Works every time.

Insufficient. Here are some more reasons to advance your "cause:"

1. Start a website such as "No SSB International" and sarcastically
berate everyone who is the least bit against CW license testing.

2. Constantly imply/accuse/state-outright that NCTAs "hate the code"
and want to "forbid its use." Warn everyone of their "conspiracy."

3. Keep repeating "CW gets through when nothing else will" up to and
including having it engraved on your tombstone.

4. Always repeat to everyone that ANYTHING involving digital
electronics is NOT "real radio." "Real radios" glow in the dark and
are at least 80 pounds in weight, made by true red-white-and-blue
All-American companies. "Always have been, always will."

5. Dismiss every comment about radios and radio theory unfamiliar to
you as "inconsequential" and "having nothing whatsoever to do with
ham radio" unless it was officially published by the ARRL. If it is too
technical (involving more than Ohm's Law) and published in QEX,
dismiss it anyway since it may use some digital device and is not
needed by CW operators.

6. Always denigrate, dismiss, and despise those of "lesser" class than
Extra (heavy) who did not pass a 20 WPM CW test. They are
ignorant, slothful, despicable, dumbed-down because "true"
knowledge, enlightenment, and superiority comes only from God-given
morsemanship.

7. ESPECIALLY denigrate, dismiss, and despise ANYONE not having
passed an amateur radio test because they do not "live up to (your)
high standards set by the 'amateur community.'" Forbid them,

intimidate them, try to suppress their Right to free speech, free assembly and right to petition their government. Remind everyone that ham radio is run-governed-ruled only by hams and no other citizen may comment since they are "undeserving" or "inferior." The First Amendment does not apply to US citizens not possessing a valid amateur radio license.

8. Harass and intimidate all women not in your immediate family group since they are "obviously inferior and not in the true spirit of (all-male or should be) amateur radio." Make any woman a target of abuse if they say anything against your superior viewpoint. Use the most flimsy excuse to show they are a "threat to the ARS."

9. Remember that you and you alone represent the ARS. Whatever personal desires or skills you have are the hallmarks of what is "best" in the ARS. Show all that you are superior because you are.

10. Make fun of experimenters, new modes, new techniques or technology, anything which has not had the "official blessing" of appearing in an ARRL publication. That is a threat to your Way Of Life as only you (as a superior licensed being) can sanction what is "good" for ham radio. Defeat change, destroy the new.

11. Ignore and dismiss anything done in other radio services as having anything to do with amateur radio. Amateur radio is all about "working DX with CW on HF" and anything else not involved with emergencies is obviously inconsequential, of no value, and relates to evil, despicable, criminal CB radio.

12. Remember that you, and you alone, "deserve" special treatment and respect as a tested and credentialed morseman. You are superior in all respects and may freely engage in any behavior you choose while lesser beings must respect, honor, and revere you, always say nice-nice to you under all conditions. You perform a Service to them by simply existing and the world owes you much because of those amateur credentials. You deserve everything you get.

13. Always take Every general comment against your personal viewpoint as specifically made to you, personally. You represent the ARS and what you do is what is good for the ARS, therefore each and every negative against you is against over half a million other licensees. With some practice (and a good ISP) you can go psychotic, split your personality, assume new identities and credentials, harass and stalk others who have opinions against your royal presence. Always seek retribution against those not honoring your supreme psychoses.

The preceding are a few items used by others in this newsgroup. They are offered as a general guide to future newsgroup communications for you in regard to the necessary, obligatory retention of morsemanship in US amateur radio and to show newcomers the joys of becoming a real, live, beeping amateur radio operator-station. Morsemen are superior. Always.

With all kindest regards,
Len

4147. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:29:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C69515D.6E0E395B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33608

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58!@worldnet.att.net
> > > I beg your Pardone, Sire, but that surely is Carl Stevenson's and Cecil
> > >Moore's attitude, if not the FCC's.
> >
> > Nonsense, again. If the FCC wanted to see very single ham be a digital
> > designer, they could make a rules change that requires same.
>
> Have you noticed that everyone who disagrees with Dick, including the FCC,
> have some deep, evil, ulterior motive?
>

You don't belive the FCC had an ulterior motive in dropping the code test? Do you read? Read what they had to say about the medical waivers. That is proof enough.

What ulterior motive do they have in insisting that hams leap into the digital age? Can you say spectrum auctions? Do they really believe that hams who can be trained in a single day to pass the minimal licensing exam will likely *ever* learn anything serious about radio or digital tecnhology? You may believe it but I don't.

4148. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:31:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C695201.D3CA7507@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33609

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the
> > FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think.
>
> Nope, what we learned was that we still live in a Republic where the
> FCC is supposed to do what is best for all citizens, not just what
> is best for hams.

If that was true the best thing they could do is abolish the ARS.
In fact they may eventually do just that. Ask Riley. Better yet, read his
response to Kim. Enough Kims and its all over.

4149. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:34:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C695283.B84D0684@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33610

CAM wrote:

>
> I'm not talking about non-dead bands, Dick. "CW gets through when no
> other mode will" is simply a false statement. No mode gets through
> "when the band is absolutely dead".

And as you always do when it suits your purplose, you evaded
the point, which was that much of the time the band(s) just SEEMS dead.

4150. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:37:17 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a492jlnpl1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 33611

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C68C44C.4125A1D5@worldnet.att.net...
> Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all the
"other
> side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir and
stir
> and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the knaves
but
> the good guys too? What is it about being a pugnacions louts like Carl and
Cecil
> that get them a pass for all the damaging assertions, accusations and
downright
> lies, while mainstreamers like you turn the heat on those of us who defend
> ourselves?

I don't know if you noticed, but most of my 'heat' is directed toward them.
Cecil has called me a few names in the past too, Dick. It makes me mad, but
I usually delete them in my response, and try to refrain from responding in
kind.

>Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in
> kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade? I'll say it again- I showed
up
> here a few years ahead of you with a helpful attitude, and what happened
> immediatly, almost instantly, dismayed me, sae me back on my heels in
disbelief.

It's about attitude, I think. One thing I always liked about ham radio as a
newcomer was the attitude I encountered on the air. Very positive. I like
that in hams on newsgroups as well. I don't see much of it though. Jim,
N2EY has a pretty good one, I think.

> And these characters seem to hold some sort of hammer over many of you
> middle-roaders, ARRL and even the FCC. It's nothing short of amazing!

Yeah, Rush Limbaugh doesn't like me either. Because I try to consider
opposing viewpoints I guess. He hates when that happens.

> I don't doubt that at all. So why don't we see someone taking Stevenson
and
> Moore to task in kind, perhaps with an eye to a little more civility and
less
> rancor?

You remember back as a school kid how the guy who was always getting razzed
the most was the one who let it get to him the most? Now move to the 21st

century internet newsgroups. The only points Carl and Cecil really score are for logical points. Concentrate on them. If you can't come up with a logical counterpoint, then, maybe they were right? Don't try to argue against arguments that don't have a logical counterargument. That's my best advice.

> We all know the code test is a done deal, awaiting the calendar, for
> whatever time that may take. That changes nothing about the FACT that
> radiotelegraphy remains one of the most universal tools a ham has available, if
> only he is intelligent enough to use it.

Ya know, Dick. I don't see a lot of actual resistance from them to the idea that radiotelegraphy is a useful tool for radio amateurs. I see resistance from them to the idea that it is a cure-all, end-all to radio communications. You gotta know they're right about that.

> If so, there's a simple solution to it all- he
> can merely recognize and admit that it is fact, and stop his belligerance toward
> CW and everyone who is able to use it, just as we have certainly adknowledged
> the fact that modern modes HAVE found a and continue to find acceptance within
> ham radio I'm a very active user), and we can all get on with life.

I don't see it as much as beligerence toward CW as it is beligerence toward you, Dick. What that means is you guys aren't arguing ideas. You're arguing personalities.

>Instead, he
> slams around like a loose cannon chasing a bull in a china shop, and somewhere
> along the way, someone is gonna take potshots at him. Ite's inevitable, as long
> as he keep on that track, and it seems no one can do a derail job on him.

And they see you the same way - a bull in a logical china shop.

> > What kind of response do you expect
> > to receive to your ideas when you expend so much verbiage calling people
> > names?

> I'll say it one more time- I turned the other cheek and it got whacked right
> off, and I'm tired of it. Don't to that anymore.

Then apparently all what you want out of this is to throw insults back and forth.
Cuz that's all it's ever going to be. It's what you make of it.

> You find a way to call off the dogs, and I'll be pleased to stop stomping 'em.

How can someone call off the dogs when you keep throwing meat at them?

> I think you misread the term as it was not intended to be derogatory,
rather as
> an abbreviation. Even the geeks of today call themselves geeks. It's
language in
> transition. I used 'techies' to keep from having to use half a sentence to
> otherwise describe them.

Actually, you used 'tired old refrains' to describe them.

> So when they feel like being called assholes, all they gotta do
> is provoke me, right?

Yep. And then you procede to make an even bigger one out of yourself. You
really showed them, right?

> So what they claim is so much vapor designed
> solely to make me angry? So why aren't they being called to task for it?

Because you repeatedly ask for it? Can you at least TRY to take some advice
about namecalling?

> Reality doesn't seem to mean much to them.

Because they call you names? It's the same thing you're doing. Is it
supposed to only be realistic when you do it?

> > Try editing out all the personal stuff before you send. You might find
> > you'll see less of it in their replies to you.

> Yep, just let the slams come on long enough and I imagine they will
> eventually believe their own nonsense.

So it's really all about you, then isn't it Dick. Not the issues. Or is it
about Morse code to the exclusion of all else. Because I don't see what
else you're bringing to the table.

The reason I listen to you, and your assessments, is because you've been a
ham a lot longer than I have. I know that you've seen a change in the way
things are on the air. But at the same time I know I have to filter out a
lot of the 'grouchy old guy who doesn't suffer fools gladly' parts - because
it's not just fools that old guys don't suffer gladly. They don't suffer
anything without grousing about it.

> And who knows about all the
> bewildered newcomers?

They're probably bewildered by all the beligerant namecalling, that's for
sure.

> Don't own a boat, Jim. I guess I'm getting a bit on the intolerant side
> in my old age. I just don't suffer fools and jackasses near so easily as
> I once did, even those who claim to be geniuses.

Well, I think they probably are pretty close to being geniuses. (The self-fulfilling part of genius, is that stupid people have trouble recognizing it.) That's why I try at least, to choose my words carefully when I post them. There's a pretty well above average group here in general. So when I make a stupid blunderous statement, chances are really good I'm going to hear about it. Best thing one can do is to avoid saying any more than necessary. It's easier to edit, if nothing else. Ever notice Cecil's posts? Very few words, but very carefully chosen ones....usually. One can only put ones foot in his mouth while it is open.

73 de ac6xg

4151. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:42:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C695478.552E2F55@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33612

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > etc.? Look what happened to the Iridium system.
>
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Hey, it is still kicking. They did not dump it in the ocean
> after all. The ARRL really fouled up a golden opportunity.
> They could have bought when it was on the chopping block at
> pennies on the dollar and had the robust worldwide
> communication system that the membership wants.

And who would have paid the $5million per month maintenance
tab?

4152. Re: Cell Phone: Are they Safe? - My Research

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 18:56:33 UTC
From: Rick Tannehill <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3C6813E1.F295B7BF@firstinter.net>
Source record: 33613

I would add that the 10-20 year lag time between exposure and incidence can be partially deduced by looking at people who have worked in similar RF exposure occupations for the past 40-50 years. This would include people who have worked in the mobile two-way radio fields, including public safety, and of course amateurs. In all the epidemological studies I've seen, there is a small but measureable increase in leukemia-like cancers, but not in malignant tumors. Though not conclusive by any means, it provides hopeful data that we are not building in 120 million cancer time bombs 20 years hence.

The world is full of small risks..... ham radio and cell phones are ones that I voluntarily choose to accept :_)

Rick Tannehill

Rick Tannehill

W1RFI wrote:

> From: cellphoneemf@aol.com (McNeil)
>
> >I'm a graduate student at UConn, and I've done some research on the
> >safety of cell phones. You can view my article at
> >http://members.aol.com/cellphoneemf/. I'd love to get feedback.
> >Thanks.
>
> Interesting work. I scanned it briefly, and did note a few details that missed
> the mark.
>
> For example:
>
> "The animal studies also cast doubt on the safety of cellular phones and other
> low-level radiation sources. It is confusing as to why the Toler study(20)
> chose to expose the mice to 435 MHz as opposed to 2450 MHz since it duplicated
> the Chou (21) experiment in every other aspect."
>
> On what basis did you feel the choice of frequency "cast doubt?" If one wants
> to do an animal study that has a reasonable relationship with possible human
> effects, one would choose a frequency that is not close to the resonant
> frequency of the animal. Your "cast doubt" conclusion missed the mark.
>
> Other choices of words, IMHO, show that there is a significant bias to the
> study and its conclusions. I am sure your research found that groups like the
> World Health Organization, Committee for Man and Radiation, etc., have made
> statements that is no substantive evidence that exposure to RF at the levels of
> the current standards pose a known human health risk. They then go on to
> discuss the unknowns, the ongoing studies and the need for same. Translating

> that to "grave concern" is, IMHO, not accurate and shows bias.
>
> Just a very fast take.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4153. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 19:34:13 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202111134.2b3c15c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33614

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C67D500.8384340F@IEEE.org>...
> Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.

Cecil,

You have my deepest sympathies. Take care now.

Sincerely

Bert

4154. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 20:01:38 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <CqV98.6978$421.588813@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33615

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020211065849.17949.00000710@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all
the
> >"other
> >side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir
and stir
> >and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the
knaves but
> >the good guys too?
>
> When I get trashed by someone I consider to be one of the good guys, I
think
> long and hard about what they have to say.
>
> >Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in
> >kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade?
>
> Of course you have a choice, Dick, and you make that choice the same way
nearly
> every time...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

In a small way I would like to pronounce a plague on both your houses,
sort of like Dilbert's darning to Heck.

I am one of those who felt in 1975 or so that Morse over 12 was ridiculous
from a regulatory perspective and I can see no public purpose served by
requiring it now. At the same time when I see Morse become glandular,
Bert get trashed, and testicles get subbed for brains I begin to wonder if
it might not be a good, if unjustifiable, idea to keep it around even at 5
wpm to keep this collection of children at bay. For that is about what
NCI is -- a playpen rebellion comparable to the Revolt of the Sociology
Majors we called the 60s und I vas dere Sharlie. Had the hard sci, math,
engineering people been involved there wouldn't be a building standing but
apparently the rubble today would all have digital networks and MTV.

Like Dick I as well have been accused of being a mother raper, father
raper, and for reasons I cannot fathom am supposed to be impressed when
they move to the other side of the bench.
The more thoughtful, like Jim, who recognize that the change may be

necessary and try to make it sufficient are met with talk that sounds like some coaches and all cheerleaders' 'Fight, fight, fight.' Impress them with our prowess, do.

It is not the elimination of the Morse test but the entry of a real collection of spoiled brats that will doom the Amateur Service.

Dick N&#65533;BK

4155. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 21:28:27 UTC
From: iron3@charter.net
Message-ID: <u6geui6slnpb18@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33616
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Well sad to say, Ham radio even for emergencies is becoming a thing of the past. Newer technologies are here and coming, that Federal, State and local emergency services are using, that can be setup and be on the air in minutes. I like CW, but I can't think of any scenario where it would be absolutly needed, abeit nuclear war, where someone needs it. (In which case I for one, am not going to hang a dipole in a tre and pound a key..;P) or your homebrewing a transmitter from scratch on a desert island to call for coffee. Again, not downing CW, I enjoy CW, just technology has changed so much with satellite, microwave, etc. I don't think even alot of newer people are interested in it as they were 20 years ago. I think CW will be here as long as there is ham radio if nothing else than tradition. But there is a different people today coming in expecting different things like satellite, microwave, computer radio interface, etc. Not that thats bad, just times change.. Even homebrewing is becoming more of a "specialty". Mass production made alot of stuff in ham radio cheaper to buy than make. I personally like to make as much of my gear that I can. Also like to restore old receivers and transmitters, but the guys who do it are getting fewer. Lots of the old Elmers are SK or too old to teach anymore. For guys just coming in the hobby and even for guys like myself, you could learn alot from the old timers but not enough people are learning to take the place of the ones gone. I mostly grew up just when the old tube gear was going to solid state so right off I was handicapped with the old stuff not knowing anything or finding anyone that knew anyting about it. Most of the new gear is "Plug and Pray", fry a board you throw it out and get a new one, never understanding how it works.. I read my butt off on every book I could find. I really believe I would be much more knowledagble if I had some experienced Elmers around to show me some things. But I did ok considering I was learning a technology that most guys had forgotten. (probably alot of you guys were in the same boat..) I think mass production of gear and the loss of good Elmers have seriously crippled new people as far as learning. Shame really. Nothing like firing up an old rig and making a contact or hearing a station on a radio you repaired or made yourself. The thrill of something you made or repaired is something that few hams experience today. This is what I really think is missing today. Enough ranting..Thanks for reading..
"Zoran Brlecic" <WA7AA@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:3C5EC263.EB0D56FF@attbi.com...
> Vito wrote:
>
> > CW was a necessary evil left over from
> > the days before modulation was invented.
>
> And ham radio is probably a necessary evil left over from the days before
> cellphones and Internet were invented?

>
>
>
> 73 .... Zoran WA7AA
>
>
>
>
>

4156. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 22:49:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grdwdi2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33617

On Mon, 11 Feb 2002 18:42:23 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> And who would have paid the $5million per month maintenance
>tab?

Who's paying it now?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4157. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 23:33:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211183337.18919.00000679@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33618

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> If that was true the best thing they could do is abolish the ARS.
>In fact they may eventually do just that. Ask Riley. Better yet, read his
>response to Kim. Enough Kims and its all over.

And Dale Hatfield's speech seems to imply that enough hams who don't need no steenkin' new technology and it's all over.

You seem to support Riley's view but discount Hatfield's. Of course, if memory serves, Hatfield retired? OTOH, OET influences more rulemaking procedures that does the EB, if I read it correctly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4158. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 23:43:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211184316.18919.00000681@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33619

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> No, no, Dick. You are on the right track, but you have it wrong. You should
>> call them "lazy" and "wannabe." Following the fine example you have set wrt
>> Morse code, THAT should make them want to build...

> BIG difference, Ed. I have actually built a considerable amount of ham gear.

Was it because someone called you lazy first? :-)

>On the other hand, how much CW has Carl actually worked? Any at all? Not
enough to gain a HF license prior to
>you know what.

Carl was a Tech+ prior to restructuring. Last I recall, that license had HF
priveleges.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>

4159. Re: Cell Phone: Are they Safe? - My Research

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 23:50:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211185059.18919.00000685@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33620

From: Rick Tannehill rickw7rt@firstinter.net

>In all the epidemological studies I've seen, there is a small but measureable
>increase in leukemia-like cancers, but not in malignant tumors.

The Milham study was one of the more famous (infamous?) ones involving Amateur Radio. In it, Dr Milham found a slight increase in two rare forms of leukemia. One factor not often mentioned is that the average age of death of the hams studied was greater than the median for the population as a whole. :-) I have not analyzed the confounding factors that might account for this, just offer it as food for thought. (Examples might be the socio-economic class of the hams compared to the general population, the fact that ham do not start ham radio at birth, but the average age of death includes those who die very young, etc.)

>The world is full of small risks..... ham radio and cell phones are ones
>that I voluntarily choose to accept :_)

One other thing to put into perspective -- the specific-absorbtion rate (SAR) permitted to any small amount of tissue from a cell phone is 1.6 W/kg, if memory serves. The SAR that applies to whole-body exposure, such as occurs from most Amateur Radio operation is 0.08 W/kg. FWIW.

See http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety for some information and links.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4160. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 00:01:22 UTC
From: Don Miller <brazzos@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a49lidmkj1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 33621

The very fine micro print embedded in the security markings of the FCC certificate states that the privileges were only good and current if the test was taken on the 3rd-odd Wed in a week of the even numbered month during the odd -off calendar leap year, during a non-millennium decade.

Such operations may commence if operator is able to show "good faith" operating practice and enhanced skill levels using a battery powered code oscillator that uses it's "exciter circuit" to start the washing machine in the gentle mode all the while making the toilet flush and the doorbell ring simultaneously.

I could go on & on clarifying additional micro embedded fine prints from the FCC but I must go now, the ice maker on my refrigerator wishes to go "online" now to request groceries. :-)

73,s

Don Miller WN8IIJ

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202110721000.807-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> No, she isn't incorrect. The code element granted via a CSCE is good
forever
> with regard to operating privileges, but only valid for 365 days for
upgrade
> purposes (to general or extra, currently). If one does not UPGRADE within
365
> days to general (or extra), one loses the code credit and must retake
element
> 1. However, one can continue to operate on the "novice HF bands" even if
the
> retaken element is failed!
>
> On Mon, 11 Feb 2002, Keith Hosman wrote:
> >On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 18:04:48 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >
> >>Remember, too, that as a Tech, if you take and pass the 5wpm CW test, it
is
> >>only good for upgrading to General (with the General written) for one
year.
> >>If you do not upgrade to General within that timeframe, you will have to
> >>take the CW test again.
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >>

> >umm I believe you are incorrect on the front of my certificate for
> >successful completion it says "If you hold a current fcc granted
> >(codeless) technicians class operators license, and this certificate
> >indicates element 1 credit, this certificate indefinately permits you
> >hf operating priviledges as specified in section 97.301(e) of the fcc
> >rules. This document must be kept indefinately with your technicians
> >class license in order to use these privelidges"
> >
> >
> >Keith Hosman
> >Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
> >Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
> >American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist
> >
>

4161. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 00:29:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211192956.26452.00000646@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33622

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
>> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
>> 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
>> eval board and get to experimenting.

> Well, there you have it.

There you have what? That he wants to see just as many hams experimenting with digital radio as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the 50s? Why is that a "there you have it" sort of thing to you?

> You don't even know what you're saying.

I think that it is your interpretation of what he is saying that is somewhat at question here, Dick.

>Your "experimenting" is all done with digital theory and writing software,
>forget actually putting a rig on the air (save for your 'favorite' mode, CW).

He offered DSP as one easy way that hams could experiment with digital modes. Just how did YOU do PSK-31, Hellschreiber and the other modes you claim to have operated without using digital signal processing software written by others?

Are you really faulting Cecil for wanting hams to experiment with DSP to easily implement digital techniques while you are using the DSP software for soundcards written by others to do your own experimentation?

Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

> Mine is USING digital modes on the air to compare and see what each will
> actually do in various condions.

Using DSP software written by others, no less.

>Probably the clearest demonstration of our differences goes back the flap
>over PSK31 where I could copy the CWID but not the PSK on that group of
> weaksignal Europeans on a near-dead 20 meter band.

>You said one must compare modes in a 31 hz bandpass and I said nonsense, in
>an
>operational situation you compare under the conditions you use. Theory vs
>practice.

I agree. All modes, from OOK CW to any digital mode, have their limitations. With PSK-31, one limitation is that the sudden phase shifts that can occur during unstable ionospheric conditions throw it for a loop. I would say that a "dead band" probably qualifies.

> Looks like you're out of luck Cecil.

OTOH, you think that Cecil proposing that hams experiment with improving the software you use to decode PSK 31 makes him "out of luck."

I just can't follow the logic here, Dick. I really can't.

> So what in the world makes you think the ARS would "benefit" from every ham
>designing his own discrete digital mode?
Where did he say THAT? Man, you can read anything into anything. He said:

>>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
>> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
>> 1950's.

How did you get "every ham should be designing new digital modes" out of that?

No wonder you are always so mad at what you think other people say!

>How many more would you like to add, or more to the point, how much
>dissipation do we
>need? No, I don't advocate stopping where we are. I DO advocate that new
>digital mode
>development will NOT be enhanced by each novice digidesigner flooding the ARS
>with
>his own novice output. After all, we have the likes of Peter Martinez working
>for us.

And I think that with a number of hams (note, please -- I did not say EVERYBODY) working on improving existing modes or even developing new ones, Amateur Radio will develop improvements. Why would you possibly not want to see this happen? We already have rules that require that the modulation method be legal on the frequency in use and the encoding method be public.

> Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to learn
>the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a
> evaluation board. LOTS of time.

Sure, good things sometimes do take lots of time. I spent lots of time learning antenna modeling -- I learned a lot in the process. I spent a lot more time learning about RFI -- I think we can safely say that Amateur Radio benefitted from that. Why do you feel that a ham who learns DSP will benefit only "marginally?"

> But wait- they didn't have time to learn Morse code, which would
>take far less than learning DSP.

It really IS all about Morse code for you, isn't it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4162. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 00:59:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202111659.20c85e4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Adam MAURER" <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Gnk98.4130$BE4.11235@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>...
> Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> request for a good ol QSL card.
>
> I hope you advocates of e-QSLing have already worked the rare ones on all
> band/mode combos, coz it'll be a different ball game now.
>
>
Don't bet on that. This thing is another techie brainfart whose time
will never come. Just like all those "e-commerce" brainfarts crashed
and burned a couple years back and dropped the tech stock markets thru
the cellar floors. There is no "law" which sez that the expeditions
"must" post their logs. Back to bizness as usual.
>
>
Boink.
>
>
>
> Adam, VK4CP
>
>
w3rv

4163. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 01:17:34 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a49qi2$f5r$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0202111659.20c85e4e@posting.google.com...
> "Adam MAURER" <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Gnk98.4130$BE4.11235@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>...
> > Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> > DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> > request for a good ol QSL card.
> >
> > I hope you advocates of e-QSLing have already worked the rare ones on
all
> > band/mode combos, coz it'll be a different ball game now.
> >
> >
> Don't bet on that. This thing is another techie brainfart whose time
> will never come. Just like all those "e-commerce" brainfarts crashed
> and burned a couple years back and dropped the tech stock markets thru
> the cellar floors. There is no "law" which sez that the expeditions
> "must" post their logs. Back to bizness as usual.
> >

Yeah. Get a horse!

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

4164. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 01:25:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020211202536.19515.00000036@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33625

In article <20020210222817.17389.00000696@mb-cr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>That is completely unnecessary. All you have to do is actually *be*
>>present.
>
> Hey Larry....yeah, I know, but I just avoid any opprotunity for someone
>to
>question her operation...Especially on the local repeater.
>
>>The 10-year old can say your call sign just as well as you can.
>
> Sure can, the little wench!

Steve:

Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year old daughter?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4165. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 01:44:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211204454.17580.00001076@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33626

In article <3C67D0D3.4CF01402@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
>with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
>1950's.

There are probably more hams experimenting with digital modes today
than there were on SSB in the early '50s.

>There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
>eval board and get to experimenting.

Software is another matter, though.

With SSB, the result was standardized and the development was in how to get
the desired result. Not true with the modes you're describing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4166. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 01:44:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211204454.17580.00001075@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33628

In article <20020210234149.21287.00000085@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>n article <20020210144326.16072.00001032@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) >writes:
>
>>>Jim:
>>>
>>>I respectfully disagree with your disagreement, and your self-answered >>>question. I believe that if FISTS had organized the same type of campaign >>>against a significant reduction of code testing requirements, that the FCC >>>would have had no choice but to pay attention to their position on the >>>matter. If double the number of comments had been received by the FCC, >>>the clear majority in favor of either the status quo in code testing, or a >>>workable compromise (like 12-13 WPM), then the FCC would have been >>>very hard pressed to act against such overwhelming advocacy.
>>
>>As it was, the majority (57%) favored at least two code test speeds, >>according to a tabulation of comments by an NCI member who read all the >>comments and categorized them. His honesty in presenting the data even >>when it clearly showed the nocodetest/minimum code test position to be a >>minority one is to be commended.
>
>Jim:
>
>Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the >FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think. Nothing >new here.

No, that's not quite right, Larry.

The 57% majority was not just hams' opinions - it came from ALL who commented. Of course most who commented were hams, but many were not, and all parties are invited to comment.

>>>>FISTS wisely stayed out of the fracas, knowing that taking a political >>>>position would only divide their membership.
>>>
>>>Why should that be? FISTS is called "The International Morse >>>Preservation Society." What do those words mean?
>>
>>It means we work to keep the mode alive and healthy, with or without tests.
>
>Considering the increasingly deplorable quality of sending I'm hearing >coming from FISTS members, I'm not sure how they plan to accomplish

>that goal. ThelastfewQSO'sI'vehadwithFISTSmembershassounded
>basicallylikethis,onlythisprobablyismuchbetterspacedthanthoseFISTS'
>sendingwas.

My experience has been different. However, one of the main purposes of
FISTS is training.
>
>>>That we'll keep
>>>Morse code alive as long as there are a bunch of withered old codgers
>>>around, exchanging numbers on the air in run-together CW using
>>>mal-adjusted bugs, or that we'll support the retention of Morse code
>>>proficiency in the ARS through continuation of code testing as a
>>>requirement for maximum HF operating privileges? Remember,
>>>many workable compromises were totally ignored -- including the
>>>removal of the code testing burden from the FCC by having the ARRL
>>>do all the test scoring, record keeping, and updating of the amateur
>>>licensee database.
>>
>>Yup - but the FCC doesn't care about that. They have other fish to fry.
>
>Well, "frying" those fish is Riley Hollingsworth's job, but maintaining
>licensing standards could have made his job much easier, IMHO.

Not what I'm talking about. Sorry if I wasn't clear. See below.
>
>>Consider the medical waiver thing. FCC has to handle all of those because
>who
>>got a medical waiver is NOT in the public database. FCC just wanted out of
>>it.
>
>The medical waiver fiasco is an atrocity inflicted upon us by the improper
>wielding of political influence by the late JY1, and the complicity of
>former President Bush's State Department. It began with the whining of
>another codeless ham who, if the truth be told, should have simply been
>politely informed by JY1 that this was not an appropriate matter for him
>to address through diplomatic channels. The entire thing was badly
>botched on all three sides -- again, IMHO.

Some people don;t even believe the JY1 story, even though it has been
explicitly confirmed by people who really "were there".

>It's just too bad that someone
>at the FCC couldn't see the problems a "medical waiver" would cause
>for them, from an administrative point-of-view, and send the proposal
>back to the State Department with that very point driven home in the
>clearest terms. The whole thing was just an exercise in political
>ass-kissing all around, to the discredit of all involved. And that's not
>just IMHO, that's a natural fact.

Nah, it's a lot simpler than that. Rewind back to 1990...

FCC isn't enamored of code testing for a variety of reasons. They've been pushing
for a nocodetest license since 1975, they dropped the sending test, and still they
encounter all sorts of opposition to lowering standards. The White House calls and
wants to know what's what about the code test and why one of our few friends in
the Middle East is making a big deal of it.

FCC folks know they can't get around the treaty thing, so they do the next-best and
create a bandaid solution that makes the White House happy. End of story.

Remember that Papa Bush & Co. had a vested interest in eliminating the RO
requirement on commercial vessels like oil tankers, too.
>
>>>>Note that FISTS and the ARRL
>>>>did encourage all to express their opinions direct to the FCC.
>>>
>>>Well, that was mighty nice of them to encourage us to do something
>>>we all had the right to do anyway.
>>
>>But did we do it? I know you did (very well, I might add) and so did I, but
>>where was everyone else?
>
>Your acknowledgement is very kind, considering the quality of your own
>comments to the FCC.

I would invite all to read both our comments. They were posted here, too.

>As to everyone else, I think that what we've seen
>is the total disbelief in the title of the FISTS organization, "The
>International Morse Preservation Society." If more FISTS members took
>that high-sounding title to heart, perhaps they would have sent in
>enough comments to make a difference. However, that didn't happen.

Unfortunately true. That is not FISTS' fault, IMHO.

>Now, we're stuck with the result -- which will inevitably a conversion
>of CW bandwidth to phone usage.

CW/digital, you mean. And it's already started.
--
>
>>I think there's another motive that the FCC is acting on. One of their
>>biggest problems is pirate stations - bootleggers, freebanders, whatever.
>>FCC figures that the code test is what keeps a lot of these folks out of
>>ham radio, so by eliminating it and simplifying the writtens there will
>>be more hams and fewer pirates.
>>
>>Remember that it's much easier to do enforcement action against a
>>licensee than against a totally unlicensed person. You know where the
>>licensee is and who he/she is, for one thing.

>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Sort of like, "If you can't beat 'em, let 'em join -- then work on them
>from the inside out.

Bingo.

>Funny, that concept would never have occurred
>to me.

It took me a long time to cotton on to it. But does it not make perfect sense? The
person with a license has expended some resources to get it, has agreed to play
by the rules, and most of all has told Referee Riley exactly who he/she is, and

where he/she can be found. Compare this to the anonymous unlicensed pirate.

So every comment that said "it'll let the cb types in!!" told the FCC that they were
on the right track.

Somebody once said that the easiest and most effective way to change somebody
from liberal to conservative is to give them a decent job, a mortgage, car payments
and a couple of kids. Same principle applies.

>Once again, IMHO, that sounds like a lazy man's way out.

Big part of the game is saving FCC resources.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4167. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 01:44:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020211204455.17580.00001077@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33627

In article <3C67F8E2.D63C7A68@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> etc.? Look what happened to the Iridium system.
>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Hey, it is still kicking. They did not dump it in the ocean
>after all.

That's good. But how much did it cost to set up? Have the investors
gotten back anyhting?

> The ARRL really fouled up a golden opportunity.

I don't see how.

>They could have bought when it was on the chopping block at
>pennies on the dollar and had the robust worldwide
>communication system that the membership wants.

Maybe. What are the operating costs again?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4168. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 02:28:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c687f89_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33629

I'd bet that in nearly every idea that becomes a tangible thing, there is a person who only had the conceptualization of it ever being reality. For those who cannot read and speak proper English, what that means is: a designer puts ideas on paper that builders use. A research scientist comes up with procedural operations that surgeons experiment with and perfect.

There are thinkers, there are doers. There are teachers and there are the learned. This world cannot survive without both. Few people are both.

Kim W5TIT

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020211192956.26452.00000646@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams
experimenting
> >> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the
early
> >> 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a
DSP
> >> eval board and get to experimenting.
>
> > Well, there you have it.
>
> There you have what? That he wants to see just as many hams experimenting
with
> digital radio as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the 50s? Why
is
> that a "there you have it" sort of thing to you?
>
> > You don't even know what you're saying.
>
> I think that it is your interpretation of what he is saying that is
somewhat at
> question here, Dick.
>
> >Your "experimenting" is all done with digital theory and writing
software,
> >forget actually putting a rig on the air (save for your 'favorite' mode,
CW).
>
> He offered DSP as one easy way that hams could experiment with digital
modes.
> Just how did YOU do PSK-31, Hellschreiber and the other modes you claim to

have
> operated without using digital signal processing software written by
others?
>
> Are you really faulting Cecil for wanting hams to experiment with DSP to
easily
> implement digital techniques while you are using the DSP software for
> soundcards written by others to do your own experimentation?
>
> Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?
>
> > Mine is USING digital modes on the air to compare and see what each will
> > actually do in various condions.
>
> Using DSP software written by others, no less.
>
> >Probably the clearest demonstration of our differences goes back the flap
> >over PSK31 where I could copy the CWID but not the PSK on that group of
> > weaksignal Europeans on a near-dead 20 meter band.
>
> >You said one must compare modes in a 31 hz bandpass and I said nonsense,
in
> >an
> >operational situation you compare under the conditions you use. Theory vs
> >practice.
>
> I agree. All modes, from OOK CW to any digital mode, have their
limitations.
> With PSK-31, one limitation is that the sudden phase shifts that can occur
> during unstable ionospheric conditions throw it for a loop. I would say
that a
> "dead band" probably qualifies.
>
> > Looks like you're out of luck Cecil.
>
> OTOH, you think that Cecil proposing that hams experiment with improving
the
> software you use to decode PSK 31 makes him "out of luck."
>
> I just can't follow the logic here, Dick. I really can't.
>
> > So what in the world makes you think the ARS would "benefit" from every
ham
> >designing his own discrete digital mode?
> Where did he say THAT? Man, you can read anything into anything. He said:
>
> >>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams
experimenting
> >> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the
early

> >> 1950's.
>
> How did you get "every ham should be designing new digital modes" out of
that?
>
> No wonder you are always so mad at what you think other people say!
>
> >How many more would you like to add, or more to the point, how much
> >dissipation do we
> >need? No, I don't advocate stopping where we are. I DO advocate that new
> >digital mode
> >development will NOT be enhanced by each novice digidesigner flooding the
ARS
> >with
> >his own novice output. After all, we have the likes of Peter Martinez
working
> >for us.
>
> And I think that with a number of hams (note, please -- I did not say
> EVERYBODY) working on improving existing modes or even developing new
ones,
> Amateur Radio will develop improvements. Why would you possibly not want
to see
> this happen? We already have rules that require that the modulation
method be
> legal on the frequency in use and the encoding method be public.
>
> > Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to
learn
> >the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a
> > evaluation board. LOTS of time.
>
> Sure, good things sometimes do take lots of time. I spent lots of time
learning
> antenna modeling -- I learned a lot in the process. I spent a lot more
time
> learning about RFI -- I think we can safely say that Amateur Radio
benefitted
> from that. Why do you feel that a ham who learns DSP will benefit only
> "marginally?"
>
> > But wait- they didn't have time to learn Morse code, which would
> >take far less than learning DSP.
>
> It really IS all about Morse code for you, isn't it?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

4169. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 02:29:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c687fe3$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33630

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020211202536.19515.00000036@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <20020210222817.17389.00000696@mb-cr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >
> >>That is completely unnecessary. All you have to do is actually *be*
> >>present.
> >
> > Hey Larry....yeah, I know, but I just avoid any opprotunity for
someone
> >to
> >question her operation...Especially on the local repeater.
> >
> >>The 10-year old can say your call sign just as well as you can.
> >
> > Sure can, the little wench!
>
> Steve:
>
> Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year
> old daughter?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh good grief. Hey, Larry, you need to go move in with those Amish folks
that you mentioned. Even they'd be shocked at your puritanical thoughts.

Kim W5TIT

4170. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 03:27:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4a26n$cb5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33631

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C694F65.57F8492F@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > > To do that, the FCC would have had to make
> > >illegal all those 23 channel CBs that had already been sold.
> > >
> > They did, as I recall. Not to use, but to sell. New cb sets had to
> > be 40 channel. I don't know about resale of existing 23 channel sets.
>
> As I recall there was a cutoff date after which the 23 channel sets were
illegal
> to use. I don't remember the exact particulars. I don't think it was ever
enforced
> (was anything about CB enforced?)

They never became illegal to use.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4171. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 03:34:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4a331$c48$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33632

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020211070506.17580.00001058@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a47hg8$d3m$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >> >The FCC has decided
> >> >> >that a 5wpm Morse code exam is a sufficient qualification
presently.
> >> >>
> >> >> Actually, they've decided that the ONLY reason to test at all is
S25.5.
> >> >
> >> >Agreed...and when the FCC first introduced the Novice at 5 wpm
> >> >some 50 years ago, they had at that time determined 5 wpm
> >> >met the treaty requirement.
> >>
> >> More importantly, it was NEVER challenged.
> >
> >Your point? Are you suggesting the FCC was inviolation
> >of the treaty?
>
> No, just the opposite.
>
> >If yes, please explain.
> >
> >> For the first 25 or so years of its existence the Novice was a
short-term
> >> one-shot
> >> "learner's permit" that was not intended to be a permanent license. The
> >real
> >> proof
> >> of Bill's claim is the Technician, which was also introduced in 1951.
> >
> >Another good example. Same question as before.
>
> Same answer.
>
> One could claim that the Novice was not absolute proof of 5 wpm being in
> accord with the treaty because of the characteristics of the original
Novice
> license. The same cannot be said of the Tech license.

Let me see if I get this straight.

The FCC created both the tech and Novice, each with a 5 wpm
test element. That was some 50 years ago. In that time, the
issue of the validity of 5 wpm meeting the treaty requirements
has never been raised by anyone...and it is your opinion then that
the 50 years of unchallenged history doesn't
constitute sufficient proof as to the validity of 5 wpm
meeting the treaty?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4172. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 05:41:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68AB19.5CC20940@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33633

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Please explain how upgrading from Advanced to Extra dumbed me down, Dick.
>
> You can ignore it all you wish, but you didn't move up to the tests, the tests moved
> down to you.

How did the test moving down to me make me dumber as an Extra
than I was as an Advanced?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4173. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 05:45:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68ABFD.C8EB3CFD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33634

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So what in the world makes you think the ARS would "benefit" from every ham
> designing his own discrete digital mode?

It's logical for a person to start out experimenting with filters,
CW filters, SSB filters, etc. Designing software to decode CW or
FSK is challenging and doesn't require a new mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4174. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 05:53:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68ADCD.F8F9267E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33635

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Have you purchased your ticket on the next train to Mars? That's
> possible, too.

Actually, private enterprise is already working on a solution for a
round trip vacation to Mars. They'll be using the earth and moon
as slingshots.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4175. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 06:03:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68B021.74A95E38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33636

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the
> > > FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think.
> >
> > Nope, what we learned was that we still live in a Republic where the
> > FCC is supposed to do what is best for all citizens, not just what
> > is best for hams.
>
> If that was true the best thing they could do is abolish the ARS.

Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
The FCC is not willing to do that.

> In fact they may eventually do just that. Ask Riley. Better yet, read his
> response to Kim. Enough Kims and its all over.

How's this for the "W" on the QSL card?

\ /\ /
\ / \ /
\o/ \o/
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4176. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 06:05:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68B0BF.BE86F881@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33637

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> > I'm not talking about non-dead bands, Dick. "CW gets through when no
> > other mode will" is simply a false statement. No mode gets through
> > "when the band is absolutely dead".
>
> And as you always do when it suits your purplose, you evaded
> the point, which was that much of the time the band(s) just SEEMS dead.

I'm not talking about bands that seem dead, Dick. I'm talking about
bands that *are* dead.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4177. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 06:07:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C68B110.79C8C554@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33638

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Oh good grief. Hey, Larry, you need to go move in with those Amish folks
> that you mentioned. Even they'd be shocked at your puritanical thoughts.

I'll bet the Amish have their share of wenches.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4178. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 06:26:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212012625.18905.00000763@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33639

>Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5
>Proposal
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/11/2002 11:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C68ADCD.F8F9267E@IEEE.org>

>
>Actually, private enterprise is already working on a solution for a
>round trip vacation to Mars. They'll be using the earth and moon
>as slingshots.

I'd sure like to get the concession on the rubber band they intend to
stretch between the two!

=)

Steve, K4YZ

4179. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 06:39:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212013936.26489.00000770@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33640

>Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 2/11/2002 7:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020211202536.19515.00000036@mb-md.aol.com>

>Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year
>old daughter?

Only with a wink, smile and a nod!

Now Larry, take a deeeeeeep breath and B-R-E-A-T-H-E....! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

4180. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:13:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A127D.A2D8A24B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33641

Richard McCollum wrote:

>It is not the elimination of the Morse test but the entry of a real

> collection of spoiled brats that will doom the Amateur Service.

Fact is, it's not so much the loss of the Morse qualification that is so damaging as is the attitude of those who so heartily applaude its departure; for they show clearly an attitude very much foreign to that so long displayed by most participants in ham radio, that is, whatever job is to be done one just goes ahead and gets it done.
Those very same spoiled children displaying their childishness.
Adults just don't act like that.

4181. Re: Digital Radio and "Futures Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:15:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A1315.BCF56CA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33642

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Mon, 11 Feb 2002 18:42:23 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > And who would have paid the $5million per month maintenance
> >tab?
>
> Who's paying it now?

I don't know, but that was one of the big snags cited when the company went bust and the primary reason no one was in a hurry to buy it out. Evidently someone eventually did, if it wasn't all dumped into the ocean as was iminent at one time. Seems like the government may have taken it over.

4182. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:23:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A14F2.ADA245E4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33643

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > If that was true the best thing they could do is abolish the ARS.
> >In fact they may eventually do just that. Ask Riley. Better yet, read his
> >response to Kim. Enough Kims and its all over.
>

Not to worry, Ed. With the proliferation of nonsense witnin the ARS Dale Hatfield's "warning shot" will have proved to be more prophetic than anything else. By the time FCC will need to gather the evidence needed to yank assignments to sell to other services, we will have provided far more than they need. I feel rather sure that those who covet our spectrum have every confidence it will go that way, based on nothing more than what they can monitor on the air-on SSB and FM, of course.

> And Dale Hatfield's speech seems to imply that enough hams who don't need no
> steenkin' new technology and it's all over.

Well the only hams who "need" any new technology, steenkin' or not, are the Moores and Stevensons who are driven by it, and of course made a career of fully immersing themselves in it. The rest of us are just along for the ride. We pick it up as it becomes attractive to us, and become users, as time passes and utility and usefullness of the modes show themselves - just as it has always happened.

>
>
> You seem to support Riley's view but discount Hatfield's. Of course, if memory
> serves, Hatfield retired? OTOH, OET influences more rulemaking procedures that
> does the EB, if I read it correctly.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4183. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:43:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A19A3.3F4565BE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33644

W1RFI wrote:

> > But wait- they didn't have time to learn Morse code, which would
> >take far less than learning DSP.
>
> It really IS all about Morse code for you, isn't it?

No Ed, it "really" isn't, it's about a bunch of spoiled brats who "don't have time" to meet the requirements spoiling the ARS by whining, ranting and getting their way..

4184. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:45:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A1A15.A525A9F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33645

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Please explain how upgrading from Advanced to Extra dumbed me down, Dick.
> >
> > You can ignore it all you wish, but you didn't move up to the tests, the tests moved
> > down to you.
>
> How did the test moving down to me make me dumber as an Extra
> than I was as an Advanced?

Din't say it did. But nothing can change the fact that anyone who passed
his Extra exam after the restructuring is less qualified than before.

4185. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:48:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A1AD2.9610DD2B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33646

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > Sooo, what we learned from the Restructuring comment period is that the
> > > > FCC really doesn't give a damn what the majority of ham think.
> > >
> > > Nope, what we learned was that we still live in a Republic where the
> > > FCC is supposed to do what is best for all citizens, not just what
> > > is best for hams.
> >
> > If that was true the best thing they could do is abolish the ARS.
>
> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.

Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit from
emergency communications.

4186. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 08:54:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A1C26.7836E6F8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33647

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > I'm not talking about non-dead bands, Dick. "CW gets through when no
> > > other mode will" is simply a false statement. No mode gets through
> > > "when the band is absolutely dead".
> >
> > And as you always do when it suits your purplose, you evaded
> > the point, which was that much of the time the band(s) just SEEMS dead.
>
> I'm not talking about bands that seem dead, Dick. I'm talking about
> bands that *are* dead.

I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.
I've worked a lot of weak DX on "dead" bands. Even 6 meters. The point is
hams are often way too quick to declare a band
"dead".

4187. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 10:24:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <536a8.64$Nf3.7290@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33648

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C68B110.79C8C554@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Oh good grief. Hey, Larry, you need to go move in with those Amish
folks
> > that you mentioned. Even they'd be shocked at your puritanical
thoughts.
>
> I'll bet the Amish have their share of wenches.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

See Brian Kelly's Amish story.

4188. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 10:40:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212054005.16072.00001068@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33650

In article <a4a331$c48$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Let me see if I get this straight.
>
>The FCC created both the tech and Novice, each with a 5 wpm
>test element. That was some 50 years ago.

Yup, 1951.

>In that time, the
>issue of the validity of 5 wpm meeting the treaty requirements
>has never been raised by anyone...

True.

>and it is your opinion then that
>the 50 years of unchallenged history doesn't
>constitute sufficient proof as to the validity of 5 wpm
>meeting the treaty?
>
Just the opposite, Bill. Sorry if I wasn't clear.

The last point I was making is that even if we discount the Novice as
proof of 5 wpm, the Tech proves the point handily. The Tech has always
been a permanent renewable license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4189. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 10:40:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212054006.16072.00001069@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33649

In article <a4a26n$cb5$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C694F65.57F8492F@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>> > > To do that, the FCC would have had to make
>> > >illegal all those 23 channel CBs that had already been sold.
>> > >
>> > They did, as I recall. Not to use, but to sell. New cb sets had to
>> > be 40 channel. I don't know about resale of existing 23 channel sets.
>>
>> As I recall there was a cutoff date after which the 23 channel sets were
>illegal
>> to use. I don't remember the exact particulars. I don't think it was ever
>enforced
>> (was anything about CB enforced?)
>
>They never became illegal to use.
>
Even if they did, it wouldn't stop anybody.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4190. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 10:57:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212055757.17396.00000947@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33701

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Adults just don't act like that.

Hey, Dick... why don't you tell me to go soak my head again, just to show how adult YOU have been through all this.

"Adults" don't get on public newsgroups and cuss at other participants,either. And adults don't pull the "your honor, she MADE me beat" her excuse when they do.

I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4191. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 10:59:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212055920.17396.00000948@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33702

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.

> Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit
>from emergency communications.

The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread emergencies
that ham radio helps with.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4192. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 11:02:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212060248.17396.00000949@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33703

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>With SSB, the result was standardized and the development was in how to get
>the desired result. Not true with the modes you're describing.

Then he is describing the development of new modes and technology, not just the duplication of what has gone before outside of Amateur Radio. IMHO, this would have Amateur Radio adding to the state of the radio art.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4193. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 11:08:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212060833.17396.00000952@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33704

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>Don't bet on that. This thing is another techie brainfart whose time
>will never come.

I think eQSLing it will indeed happen, Brian, but it will not replace the paper card. If a DXpedition wants to issue paper cards, they will do so, and I bet hams will work them. If a DXpedition wants to avoid the hassle of paper cards and just upload their logs, they will do so, and I bet hams will work them.

But eQSL will not supplant paper QSLs for decades to come, I imagine. Just think of the uproar if ARRL were to decide not to accept paper cards from North Korea, and they chose to QSL only via paper. We may see an e-only award or two, but the mainstream awards will accept either paper or electronic QSLs.

It will all be a matter of choice. The DXpeditions do what they want, and the hams on the other end choose whether they want to work them. Some few may choose not to work a station that won't issue a paper card, but that will be a choice that makes the pileup a tiny bit smaller, increasing my odds just a bit. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4194. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 11:12:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212061203.17396.00000954@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33705

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> No Ed, it "really" isn't, it's about a bunch of spoiled brats who "don't
>have
>time" to meet the requirements spoiling the ARS by whining, ranting and
>getting
>their way..

I don't know of anyone who was issued an FCC license without meeting the requirements. Do you?

I would imagine that most of the people who have upgraded since restructuring neither whined, ranted nor spoiled Amateur Radio by doing so.

Would you characterize the post you just made calling people you don't know "spoiled brats" a whine or a rant? To tie it in with another post, do you think it is adult to call people you don't know "spoiled brats?"

Just curious whether you have one standard -- or one for yourself and a different standard for others.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4195. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 11:19:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212061917.17396.00000956@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33706

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>It's logical for a person to start out experimenting with filters,
>CW filters, SSB filters, etc. Designing software to decode CW or
>FSK is challenging and doesn't require a new mode.

But designing software to decode existing modes could design better ways to do it.

As DSP gets higher into the RF region, it will become easier to use this faster technology to do things that can hardly be imagined. Just as an example with OOK CW, at 100 kHz IF, very doable with existing, affordable DSP technology, each dit at 20 wpm would have about 60 ms duration. In that 60 ms, there would be 6000 cycles. Although there is not necessarily coherence between a dit and the next, it should be possible to find the coherence in 6000 cycles of IF and thus, by finding the coherence then going back and looking at the entire element again, do coherent-CW detection on a dit-by-dit basis.

And when DSP gets to 30 MHz and 32 bits, it will be possible to do so at RF with dynamic range approaching useful (~96 dB). It is more likely, however, that any such DSP radio will use a combination of analog and digital techniques.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4196. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 12:22:57 UTC
From: "Bob L." <blf@westeastmailerx.com>
Message-ID: <a4b18g$90g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33707

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> I earned my living interpreting FCC regulations correctly and
> teaching communications law...I even participated in writing
> them and the enforcement procedures for them while I was on the
> FCC's staff for three decades. I have no problem reading and
> interpreting FCC rules correctly.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
Strange, three decades? I knew Reed Hundt, yet he never
mentioned your name?

4197. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 13:00:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212080024.07629.00000001@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33708

From: "Bob L." blf@westeastmailerx.com

>> I earned my living interpreting FCC regulations correctly and
>> teaching communications law...I even participated in writing
>> them and the enforcement procedures for them while I was on the
>> FCC's staff for three decades. I have no problem reading and
>> interpreting FCC rules correctly.

> Strange, three decades? I knew Reed Hundt, yet he never
> mentioned your name?

The FCC has thousands of employees. How many of their names did Reed mention to you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4198. ARES (was Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 13:56:08 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C691EF8.DF261C98@crosslink.net>
Source record: 33709
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

iron3@charter.net wrote:
>
> Well sad to say, Ham radio even for emergencies is becoming a thing of the
> past. Newer technologies are here....

Don't scrap your ARES nets just yet. If 9-11 is any indication the reverse may be true, at least for a while. Many agencies had come to rely on cell phones (some had even scrapped their radios) only to find the cell net hopelessly jammed when everybody and their dog tried to use it at once. That's why officials are scrambling to change the system so they can cut off "non-essential users" (ie, us); but the telcos are saying "prohibitively expensive".

73 KA3DWW

4199. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 14:42:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6929CD.E1A522B8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33710

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Please explain how upgrading from Advanced to Extra dumbed me down, Dick.
> > >
> > > You can ignore it all you wish, but you didn't move up to the tests, the tests moved
> > > down to you.
> >
> > How did the test moving down to me make me dumber as an Extra
> > than I was as an Advanced?
>
> Din't say it did. But nothing can change the fact that anyone who passed
> his Extra exam after the restructuring is less qualified than before.

How am I less qualified now as an Extra than before restructuring
as an Advanced? What qualifications did I suddenly lose by becoming
an Extra? This effect you describe could be devastating because I
am not aware of any loss of qualifications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4200. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 14:53:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C692C62.BC2E3703@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33711

W1RFI wrote:
> As DSP gets higher into the RF region, it will become easier to use this faster
> technology to do things that can hardly be imagined. Just as an example with
> OOK CW, at 100 kHz IF, very doable with existing, affordable DSP technology,
> each dit at 20 wpm would have about 60 ms duration. In that 60 ms, there would
> be 6000 cycles. Although there is not necessarily coherence between a dit and
> the next, it should be possible to find the coherence in 6000 cycles of IF and
> thus, by finding the coherence then going back and looking at the entire
> element again, do coherent-CW detection on a dit-by-dit basis.

Coherent CW (CCW) based on a fixed baud rate would be one hell of a mode
and would run circles around all but the most sophisticated modes that
hams use today.

> And when DSP gets to 30 MHz and 32 bits, it will be possible to do so at RF
> with dynamic range approaching useful (~96 dB). It is more likely, however,
> that any such DSP radio will use a combination of analog and digital
> techniques.

I drove up to Texas Towers yesterday and got me an IC-756pro. I played with
it last night and it has 32 bit processing power. Amazing stuff. The Clear
Speech audio system performs miracles according to some users. All this DSP
stuff was done by programmers. The present state of the art in radio includes
software as well as hardware. Promoting the state of the art is one of the
basis and purposes of amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4201. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 14:59:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C692DC5.5DEB8578@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33712

N2EY wrote:
> The last point I was making is that even if we discount the Novice as
> proof of 5 wpm, the Tech proves the point handily. The Tech has always
> been a permanent renewable license.

But back in the 50's if I remember correctly, Tech's weren't allowed on HF.
Therefore, they did not fall under ï¿½25.5.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4202. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:04:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C692EEC.B60FFEDA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33713

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
>
> Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit from
> emergency communications.

I'm not sure that's a true statement, Dick. In any 80 year life span, there's
a good chance that a person has benefited from emergency communications even
if indirectly. If emergency communications benefits my cousin in Louisiana,
then I indirectly benefit from it. In fact, it would be safe to surmise
that all citizens of the US benefit from emergency communications even if
only indirectly. Emergency communications promotes the general welfare.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4203. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:05:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C692F47.719EE04D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33714

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
>
> > Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit
> >from emergency communications.
>
> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread emergencies
> that ham radio helps with.

But consider the indirect benefit. Do you know someone who is of value
to you who has benefited from emergency communications? I do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4204. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:09:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C693027.88DB804F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33716

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm not talking about bands that seem dead, Dick. I'm talking about
> > bands that *are* dead.
>
> I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.
> I've worked a lot of weak DX on "dead" bands.

No you have not! It is impossible to work anyone on a dead band. If you
can work someone, the band if not dead. Why is that so hard to understand?
If you think the band is dead and you work someone on it, you were mistaken
about the band being dead. Your inability to hear any signals does not
prove a band is dead. Your thoughts do not cause reality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4205. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:10:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202120710.1846f954@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33715

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020211065326.17949.00000708@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>Actually, the VECs handled the medical waivers.
>
> >Weren't they all reviewed by the FCC and filed by them?
>
> I may be in a bit over my head on this one, but to my understanding, any FCC
> review of the waivers was no more extensive than any other application matter.
> I have cc'ed my low friend in high places in the ARRL VEC to ensure that I am
> correct. If he tells me I am wrong, I will post his response.

Thanks, Ed.

But I would submit that the FCC saw the medical waiver situation as a band-aid that they wanted to get rid of. Even if their review was not extensive, it was a lot of admin work. Same reason to simplify the license structure applies.

Under the old system, a new ham could go through 6 steps from no-license to Extra, each one requiring FCC action (initial license, four upgrades, medical waiver). Under the new system there are only 3 possible steps - half the old total. In the short term, the new system has produced lots of upgrades but in the longer term it means much less admin work for the FCC. And that may be a very good thing in the longer term IF less admin means more enforcement.

Go Riley!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4206. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:13:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C693107.749C0727@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33717

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >Don't bet on that. This thing is another techie brainfart whose time
> >will never come.
>
> I think eQSLing it will indeed happen, Brian, but it will not replace the paper
> card.

I have a question. There seems to be some question about verifying QSL
cards. If I print out a QSL card on my printer and mail it to someone,
what is the difference in emailing the .jpg file and having the ham
on the receiving end print it out? The printout is the same either way.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4207. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:34:19 UTC
From: Peter Buchhop <pbuchhop@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <a4bco7hfd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33718
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have to agree with you. I am a new ham, probably on the younger end of the curve, manage
an emerging technology and am heavily involved in new cutting edge technology. But, in
this area, I agree physical, hand-signed cards are superior to eQSLs; at least for me anyway.
Not being a fan of eQSL doesn't make one a Luddite.
73,
Pete

"Robert Lyons" <boblyons@umich.edu> wrote in message news:3C67CDF8.E65BD1EB@umich.edu...
> Charles Johnston wrote:
> >
> > DXCC qsl'ing is now -cheaper- and -faster- than ever....a huge and
> > bold step in the right direction.
>
>
> Yeah, I suppose it's inevitable, but I for one will not appreciate an
> electronic QSL as much as I do the old-style postcard kind. I like
> seeing the pictures chosen by the DX, I like it when I get a card with
> a hand-written message on it (yeah, that's pretty rare) and I like
> getting stamps from the DX country on their envelope.
>
> Sure, lots of people now just print out a stick-on label for their
> card. Lots of people just use those generic callsign-and-qso-info cards.
> Lots of cards don't come with exotic stamps, since they arrived via the
> manager, or were metered instead of stamped. Still, I come home every
> day and the first thing I do is check the mailbox for QSL cards. The
> electronic ones just won't have the same thrill.
>
> 73 de Bob, KI8AB

4208. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:41:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212104130.04583.00000002@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33719

In article <3C67D500.8384340F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
>>
>> Does your XYL know you are sharing such intimate personal
>> information with a bunch of strangers (to her) in a Usenet
>> newsgroup?
>
>Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.

Cecil:

My condolences, but I should think that this would be all the more
reason to keep such information to yourself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4209. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:41:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212104130.04583.00000001@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33720

In article <yMW98.26295$7J2.451959846@hebe.telenet-ops.be>, nicky18@freesex.net writes:

>
>http://devoted.to/nicky18
>
>Hi,
>
>I am Marc and my girlfriend Nicky and I want to be pornstars. We have just
>made some hardcore takes at home and want to know what you are thinking about
>us.
>
>Please take a look at http://devoted.to/nicky18

Marc & Nicky:

I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've certainly made it as total wankers!

And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4210. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:41:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212104131.04583.00000003@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33721

In article <20020211065849.17949.00000710@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all the
>>"other
>>side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir and
>stir
>>and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the knaves
>but
>>the good guys too?
>
>When I get trashed by someone I consider to be one of the good guys, I think
>long and hard about what they have to say.

Ed:

The very first time I posted on the old Fidonet Ham Radio echo, it was
to politely and very respectfully disagree with a no-coder who was
in the process of telling us exactly what he thought of the code tests
and those who supported them, in no uncertain terms.

>>Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in
>>kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade?
>
>Of course you have a choice, Dick, and you make that choice the same way
>nearly
>every time...

Individuals who reside in vitreous abodes should refrain from hurling
aggregate projectiles.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4211. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:41:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212104131.04583.00000004@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 33722

In article <CqV98.6978$421.588813@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>It is not the elimination of the Morse test but the entry of a real
>collection of spoiled brats that will doom the Amateur Service.
>
>Dick Nï¿½BK

Dick:

You're talking about only one thing here. The Morse code test is what kept the spoiled brats *out* of the ARS, for the most part. I say "for the most part" because there are always the code-tested-but-politically-correct types who sided with the no-coders in order to avoid the social disenfranchisement that usually comes when you dare to suggest that someone actually make an effort to learn a useful communications skill.

The NCTA is all about laziness -- it's never been about anything else. The current crop of "newcomers" to the ARS are at an all-time low in technical involvement, in spite of the fact that there is virtually nothing left WRT code testing. Pretty soon, a "technically competent" ham will be defined as one who can successfully get his off-the-shelf HF rig on-the-air (using SSB, of course) without the assistance of more than a half-dozen "Elmers." Whoopie!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4212. W9INN Antennas site now ONLINE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 15:55:44 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c693b00@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33723
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

The Official W9INN Antennas Page is ONLINE at the web site listed below.
It features illustrations, measured field data, and ordering
information.

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

4213. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:25:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A93EB.C0AFD8BB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33724

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Adults just don't act like that.
>
> Hey, Dick... why don't you tell me to go soak my head again, just to show how
> adult YOU have been through all this.
>
> "Adults" don't get on public newsgroups and cuss at other participants,either.
> And adults don't pull the "your honor, she MADE me beat" her excuse when they
> do.
>
> I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hey, Ed- go soak your head!

4214. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:26:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A942E.10B3A71C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33725

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
>
> > Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit
> >from emergency communications.
>
> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread emergencies
> that ham radio helps with.

And that fact clearly invalidates Cecil's point.

4215. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:36:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A9683.3EC424CA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33726

N2EY wrote:

I would submit that the FCC saw the medical waiver situation as a band-aid

> that they wanted to get rid of

Even though the VEs handled all the paperwork, just dealing with all the complaints about abuses was reason enough for FCC to decide to drop code speeds enough to get rid of it.

4216. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:38:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212123837.17384.00001746@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 33728

In article <20020212060248.17396.00000949@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>With SSB, the result was standardized and the development was in how to get
>>the desired result. Not true with the modes you're describing.
>
>Then he is describing the development of new modes and technology, not just
the
>duplication of what has gone before outside of Amateur Radio. IMHO, this would
>have Amateur Radio adding to the state of the radio art.

I'm still working on the "standardization" of SSB.

How in the heck does one "standardize" SSB other than an arbitrary choice of sideband on frequency?!?

There's no variability on AM other than government regulations stating a maximum spectral occupancy on a signal. With FM and PM there can be a wide latitude of modulation index and thus spectral occupancy... which requires a receiving bandwidth, possible modulation frequency "equalization," etc. SSB is AM with only one sideband group and the carrier suppressed.

It must be buzzphrase time; "there was STANDARDIZED SSB!" :-)

With kind but curious regards,
Len

4217. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:38:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212123838.17384.00001747@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 33729

In article <3C692F47.719EE04D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> >> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
>>
>> > Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit
>> >from emergency communications.
>>
>> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread
>> emergencies that ham radio helps with.
>
>But consider the indirect benefit. Do you know someone who is of value
>to you who has benefited from emergency communications? I do.

Do you consider 4 to 5 million people *IN* an earthquake as applicable
to this "emergency communications" discussion? Every one of my
neighbors were IN such a widespread emergency eight years ago. The
Part 90 Public Safety Radio Services, even a few PLMRS radios were
on the job working to aid communications. Immediately. They were
equipped and trained for that sort of thing. Total electrical power
failure over a huge area for many hours. Where was all the vaunted
ham emergency communications? Were they even needed if they
got on the air? [unknown since all that's been published has been
some generalizations and general proselyting phraseology]

I realize that some emergency situations in certain geographical areas
aren't counted as such. It wasn't in anybody's back yard, was it?
Not a hurricane with dramatic period of warnings, announcements,
and activations to build up to an anticlimax. It didn't happen on the
Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
the *IMPORTANT* things happen. It just happened. Suddenly. It
only killed 53 immediately, another 4 dying shortly after the first
shaking. The injured and the damage was all taken care of using
the established public safety and utilties infrastructure communications.

That's apparently unimportant to what some in this country IMAGINE
is involved in "emergency communications." Understood. NIMBY to
most everyone else. Five million people only count if they are located
in an "important" region of the USA where all the "right-thinking" folks
are.

Still waiting for an Official ARRL Radiogram message to arrive here.
So are my neighbors, friends, and acquaintences. Is there a paper

shortage on Official message forms?

With kind regards,
Len

4218. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:38:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A9717.C13C4415@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33727

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm not talking about bands that seem dead, Dick. I'm talking about
> > > bands that *are* dead.
> >
> > I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.
> > I've worked a lot of weak DX on "dead" bands.
>
> No you have not! It is impossible to work anyone on a dead band. If you
> can work someone, the band if not dead. Why is that so hard to understand?
> If you think the band is dead and you work someone on it, you were mistaken
> about the band being dead. Your inability to hear any signals does not
> prove a band is dead. Your thoughts do not cause reality.

">
> I'm not talking about bands that seem dead, Dick. I'm talking about
> bands that *are* dead.

I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.
I've worked a lot of weak DX on "dead" bands. Even 6 meters. The point is
hams are often way too quick to declare a band
"dead". "

Troll, troll, troll yer boat.............

4219. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:42:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A97FA.3EE85544@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33730

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C67D500.8384340F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
> >>
> >> Does your XYL know you are sharing such intimate personal
> >> information with a bunch of strangers (to her) in a Usenet
> >> newsgroup?
> > >
> >Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.
>
> Cecil:
>
> My condolences, but I should think that this would be all the more
> reason to keep such information to yourself.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

From his earlier posts I gather that was a different wife. The last one dumped him. Must have been her. If I remember right she also sold illicit substances she allegedly got from a crooked cop. Yeh.

4220. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:44:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A9881.AF4AFAF7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33731

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20020211065849.17949.00000710@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >> Sure, Jim, we could all do that, couldn't we? So why is it that all the
> >>"other
> >>side" of the "discussion" get almost wholly ignored while they stir and
> >stir
> >>and stir, and we, namely Larry and me, get trashed by not only the knaves
> >but
> >>the good guys too?
> >
> >When I get trashed by someone I consider to be one of the good guys, I think
> >long and hard about what they have to say.
>
> Ed:
>
> The very first time I posted on the old Fidonet Ham Radio echo, it was
> to politely and very respectfully disagree with a no-coder who was
> in the process of telling us exactly what he thought of the code tests
> and those who supported them, in no uncertain terms.
>
> >>Do you really think I like to feel I have no choice but to respond in
> >>kind, maybe with a little twist to the blade?
> >
> >Of course you have a choice, Dick, and you make that choice the same way
> >nearly
> >every time...
>
> Individuals who reside in vitreous abodes should refrain from hurling
> aggregate projectiles.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

We all know I don't live in a glass house but Ed, well, he hangs out at that ivory,
or is that porcelein? tower in Newington.

A good headsoak might do wonders for his personality.

4221. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:52:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6A9A4F.DDEDFF3A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33732

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > No Ed, it "really" isn't, it's about a bunch of spoiled brats who "don't
> >have
> >time" to meet the requirements spoiling the ARS by whining, ranting and
> >getting
> >their way..
>
> I don't know of anyone who was issued an FCC license without meeting the
> requirements. Do you?

Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two. Of course that assumes the requirements they WANTED to license under, but just never could cut the mustard. So they hung around wailing and moaning until all the incessant whining got the requirements dropped to their level.

>
>
> I would imagine that most of the people who have upgraded since restructuring
> neither whined, ranted nor spoiled Amateur Radio by doing so.
>

You've been paying attention, then. It's still going on, right here.

> Would you characterize the post you just made calling people you don't know
> "spoiled brats" a whine or a rant? To tie it in with another post, do you
> think it is adult to call people you don't know "spoiled brats?"
>

The longer you rant the more you look like one yourself.

>
> Just curious whether you have one standard -- or one for yourself and a
> different standard for others.
>

Well we can clear that up for you with a good headsoak.

4222. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 17:55:31 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a4bkujdtv1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 33733

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote:
>On Mon, 11 Feb 2002 18:42:23 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> And who would have paid the $5million per month maintenance
>>tab?
>
> Who's paying it now?

The DoD is paying a $3 million/month phone bill now, so that is probably covering the basics. That the DoD also took the trouble to build their own private ground terminal in Hawaii suggests that they seriously like this service. Between that sugar daddy and the fact that the new owners have only a $25 million investment to get return on, rather than the billions that were written off in bankruptcy, the service has gotten pretty cheap relatively speaking. The per-minute rates seem to now be as good as I pay for international GSM roaming.

Of course the other effect has been to drive their competitor Globalstar to the brink. And I see Teledesic has scaled back their yet-to-launch LEO constellation from nearly 600 satellites originally and 288 satellites 5 years ago down to 30 now. It seems that LEO satellite service is a solution which still has a limited problem space.

Dennis Ferguson

4223. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:33:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69600F.42BA5179@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33734

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...
>
> Hey, Ed- go soak your head!

Too cold up there for that but it's sunny and warm here today.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4224. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:35:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69606F.7586289E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33735

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Pretty soon, a "technically
> competent" ham will be defined as one who can successfully get
> his off-the-shelf HF rig on-the-air (using SSB, of course) without
> the assistance of more than a half-dozen "Elmers." Whoopie!

That may be but has absolutely nothing to do with Morse code
testing according to the FCC.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4225. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:40:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212134011.22158.00000942@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33736

In article <3C692C62.BC2E3703@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>I drove up to Texas Towers yesterday and got me an IC-756pro. I played with
>it last night and it has 32 bit processing power. Amazing stuff. The Clear
>Speech audio system performs miracles according to some users. All this DSP
>stuff was done by programmers. The present state of the art in radio includes
>software as well as hardware. Promoting the state of the art is one of the
>basis and purposes of amateur radio.

How much of the programming in that rig was done by hams as amateurs? How
much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4226. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:40:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212134012.22158.00000943@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33737

In article <3C692DC5.5DEB8578@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> The last point I was making is that even if we discount the Novice as
>> proof of 5 wpm, the Tech proves the point handily. The Tech has always
>> been a permanent renewable license.
>
>But back in the 50's if I remember correctly, Tech's weren't allowed on HF.

That is correct.

>Therefore, they did not fall under ï¿½25.5.

That is not correct.

S25.5 actually says that ALL amateurs must be code tested. Later amendments added exceptions. At first the exception was for hams whose licenses were only for the bands above 1000 MHz. The amendment limit has since been lowered to 30 MHz.

'50s and '60s Techs had to be code tested to meet the treaty because their privileges extended below the limit then set by the amendments.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4227. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:42:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C696211.6C53B55D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33738

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two. Of course that assumes the requirements they
> WANTED to license under, but just never could cut the mustard. So they hung
> around wailing and moaning until all the incessant whining got the requirements
> dropped to their level.

Maybe some day they will dumb down the EE degree requirements until
you can qualify. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4228. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:44:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C696282.57D67AAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33739

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Even though the VEs handled all the paperwork, just dealing with all the complaints about
> abuses was reason enough for FCC to decide to drop code speeds enough to get rid of it.

Guess who was responsible for those complaints? The PCTA folk, of course.
Next time, be careful what you wish for.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4229. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:47:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69632C.50F1F5A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33740

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread emergencies
> > that ham radio helps with.
>
> And that fact clearly invalidates Cecil's point.

Nope, it doesn't, Dick. The citizens who do find themselves in the widespread emergencies have loved ones all across the country who benefit indirectly from those emergency communications. I'll bet the majority of citizens have benefited either directly or indirectly from emergency communications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4230. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:51:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C696428.E515A818@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33742

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.

I know exactly what you are, Dick. I just cannot bring myself to say it in public. One time I was unloading 100# feedsacks from a big truck. The guy in the truck accidentally dropped one of the sacks right on top of me. I wasn't expecting it and fell down under the sack. I looked at him with the "urge to kill" in my eyes and he said: "Don't call me what I is!" So I won't call you what you is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4231. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:54:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6964CE.1A5157C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33743

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.

> My condolences, but I should think that this would be all the more
> reason to keep such information to yourself.

Why, Larry? Oral sex is great, healthy, and good for what ails you.
You should try it once - it might cure your hatred.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4232. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:54:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grffs70.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33741

On Tue, 12 Feb 2002 07:22:57 -0500, Bob L. wrote:

> Strange, three decades? I knew Reed Hundt, yet he never
> mentioned your name?

He was The Chairman from Mars who never "got" what the agency did
for a living and his missing-the-target policies were one major
reason for my electing early retirement.

"Knowing Reed Hundt" is not a plus in my book.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4233. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 18:55:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C696521.6FBDB008@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33744

Dick Carroll wrote:
> From his earlier posts I gather that was a different wife. The last one dumped
> him. Must have been her. If I remember right she also sold illicit substances she
> allegedly got from a crooked cop. Yeh.

First wife was in Texas in the 50's while oral sex was still illegal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4234. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 19:03:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6966F6.4A397C01@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33745

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C692C62.BC2E3703@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >I drove up to Texas Towers yesterday and got me an IC-756pro. I played with
> >it last night and it has 32 bit processing power. Amazing stuff. The Clear
> >Speech audio system performs miracles according to some users. All this DSP
> >stuff was done by programmers. The present state of the art in radio includes
> >software as well as hardware. Promoting the state of the art is one of the
> >basis and purposes of amateur radio.
>
> How much of the programming in that rig was done by hams as amateurs? How
> much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?

This is obviously hearsay, but I heard that a good percentage of ICOM RF
designers are hams. My development tools cannot match a 24 bit A/D and
32 bit processing power but I learn a lot by experimenting with my DSP
eval board. It's a Motorola DSP eval board that is presently pretty
much obsolete by now but simply observing its limitations gives me an
idea of how the 24/32 bit stuff operates.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4235. Re: N O C O D E = N O H A M .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 19:44:26 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202121144.22217d49@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33746

Realham <drwellnd@srynet.com> wrote in message news:<3C6577F7.A152D89B@srynet.com>...
> NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
> Moan CBers moan.

Moan...another troll.

```
====================
1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
||||||||||
====================
```
Digital Troll-O-Meter

Hey what's this?

http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1332041251

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4236. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 20:35:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212153553.18901.00000760@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33748

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/12/2002 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C693107.749C0727@IEEE.org>

>If I print out a QSL card on my printer and mail it to someone,
>what is the difference in emailing the .jpg file and having the ham
>on the receiving end print it out? The printout is the same either way.

(1) A human hand did not touch it.

(2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4237. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 20:35:57 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0202121235.690ce8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33747

In summary ...

1... for a period of time after April 15, 2000 [known as Black Thursday by some] if you held a pre-Mar 21, 1987, Tech Plus, you could gather the paperwork and have the VE certify that to the FCC, resulting in a General. That license required Element 1 (5wpm) and Element 3 (the current General). I thought that opportunity expired with the 2001 rewrite of Element 3 -- but not sure?

2... if you hold a pre-Feb 14, 1991, Technical license or a post-Feb 14, 1991, through Apr 15, 2000, Technician Plus license, you are classified as Technician Plus until you upgrade or allow the license to expire beyond the grace period;
your Element 1 can be applied toward the General license when Element 3 is passed.

3... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2000, the Element 1 CSCE is valid for upgrade to General for 365 days, during which time you either need to pass Element 3 or ...

4... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2001, the CSCE grants the Novice/Tech Plus operating privileges for as long as you hold the license; however, you will be classified as Technician, not Technician Plus.

5... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2000, and Element 3 within 365 days to earn General, I believe you may test for Extra based on holding General, not on the Element 1 CSCE?

KB9RVB
Carl

"GR" <greinsch@charter.net> wrote in message news:<u6dglvk45jl5bb@corp.supernews.com>...
> What will I have to do to go from Tech Plus to General Class?
>
> Will I have to take the CW again?
>
> Gary
> KC5WSR

4238. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 20:44:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212154455.18901.00000763@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33749

>Subject: Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/12/2002 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C6964CE.1A5157C6@IEEE.org>

>
>Why, Larry? Oral sex is great, healthy, and good for what ails you.
>You should try it once - it might cure your hatred.

Preferably with a woman, Larry.

Steve, K4YZ

4239. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 21:14:34 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6985BA.160B0321@psu.edu>
Source record: 33750

No difference as far as I can see. As a fairly new ham, I was flabbergasted by the Bureau approach to qsl'ing. Seemed like a huge amount of hassle. I might even get involved in DXCC and other stuff like that now that the QSL walls are coming down.

I know there is inertia to overcome, but it is hard to deny that eqsl's are superior in all ways but one, and that is the niceness of receiving a card from far away places.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:

>
> I have a question. There seems to be some question about verifying QSL
> cards. If I print out a QSL card on my printer and mail it to someone,
> what is the difference in emailing the .jpg file and having the ham
> on the receiving end print it out? The printout is the same either way.

4240. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 21:21:06 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C698741.13E21FD5@psu.edu>
Source record: 33951

True enough, Steve. But how often are those original signatures ever
verified? It's probably easier to verify that email was sent to you by
someone than trying to verify a signature from halfway around the world.

There is a nice touch in recieving a QSL from someone from far away.
But if the ham uses a bureau, then there isn't even that.

I think the only real losers in this are the people who print QSL's for profit.

- Mike -

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 2/12/2002 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C693107.749C0727@IEEE.org>
>
> >If I print out a QSL card on my printer and mail it to someone,
> >what is the difference in emailing the .jpg file and having the ham
> >on the receiving end print it out? The printout is the same either way.
>
> (1) A human hand did not touch it.
>
> (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.

4241. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 21:51:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C698E53.CB94B733@uci.edu>
Source record: 33952

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Sounds fantastic. Guess it didn't work out for them though.
>
> I don't understand. What didn't work out for whom?

I think it was Phil Kane who wrote the following:

"That's what Metricom / Ricochet was doing.
They went bankrupt last year, taking my wireless internet away."

Remember?

> Did you understand that these networks are hobbyists cobbing together Part > 15 devices, not commercial ventures?

As I said before, what I don't understand is how hobbiests can go
bankrupt.

Why do you insist on driving around in circles, Ed?

4242. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 22:27:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212172719.17433.00000982@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33953

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 2/12/2002 3:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C698741.13E21FD5@psu.edu>

>True enough, Steve. But how often are those original signatures ever
>verified?

Often enough. On my first application for DXCC, they were unable to
determine if one card was valid or not (I'd had it 10 years and it was faded).

Also, my best friend, who is VERY active in DXCC, has had cards retruned
for various administrative reasons.

>There is a nice touch in recieving a QSL from someone from far away.
>But if the ham uses a bureau, then there isn't even that.

Why? I get lot's of cards via the bureau that have personal notes
attached...even if it's just "TNX QSO ES 73". I don't care that they arrive in
seperate envleopes.

>I think the only real losers in this are the people who print QSL's for
>profit.

And those of us who want something that the other fellow had in is hands
first.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4243. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 22:28:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212172846.17433.00000984@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 33954

>Subject: Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5
>Proposal
>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>Date: 2/12/2002 3:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C698E53.CB94B733@uci.edu>

>Why do you insist on driving around in circles, Ed?

You Go More Often When You Go Both Ways.

73!

Steve, K4YZ

4244. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-12 22:39:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212173952.16502.00000002@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 33955

In article <3C6966F6.4A397C01@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C692C62.BC2E3703@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >I drove up to Texas Towers yesterday and got me an IC-756pro. I played
>with
>> >it last night and it has 32 bit processing power. Amazing stuff. The Clear
>> >Speech audio system performs miracles according to some users. All this
>DSP
>> >stuff was done by programmers. The present state of the art in radio
>includes
>> >software as well as hardware. Promoting the state of the art is one of the
>> >basis and purposes of amateur radio.
>>
>> How much of the programming in that rig was done by hams as amateurs? How
>> much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?
>
>This is obviously hearsay, but I heard that a good percentage of ICOM RF
>designers are hams.

The question was:

"How much of the programming in that rig was done by hams as amateurs?"

In other words, by hams who are NOT functioning *at work*.

>My development tools cannot match a 24 bit A/D and
>32 bit processing power but I learn a lot by experimenting with my DSP
>eval board.

That's great, Cecil, but the question was:

"How much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?"

emphasis on *that rug* and *you*.

>It's a Motorola DSP eval board that is presently pretty
>much obsolete by now but simply observing its limitations gives me an
>idea of how the 24/32 bit stuff operates.

Sure - but will you actually reprogram the '756?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4245. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:09:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202121709.23dd7b1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33957

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020212060248.17396.00000949@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >With SSB, the result was standardized and the development was in how to get
> >the desired result. Not true with the modes you're describing.
>
> Then he is describing the development of new modes and technology, not just the
> duplication of what has gone before outside of Amateur Radio.

I think you misunderstand, Ed.

With SSB, the standardized result was an amplitude-modulated voice signal
with the carrier and one sideband attenuated. Such a signal can be generated
and demodulated several ways, but all are compatible. Hams did not just
"duplicate what had gone before".

With "new modes and technology", the problem is a growing proliferation
of digital modes that are incompatible. Digital tower of babel and all that.
Limits the appeal of new modes.

> IMHO, this would
> have Amateur Radio adding to the state of the radio art.

Of course - a good thing.

But there's a slight semantic change there, Ed. The usual phrase is
"advancing the state of the art" which is usually defined as pushing
things "forward" in some way or another. For example, SSB voice is
an advance over DSB voice for communications purposes because it uses
less spectrum and delivers better S/N for the same power level.

How does one define "adding to the state of the art"? Seems to me it
would mean anything that hadn't been done exactly the same way before.
By that definition, any new design that is not an exact copy of a
previous one adds to the state of the art.

Works for me!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4246. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:11:32 UTC
From: Bob L <blf@westeastmailx.com>
Message-ID: <a4ce9nbso0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33956

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:>
> He was The Chairman from Mars who never "got" what the agency did
> for a living and his missing-the-target policies were one major
> reason for my electing early retirement.
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Hundt's assigned mission did not include trying to be
popular. You either followed his orders or got out of the way.
It was not your job to like his policies, just carry out his orders
or leave. Civilians always have a difficult time grasping this simple
concept. Hundt carried out the orders of his superiors with
aplomb. Mission completed, he returned to private pursuits. Not
all the difficult to understand, is it? You ought to read his latest
book, not too badly written, even for a liberal Democrat.

Best of Luck & Good Luck in The Contest,

Bob

4247. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:39:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69C3BF.CDC31AF6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33958

N2EY wrote:
> "How much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?"

Obviously a rhetorical question. Are you saying that just because I
cannot reprogram my store bought rig, that I should forget about
experimenting? I'm surprised.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4248. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:40:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4chne$47c$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33962

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212055920.17396.00000948@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Abolishing the ARS would sacrifice a lot of emergency communications.
>
> > Then your statement is incorrect. The majority of citizens never benefit
> >from emergency communications.
>
> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread
emergencies
> that ham radio helps with.

Additionally, people can be helped indirectly simply
because hams have helped provide local assessments
as to road conditions, travel problems, etc. The
public may have no idea that a news advisory in
any way involved hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4249. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:42:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69C46A.839FB463@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33959

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> (1) A human hand did not touch it.

Why is that a problem?

> (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.

I don't sign my QSL cards. The only difference between the QSL
cards that I snailmail and the ones that I email are the postmarks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4250. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:46:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4chne$47c$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33963

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212134012.22158.00000943@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3C692DC5.5DEB8578@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> The last point I was making is that even if we discount the Novice as
> >> proof of 5 wpm, the Tech proves the point handily. The Tech has always
> >> been a permanent renewable license.
> >
> >But back in the 50's if I remember correctly, Tech's weren't allowed on
HF.
>
> That is correct.
>
> >Therefore, they did not fall under §25.5.
>
> That is not correct.
>
> S25.5 actually says that ALL amateurs must be code tested. Later
amendments
> added exceptions. At first the exception was for hams whose licenses were
only
> for the bands above 1000 MHz. The amendment limit has since been lowered
to
> 30 MHz.
>
> '50s and '60s Techs had to be code tested to meet the treaty because their
> privileges extended below the limit then set by the amendments.

Jim is right. Does anyone recall when the exception went to 1000 MHz
and then lowered further to 30 MHz?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4251. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:47:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69c58c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33960

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212013936.26489.00000770@mb-fx.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Part 97 Question
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >Date: 2/11/2002 7:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020211202536.19515.00000036@mb-md.aol.com>
>
> >Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year
> >old daughter?
>
> Only with a wink, smile and a nod!
>
> Now Larry, take a deeeeeeep breath and B-R-E-A-T-H-E....! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve: Perhaps it's Larry that needs the shot--eh? ;)

Kim W5TIT

4252. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:50:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69c637_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33961

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6A19A3.3F4565BE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> > > But wait- they didn't have time to learn Morse code, which would
> > >take far less than learning DSP.
> >
> > It really IS all about Morse code for you, isn't it?
>
> No Ed, it "really" isn't, it's about a bunch of spoiled brats who "don't
have
> time" to meet the requirements spoiling the ARS by whining, ranting and
getting
> their way..
>

GASP Are there hams that did not meet the requirements to become a ham?!!

Kim W5TIT

4253. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 01:59:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4chng$47c$3@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33964

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6A127D.A2D8A24B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >It is not the elimination of the Morse test but the entry of a real
>
> > collection of spoiled brats that will doom the Amateur Service.
>
> Fact is, it's not so much the loss of the Morse qualification that is so
> damaging as is the attitude of those who so heartily applaude its
departure;
> for they show clearly an attitude very much foreign to that so long
displayed
> by most participants in ham radio, that is, whatever job is to be done one
> just goes ahead and gets it done.

What exactly is the attitude you claim is being exhibited?

> Those very same spoiled children displaying their childishness.

When the code issue became a form of battle, why is it "childish"
for the winning side to exhibit joy in the outcome?

> Adults just don't act like that.

Let's see:
Superbowl parties,
election parties,
end of prohibition,
Desert Storm celebration,
end of 55mph national limit,
etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4254. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:04:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33970

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020212104130.04583.00000001@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <yMW98.26295$7J2.451959846@hebe.telenet-ops.be>,
nicky18@freesex.net
> writes:
>
> >
> >http://devoted.to/nicky18
> >
> >Hi,
> >
> >I am Marc and my girlfriend Nicky and I want to be pornstars. We have
just
> >made some hardcore takes at home and want to know what you are thinking
about
> >us.
> >
> >Please take a look at http://devoted.to/nicky18
>
> Marc & Nicky:
>
> I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've certainly
> made it as total wankers!
>
> And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole newsgroup who
opened the message, Larry...

No surprise there.

Kim W5TIT

4255. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:07:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B0E3E.E8B9829D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33965

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two. Of course that assumes the requirements they
> > WANTED to license under, but just never could cut the mustard. So they hung
> > around wailing and moaning until all the incessant whining got the requirements
> > dropped to their level.
>
> Maybe some day they will dumb down the EE degree requirements until
> you can qualify. :-)
> --

Thanks for the thought, but I'm not interested. I use radio as a hobby.

4256. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:07:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69ca58$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33971

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020212104131.04583.00000004@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <CqV98.6978$421.588813@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> >It is not the elimination of the Morse test but the entry of a real
> >collection of spoiled brats that will doom the Amateur Service.
> >
> >Dick N�BK
>
> Dick:
>
> You're talking about only one thing here. The Morse code test is
> what kept the spoiled brats *out* of the ARS, for the most part. I
> say "for the most part" because there are always the code-tested-
> but-politically-correct types who sided with the no-coders in order
> to avoid the social disenfranchisement that usually comes when
> you dare to suggest that someone actually make an effort to learn
> a useful communications skill.
>

So, are you saying that the CW test should provide a means to keep riff-raff
out of the ARS? Uh, for the "most part," of course.

>
> The NCTA is all about laziness -- it's never been about anything else.
> The current crop of "newcomers" to the ARS are at an all-time low
> in technical involvement, in spite of the fact that there is virtually
> nothing left WRT code testing. Pretty soon, a "technically
> competent" ham will be defined as one who can successfully get
> his off-the-shelf HF rig on-the-air (using SSB, of course) without
> the assistance of more than a half-dozen "Elmers." Whoopie!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I doubt every word you just wrote above. Every word. More, you are
beginning to sound a lot like good 'ol Mr. Misery: Vince Fiscus I think his
name is. How much misery you gonna take?

Kim W5TIT

4257. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:08:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B0E93.E03D14EE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33966

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Even though the VEs handled all the paperwork, just dealing with all the complaints about
> > abuses was reason enough for FCC to decide to drop code speeds enough to get rid of it.
>
> Guess who was responsible for those complaints? The PCTA folk, of course.
> Next time, be careful what you wish for.

We understand, Cecil. People like you advocate breaking rules you don't happen to like.

4258. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:09:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69cab7$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33972

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6A93EB.C0AFD8BB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Adults just don't act like that.
> >
> > Hey, Dick... why don't you tell me to go soak my head again, just to
show how
> > adult YOU have been through all this.
> >
> > "Adults" don't get on public newsgroups and cuss at other
participants,either.
> > And adults don't pull the "your honor, she MADE me beat" her excuse when
they
> > do.
> >
> > I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Hey, Ed- go soak your head!
>

Ed, I think it's a little much to ask for so much all at once. For Dick, an
improvement would be for him to start acting human.

Kim W5TIT

4259. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:11:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69cb54$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33974

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6A97FA.3EE85544@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <3C67D500.8384340F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >>
> > >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >> >Yes, I am a criminal, Dick. I had oral sex with my wife.
> > >>
> > >> Does your XYL know you are sharing such intimate personal
> > >> information with a bunch of strangers (to her) in a Usenet
> > >> newsgroup?
> > >
> > >Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.
> >
> > Cecil:
> >
> > My condolences, but I should think that this would be all the more
> > reason to keep such information to yourself.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> From his earlier posts I gather that was a different wife. The last one
dumped
> him. Must have been her. If I remember right she also sold illicit
substances she
> allegedly got from a crooked cop. Yeh.
>

Yeah, that's Larry and Little Dick. Going for the jugular as usual... Hey,
Little Dick...how's *you're* sex life, uh, "these days," eh?

Kim W5TIT

4260. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:12:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212211232.16072.00001081@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 33969

In article <3C69C3BF.CDC31AF6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> "How much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?"
>
>Obviously a rhetorical question.

Not at all. It means what it says.

> Are you saying that just because I
>cannot reprogram my store bought rig, that I should forget about
>experimenting?

Nope. I'm asking if you will reprogram your storebought rig.

>I'm surprised.

You misunderstood.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4261. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:12:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B0F8A.BD74F72D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33968

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I know what you're talking about obviously you still don't know what I am.
>
> I know exactly what you are, Dick. I just cannot bring myself to say it in
> public. One time I was unloading 100# feedsacks from a big truck. The guy
> in the truck accidentally dropped one of the sacks right on top of me. I
> wasn't expecting it and fell down under the sack. I looked at him with
> the "urge to kill" in my eyes and he said: "Don't call me what I is!"
> So I won't call you what you is.

I'm notg quite so reticent, I'll be quite willing to call what you is. You is a dumshit troll who lives for the purpose of playing wordgames.
So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio statio to determine that a band is dead?

4262. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:14:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69cbdc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33976

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C69606F.7586289E@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Pretty soon, a "technically
> > competent" ham will be defined as one who can successfully get
> > his off-the-shelf HF rig on-the-air (using SSB, of course) without
> > the assistance of more than a half-dozen "Elmers." Whoopie!
>
> That may be but has absolutely nothing to do with Morse code
> testing according to the FCC.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Aw, they're getting tired of their argument, Cecil, that's what it all boils down to. They're miserable, they're old, they're bored and they can't even remember what the point was...

Kim W5TIT

4263. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:15:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69cc30_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33977

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C696211.6C53B55D@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two. Of course that assumes the
requirements they
> > WANTED to license under, but just never could cut the mustard. So they
hung
> > around wailing and moaning until all the incessant whining got the
requirements
> > dropped to their level.
>
> Maybe some day they will dumb down the EE degree requirements until
> you can qualify. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Had a great time, too, Cecil!!!! ;)

Kim W5TIT

4264. Re: ARES (was Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:15:42 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c69cb1b.610792@news.bright.net>
Source record: 33967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Tue, 12 Feb 2002 08:56:08 -0500, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote:

>iron3@charter.net wrote:
>>
>> Well sad to say, Ham radio even for emergencies is becoming a thing of the
>> past. Newer technologies are here....
>
>Don't scrap your ARES nets just yet. If 9-11 is any indication the
>reverse may be true, at least for a while. Many agencies had come to
>rely on cell phones (some had even scrapped their radios) only to find
>the cell net hopelessly jammed when everybody and their dog tried to use
>it at once. That's why officials are scrambling to change the system so
>they can cut off "non-essential users" (ie, us); but the telcos are
>saying "prohibitively expensive".
>
>73 KA3DWW

No kidding, I spent a month in WV last summer during the disaster relief effort after the flooding they had. Using the VHF radios the Red Cross has in their Emergency Response Vehicles was a challenge, we definately could have used some more hams to facilitate better communication.

And I ran into that again in NYC, I spent the majority of 3 months there with the Red Cross, the cell phone they issued me was pi$$ing me off. Too many people in this line of work are relying too much on cell phones, this is why I took my amateur test last saturday (and passed), and am now working on getting the code down for my general ticket.

Keith Hosman

Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4265. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:17:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69cc81_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33978

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6964CE.1A5157C6@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Larry, my wife and son were killed by a drunk driver.
>
> > My condolences, but I should think that this would be all the more
> > reason to keep such information to yourself.
>
> Why, Larry? Oral sex is great, healthy, and good for what ails you.
> You should try it once - it might cure your hatred.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Might want to try it on a can of Ken-L ration first, though...

Kim W5TIT

4266. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:17:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4cio0$b6e$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33973

"Bob L" <blf@westeastmailx.com> wrote in message
news:a4ce9nbso0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:>
> > He was The Chairman from Mars who never "got" what the agency did
> > for a living and his missing-the-target policies were one major
> > reason for my electing early retirement.
> >
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
>
> Hundt's assigned mission did not include trying to be
> popular. You either followed his orders or got out of the way.
> It was not your job to like his policies, just carry out his orders
> or leave. Civilians always have a difficult time grasping this simple
> concept.

Phil,

Why do you think it is any different anywhere else? The same
is true in private industry. Those that buck "headstrong" against
executive policies pretty much face the same options...leave
or be fired.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4267. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:23:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B122E.DBDD239A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33975

Bob L wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:>
> > He was The Chairman from Mars who never "got" what the agency did
> > for a living and his missing-the-target policies were one major
> > reason for my electing early retirement.
> >
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
>
> Hundt's assigned mission did not include trying to be
> popular. You either followed his orders or got out of the way.
> It was not your job to like his policies, just carry out his orders
> or leave. Civilians always have a difficult time grasping this simple
> concept. Hundt carried out the orders of his superiors with
> aplomb. Mission completed, he returned to private pursuits. Not
> all the difficult to understand, is it? You ought to read his latest
> book, not too badly written, even for a liberal Democrat.

I've always been certain that Hundt was installed for the sole purpose of ramming through the mandatory converstion to HDTV. His entire commission career shouted that out, loud.

4268. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:35:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B14D7.620F0767@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33979

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C69C3BF.CDC31AF6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> "How much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?"
> >>
> >Obviously a rhetorical question.
>
> Not at all. It means what it says.
>
> > Are you saying that just because I
> >cannot reprogram my store bought rig, that I should forget about
> >experimenting?
>
> Nope. I'm asking if you will reprogram your storebought rig.
>
> >I'm surprised.
>
> You misunderstood.

Let's put this into perspective.

The code bashers sat that requiring hams to learn a useful skill like Morse code so that they could be qualified to actually operate it, is of no benefit. But requiring them to learn basic digital theory thatg will be useless to them to use on their storebought rigs. is necessary. We got it.

4269. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:39:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69d203_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33980

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212153553.18901.00000760@mb-mf.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 2/12/2002 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C693107.749C0727@IEEE.org>
>
> >If I print out a QSL card on my printer and mail it to someone,
> >what is the difference in emailing the .jpg file and having the ham
> >on the receiving end print it out? The printout is the same either way.
>
> (1) A human hand did not touch it.
>
> (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

There is a really simple verifiable way to put a signature on a computer generated piece of artwork...or anything else for that matter, involving objects built on "layers" in a document.

At the first layer, I put the name "Kim Walker" and fill in whatever else I want. In my Corel software, would then just add a "box" with a fill of white. From there, just build the QSL card, and send the very first one to the ARRL--or whomever is the independent third party. This could be sent either as the original file format or as a .gif or .jpg, or whatever. In Corel, the original file would be in .cdr format and only able to be opened by Corel Draw...so the hard part would be some kind of standard to use where the ARRL doesn't have to go out and purchase every piece of graphic arts package there is.

At any rate, if the ARRL has the original file, and there is ever any question as to someone's QSL card, they have the original, with the "secret message" on the bottom stack.

Is QSLing really *that* involved? I am asking...I haven't ever really paperchased, so I don't know. There's also other much more sophisticated ways of electronic signatures...so it could be done.

Kim W5TIT

4270. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:51:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c69d4a1$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33983

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6B14D7.620F0767@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3C69C3BF.CDC31AF6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >> "How much reprogramming of that rig will you do, Cecil?"
> > >
> > >Obviously a rhetorical question.
> >
> > Not at all. It means what it says.
> >
> > > Are you saying that just because I
> > >cannot reprogram my store bought rig, that I should forget about
> > >experimenting?
> >
> > Nope. I'm asking if you will reprogram your storebought rig.
> >
> > >I'm surprised.
> >
> > You misunderstood.
>
> Let's put this into perspective.
>
> The code bashers sat that requiring hams to learn a useful skill like
Morse code
> so that they could be qualified to actually operate it, is of no benefit.
But
> requiring them to learn basic digital theory thatg will be useless to them
to use
> on their storebought rigs. is necessary. We got it.
>

Ya got a mouse in your pocket? With that diatribe above, I am certain there
is no "we" that got a thing...only you...

Kim W5TIT

4271. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:58:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212215835.27226.00000078@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 33981

In article <3C68B110.79C8C554@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>I'll bet the Amish have their share of wenches.

Cecil:

I'm sure they do, but I'll bet they're not 10 years old!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4272. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 02:58:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020212215835.27226.00000079@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 33982

In article <20020212013936.26489.00000770@mb-fx.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year
>>old daughter?
>
> Only with a wink, smile and a nod!
>
> Now Larry, take a deeeeeeep breath and B-R-E-A-T-H-E....! ! !
>
>73

Steve:

There is nothing wrong with my respiration. However, any man who referred to a 10-year old daughter of mine as a "wench" would probably have some problems with chewing for the next couple of years -- until his reconstructive dental work was finished.

Of course, I don't expect you to understand such a thing. However, my theory is that any 10-year old girl who's father refers to her as a "wench" will probably end up being one someday!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4273. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:02:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69D758.28928EC1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33984

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Maybe some day they will dumb down the EE degree requirements until
> > you can qualify. :-)
>
> Thanks for the thought, but I'm not interested. I use radio as a hobby.

If you can be not interested in a EE degree even though you are/were in the field of electronics, why can't I not have been interested in an Extra class license until it was easy for me to obtain?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4274. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:07:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69D859.65229E04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33985

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The code bashers say that requiring hams to learn a useful skill like Morse code
> so that they could be qualified to actually operate it, is of no benefit. But
> requiring them to learn basic digital theory that will be useless to them to use
> on their storebought rigs is necessary. We got it.

Who said anything about "requiring" it, Dick. I recommend learning Morse code
AND experimenting with digital software/firmware/hardware without any sign
of a requirement. I recommend choosing to do those things because they are fun,
not because they are required.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4275. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:07:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69D885.599A75DC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33986

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I'm surprised.
>
> You misunderstood.

Because your question made not sense.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4276. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:10:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69D909.FD5B7C0F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33988

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to determine that a
> band is dead?

MUF, of course. No station required.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4277. Re: Digital Radio and "Future Systems" (was Re: ARS w/o S25.5 Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:13:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212221305.19016.00000808@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33987

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>As I said before, what I don't understand is how hobbiests can go
>bankrupt.

>Why do you insist on driving around in circles, Ed?

Because you seem to "insist" that I was referring to commercial ISPs when I was talking about hobbyists that are using Part 15 devices to create ad hoc free-access networks.

If you feel this is a circle, perhaps it is best that we end the conversation. Sorry to have troubled you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4278. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:13:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69D9F0.508F278E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33989

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> There is nothing wrong with my respiration. However, any man who
> referred to a 10-year old daughter of mine as a "wench" would probably
> have some problems with chewing for the next couple of years --
> until his reconstructive dental work was finished.
>
> Of course, I don't expect you to understand such a thing. However,
> my theory is that any 10-year old girl who's father refers to her as a
> "wench" will probably end up being one someday!

Dang, Larry, don't you ever crack open a dictionary? From Webster's:
"wench - 1 a: a young woman: GIRL" Larry, that's the the ***FIRST***
definition!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4279. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:19:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212221953.19016.00000809@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33990

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I don't know of anyone who was issued an FCC license without meeting the
>> requirements. Do you?
>
>Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two.

In what way did they break FCC regulations when they took their exams? What FCC requirement did they not meet? If you know of a compromised VE session, are you willing to come forward so that the appropriate action can be taken?

>So they hung
>around wailing and moaning until all the incessant whining got the
>requirements
>dropped to their level.

Are you saying that if ARRL whines enough, it will win the current battle over 70 cm?

>> I would imagine that most of the people who have upgraded since
>restructuring
>> neither whined, ranted nor spoiled Amateur Radio by doing so.

> You've been paying attention, then. It's still going on, right here.

Umm, Dick -- most of the people who upgraded are not here...

>To tie it in with another post, do you
>> think it is adult to call people you don't know "spoiled brats?"

>The longer you rant the more you look like one yourself.

Was that a yes or no? I was hoping that you would do a bit better than "bounces off of me and sticks to you." Is this another do as I say, not do as I do thing?

>> Just curious whether you have one standard -- or one for yourself and a
>> different standard for others.

> Well we can clear that up for you with a good headsoak.

That's what I thought. I guess the standard you expect new hams to meet is the double, eh? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4280. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:22:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212222245.19016.00000810@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33991

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...

>Hey, Ed- go soak your head!

Well, not sure what you are up to, Dick, but clearly, it is not leading by example. :-)

Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4281. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:25:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212222531.19016.00000811@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33992

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.

Many of the QSLs I see do not have a signature.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4282. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:28:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212222852.19016.00000813@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33993

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> A good headsoak might do wonders for his personality.

Well, it is pretty clear that this thread has the thread to the point of uselessness. If that is what you wish, I suppose you got it, though for the life of me, I can't figure out why. Seems to end up here near about every time, though, somehow...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4283. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:31:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B21EC.8168DF86@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33994

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Maybe some day they will dumb down the EE degree requirements until
> > > you can qualify. :-)
> >
> > Thanks for the thought, but I'm not interested. I use radio as a hobby.
>
> If you can be not interested in a EE degree even though you are/were in the field
> of electronics, why can't I not have been interested in an Extra class license
> until it was easy for me to obtain?

So why do you continue to equate electrical engineeringt with ham radio? They don't have all that much in common, only the radio portion. I'm quigte sure engineering covers many other things, in fact you stated your electrical engineering training was not about radio at all, rather power transmission. Could you explain, leaving out your normal trolling?

4284. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:31:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212223147.19016.00000816@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33995

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Even though the VEs handled all the paperwork, just dealing with all the
>complaints about
>abuses was reason enough for FCC to decide to drop code speeds enough to get
>rid of it.

It is ironic, but I believe that those who filed those complaints thought that they were defending the sanctity of the mode by preventing people from abusing the system by learning code only to 5 wpm.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4285. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:34:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B22CD.A6FADB2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33996

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I'm surprised.
> >
> > You misunderstood.
>
> Because your question made not sense.

Your answer made not as much sense.

4286. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:40:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212224000.19016.00000817@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33997

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Coherent CW (CCW) based on a fixed baud rate would be one hell of a mode
>and would run circles around all but the most sophisticated modes that
>hams use today.

Actually, hams are doing it. The same techniques could be and are applied to other modes, probably more effectively than with OOK CW. My suggestion was that DSP might let one lock up on the coherence in an individual dit or dah element, even if it was not in phase lock with the previous or subsequent elements.

>I drove up to Texas Towers yesterday and got me an IC-756pro. I played with
>it last night and it has 32 bit processing power.

Yes, but alas, only a 24-bit A/D. And to get to the ~130 dB blocking dynamic range of the better modern analog rigs, one would need at least 43 bits. Someday, maybe, although I think that the analog end of the A/D would possibly crunch before the 43 bits did. That is why I feel that DSP and SDR radios of the future will probably still use a combination of analog and digital receive techniques.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4287. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:41:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69E077.B14DD5BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34000

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering with ham radio?

How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4288. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:42:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212224227.19016.00000818@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33998

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Sure - but will you actually reprogram the '756?

Has Icom given him access to the information he would need to even think about it? If Icom were open source, do you think it likely that Cecil would use some of what he had learned using the eval board to work on the programming of the '756?

Let me ask Cecil the question. Cec? Do you think you would?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4289. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:44:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020212224405.19016.00000819@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33999

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>The code bashers sat that requiring hams to learn a useful skill like Morse
>code
>so that they could be qualified to actually operate it, is of no benefit. But
>requiring them to learn basic digital theory thatg will be useless to them to
>use
>on their storebought rigs. is necessary. We got it.

Okay, so you are saying that if he learns Morse code, he will be able to
program his storebought DSP rig.

We got it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4290. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:44:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69E117.2C3AEE4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33802

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >I'm surprised.
> > >
> > > You misunderstood.
> >
> > Because your question made not sense.
>
> Your answer made not as much sense.

Typo. Should have been "no" instead of "not". Spellcheckers
don't catch that kind of error.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4291. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:45:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C69E169.BBC298D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33803

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.
>
> Many of the QSLs I see do not have a signature.

I don't recall ever signing a QSL card,
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4292. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:47:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B25B0.830BE9D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33801

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to determine that a
> > band is dead?
>
> MUF, of course. No station required.

Yup, and since virtually allo hams lack the gear needed to make MUF tests, they almost universaly check for band conditions by
tuning around and listening for band activity. I guess when you find no activity you, like most hams, consider the band "Dead" without
actually confirming it through MUF tests. And often you'd be wrong, the band isn'te dead at all, but marginally usable but unused because most hams checking it assume it's dead!

Nice to see you following right along.

4293. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:51:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B26BA.6386FCD5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33804

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I think it probably best that you don't judge what is adult conduct...
>
> >Hey, Ed- go soak your head!
>
> Well, not sure what you are up to, Dick, but clearly, it is not leading by
> example. :-)
>
> Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.

Just want you to understand what it feels like, Ed.

4294. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 03:58:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B2872.C1641FF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33805

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Even though the VEs handled all the paperwork, just dealing with all the
> >complaints about
> >abuses was reason enough for FCC to decide to drop code speeds enough to get
> >rid of it.
>
> It is ironic, but I believe that those who filed those complaints thought that
> they were defending the sanctity of the mode by preventing people from abusing
> the system by learning code only to 5 wpm.

You really are a bit twisted over all this, aren't you Ed? You can't imagine that those reporting violations might have been concerned that the culprits were violating the law. Of course that might have been considered inconsequential beside all the CB violations going on, and hey, we sure do welcome all those violators, don't we?

4295. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 04:08:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B2AB7.A9B15206@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33806

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The code bashers sat that requiring hams to learn a useful skill like Morse
> >code
> >so that they could be qualified to actually operate it, is of no benefit. But
> >requiring them to learn basic digital theory thatg will be useless to them to
> >use
> >on their storebought rigs. is necessary. We got it.
>
> Okay, so you are saying that if he learns Morse code, he will be able to
> program his storebought DSP rig.

Thats not what I said at all. I said that codebashers insist that hams learn things like DSP programming that are useless to most of them but that they do not need to learn or be tested on useful modes like CW. That's the real meaning of his statement.

4296. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 04:12:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6B2B98.2106078E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33807

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering with ham radio?
>
> How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
> is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.

Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed electrical engineer. Almost none of the early ham gear was, either. Sure, design engineers get paid to design whatever their employers decide they can sell, including the coreless telephones that Squiggy cranks out. But your fixation on the connection between engineering and ham radio is very false, and most hams know it. The fact that an engineer is also a ham is simply a footnote.

4297. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 04:24:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grg5yb2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33808

On Tue, 12 Feb 2002 21:17:58 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Why do you think it is any different anywhere else? The same
>is true in private industry. Those that buck "headstrong" against
>executive policies pretty much face the same options...leave
>or be fired.

I spent 15 years in academia and private industry in addition to my time with The Uncle, so I know that the above is true.

The one thing that attracted me to and kept me at the FCC was that my expertise and efforts in the arcane world of communications regulation were appreciated and respected, and that as long as I did my job professionally and met the expected performance standards, arbitrary discharge was not a worry.

My long-term immediate supervisor and I did not always agree, and at times we strongly disagreed, but we respected each other. As his de-facto "consigliere" I guided him just as much as he guided me .

The burn-out started when top management (read: Hundt and his bag carriers, reqardless of whether they were "just carring out orders" or not) started tinkering with a mechanism that they did not have either the committment or the knowledge to keep running smoothly and when they tried to put it back together there were several gears and springs left over.

That was one reason why I set up a solo practice after I retired from the Commish'. No one to blame but myself.

Those of us who know have an obligation to advise and guide those who do not know.

That's the kind of engineering and law (and ham radio and a lot of other areas of my private life) that I practice.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4298. Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 04:33:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grg6rc3.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33809

On Tue, 12 Feb 2002 20:11:32 -0500, Bob L wrote:

> Hundt's assigned mission did not include trying to be
>popular. You either followed his orders or got out of the way.
>It was not your job to like his policies, just carry out his orders
>or leave.

It was my job to be a regulatory professional and do what was necessary to carry out that very specialized business. I had that obligation to the People of the United States for whose benefit I worked.

He and the folks with which he surrounded himself had no idea what the nuts and bolts of communications regulation was all about, and not only refused to be guided by those of us who did but considered those of us who believed that we were doing something important as just so much Kleenex to be crumpled up and discarded.

86 out of 97 of us who were eligible field enforcement veterans with lots of skill and experience took the voluntary early retirement option in September 1995. What does that say? Hundt finished the trashing of the field with involuntary layoffs of 160+ others a year later. By your theory every one of us was out of step but Jack, or in this case, Reed.

>Civilians always have a difficult time grasping this simple
>concept.

The FCC is not the Army, and yes I do understand it. Prior to the FCC I spent 7 years with DoD, mostly with SAC in the post-LeMay pre-Vietnam days.

Understanding it and believing that it is a good model of management of a professional organization are two different things.

>Hundt carried out the orders of his superiors with aplomb.

He did a wonderful job of taking an agency which was respected world-wide and trashing it.

>Mission completed, he returned to private pursuits. Not
>all the difficult to understand, is it?

We have different ideas about what communication regulation is all about.

>You ought to read his latest
>book, not too badly written, even for a liberal Democrat.

I have no desire to squander whatever eyesight I have left on
reading any of his books.

>Best of Luck & Good Luck in The Contest,

Don't take any wooden nickels.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

4299. Re: ARES (was Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 05:44:00 UTC
From: iron3@charter.net
Message-ID: <u6k0bmfo0bcq19@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 33810
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

I agree Vito,
We need more people involved in ARES. We get perhaps one or two stations signing on in my area. I agree that ham radio would be good in an emergency. Cell phones in alot of areas are hit and miss, as in mine. In alot of the Western states such as mine, radio would be, in any manmade or natural disaster, the only way to communicate. And, we have the gear and can set up in a house or the field if needed should local emergency communications are knocked out.
What disturbs me is lack of participation in areas should an emergency occur. In alot of areas we're simply not ready. 73's Jim

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3C691EF8.DF261C98@crosslink.net...
> iron3@charter.net wrote:
> >
> > Well sad to say, Ham radio even for emergencies is becoming a thing of
the
> > past. Newer technologies are here....
>
> Don't scrap your ARES nets just yet. If 9-11 is any indication the
> reverse may be true, at least for a while. Many agencies had come to
> rely on cell phones (some had even scrapped their radios) only to find
> the cell net hopelessly jammed when everybody and their dog tried to use
> it at once. That's why officials are scrambling to change the system so
> they can cut off "non-essential users" (ie, us); but the telcos are
> saying "prohibitively expensive".
>
> 73 KA3DWW

4300. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 06:27:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213012711.13432.00000034@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 33812

In article <c2356669.0202121709.23dd7b1d@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020212060248.17396.00000949@mb-cr.aol.com>...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >With SSB, the result was standardized and the development was in how to get
>> >the desired result. Not true with the modes you're describing.
>>
>> Then he is describing the development of new modes and technology, not just
the
>> duplication of what has gone before outside of Amateur Radio.
>
>I think you misunderstand, Ed.
>
>With SSB, the standardized result was an amplitude-modulated voice signal
>with the carrier and one sideband attenuated. Such a signal can be generated
>and demodulated several ways, but all are compatible. Hams did not just
>"duplicate what had gone before".

You cannot call that "standardization" with a straight face. That is just
plain
physics of amplitude modulating a carrier frequency. :-)

>With "new modes and technology", the problem is a growing proliferation
>of digital modes that are incompatible. Digital tower of babel and all that.
>Limits the appeal of new modes.

Just HOW does this "limiting of appeal" come about? You no have the
equipment to do it? You no unnastand da mode?

REAL standardization as applied to something understandable to PCTAs is
the ITU-R specifically calling out the International Morse Code as it is used
in international telegram telegraphy. There still are many, many different
versions of codes in 1-0, on-off keying. [some PCTAs call this "digital"...:-)
]

REAL standardization occurs when a majority uses a particular method, one
among many different ones possible. Some other cases in point: RS-232 as
a serial interface on computing equipment and peripherals; NTSC or PAL
scanning, synchronization, and video modulation (light polarity relative to
carrier level); the American Standard Code for Information Interchange
(ASCII) which everyone is using to transfer messages into/out-of their
computers; even the screw threads in the threaded fasteners holding their
manufactured or I-designed-it-myself-but-bought-as-kits radio equipment.

Real whining, bitching, and griping comes about when some who have never ever tried to experiment with something new and strange DEMAND "instant standardization" and off-the-shelf-availability.

>But there's a slight semantic change there, Ed. The usual phrase is
>"advancing the state of the art" which is usually defined as pushing
>things "forward" in some way or another. For example, SSB voice is
>an advance over DSB voice for communications purposes because it uses
>less spectrum and delivers better S/N for the same power level.

We all know about SSB, Jimmy. :-)

"Single sideband" methods were already in use in landline telephony BEFORE it was ever "on the air" by anyone. The COMMERCIAL communications providers PROVED the "better S/N" part in regular 24/7 use on HF, accumulated data along with traffic and outages. [12 KHz wide sideband frequency-multiplexing four voice-grade circuits at once]

Single-channel, single-user SSB had not found a ready market until after WW2 and SAC needing a long-distance voice comm link to their airborne loiterers. Not CW, a VOICE circuit. The "less spectrum and better S/N for the same power level" applied to WEIGHT of airborne equipment. SAC SSB did not need heavy modulators required of standard AM at the time when it could get by with lighter Class B finals and low-level modulation. Remember that this is AIRBORNE equipment. Ever go through a weights-and-balance exercise at different "stations?" :-)

What most hams of the late 1940s and early 1950s liked, by their words, almost to a man, was that SSB did NOT need a 500 Watt audio power amplifier to modulate a 1000 Watt final. Price a 1950 modulation transformer in 1950 dollars sometime. :-)

>How does one define "adding to the state of the art"? Seems to me it
>would mean anything that hadn't been done exactly the same way before.
>By that definition, any new design that is not an exact copy of a
>previous one adds to the state of the art.
>
>Works for me!

So...to use the Miccolis Confrontational method...you would call yanking a chassis out of its cabinet and putting it in another, differently-painted, new flashy cabinet as "adding to the state of the art?!?"

...modern art, maybe. :-)

4301. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 06:27:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213012712.13432.00000035@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 33811

In article <a4chne$47c$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread
>> emergencies that ham radio helps with.
>
>Additionally, people can be helped indirectly simply
>because hams have helped provide local assessments
>as to road conditions, travel problems, etc. The
>public may have no idea that a news advisory in
>any way involved hams.

Bill, with all due respect, my wife and I did a trip to the
midwest a half year ago, 6073 miles through 12 states,
getting rather complete travel advisories over the Internet
from the states' own websites of their respective transportation
agencies. We did that because we've used the information
from the Washington, Oregon, and California agencies before
from winter to summer seasons. All of those sites had rather
detailed advisories on road conditions, road reconstruction
locations, even including two large fires in Nevada and
California.

In truth, I do not know the EXACT nature of how all of those
agencies get their information except that all of them state
they get it through their respective state patrols, various local
police, road construction crews and the supervising agencies
for road construction. None of them indicated or even hinted
at amateur radio or CB REACT as supplying "news advisories"
on anything. I'm sure that could happen but we haven't
experienced it, seen it. Considering that state patrols are
Out There 24/7 and that the various state transportation
agencies keep tabs on roads, waterways, and other modes
of travel 24/7...would the general public trust them (thousands
of individuals on the scenes) or a few radio amateurs who
just happened to be on some scene rather by chance?

The state police agencies have radios well netted together, as
do the road supervisory agencies, state and national part
rangers, and others. It is their task, work, and duty to report
anything that might affect the public. They do it well.

Now, if an alien invasion from outer space were to threaten the
general public, I'm sure that ham radio could help "advise" the
public and even repulse those nasty critters. A movie a few
years told all about how to do it... :-)

4302. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:12:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213061253.18984.00000970@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33813

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/12/2002 7:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C69C46A.839FB463@IEEE.org>

>> (1) A human hand did not touch it.
>
>Why is that a problem?

If you have to ask, Cecil, then there is no answer that will satisfy your
question.

>> (2) A verifyable ORIGINAL signature or mark.
>
>I don't sign my QSL cards. The only difference between the QSL
>cards that I snailmail and the ones that I email are the postmarks.

ta-DAAAA ! ! ! ! (postmark)

73

Steve

4303. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:15:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213061537.18938.00000905@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33814

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>What most hams of the late 1940s and early 1950s liked, by their
>words, almost to a man, was that SSB did NOT need a 500 Watt
>audio power amplifier to modulate a 1000 Watt final. Price a 1950
>modulation transformer in 1950 dollars sometime. :-)

Of course, the could have used low-level modulation to produce a full-carrier, double-sideband signal then, too. I believe that some of them actually did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4304. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:18:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213061808.18984.00000971@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33815

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 2/12/2002 8:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c69d203_2@newsa.ev1.net>

>There is a really simple verifiable way to put a signature on a computer
>generated piece of artwork...(SNIP)

That's not what I was getting at, Kim. I know that if we can transact billions of dollars in commerce each day via wire, we can create a QSL service on line that can be "verified".

I want something that was "there"...In the other person's hand at one time or another.

Kim, if your husband sends you "eFlowers" Thursday instead of the real roses, how long will it be before he shares the same bedroom with you?

Get the picture?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4305. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:22:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213062206.18938.00000906@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33816

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> It is ironic, but I believe that those who filed those complaints thought
>> that they were defending the sanctity of the mode by preventing people from
>> abusing the system by learning code only to 5 wpm.

>You really are a bit twisted over all this, aren't you Ed? You can't imagine
>that those reporting violations might have been concerned that the culprits
>were violating the law.

Of course I imagined that, Dick. Why else would they have complained to the FCC about rules violations? I am sorry I didn't make my understanding of that more clear, but I could not have imagined that someone would think that I didn't understand that people who complain about rules violations are concerned about the rules violations.

What is ironic is the end result. Personally, I think it unfortunate that the FCC didn't keep some higher-speed code testing while they had the chance. I think that their waiver problem would have virtually gone away if they had retained a 20 wpm code test that gave one access to the lower 25 kHz of 80, 40, 20, 15 and 10 meters.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4306. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:22:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213062227.18984.00000972@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33817

>ubject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/12/2002 9:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020212221953.19016.00000809@mb-mk.aol.com>

>>> I don't know of anyone who was issued an FCC license without meeting the
>>> requirements. Do you?

>>Sure. Stevenson and Moore, for two.

>In what way did they break FCC regulations when they took their exams? What
>FCC
>requirement did they not meet?

But were they FORCED to do it?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4307. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:24:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213062456.18984.00000973@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33819

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/12/2002 9:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C69E169.BBC298D2@IEEE.org>

>I don't recall ever signing a QSL card,

I think the ARRL has voted to accept any W6RCA/W5DXP QSL card for awards
that has any dried alcohol beverage stains dried on it or THC residue in the
fiber.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4308. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:25:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213062504.18938.00000907@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33818

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.

> Just want you to understand what it feels like, Ed.

I do not recall ever telling you to go soak your head, Dick. Is this your way of telling me that you are feeling better now?

Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I am annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your repeating of your favorite childlike insult?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4309. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:30:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213063026.18938.00000908@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33821

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
>is beyond comprehension.

It would be no less accurate to describe Amateur Radio as a public-service hobby, or even as an international goodwill hobby.

In fact, I think that the public-service aspect of the service is the most important to our survival. When Steve Mansfield goes to DC to meet with Congressfolk, he does not talk to them about our technical achievements. The fact that Amateur Radio makes public-service contributions is the area they are most interested in.

ï¿½97.1 Basis and purpose.
The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an amateur radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the following principles:

(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service to the public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service, particularly with respect to providing emergency communications.

(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.

(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communications and technical phases of the art.

(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4310. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:31:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213063118.18938.00000909@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33820

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>EE's designed almost every ham radio.

MEs designed every car I drive, too, Cecil. Does that make driving a
mechanical hobby?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4311. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 11:34:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213063415.18938.00000911@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33822

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed
>electrical engineer.

Dick, I am curious; did you publish any of those original designs anywhere? I know that all of the ham magazines are always looking for new articles.

> Almost none of the early ham gear was, either.

I think that one would have to go back at least to the early 1940s for that to be true. Although I believe that kitbuilding is a type of homebrewing, that doesn't count in this context because virtually all of the kits were designed by engineers.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4312. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 12:19:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213071959.22158.00000962@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 33823

In article <20020213061537.18938.00000905@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

[They] (1950s hams)

> could have used low-level modulation to produce a full-carrier,
>double-sideband signal then, too. I believe that some of them actually did.

That's right, Ed. Various forms of grid modulation and linear operation were used by hams in the AM days.

But all of these methods suffered from the disadvantage of low efficiency. Typically, 35% was about the maximum efficiency obtainable with good quality audio. High efficiency linear amplifiers like the Doherty were unattractive to hams due to complexity and difficulty of frequency and band changing.

Efficiency was a concern of hams because the regulations of the time limited hams to 1 kW input power. A 1 kW AM rig using low level modulation could only produce about 300-350 watts carrier, while a high level modulated 1 kW rig could'
produce 700-750 watts carrier. Yes, it's only 3-4 dB, but it mattered to the hams
of that time.

Oddly enough, the rules change to 1.5 kW peak output reduced the amateur AM power level by about one half (typically 375 watts carrier)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4313. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 12:34:56 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Q3ta8.4496$qt6.372815@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33824

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212123838.17384.00001747@mb-mt.aol.com...
> In article <3C692F47.719EE04D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>

> It didn't happen on the
> Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
> the *IMPORTANT* things happen.

This has to be one of the coldest comments I've ever read here or on any
newsgroup.

BTW, the people of Calif KNOW that the possibility of earthquakes exist.
They accept it as a part of leaving in such warm and beautiful splendor.
The people that live in the area you have chosen top slander had no such
knowledege that one day something like this would happen.

>
> With kind regards,
> Len

I truly doubt that you have any regards, let alone kind ones

No regard for you

Ron

4314. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 13:03:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202130503.4417a7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33825

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C69D885.599A75DC@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I'm surprised.
> >
> > You misunderstood.
>
> Because your question made not sense.

Then let me rephrase:

Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
IC-756, Cecil?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4315. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 15:53:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6BCFD2.DF47A4DC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33826

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> It is ironic, but I believe that those who filed those complaints thought
> >> that they were defending the sanctity of the mode by preventing people from
> >> abusing the system by learning code only to 5 wpm.
>
> >You really are a bit twisted over all this, aren't you Ed? You can't imagine
> >that those reporting violations might have been concerned that the culprits
> >were violating the law.
>
> Of course I imagined that, Dick. Why else would they have complained to the
> FCC about rules violations? I am sorry I didn't make my understanding of that
> more clear, but I could not have imagined that someone would think that I
> didn't understand that people who complain about rules violations are concerned
> about the rules violations.
>
> What is ironic is the end result. Personally, I think it unfortunate that the
> FCC didn't keep some higher-speed code testing while they had the chance. I
> think that their waiver problem would have virtually gone away if they had
> retained a 20 wpm code test that gave one access to the lower 25 kHz of 80, 40,
> 20, 15 and 10 meters.

If I misread your post, I apoligize. I agree with this one.

4316. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 16:02:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6BD1F4.FF179A16@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,He

N2EY wrote:

> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C69D885.599A75DC@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >I'm surprised.
> > >
> > > You misunderstood.
> >
> > Because your question made not sense.
>
> Then let me rephrase:
>
> Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
> IC-756, Cecil?

OK, Cecil, start the dance....around the question. He'll do everything but answer it.

4317. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 16:06:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6BD2DE.AB3517AB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33828

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.
>
> > Just want you to understand what it feels like, Ed.
>
> I do not recall ever telling you to go soak your head, Dick. Is this your way
> of telling me that you are feeling better now?
>
> Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I am
> annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your repeating of
> your favorite childlike insult?
>

If you're not perceptive enough to understand at this point there's no point in
trying to explain it to ya.

4318. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 16:36:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202130836.48af7bf6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33829

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020212224227.19016.00000818@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Sure - but will you actually reprogram the '756?
>
> Has Icom given him access to the information he would need to even think about
> it?

I don't know, Ed. That's one of the reasons I asked the question.

> If Icom were open source, do you think it likely that Cecil would use
> some of what he had learned using the eval board to work on the programming of
> the '756?

Maybe - I don't really know. That's another reason I asked the question.
>
> Let me ask Cecil the question. Cec? Do you think you would?

Interesting how my original question is being dodged. Here it is again:

Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?

Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
about the bush?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4319. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 18:16:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202131016.50b8a922@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33830

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C6B2B98.2106078E@worldnet.att.net>...

> Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed
> electrical engineer.

All of the rigs I designed and built were built by a degreed electical
engineer. ;-)

Some of them were built before he got his degree, however.

> Almost none of the early ham gear was, either.

Same is true today. An EE degree isn't necessary to design and build
one's own amateur equipment.

> Sure,
> design engineers get paid to design whatever their employers decide they can
> sell, including the coreless telephones that Squiggy cranks out. But your
> fixation on the connection between engineering and ham radio is very false,
> and most hams know it. The fact that an engineer is also a ham is simply a
> footnote.

In some cases there's a connection and in many cases there isn't. EE covers a
LOT of ground, not just radio.

It would be interesting to know how many rrappers actually design and build
amateur rigs (meaning transmitters, receivers and transmitters, not just
accessories and such). An important qualification is that they do it as
amateurs, meaning their projects are separate from their work.

Lessee, there's me, W1RFI and W0EX. Anybody else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4320. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 20:20:32 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <9m6l6u814dkml7n7mo5brfi37lsmsei82n@4ax.com>
Source record: 33831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 11:55:33 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
<vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:

>Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
>DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
>request for a good ol QSL card.

Well, I'm glad to see, at long last, an open admission that it's a way
of funding a free vacation for "the deserving"!

;-)
73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4321. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 20:51:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202131250.1120d051@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33832

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C6BD1F4.FF179A16@worldnet.att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C69D885.599A75DC@IEEE.org>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > > >I'm surprised.
> > > > >
> > > > > You misunderstood.
> > > >
> > > Because your question made not sense.
> > >
> > Then let me rephrase:
> > >
> > Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
> > IC-756, Cecil?
> >
> OK, Cecil, start the dance....around the question. He'll do everything but answer it.

Maybe yes, maybe no. Gotta keep my friend in Madisonville entertained. Is this
a square, contra or big circle number?

Strike up the band!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4322. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 20:58:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6AD36E.525982EC@uci.edu>
Source record: 33833

"Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020212123838.17384.00001747@mb-mt.aol.com...
> > It didn't happen on the
> > Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
> > the *IMPORTANT* things happen.
>
> This has to be one of the coldest comments I've ever read here or on any
> newsgroup.

He's the kind of guy who would cut off your nose to spite your face as
long as it wouldn't get him all messy.

4323. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 21:27:36 UTC
From: John Passaneau <jxp16@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <a4elo5$1bpo@r02n01.cac.psu.edu>
Source record: 33835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi all:

After reading this thread for awhile, I went to the ARRL web site, and did a search on "eqsl", "e-qsl" etc. and I found a few mentions of e-qsl, but nothing that mentions that the ARRL is doing anything but thinking about accepting e-qsl's. So is this really true or is someone reading more into ARRL thinking about it than has happened yet.

--
John Passaneau, W3JXP
Physics Dept. Electronics Shop
Penn State University
104 Davey Lab, University Park , Pa. 16802
814.863.4297, jxp16@psu.edu

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:9m6l6u814dkml7n7mo5brfi37lsmsei82n@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 11:55:33 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
> <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> >Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> >DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> >request for a good ol QSL card.
>
> Well, I'm glad to see, at long last, an open admission that it's a way
> of funding a free vacation for "the deserving"!
>
> ;-)
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4324. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 21:29:06 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202132123330.5401-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 33834

On 12 Feb 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
>1... for a period of time after April 15, 2000 [known as Black
>Thursday by some] if you held a pre-Mar 21, 1987, Tech Plus, you could
>gather the paperwork and have the VE certify that to the FCC,
>resulting in a General. That license required Element 1 (5wpm) and
>Element 3 (the current General). I thought that opportunity expired
>with the 2001 rewrite of Element 3 -- but not sure?

No, it hasn't. Element credit locked in by a license is good forever. For January, I think we had one of these to process. In December, my group had 3 - but we convinced one to try the Extra test and he passed that also.

>2... if you hold a pre-Feb 14, 1991, Technical license or a post-Feb
>14, 1991, through Apr 15, 2000, Technician Plus license, you are
>classified as Technician Plus until you upgrade or allow the license
>to expire beyond the grace period;

Or renew, since the renewed license will only say "Technician." At that point, one will have to bring the old license or CSCE showing the code element (from 1991-2000). Remember also that from 1991 to mid-1994, the FCC didn't print "Technician Plus" licenses.

>your Element 1 can be applied toward the General license when Element
>3 is passed.

True.

>3... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2000, the Element 1 CSCE is
>valid for upgrade to General for 365 days, during which time you
>either need to pass Element 3 or ...

Correct, except, ON or after April 15, 2000.

>4... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2001, the CSCE grants the
>Novice/Tech Plus operating privileges for as long as you hold the
>license; however, you will be classified as Technician, not Technician
>Plus.

Correct.

>5... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2000, and Element 3 within
>365 days to earn General, I believe you may test for Extra based on
>holding General, not on the Element 1 CSCE?

No. One doesn't have to have the general class license in hand. Simply having the element credit for element 3 is sufficient to be tested for element 4.

4325. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 21:53:19 UTC
From: qrp5@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <cce22972.0202131353.35992ac6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33836

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c6470ac_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com...
> > Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> > person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> > come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> > the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> > control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> > may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> > looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> > find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
> > clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> > Respectfully, JJ
>
> JJ,
>
> The restrictions against initiating a call or identifying the station
> do not appear in Part 97.
>
> Thus, it would seem that a "guest" operating under the continuous
> supervision of a properly licensed control operator can do whatever
> the control operator is allowed to do, as long as the control operator
> permits it and it is otherwise within the rules.
>
> Carl - wa6vse

Carl, it would seem that most would agree with you. (also TNX to Phil Kane for his input on this question) It has been determined by our club, however, that any unlicesed person initiating a call or ID'ing with another's call sign will be reported to the FCC, regardless if a control operator is present or not. While this seems contrary to the interpretation as understood by most hams who responded, it is a decision we will have to live with locally. There have already been confrontations to people who were not aware of our interpretation. Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of much trouble in the future. Even our own VE's are divided on this, as well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties. I thank you all who responded. Respectfully, JJ

4326. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 22:05:26 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33837
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello John,
The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card. This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for DXCC.
It can be seen by some that this is a new approval, and a change in policy, by the ARRL since no electronic qsl cards of any type have ever been "accepted" before for anyone under any conditions. But..also since the ARRL is only accepting eQSL cards that have been mailed others can say there is no ARRL policy change as they are "still accepting" mailed cards. It can go either way.... Personally since nothing like this (electronically derived qsl cards) has ever been "approved" for DXCC before I see it as a "change in policy" by the ARRL.
Others disagree....be that as it may there is no argument that this is a real shot-in-the-arm for eQSL users and will very likely spin-off as more participation in the DXCC awards program to the benefit of the ARRL since only it's members are eligible for their own brand of awards. I see it as a win-win situation.....and..it most definitely is "something new" IMHO....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

4327. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:26:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213182618.18897.00000971@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33838

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>t would be interesting to know how many rrappers actually design and build
>amateur rigs (meaning transmitters, receivers and transmitters, not just
>accessories and such).

>Lessee, there's me, W1RFI and W0EX. Anybody else?

Actually, I don't know as I have ever operated a transmitter entirely of my own design. The 74S00 transmitter I used for much of my 250 mw QRP WAS was adapted heavily from a design published in 73 magazine. The TT2, of course, was designed by W1FB (then W1CER).

The ARRL Lab was once asked to build a chirpy rig so that one of our videos could tell the students what a chirp was. I decided that this was NOT the best assignment to give to Zack Lau, so I designed it myself. But I never put it on the air. Does that count? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4328. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:31:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213183124.18897.00000973@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33839

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I am
>> annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your repeating of
>> your favorite childlike insult?

> If you're not perceptive enough to understand at this point there's no point
>in trying to explain it to ya.

Why would I not be perceptive enough to understand why I am annoyed at you,
Dick?

This is really getting pretty wild.

Tell you what, though -- seeing as you think that I lack perception, why don't
you explain it to everyone else, so they can understand why you feel that
childish insults will make people want to learn code.

Bill and Carl must think that you are their strongest asset. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4329. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:39:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213183907.18897.00000976@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33840

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Efficiency was a concern of hams because the regulations of the time limited
>hams to 1 kW input power. A 1 kW AM rig using low level modulation could only
>produce about 300-350 watts carrier, while a high level modulated 1 kW rig
>could' produce 700-750 watts carrier. Yes, it's only 3-4 dB, but it mattered
to the
>hams of that time.

Matters today, too. Even QRPers sometimes want to squeeze out the extra watt.
:-)

But AB amps typically hit about 60% efficiency, if memory serves, while the
Class C amps typicallly hit around 75%. While 3-4 dB would matter, I am not
sure that 0.7 dB is worth all that fuss.

One should have been able to generate the AM at the milliwatt level, then
follow it by Class AB amps right up to the final, which would be able to run at
about 60% efficiency. Admittedly, the overall efficiency of the system would
not be all that great, but in terms of RF out, the final would have been the
limiting 1 KW DC input factor.

Just not as elegant as a plate-modulated DSP AM rig. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4330. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:41:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213184109.18897.00000977@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 33841

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>I don't sign my QSL cards. The only difference between the QSL
>>cards that I snailmail and the ones that I email are the postmarks.

> ta-DAAAA ! ! ! ! (postmark)

The cards that come through the buro do not have postmarks.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

4331. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:49:01 UTC
From: Gary Danaher <gdanaher@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C6AFB90.41624261@attbi.com>
Source record: 33842
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The folks at eQSL solved two problems. Firstly they found a way to make their record keeping system of some value to some people. Without the document being submitable for credit, few people wanted them. They're too easy to counterfeit on the computer. Secondly, they found a way to make some money. By charging a dollar and then sending the card out at the postal card rate of 22? cents, finally they are in the black. Amateurs have been creating and mailing out electronically created cards for years. There is nothing new at all there except the process perhaps of 'ordering' the card on-line.

John Passaneau wrote:

> Hi all:
>
> After reading this thread for awhile, I went to the ARRL web site, and did a
> search on "eqsl", "e-qsl" etc. and I found a few mentions of e-qsl, but
> nothing that mentions that the ARRL is doing anything but thinking about
> accepting e-qsl's. So is this really true or is someone reading more into
> ARRL thinking about it than has happened yet.
>
> --
> John Passaneau, W3JXP
> Physics Dept. Electronics Shop
> Penn State University
> 104 Davey Lab, University Park , Pa. 16802
> 814.863.4297, jxp16@psu.edu
>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:9m6l6u814dkml7n7mo5brfi37lsmsei82n@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 11:55:33 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
> > <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > >Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> > >DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> > >request for a good ol QSL card.
> >
> > Well, I'm glad to see, at long last, an open admission that it's a way
> > of funding a free vacation for "the deserving"!
> >
> > ;-)
> > 73 de G3NYY
> >
> > --
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4332. Another landmark eQSL acceptance!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-13 23:49:15 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c6afb7a$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33843
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Chalk-up another acceptance for eQSL's......

Confirmation was received today from the president-elect of the
3905 Century Club that their awards program will accept hard copies
of eQSL's as confirmation. The hard copy can be printed by the
recipient on his home computer if desired, or you can use eQSL's service
to have them printed and mailed to you.

Either is OK for Century Club awards.
---
info retrieved from eQSL Discussion email list as posted there by
David, KC0JB

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

4333. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 00:54:59 UTC
From: Steven - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a4f1t8pdu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33844
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> Hello John,
> The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted
> at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service
> is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card.
> This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for
> all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic
> qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk
> verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> DXCC.

However, if the sender of the QSL card objects to having Eqsls act as a
"qsl manager", they can notify the Eqsl and the DXCC desk
and then the cards will not be accepted for DXCC credit.

I have noticed a number of people requesting that their logs be
"returned" as they do not want Eqsl acting in this capacity. The prime
reason given is that the logs were sent with the understanding that no
money was needed (other than a donation. Now Eqsl wants to charge for a
contact (which is fine, I guess). but they "object" to having Eqsl
represent itself as a qsl manager for them without 1st asking.

Additionally, there is now the problem for those subscribing as to logs
from non legitimate managers and / or pirate operations being submitted.
How does Eqsl plan to handle types like HH2HM, who are notorious for not
only being the DX but also pretending to being the manager for same.
Nothing he manages counts for anything unless the legitimate operator
verifies this.

Lots a holes still. Although progress none the less..I guess

> It can be seen by some that this is a new approval, and a change in
> policy, by the ARRL since no electronic qsl cards of any type have ever
> been "accepted" before for anyone under any conditions. But..also
> since the ARRL is only accepting eQSL cards that have been mailed others
> can say there is no ARRL policy change as they are "still accepting"
> mailed cards. It can go either way.... Personally since nothing like
> this (electronically derived qsl cards) has ever been "approved" for
> DXCC before I see it as a "change in policy" by the ARRL.

No, the ARRL is accepting QSL cards that have been approved by a quasi
qsl manager. This is not a change, as much as you would want it to be,
as it seems you posted substantial pieces of the pie, but not the whole

thing. Wayne clarified the ARRL/DXCC position on the 4 reflectors you spammed to and you still chose to ignore the complete picture.

It's more of a clarification as to acceptance of QSL from a qsl manager than a complete policy change... sorry Charlie ;-)

> Others disagree....be that as it may there is no argument that this is
> a real shot-in-the-arm for eQSL users and will very likely spin-off as
> more participation in the DXCC awards program to the benefit of the ARRL
> since only it's members are eligible for their own brand of awards. I
> see it as a win-win situation.....and..it most definitely is "something
> new" IMHO....

I will agree with most of this. I really doubt that the big time DX will e-qsl (maybe some ex-quam types for instance... Hi Jim!!!)) but for the most part, it seems cards are your basic DX varieties (Europeans, S. Americans, etc)

4334. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:30:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b14ec$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33845

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020212215835.27226.00000079@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <20020212013936.26489.00000770@mb-fx.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >
> >>Is this an appropriate manner for a father to refer to his 10-year
> >>old daughter?
> >
> > Only with a wink, smile and a nod!
> >
> > Now Larry, take a deeeeeeep breath and B-R-E-A-T-H-E....! ! !
> >
> >73
>
> Steve:
>
> There is nothing wrong with my respiration. However, any man who
> referred to a 10-year old daughter of mine as a "wench" would probably
> have some problems with chewing for the next couple of years --
> until his reconstructive dental work was finished.
>
> Of course, I don't expect you to understand such a thing. However,
> my theory is that any 10-year old girl who's father refers to her as a
> "wench" will probably end up being one someday!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I think Larry's just plain jealous, Steve! ;)

Kim W5TIT

4335. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:33:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b158f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33846

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C69D9F0.508F278E@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > There is nothing wrong with my respiration. However, any man who
> > referred to a 10-year old daughter of mine as a "wench" would probably
> > have some problems with chewing for the next couple of years --
> > until his reconstructive dental work was finished.
> >
> > Of course, I don't expect you to understand such a thing. However,
> > my theory is that any 10-year old girl who's father refers to her as a
> > "wench" will probably end up being one someday!
>
> Dang, Larry, don't you ever crack open a dictionary? From Webster's:
> "wench - 1 a: a young woman: GIRL" Larry, that's the the ***FIRST***
> definition!
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I beg your pardon, Cecil. No, no, no. Larry must see something filthy in every thought of a woman--ain't ya got that yet? He's so obsessed with sex (for not having any) that his filthy mind contorts everything to something of a sexual nature!

Kim W5TIT

4336. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:37:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b168e$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33847

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6B25B0.830BE9D@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to
determine that a
> > > band is dead?
> >
> > MUF, of course. No station required.
>
> Yup, and since virtually allo hams lack the gear needed to make MUF
tests, they
> almost universaly check for band conditions by
> tuning around and listening for band activity. I guess when you find no
activity you,
> like most hams, consider the band "Dead" without
> actually confirming it through MUF tests. And often you'd be wrong, the
band isn'te
> dead at all, but marginally usable but unused because most hams checking
it assume
> it's dead!
>
> Nice to see you following right along.
>

Why anyone would just "tune" around on a band is beyond me. Why would they do just that and not give a CQ call once in a while?! MUF be damned...just key up and say howdy.

Kim W5TIT

4337. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:44:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b1830_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33848

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213061808.18984.00000971@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/12/2002 8:39 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c69d203_2@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >There is a really simple verifiable way to put a signature on a computer
> >generated piece of artwork...(SNIP)
>
> That's not what I was getting at, Kim. I know that if we can
transact
> billions of dollars in commerce each day via wire, we can create a QSL
service
> on line that can be "verified".
>
> I want something that was "there"...In the other person's hand at one
time
> or another.
>

I responded to you via email, Steve, because I read email before I downloaded the newsgroup tonight...so you'll have seen my response there, too. I know what you mean about having the "real" thing. I just wanted to be sure to relay that the verification problem can be overcome.

>
> Kim, if your husband sends you "eFlowers" Thursday instead of the
real
> roses, how long will it be before he shares the same bedroom with you?
>
> Get the picture?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

As I said in my email...you know me better than that. I really would rather not have plant stuff at all, but a live plant if one must--flowers die and they're ridiculously expensive! I'd rather kill a plant slowly over time...that's a joke...I don't have a green thumb! :)

Now, if my darlin' insists on sending just pictures of radios, tools, and gadgets (my favorite things to get for presents), then we'd have a problem. LOL

Kim W5TIT

4338. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:45:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b1868$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33849

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213062504.18938.00000907@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.
>
> > Just want you to understand what it feels like, Ed.
>
> I do not recall ever telling you to go soak your head, Dick. Is this your
way
> of telling me that you are feeling better now?
>
> Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I am
> annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your repeating
of
> your favorite childlike insult?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

GADS...thank you, Ed!!!! THAT is the EXACT point.

Kim W5TIT

4339. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:48:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b1938_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33850

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6BD2DE.AB3517AB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> Perhaps we can resume this when you are feeling better.
> >
> > > Just want you to understand what it feels like, Ed.
> >
> > I do not recall ever telling you to go soak your head, Dick. Is this
your way
> > of telling me that you are feeling better now?
> >
> > Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I am
> > annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your repeating
of
> > your favorite childlike insult?
> >
>
> If you're not perceptive enough to understand at this point there's no
point in
> trying to explain it to ya.
>

Hey, Little Dick!? Speaking of 'splainin', you never answered me on the
explaining spread spectrum technology to us...

Can't can ya...heh heh heh

Kim W5TIT

4340. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 01:57:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b1b4b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33852

"JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:cce22972.0202131353.35992ac6@posting.google.com...
>
> Carl, it would seem that most would agree with you. (also TNX to Phil
> Kane for his input on this question) It has been determined by our
> club, however, that any unlicesed person initiating a call or ID'ing
> with another's call sign will be reported to the FCC, regardless if a
> control operator is present or not. While this seems contrary to the
> interpretation as understood by most hams who responded, it is a
> decision we will have to live with locally. There have already been
> confrontations to people who were not aware of our interpretation.
> Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a
> common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of
> much trouble in the future. Even our own VE's are divided on this, as
> well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties. I thank
> you all who responded. Respectfully, JJ

JJ: If I read this correctly, then the following:

Even though FCC R&R are not prohibitive of a Control Operator simply having to be present during the transmission of an unlicensed person operating their station, your club is going to choose to report such operators to the FCC??!!

Your club is, of course, free to do as they see fit...however, I can't help but interject that this is a huge, huge waste of time for the persons doing the reporting and certainly for the FCC. Don't you think such unwarranted action will have the FCC getting quite antsy about the credibility of your club?

The people you will be reporting are in no violation whatsoever...and you may find yourselves in the middle of lawsuit if you happen to "piss off" the wrong person who has enough money to play with. I know I'd take you to court for such action if I were a victim and had the money.

If I misunderstand what it is you are saying, then please accept my apology for the misunderstanding.

Kim W5TIT

4341. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:00:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nTEa8.3085$%T7.581783722@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 33851

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020212222852.19016.00000813@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > A good headsoak might do wonders for his personality.
>
> Well, it is pretty clear that this thread has the thread to the point of
> uselessness. If that is what you wish, I suppose you got it, though for
the
> life of me, I can't figure out why. Seems to end up here near about every
> time, though, somehow...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hello Ed, same stuff, different year. Since you seem to know where it all
ends up, why do you stick around?

How's the ARRL? The antenna modeling class looks like a winner. How was
the RFI class?

73,
Brian/N0iMD

ps: Hello gang.
Len, why? Stay well.
Cecil, do you still cw with the cranks? No wonder you force yourself to
dring spoiled grape joos.
Bill, you're still one of the nicest guys on here.
Dick, its nice to see the actuarial tables haven't claimed your callsign
yet. Has anyone thought of or offered to form a memorial club with your
call?
Carl, keep fighting the good fight.
Dave, how's "real" DX from the pile-up side?
Jim, are you still posting 5 pages at a time? ;))
Larry, I see that you still hate ham radio. Don't forget to renew your
license.
Steve, God blesses fools.
Jim, nice to see you being fairly reasonable.
Bert, well, what can I say?
McDick, I still don't understand anything you post.
Brian, still got it ALL figure out, doncha?
Kim, I see you're still poking your callsign in where it's not wanted ;^)
Crazy Steve, will the real DXpert please stand up? (steve remains seated)
KH2Jim, go ahead and stand up.

Mike Deignan, I guess we didn't need no steenking actuarial table to collect up all the excess callsigns.
CutieBoy, sayonara baby.
Eric June, wasn't anything left after converting CAM?
The wiccan General?

Sorry if I left anyone out.

4342. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:18:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213211842.24789.00000001@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33855

In article <20020213071959.22158.00000962@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20020213061537.18938.00000905@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI) writes:
>
>[They] (1950s hams)
>
>> could have used low-level modulation to produce a full-carrier,
>>double-sideband signal then, too. I believe that some of them actually did.
>
>That's right, Ed. Various forms of grid modulation and linear operation were
>used by hams in the AM days.
>
>But all of these methods suffered from the disadvantage of low efficiency.
>Typically, 35% was about the maximum efficiency obtainable with good
>quality audio. High efficiency linear amplifiers like the Doherty were
>unattractive to hams due to complexity and difficulty of frequency and
>band changing.
>
>Efficiency was a concern of hams because the regulations of the time limited
>hams to 1 kW input power. A 1 kW AM rig using low level modulation could only
>produce about 300-350 watts carrier, while a high level modulated 1 kW rig
>could' produce 700-750 watts carrier. Yes, it's only 3-4 dB, but it mattered
to the
>hams of that time.
>
>Oddly enough, the rules change to 1.5 kW peak output reduced the amateur AM
> power level by about one half (typically 375 watts carrier)

On "EFFICIENCY (in finals, etc.):"

AM broadcast station KMPC here in the SFV runs 50 KW directly
into their towers. Judging by their RF envelopes, they peak to 80%
modulation (on commercials). Let's say their whole transmitter
station pulls 100 KW of electrical power from the DWP here. The
residential electrical rate in Los Angeles is about 12 cents per KWHr.
I suspect that KMPC gets billed as a steady industrial user on
electricity but let's figure what it costs the station just in electrical
power by the residential rate: 100 KW x $0.12 per hour or $12/hour,
the salary cost of a maintenance man (janitor to "paratransit
operators").

Okay, let's suppose Joe Ham is running a 1 KW input Class C final
that is 70% efficient. Joe is thus using 300 W dissipated as heat at

his residence and the per-hour billed electrical wasted power costs
him 3.6 cents per hour.

Harry Ham might be running a 1 KW input Class B final that is only
40% efficient and thus wasting 600 W as heat. Harry Ham is thus
spending 7.2 cents per hour to heat his shack, less than a nickel
more an hour than Joe Ham.

Considering that both Joe and Harry are consuming electrical power
for their receivers, exciters, lights, and other station peripherals, they
both are using a fair amount of electricity. It might be as "high" as
a dime an hour! Nonetheless, Harry Ham is spending only 3.6 cents
more an hour than Joe Ham...all due to that "inefficient" final of Harry's.

But is anything really wasted? Regardless of insistence on the desert-
like temperatures that are supposed to exist in Southern California, some
(thermal) heat is welcome in residences during non-summer days. :-)

Hmmm...maybe the counter argument is that the "wasted" heat is local
and "damaging" to the final itself? If so, the solution nearly always is to
add a fan/blower. Problem is, that fan/blower also takes electricity and
adds an increment of a fractional penny per hour in billing. What was
70% efficiency might reduce to a mere 69%! [horrors, inefficiency!]

As it turns out, Joe Ham is a boatanchor devotee and likes to run
tube equipment...Hallicrafters, Hammarlund, Collins (he is looking for
National right now) and refuses to budge from his "Class C is the best
and that's that!" position. All that peripheral tube equipment is, by
comparison to solid-state radio stuff, terribly inefficient! Joe's station
takes over 300 W just to run all those tube heaters with plates
averaging 3 W per tube over and above an equal-function solid-state
stage. But, by St. Hiram, Joe Ham is EFFICIENT in his final! :-)

Harry Ham is not a traditionalist, uses those despicable "rice boxes"
with all those transistor and IC thingies inside them, can just push-
button up a new mode without retuning his final's pi-net (doesn't have
one). No problem switching from OOK CW to SSB voice to data.
Harry isn't much bothered by "efficiency" of that "inefficient" final.

With warmest (from efficiency) regards,
Len

4343. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:18:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213211843.24789.00000002@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33854

In article <9f4bfe89.0202130836.48af7bf6@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020212224227.19016.00000818@mb-mk.aol.com>...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >Sure - but will you actually reprogram the '756?
>>
>> Has Icom given him access to the information he would need to even think
>> about it?
>
>I don't know, Ed. That's one of the reasons I asked the question.
>
>> If Icom were open source, do you think it likely that Cecil would use
>> some of what he had learned using the eval board to work on the programming
>> of the '756?
>
>Maybe - I don't really know. That's another reason I asked the question.
>>
>> Let me ask Cecil the question. Cec? Do you think you would?
>
>Interesting how my original question is being dodged. Here it is again:
>
>Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?
>
>Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
>impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
>about the bush?

The older ICOM radios using microcontrollers are NOT reprogrammable since their internal firmware is mask-programmed instead of using EEPROM or Flash memory. Given the different country markets with differing bands and band edges, new HF band assignments will be very expensive to cheapskates and cause them much whining, moaning, and bitching. :-)

If you do some checking of microcontrollers in current use (should be easy as a degreed whatever with good grades, etc., etc.) in modern ham rigs, you can find out directly if such firmware is reprogrammable or not. Instead of casting blame and implying ignorance, why don't you do the radio research and "show up" all the digital gurus? :-)

I can program in FORTRAN, Jimmie M., have done assembler code in three different microprocessor languages and am learning the instruction

set for some PIC microcontrollers. I've got four different shareware programs out there in Ziff-Davis program land and never had a single day of formal programming training. Gosh, if an unlicensed-in-amateur-radio person and supposedly-without-a-degree-electronics-engineer can do it, why can't you mighty morsemen show us all what kinda smarts ya got?

"Code" is code, isn't it? :-) {or are you a NOP? :-)]

With all kind regards,
Somebody

4344. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:18:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213211844.24789.00000003@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33853

In article <3C6AD36E.525982EC@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>"Ronnie D." wrote:
>>
>> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20020212123838.17384.00001747@mb-mt.aol.com...
>> > It didn't happen on the
>> > Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
>> > the *IMPORTANT* things happen.
>>
>> This has to be one of the coldest comments I've ever read here or on any
>> newsgroup.
>
>He's the kind of guy who would cut off your nose to spite your face as
>long as it wouldn't get him all messy.

Jimmie K., what is "messy" about explaining what happened to about
10 million folks 8 years ago? What IS messy is that amateur radio
just wasn't up to the task in this area to handle what was a definite
EMERGENCY. Actually, amateur radio wasn't needed here then.
The professionals did their jobs well, were ready, and handled the
task.

Oh, and the telephone system was initially overloaded, cell sites
included. The pros didn't rely on the dial-up telephone lines; their
fixed leased-lines didn't go through any switching centers that
would be overloaded by a mass of callers.

I'm sure that an "old" news thing wasn't in your mind when writing
your non-reply, was it? I'm sure you were going to wrap yourself in
the flag and try to tie it into the horrible September 11 Attack on
American, weren't you?

I've posted on the 1994 Northridge Earthquake several times in here
BEFORE 9-11-01. It is a good case example of a sudden
emergency. Has nothing to do with the Attack on America. Has
everything to do with a REAL sudden emergency situation affecting
very large number of people.

If you subscribe to "CW gets through when nothing else will..." then
you have to add "...but it sure won't if it doesn't have any power."

Are you prepared as an emergency super-radioman?

4345. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:18:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213211846.24789.00000004@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 33856

In article <Q3ta8.4496$qt6.372815@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

>> It didn't happen on the
>> Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
>> the *IMPORTANT* things happen.
>
>This has to be one of the coldest comments I've ever read here or on any
>newsgroup.
>
>BTW, the people of Calif KNOW that the possibility of earthquakes exist.
>They accept it as a part of leaving in such warm and beautiful splendor.
>The people that live in the area you have chosen top slander had no such
>knowledege that one day something like this would happen.

Heh, spoken like a true believer in the east coast as the center of the US universe. :-)

Ronnie D., I spent the first 19 years of my life in northern Illinois and am familiar with snow storms every winter and a few tornados. The folks who remained in the northern midwest "KNEW" that winters would be stormy and emergencies could arise. The folks who live (not "leave") in the plains states "KNOW" about tornados and other disaster possibilities and remain there. The folks living (not "leaving") in the Gulf and southeast coast areas "KNOW" about hurricanes...and they choose to remain in their home area. My wife and I have a second home in Washington state near Tacoma...an area that can only be listed as having half-year endless precipitation. I have absolutely NO problem with other folks choosing their geographic residences for whatever reasons they have.

What I DO have a problem with is the geographic bigotry exhibited by some easterners in uncalled-for remarks of "left coast" or "smell from the west" and similar denigrations.

What I DO have a problem with is the dead-brained imagination that some amateurs do NOT need emergency training and preparedness but can immediately jump into "action" and "save everyone" with their miraculously-surviving-all-emergencies ham gear. That's just total bullshit thinking, bragging, fantasy pipe-dreaming.

The ARRL *HAS* begun some positive action with their classes (see their website) on emergency preparedness but they can't reach out and shake everyone mentally to get them set. The imaginator-dreamer-self-glorifying ham MUST learn that local

government agencies do NOT base their own communications on "cell phones ("which always go down in emergencies")." They have their own radio equipment and most agencies do regular training and review and planning for emergency contingencies, coordinating among their own agency divisions and volunteer groups that work with them on a regular basis.

I use the 1994 Northridge Earthquake as an extreme example of what can suddenly happen to a large populated area without any warning. The ENTIRE electrical power to an area of about 10 million population was suddenly cut off. BLACK at a bit after 4 AM after the first shaking. Were the hams in the local area prepared? I don't know any details of that except to say there was NOTHING in evidence. The public safety folks were ready, the PDs, the FDs, the hospitals, central government offices had emergency electrical power...even the utility folks who had to do lots of clean-up and restoration of service right away. All those organizations had organized themselves, trained themselves as a coordinated group, kept on with drills and preparedness and IT PAID OFF. The public safety professionals could be proud of what they did all over this area that January.

Emotionally-oriented and self-glorifying ham hero-wannabees don't like such statements of what actually happened and who did all the dirty work. They just want feel-good phrasing of how "heroic" they are and how they "can save the day" when "all the cell phones fail." They definitely don't like to hear about the (then) new FEMA sat terminals with multi-screen video billboards for immediate third-party messaging. They want to sit secure in front of their radios and computers and brag how they are such "supermen of the air" who will instantly jump into action and save everyone on the "next" emergency with their trusty, never-fail radios that survive everything. Yeah, sure. :-)

>I truly doubt that you have any regards, let alone kind ones
>
>No regard for you

Hey, "Ronnie D" whoever you are, screw you too. I'm not sorry if I disturbed your imaginary dreams of heroism or whatever compels you to get upset if someone throws geographic bigotry right back in your direction. I'll give praise to whoever does REAL emergency work, not those who can only quote very generalized claims of self-glorifying buzzphrases found mostly on ham news sites.

First, before you get too angry about all that, PARTICIPATE in some REAL emergencies. I've been in several in my life. I don't like any of them and don't wish to see another...but one thing I've learned from them is that the only effective way through is by PLANNING, ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION, DRILLS, always looking for ways to improve, trying to expect at least some of the unexpected.

Become a part of your community instead of sitting within the "amateur community" giving each other high-fives over a "disaster job well done" when the outsiders look on with questioning expressions asking "What done? Where?" Face reality.

Happy disasters to you,
Len

4346. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:22:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C6341.788E7A82@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33857

N2EY wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020212224227.19016.00000818@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>
> Interesting how my original question is being dodged. Here it is again:
>
> Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?
>
> Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
> impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
> about the bush?

I've been wondering why Ed insists on protecting Cec and Carl myself. He never gave a code advocate that sort of support.

4347. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020213212824.26903.00000073@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33861

In article <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've certainly
>> made it as total wankers!
>>
>> And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole newsgroup who
>opened the message, Larry...
>
>No surprise there.
>
>Kim W5TIT

The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in my
reply.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4348. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020213212825.26903.00000075@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33858

In article <3c69cc81_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Might want to try it on a can of Ken-L ration first, though...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Don't look now, Kim, but I don't share your dietary preferences.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4349. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020213212825.26903.00000074@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33860

In article <20020212154455.18901.00000763@mb-mf.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>
>>Why, Larry? Oral sex is great, healthy, and good for what ails you.
>>You should try it once - it might cure your hatred.
>
> Preferably with a woman, Larry.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Advice noted, Steve. That leaves Kim out, for sure!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4350. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020213212826.26903.00000077@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33859

In article <3c69ca58$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>I doubt every word you just wrote above. Every word. More, you are
>beginning to sound a lot like good 'ol Mr. Misery: Vince Fiscus I think his
>name is. How much misery you gonna take?
>
>Kim W5TIT

I dunno, Kim -- how much misery are you gonna make?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4351. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020213212826.26903.00000076@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33862

In article <3C69606F.7586289E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Pretty soon, a "technically
>> competent" ham will be defined as one who can successfully get
>> his off-the-shelf HF rig on-the-air (using SSB, of course) without
>> the assistance of more than a half-dozen "Elmers." Whoopie!
>
>That may be but has absolutely nothing to do with Morse code
>testing according to the FCC.

Don't look now, Cecil, but what the FCC thinks of code testing
doesn't necessarily have anything to do with what would be best
for the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4352. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:28:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C64D3.76957F5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33863

W1RFI wrote:

Bill and Carl must think that you are their strongest asset. :-)

Oh, I really don't think so. You're the groveler.

4353. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:42:35 UTC
From: John Passaneau <w3jxp@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <vuFa8.246$xs1.46435@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 33864
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi :

But my point is I see nothing from the ARRL that this is true.

so what gives?

--
John Passaneau W3JXP
State College, Pa
w3jxp@adelphia.net

"Charles Johnston" <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
news:3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com...
> Hello John,
> The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted
> at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service
> is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card.
> This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for
> all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic
> qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk
> verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> DXCC.
> It can be seen by some that this is a new approval, and a change in
> policy, by the ARRL since no electronic qsl cards of any type have ever
> been "accepted" before for anyone under any conditions. But..also
> since the ARRL is only accepting eQSL cards that have been mailed others
> can say there is no ARRL policy change as they are "still accepting"
> mailed cards. It can go either way.... Personally since nothing like
> this (electronically derived qsl cards) has ever been "approved" for
> DXCC before I see it as a "change in policy" by the ARRL.
> Others disagree....be that as it may there is no argument that this is
> a real shot-in-the-arm for eQSL users and will very likely spin-off as
> more participation in the DXCC awards program to the benefit of the ARRL
> since only it's members are eligible for their own brand of awards. I
> see it as a win-win situation.....and..it most definitely is "something
> new" IMHO....
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston

> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com
>
>
>
>

4354. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:52:26 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <KDFa8.5889$qt6.511708@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33865

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213211846.24789.00000004@mb-mm.aol.com...
> In article <Q3ta8.4496$qt6.372815@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Ronnie
> D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >> It didn't happen on the
> >> Center of the US Universe which God located on the east coast where
> >> the *IMPORTANT* things happen.
> >
> >This has to be one of the coldest comments I've ever read here or on any
> >newsgroup.
> >
> >BTW, the people of Calif KNOW that the possibility of earthquakes exist.
> >They accept it as a part of leaving in such warm and beautiful splendor.
> >The people that live in the area you have chosen top slander had no such
> >knowledege that one day something like this would happen.
>
> Heh, spoken like a true believer in the east coast as the center of
> the US universe. :-)
>
> Ronnie D., I spent the first 19 years of my life in northern Illinois
> and am familiar with snow storms every winter and a few tornados.
> The folks who remained in the northern midwest "KNEW" that
> winters would be stormy and emergencies could arise. The folks
> who live (not "leave") in the plains states "KNOW" about tornados
> and other disaster possibilities and remain there. The folks living
> (not "leaving") in the Gulf and southeast coast areas "KNOW"
> about hurricanes...and they choose to remain in their home area.
> My wife and I have a second home in Washington state near
> Tacoma...an area that can only be listed as having half-year
> endless precipitation. I have absolutely NO problem with other
> folks choosing their geographic residences for whatever reasons
> they have.
>
> What I DO have a problem with is the geographic bigotry exhibited
> by some easterners in uncalled-for remarks of "left coast" or "smell
> from the west" and similar denigrations.

I haven't seen any examples of gepgraphic bigorty other than from you. :(

>
> What I DO have a problem with is the dead-brained imagination that
> some amateurs do NOT need emergency training and preparedness
> but can immediately jump into "action" and "save everyone" with

> their miraculously-surviving-all-emergencies ham gear. That's just
> total bullshit thinking, bragging, fantasy pipe-dreaming.

So how do you prepare for emergenies? Seems you leave that to others to
prepare and do FOR you. Maybe I'm wrong
but the impression is you are a taker as opposed to a giver.

>
> The ARRL *HAS* begun some positive action with their classes
> (see their website) on emergency preparedness but they can't
> reach out and shake everyone mentally to get them set. The
> imaginator-dreamer-self-glorifying ham MUST learn that local
> government agencies do NOT base their own communications on
> "cell phones ("which always go down in emergencies")." They
> have their own radio equipment and most agencies do regular
> training and review and planning for emergency contingencies,
> coordinating among their own agency divisions and volunteer
> groups that work with them on a regular basis.
>
> I use the 1994 Northridge Earthquake as an extreme example of
> what can suddenly happen to a large populated area without any
> warning. The ENTIRE electrical power to an area of about 10
> million population was suddenly cut off. BLACK at a bit after
> 4 AM after the first shaking. Were the hams in the local area
> prepared? I don't know any details of that except to say there was
> NOTHING in evidence.

If you don;t know of any details, how can you make a logical conclusion
then? Seems someone so
wrapped up in acquiring facts would have found some and then made logical
statement here. Looks more like going off without any facts.

The public safety folks were ready, the PDs,
> the FDs, the hospitals, central government offices had emergency
> electrical power...even the utility folks who had to do lots of clean-
> up and restoration of service right away. All those organizations
> had organized themselves, trained themselves as a coordinated
> group, kept on with drills and preparedness and IT PAID OFF.
> The public safety professionals could be proud of what they did all
> over this area that January.
>
> Emotionally-oriented and self-glorifying ham hero-wannabees don't
> like such statements of what actually happened and who did all the
> dirty work. They just want feel-good phrasing of how "heroic" they
> are and how they "can save the day" when "all the cell phones fail."

You must read different news articles than most. You seem to come up with
National Enquirer stories that most
main straem news misses.

> They definitely don't like to hear about the (then) new FEMA sat
> terminals with multi-screen video billboards for immediate third-party

> messaging. They want to sit secure in front of their radios and
> computers and brag how they are such "supermen of the air" who
> will instantly jump into action and save everyone on the "next"
> emergency with their trusty, never-fail radios that survive everything.
> Yeah, sure. :-)
>
> >I truly doubt that you have any regards, let alone kind ones
> >
> >No regard for you
>
> Hey, "Ronnie D" whoever you are, screw you too. I'm not sorry if I
> disturbed your imaginary dreams of heroism or whatever compels
> you to get upset if someone throws geographic bigotry right back
> in your direction. I'll give praise to whoever does REAL emergency
> work, not those who can only quote very generalized claims of
> self-glorifying buzzphrases found mostly on ham news sites.

Class act NOT!!!!!!!!! I have only been here a week or so and have yet to
see you praise anything other than yourself.

Better stay on the west caost with the other wack-jobs...ooppsss geographic
bigotry. I aplopgize to all the other
west coast wack jobs for equating them to this poster from their area.
Soeey

>
> First, before you get too angry about all that, PARTICIPATE in some
> REAL emergencies. I've been in several in my life. I don't like any
> of them and don't wish to see another...but one thing I've learned from
> them is that the only effective way through is by PLANNING,
> ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION, DRILLS, always looking for ways
> to improve, trying to expect at least some of the unexpected.

Sure you have. I'd be happy to review anything you might offer as factual
for any particiupation you actually had
in any emetgenices that you claim. Ihaven't seen anything other than the,
how did you put it, prosteliziing, of a few weak minded fools??

>
> Become a part of your community instead of sitting within the "amateur
> community" giving each other high-fives over a "disaster job well done"
> when the outsiders look on with questioning expressions asking "What
> done? Where?" Face reality.

I have and I see that you are not the nearly as sour as some of the lemons
that have fallen off the tree..you are the king of sour.

>
> Happy disasters to you,
> Len

May many befall you so that you can actively participate in them. I think
we're done here. You bring nothing but

bitterness to the table.

Still no regards to you.

Ronnie D

4355. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 02:56:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4f9bgjed1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33867

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213012712.13432.00000035@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <a4chne$47c$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> The majority of citizens do not find themselves in the widespread
> >> emergencies that ham radio helps with.
> >
> >Additionally, people can be helped indirectly simply
> >because hams have helped provide local assessments
> >as to road conditions, travel problems, etc. The
> >public may have no idea that a news advisory in
> >any way involved hams.
>
> Bill, with all due respect, my wife and I did a trip to the
> midwest a half year ago, 6073 miles through 12 states,
> getting rather complete travel advisories over the Internet
> from the states' own websites of their respective transportation
> agencies. We did that because we've used the information
> from the Washington, Oregon, and California agencies before
> from winter to summer seasons. All of those sites had rather
> detailed advisories on road conditions, road reconstruction
> locations, even including two large fires in Nevada and
> California.
>
> In truth, I do not know the EXACT nature of how all of those
> agencies get their information except that all of them state
> they get it through their respective state patrols, various local
> police, road construction crews and the supervising agencies
> for road construction. None of them indicated or even hinted
> at amateur radio or CB REACT as supplying "news advisories"
> on anything. I'm sure that could happen but we haven't
> experienced it, seen it. Considering that state patrols are
> Out There 24/7 and that the various state transportation
> agencies keep tabs on roads, waterways, and other modes
> of travel 24/7...would the general public trust them (thousands
> of individuals on the scenes) or a few radio amateurs who
> just happened to be on some scene rather by chance?

On any given day, I agree that such reports likly have zero
reliance on hams. It is under the emergency situations when
hams become the added eyes, ears and voice to the area
inumdated by the disastor that some news/conditions/etc.
may be supported by ham operations.

> The state police agencies have radios well netted together, as
> do the road supervisory agencies, state and national part
> rangers, and others. It is their task, work, and duty to report
> anything that might affect the public. They do it well.

Agreed...on 99.99% of the days/hours. It is that
emergency when the help comes from hams (as well as
other entities).

> Now, if an alien invasion from outer space were to threaten the
> general public, I'm sure that ham radio could help "advise" the
> public and even repulse those nasty critters. A movie a few
> years told all about how to do it... :-)

ID4

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4356. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:00:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4f9bjjed2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33866

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213183124.18897.00000973@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Just one question; if I am annoyed with you over this, do you think I
am
> >> annoyed with you over your views on code testing, or over your
repeating of
> >> your favorite childlike insult?
>
> > If you're not perceptive enough to understand at this point there's no
point
> >in trying to explain it to ya.
>
> Why would I not be perceptive enough to understand why I am annoyed at
you,
> Dick?
>
> This is really getting pretty wild.
>
> Tell you what, though -- seeing as you think that I lack perception, why
don't
> you explain it to everyone else, so they can understand why you feel that
> childish insults will make people want to learn code.
>
> Bill and Carl must think that you are their strongest asset. :-)

Given Dick's penchant for the childish commentary, that's exactly how I see
it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4357. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:07:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B29D9.86E046D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33868

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >That may be but has absolutely nothing to do with Morse code
> >testing according to the FCC.
>
> Don't look now, Cecil, but what the FCC thinks of code testing
> doesn't necessarily have anything to do with what would be best
> for the ARS.

Since you seem to know what is best for the ARS, why don't you get
a job at the FCC instead of driving a bus?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4358. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:10:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2ABA.92B76307@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33869

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering with ham radio?
> > >
> > How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
> > is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
>
> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed
> electrical engineer.

Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
of the transistors?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4359. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:14:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2B80.51506EA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33870

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >EE's designed almost every ham radio.
>
> MEs designed every car I drive, too, Cecil. Does that make driving a
> mechanical hobby?

It means that without mechanical engineers, you might be walking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4360. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:16:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2C04.CC646858@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33872

N2EY wrote:
> Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
> IC-756, Cecil?

I don't plan to, Jim. But I do plan to take the audio output from my IC-756
and input it into my DSP eval board for some experimenting. Virtually anyone
can do the same thing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4361. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:19:17 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c6b2cb2$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello John,
Did you visit the eQSL web site and read the email from Bill Moore of the DXCC Desk? I cannot speak for why the ARRL webmaster does or does not place what many believe to be important "news" on that site. You might consider emailing them. I would like to see their reply posted here.

My personal opinion is that they are reluctant to possibly steer anyone over to eQSL services since they (the ARRL) are going to launch the Electronic Logbook of the World ....one of these days.
It will supposedly provide for a 100% all-electronic qsl confirmation system that would feed directly into their own awards programs that would not require any paper-based qsl cards at all. However it looks like eQSL has done the end-around now by obtaining the "go-ahead" from Bill Moore himself that basically "allows" electronic eQSL's to be "accepted" for DXCC awards.

The eQSL system has many advantages over the yet-to-be-released Logbook of the World. With the LBOTW, once released and in operation, past qso's are not accepted. Not so with eQSL Furthermore....there will need to be digital signatures acquired and approved , as well as new additional ARRL fees (according to ARRL), and special ARRL- LBOTW software will need to be purchased or existing logging software will need to be upgraded (at a cost) to interface with the LBOTW system. There will need to spend $$$ spent and numerous hoops jumped through just to get only your recent qso's accredited. And of course don't forget you'll need to pay ARRL dues too....

None of this nonsense is required with eQSL.....they really have a better way and it shows already with the upsurge of acceptance (or call it usability) by various Ham Radio awards organizations. I don't chase awards anymore except for my own satisfaction and for ego-motivated "bragging rights" but I have to say I really get a kick out of the easy and automated way eQSL allows me to provide confirmations for any station I qso with...and now they are DXCC accepted too.....where is the down-side? I don't see it......

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

4362. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:19:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2CB7.2FBFF303@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33873

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
> > IC-756, Cecil?
>
> OK, Cecil, start the dance....around the question. He'll do everything but answer it.

I just answered the question, Dick, but I still don't understand the
purpose of the question. I did lots of DSP experimenting without
changing the design of my IC-706. MY DSP eval board is not fast
enough to do IF DSP. It only performs well at audio frequencies.
That certainly doesn't keep me from experimenting with it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4363. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:23:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2DA6.BF4F9E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33874

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Sure - but will you actually reprogram the '756?
>
> Has Icom given him access to the information he would need to even think about
> it? If Icom were open source, do you think it likely that Cecil would use
> some of what he had learned using the eval board to work on the programming of
> the '756?
>
> Let me ask Cecil the question. Cec? Do you think you would?

All my DSP experimenting has been done at audio frequencies. I'm sure that a development system for '756 IF processing would be more than I choose to tackle right now. I will continue experimenting at audio frequencies, however.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4364. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:27:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B2E87.76B5B96C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33875

N2EY wrote:
> Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?
>
> Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
> impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
> about the bush?

Who's beating around the bush? The answer is obviously, "No", and your
question was rhetorical. All my experimentation has been done at audio
frequencies and I will continue to do so with audio from the '756.
One doesn't even need to experiment with DSP in real time. I did a lot
of experimentation using compiled BASIC in batch mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4365. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:32:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4fb7a$b4t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33876

"JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:cce22972.0202131353.35992ac6@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c6470ac_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > "JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > news:cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com...
> > > Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> > > person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> > > come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> > > the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> > > control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> > > may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> > > looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> > > find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the proper
> > > clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> > > Respectfully, JJ
> >
> > JJ,
> >
> > The restrictions against initiating a call or identifying the station
> > do not appear in Part 97.
> >
> > Thus, it would seem that a "guest" operating under the continuous
> > supervision of a properly licensed control operator can do whatever
> > the control operator is allowed to do, as long as the control operator
> > permits it and it is otherwise within the rules.
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse
>
> Carl, it would seem that most would agree with you. (also TNX to Phil
> Kane for his input on this question) It has been determined by our
> club, however, that any unlicesed person initiating a call or ID'ing
> with another's call sign will be reported to the FCC, regardless if a
> control operator is present or not. While this seems contrary to the
> interpretation as understood by most hams who responded, it is a
> decision we will have to live with locally.

Does your "report any..." cover people operating
stations other than your club station?" Your club is free to
set any rules for its own operation as you see fit.

Have you ever actually reported one of your own...and if
yes, what was the FCC response?

> There have already been
> confrontations to people who were not aware of our interpretation.

Again, your option regarding your own club station...but that's
were your interpretation and control ends.

> Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a
> common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of
> much trouble in the future.

How so? Except perhaps on an internal club basis.

> Even our own VE's are divided on this, as
> well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties.

Why would VE's in adjacent counties care about your
internal club rules?

> I thank you all who responded. Respectfully, JJ

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4366. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:34:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B304C.A6806054@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33877

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to determine that a
> > > band is dead?
> > >
> > MUF, of course. No station required.
>
> Yup, and since virtually allo hams lack the gear needed to make MUF tests, they
> almost universaly check for band conditions by
> tuning around and listening for band activity. I guess when you find no activity you,
> like most hams, consider the band "Dead" without
> actually confirming it through MUF tests. And often you'd be wrong, the band isn'te
> dead at all, but marginally usable but unused because most hams checking it assume
> it's dead!

I have observed a tech wasting his life listening for a signal on 6m at a time
when the MUF was 10MHz. If you want to do that, Dick, be my guest.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4367. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:37:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33880

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020213212824.26903.00000073@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've
certainly
> >> made it as total wankers!
> >>
> >> And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole newsgroup
who
> >opened the message, Larry...
> >
> >No surprise there.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in my
> reply.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious that
Kim read your response without opening the original message.

4368. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:42:44 UTC
From: Ronald Sims <simsnospam@nospamronaldsims.net>
Message-ID: <a4fbht$q6f$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 33878

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >

> The burn-out started when top management (read: Hundt and his
> bag carriers, reqardless of whether they were "just carring out
> orders" or not) started tinkering with a mechanism that they
> did not have either the committment or the knowledge to keep
> running smoothly and when they tried to put it back together
> there were several gears and springs left over.

Who were Hundt's "bag carriers" at that time? Were they
Hundt's own people (staff) that he brought to the agency with
him? From what I heard, many senior and junior FOB staff at the
Washington HQ turned on, make that back-stabbed, their own
friends in the field, just to save their own skins from Hundt's
chopping block. I also heard the union was dealt with early on
by promising top union officers that their jobs would be protected,
in return for them not calling an impasse or throwing down any
other legal obstacles in the way of the Hundt steam rollers.
What a hell of a way to conduct the business of government, but
it is also the norm for life in the beltway.

Ronald

4369. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 03:45:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020213224523.17971.00001342@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 33879

In article <nTEa8.3085$%T7.581783722@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>73,
>Brian/N0iMD
>
>ps: Hello gang.
>Len, why? Stay well.

Hay Brian! Goodaseeya! Hope you are done with all the moving and the family is in good health and spirits. How do you like the old Chat Room? :-) :-) :-)

You ask why? I answer "Why not?" :-)

Hang in there...:-)

4370. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 04:34:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C824B.5F129790@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33881

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering with ham radio?
> > >
> > > How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
> > > is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
> >
> > Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed
> > electrical engineer.
>
> Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> of the transistors?

Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he still insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions. He'd like us all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly optimised circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always. Even with his own profession.

4371. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 04:35:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C829B.AB5DB79B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33882

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >EE's designed almost every ham radio.
> >
> > MEs designed every car I drive, too, Cecil. Does that make driving a
> > mechanical hobby?
>
> It means that without mechanical engineers, you might be walking.

Henry Ford was not a mechanical engineer. The Wright brothers were not
aeronautical engineers.

4372. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 04:45:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C84DE.E8BF2A7D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33883

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to determine that a
> > > > band is dead?
> > > >
> > > MUF, of course. No station required.
> >
> > Yup, and since virtually allo hams lack the gear needed to make MUF tests, they
> > almost universaly check for band conditions by
> > tuning around and listening for band activity. I guess when you find no activity you,
> > like most hams, consider the band "Dead" without
> > actually confirming it through MUF tests. And often you'd be wrong, the band isn'te
> > dead at all, but marginally usable but unused because most hams checking it assume
> > it's dead!
>
> I have observed a tech wasting his life listening for a signal on 6m

Well that may help explain Carl Stevenson and Bill Sohl....

> at a time
> when the MUF was 10MHz.

And just how did YOU know? Do you have radiosounding equipment set up to test the ionosphere?

> If you want to do that, Dick, be my guest.

Sure, Cecil, and in the process I'll be finding weak rare ones on 20 meter CW while you 'guess' the band is dead, since you relied on guessing the MUF based on the lack of the usual signal activity..

4373. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 05:02:25 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <BxHa8.5649$Nf3.309875@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33884

"Charles Johnston" <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in news:3c6b2cb2$1@news.bnb-lp.com:

> There will need to spend $$$ spent and numerous hoops jumped through
> just to get only your recent qso's accredited. And of course don't
> forget you'll need to pay ARRL dues too....
>
> None of this nonsense is required with eQSL.....they really have a
> better way and it shows already with the upsurge of acceptance (or call
> it usability) by various Ham Radio awards organizations. I don't chase
> awards anymore except for my own satisfaction and for ego-motivated
> "bragging rights" but I have to say I really get a kick out of the easy
> and automated way eQSL allows me to provide confirmations for any
> station I qso with...and now they are DXCC accepted too.....where is the
> down-side? I don't see it......

Considering that you took the cost for the ARRL's Logbook of the World into account, I'm somewhat surprised that you wouldn't consider shelling out $100 for an all-eQSL DXCC a downside.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4374. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 05:42:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B4E56.E13605FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33885

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > at a time when the MUF was 10MHz.
>
> And just how did YOU know? Do you have radiosounding equipment set up to test the
> ionosphere?

I reference the published charts.

> > If you want to do that, Dick, be my guest.
>
> Sure, Cecil, and in the process I'll be finding weak rare ones on 20 meter CW while you
> 'guess' the band is dead, since you relied on guessing the MUF based on the lack of the
> usual signal activity..

Knock yourself out, Dick. I've never understood what the attraction for weak rare
ones really is. I would much prefer 5x9 armchair copy with a friend on the other end.
But different strokes for different folks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4375. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 05:49:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6B4FE9.C0AA781E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33886

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> > you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> > Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> > of the transistors?
>
> Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he still
> insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions. He'd like us
> all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly optimised
> circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always. Even with his
> own profession.

That's exactly what I suspected, Dick. You didn't design anything. You copied someone else's design and odds are the design you copied was done by an engineer. Unfortunately, copying a design is not the same as designing. Building a kit is not designing. Sorry, you flunked the design test. I doubt that you have ever drawn a load line on a set of characteristic curves.

If you copied someone else's poem, would you then tell the world you are a poet? Get real!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4376. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214011008.19482.00000001@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33887

In article <20020213183907.18897.00000976@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Efficiency was a concern of hams because the regulations of the time limited
>>hams to 1 kW input power. A 1 kW AM rig using low level modulation could
>only
>>produce about 300-350 watts carrier, while a high level modulated 1 kW rig
>>could' produce 700-750 watts carrier. Yes, it's only 3-4 dB, but it mattered
>to the
>>hams of that time.
>
>Matters today, too. Even QRPers sometimes want to squeeze out the extra watt.
>:-)
>
>But AB amps typically hit about 60% efficiency, if memory serves, while the
>Class C amps typicallly hit around 75%. While 3-4 dB would matter, I am not
>sure that 0.7 dB is worth all that fuss.

The problem of amplifying AM voice is different, Ed. AB amplifiers are indeed capable of 60% efficiency at maximum signal, but their efficiency is lower as the signal level drops. In other words, you only get that 60% efficiency on modulation peaks. With no modulation (pure carrier) the efficiency is only about
30-35% for a conventional linear amplifier. This is the same efficiency as the various forms of grid/screen/suppressor/cathode/clamp tube modulation.

Under the old rules hams measured power input under unmodulated-carrier conditions. So at 1 kW plate input with no modulation, the 1 kW linear amplifier
or grid modulated stage only puts out 300-350 watts carrier. A 1 kW plate-modulated Class C amplifier would put out 700-750 watts carrier under no-modulation conditions. 3-4 dB advantage to the high-level modulated Class C amplifier.

Of course this is a side-effect of the way the old rules were written. The old 1 kW
rule conveniently ignored the fact that the modulator was pumping 500 additional
watts (in the form of audio) into the final under full-modulation conditions. The
linear amplifier or grid-modulated amplifier got no such consideration. The old rules had the effect of promoting the use of plate modulation and Class C finals.

>One should have been able to generate the AM at the milliwatt level, then
>follow it by Class AB amps right up to the final, which would be able to run
>at
>about 60% efficiency.

Nope. Not on AM voice with conventional linear amplifier designs. You'll get
60%
efficiency only on modulation peaks. 30-35% at carrier level. Of course you can
get more if you don't care about linearity.

>Admittedly, the overall efficiency of the system would
>not be all that great, but in terms of RF out, the final would have been the
>limiting 1 KW DC input factor.

Exactly. At 1 kW DC input the linear amplifier user can get only 300-350 watts
of carrier and 1200-1500 watts of PEP. The Class C plate modulated user
can get 700-750 watts of carrier and 2800-3000 watts of PEP!

Of course the "new" rules changed all that, and output PEP is all that matters
to the FCC now.

The cost of operation is only one factor, and a very minor one at that unless
one
operates a lot. First cost is another story!

None of this is new stuff - I learned it all back in my Novice days, before I
even
got into high school.

>Just not as elegant as a plate-modulated DSP AM rig. :-)

Some hams today are using pulse-width-modulated AM rigs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4377. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:14:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214011408.18406.00001419@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 33888

In article <KDFa8.5889$qt6.511708@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020213211846.24789.00000004@mb-mm.aol.com...
>> In article <Q3ta8.4496$qt6.372815@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Ronnie
>> D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

>I haven't seen any examples of gepgraphic bigorty other than from you. :(

Oh, oh, look out everybody, New Gun in town looking for action!
:-)

>So how do you prepare for emergenies? Seems you leave that to others to
>prepare and do FOR you. Maybe I'm wrong
>but the impression is you are a taker as opposed to a giver.

"Prepare for emergenies?" :-)

Ooops, Ronnie Rambo, you got your trigger finger caught in the
holster again...

>If you don;t know of any details, how can you make a logical conclusion
>then? Seems someone so
>wrapped up in acquiring facts would have found some and then made logical
>statement here. Looks more like going off without any facts.

Damn, all that gunfire, bullets expended and not a single one
hit anything! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>You must read different news articles than most. You seem to come up with
>National Enquirer stories that most
>main straem news misses.

Must be interesting that "main straem news." :-)

Now, take a deep breath, hold it, get a sight picture, steady
yourself and squeeeeze that trigger without disturbing the
sight picture. No, no, no...you did it wrong again!! How can
anyone be so kill-eager and shoot so badly? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Class act NOT!!!!!!!!! I have only been here a week or so and have yet to
>see you praise anything other than yourself.

Poor baby. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Was this newsgroup created Just For
You?!? Nooooooo.

Several years ago this newsgroup was created (by others) to take
the "code issue" off of rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup. The
participants in what has become a Chat Room for the established
denizens claiming turf have to Choose Sides. If you are a pro-code-
test-advocate or PCTA you need several things such as an old
Germanic chant of "CW uber alles," a 1x2 call (nearly always a
Vanity one despite denials), a love for Olde Tyme Raddio, and have
the Amateur's Code tatooed on your mighty right bicep (ultra strong
from years of morsemanship and paddle flipping). If you are a No-
code-test-advocate or NCTA you must endure countless exchanges
of specious insults against yourself, your family, and your dog or
cat for ever thinking such hideous, heretical thoughts of actually
removing the code test! Horrors to St. Hiram!

PCTAs (in here) feel no regrets, no shame, about libeling any NCTA
up to and including charges of bad underarm odor!

PCTAs are Mighty Men Among Men, upholders of male domination,
misogyny, and malapropism. They do not need sex (horrors!) of any
kind since the very thought of 40 WPM rag-chews sends them on an
orgasmic Trip into outer space...or another dimension, whichever is
handy. Both usually are.

>Better stay on the west caost with the other wack-jobs...ooppsss geographic
>bigotry. I aplopgize to all the other
>west coast wack jobs for equating them to this poster from their area.
>Soeey

Yes, yes, now don't forget to police the brass. You've made a mess
in here already and haven't hit a thing...

>Sure you have. I'd be happy to review anything you might offer as factual
>for any particiupation you actually had
>in any emetgenices that you claim. Ihaven't seen anything other than the,
>how did you put it, prosteliziing, of a few weak minded fools??

Ummm...care to try that again..."particiupation"..."emetgenices"...
"prosteliziing"...? :-)

>I have and I see that you are not the nearly as sour as some of the lemons
>that have fallen off the tree..you are the king of sour.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Such phrasing, such prose! :-)

>May many befall you so that you can actively participate in them. I think
>we're done here. You bring nothing but
>bitterness to the table.
>
>Still no regards to you.

Poor baby...all that ammunition expended and still nothing hit...tsk.

Try some practice shooting on a stack of dictionaries...or, if you are
up to, try to figure out what the SUBJECTS of message threads are
instead of twirling your three-guns and getting them caught in the

shirt sequins again.

4378. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:15:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214011536.06214.00000123@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33889

>Subject: Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/13/2002 8:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <KDFa8.5889$qt6.511708@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

Lennie the Licenseless attempts to wom his way out of another foot-in-mouth NG faux pas:

>> Ronnie D., I spent the first 19 years of my life in northern Illinois...(SNIP)

Ronnie, welcome to RRAP.

His Licenselessness, Sir Bigot of West Coast, otherwise known and "Leonard H. Anderson", is one of the most hateful, mistruthful and antagonizing bastards to ever handle a soldering gun.

Lennie believes that since he was a "profesional" radio technician at one time, he now has pomp and ceremony over all that is "Amateur".

Lennie does not have an Amatuer Radio license (there IS a licensee by that name, but it is not him...), yet he feels obligated to harass those of us that do.

Lennie is a liar. He has been caught with his britches down so many times that that rag-headed shock-jock in NYC look like a rank (pardon the pun) amateur.

Although he appraently has some working knowledge of electronics, he has NO apparent PRACTICAL knowledge of Amatuer Radio, although he once authored some items for a now-defunt magazine in the 80's.

By the way, I say "apparent working knowledge" of electronics because I am not at all sure his postings here are not simply others work for which he has taken in order to "impress" the denizens of this forum. He loves to cite countless websites as proof of his "arguments", however he has never demonstrated anything that vaguely approaches independent thought.

I also say "apparently" since he has steadfastly refused to take the Amateur exams. This no doubt due to the likelyhood of failure, and therefore public evidence of his incompetence at even rudimentary technology.

That he would make so arrogant a statement as the one he did vis-a-vis NYC and 9/11 is eveidence of his hatred and his callousness...And not surprisingly... He once spent several weeks in this forum villifying the many "homefront" volunteers of WW2 such as the Civil Defense, Civil AIr Patrol, and others.

On a side note, I note that "The History Channel" recently did a 20 minute piece on the Civil Air Patrol's war-time and post-war service, and not once did they mention how Lennie the Loser Anderson....Now HOW could they have MISSED that!?

>I haven't seen any examples of gepgraphic bigorty other than from you.

Chances are you won't. Lennie the Liar keeps repeating the Big Lie about ARRL secret agendas, "Lodge Hall" stories of how Extra Class licensees conspire to hold back other licensee's, and spends hundreds of hours making pages-long posts railing against ANYONE who shows the slightest temerity for daring to defy his overwhelming intellect (yeah...BIG intellect there.)

>> What I DO have a problem with is the dead-brained imagination that
>> some amateurs do NOT need emergency training and preparedness
>> but can immediately jump into "action" and "save everyone" with
>> their miraculously-surviving-all-emergencies ham gear. That's just
>> total bullshit thinking, bragging, fantasy pipe-dreaming.
>
>So how do you prepare for emergenies? Seems you leave that to others to
>prepare and do FOR you. Maybe I'm wrong
>but the impression is you are a taker as opposed to a giver.

He is, Ron...Very much so. Lennie has owned up to ONCE participating in a disaster as a volunteer...having NOTHING to do with radios, by the way. He currently has NO membership in ANY agency in any capacity relative to disaster planning.

And Lennie's rant above about "jumping in to the rescue" is so assinine as to be laughable.

Do you see why this guy is such a Putz?

>If you don;t know of any details, how can you make a logical conclusion
>then? Seems someone so
>wrapped up in acquiring facts would have found some and then made logical
>statement here. Looks more like going off without any facts.

Now you are getting the picture. Lennie's "facts" are third party stories and clippings from the paper. He has NO private nor professional standing in ANY emergency preparedness organization ANYWHERE.

>They just want feel-good phrasing of how "heroic" they
>> are and how they "can save the day" when "all the cell phones fail."
>
>You must read different news articles than most. You seem to come up with
>National Enquirer stories that most
>main straem news misses.

Except the FACT is that even before September 11th, the papers have been ripe with just such stories. Last year there were rampant floods in NJ and GUESS who was called upon to help several isolated and stranded communities...?!?!

(hint hint...it was NOT Lennie the Creep)

>Class act NOT!!!!!!!!! I have only been here a week or so and have yet to
>see you praise anything other than yourself.

Lennie's getting closer to that stroke that he know's is coming, Ronnie.
At least he took about a month to get me riled up. He's getting shorted fused
as the months roll on. Even those here who are in favor of "no code" policies
distance themselves from him.

He sent me several private e mails about his "position" on no code
matters, and when I privately (and subsequently publicly) that I didn't agree,
he started in on calling me a "jack booted thug", a "nazi", "elitest", etc.

>May many befall you so that you can actively participate in them. I think
>we're done here. You bring nothing but
>bitterness to the table.

YOU NAILED IT ON THE HEAD!!

Lennie made the error of trying to one-up me over a duty station I'd once
been at where Lennie had allegedly worked under contract. I called on some
friends who DO work there and a couple remembered him as a lack-luster,
ill-fitting pogue.

Furthermore, in the height of some of the most heated exchanges between
His Gutlessness and I, one fellow who lives in the same neighborhood as Lennie
dropped the dime on him to myself and several others via private e mail. He's
as big a loser in the eyes of his neighbors as he is here.

So....try to look past him. He lies, he antagonizes, and he is due for a
stroke, so let's let him be on his way.

73

Steve, K4YZ
Winchester, TN

4379. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:23:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214012332.06214.00000124@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 33890

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/13/2002 5:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020213184109.18897.00000977@mb-mf.aol.com>

>The cards that come through the buro do not have postmarks.

Every card that I have has SOME sort of original signature, mark, or evidence of handling by some party that can be VERIFIED!. We can whittle this stick real thin, Ed, but the point is that while "eQSLs" may be "convienient", they are forgeable and not reliable.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Steve, K4YZ

4380. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:29:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C9D31.E1188DFB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33891

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > at a time when the MUF was 10MHz.
> >
> > And just how did YOU know? Do you have radiosounding equipment set up to test the
> > ionosphere?
>
> I reference the published charts.
>

The propagation prediction charts, as opposed to actually listening in real time to see what's on? WOW!

> > > If you want to do that, Dick, be my guest.
> >
> > Sure, Cecil, and in the process I'll be finding weak rare ones on 20 meter CW while you
> > 'guess' the band is dead, since you relied on guessing the MUF based on the lack of the
> > usual signal activity..
>
> Knock yourself out, Dick. I've never understood what the attraction for weak rare
> ones really is. I would much prefer 5x9 armchair copy with a friend on the other end.
> But different strokes for different folks.

My,my. And you present yourself as one who is very interested in improving weak signal efficiency in ham radio. Vy interesting, OM

4381. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 06:34:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C9E51.1B73BD86@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33892

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> > > you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> > > Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> > > of the transistors?
> >
> > Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he still
> > insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions. He'd like us
> > all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly optimised
> > circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always. Even with his
> > own profession.
>
> That's exactly what I suspected, Dick. You didn't design anything. You copied
> someone else's design and odds are the design you copied was done by an engineer.
> Unfortunately, copying a design is not the same as designing. Building a kit is
> not designing. Sorry, you flunked the design test. I doubt that you have ever
> drawn a load line on a set of characteristic curves.
>
> If you copied someone else's poem, would you then tell the world you are a
> poet? Get real!

As I said, if you refuse to acknowledge that professional engineers
routinely refer to standard circuit designs and design parameters, as
opposed to doing all their design work from first principles, you're
just blowing troll-smoke. But that is exactly what we long ago learned to expect from
you.

4382. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 08:51:27 UTC
From: Adam MAURER <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <bQKa8.1863$wG3.14929@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>
Source record: 33893
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Vacation?

Get real Walt, take the up and coming Mellish Reef DXpedition (which I am involved in) for instance.

Do you honestly think a rough 3 day sail each way (real puke material) then 10 days of flat out operating to try and work as many "deserving" as possible under extremely harsh conditions, battling tick infestation and sleep depravation because of the incredible bird noise is a vacation???

...while you operate in the comfort of your shack.

--
Adam, VK4CP

Website: http://www.qsl.net/vk4cp/

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message news:9m6l6u814dkml7n7mo5brfi37lsmsei82n@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 10 Feb 2002 11:55:33 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
> <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> >Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> >DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> >request for a good ol QSL card.
>
> Well, I'm glad to see, at long last, an open admission that it's a way
> of funding a free vacation for "the deserving"!
>
> ;-)
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4383. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 10:53:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214055340.29946.00000024@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33894

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a
>>>degreed electrical engineer.

>> Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
>> you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
>> Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
>> of the transistors?

> Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he
>still insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions.
>He'd like us all to believe they don't rely on standard references
>and uniformly optimised circuits for their equipment design.

Okay, leaving out the analysis part of Cecil's question, I am curious -- did
you design your own rigs or did you copy the designs of others?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4384. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 10:57:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214055706.29946.00000025@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 33895

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Since you seem to know what is best for the ARS, why don't you get
>a job at the FCC instead of driving a bus?

The FCC wouldn't hire someone to give them an opportunity to do what is best
for any individual service.

Besides, from what I have seen Phil say here, the FCC was not always a fun
place to work.

And the real besides, is can you imagine Larry in a job that requires politics?
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4385. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 11:03:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214060317.08497.00000100@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 33896

In article <3C69D9F0.508F278E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dang, Larry, don't you ever crack open a dictionary? From Webster's:
>"wench - 1 a: a young woman: GIRL" Larry, that's the the ***FIRST***
>definition!

Cecil:

Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
little WENCH you have there!"

Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
to do so!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4386. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 11:18:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214061851.08497.00000101@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 33897

In article <a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
>> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in my
>> reply.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious that
>Kim read your response without opening the original message.

Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's subject
line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
accused *me* of being the only one who opened it? The only thing
my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing to
bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4387. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 11:18:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214061852.08497.00000102@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 33898

In article <3C6B29D9.86E046D2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Don't look now, Cecil, but what the FCC thinks of code testing
>> doesn't necessarily have anything to do with what would be best
>> for the ARS.
>
>Since you seem to know what is best for the ARS, why don't you get
>a job at the FCC instead of driving a bus?

Cecil:

I like my job. It is both satisfying and relatively low-stress. I don't
think working at the FCC would be either. Moreover, to be involved
in policy matters, I'd have to live in a crime-infested stinkhole known
as Washington, DC, or some overpriced, overtaxed, Communist-
controlled suburb in God-forsaken Maryland. No thanks!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4388. Re: Another landmark eQSL acceptance!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 11:51:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a4g9qfsqp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 33754
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Charles Johnston" <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote in message
news:3c6afb7a$1@news.bnb-lp.com...
> Chalk-up another acceptance for eQSL's......
>
> ------------
> Confirmation was received today from the president-elect of the
> 3905 Century Club that their awards program will accept hard copies
> of eQSL's as confirmation. The hard copy can be printed by the
> recipient on his home computer if desired, or you can use eQSL's service
> to have them printed and mailed to you.
>
> Either is OK for Century Club awards.
> ----------
> info retrieved from eQSL Discussion email list as posted there by
> David, KC0JB
>
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston
> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com

Thanks for that info.

4389. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:04:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214070401.02067.00001384@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33900

In article <3C6C6341.788E7A82@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020212224227.19016.00000818@mb-mk.aol.com>...
>> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>
>> Interesting how my original question is being dodged. Here it is again:
>>
>> Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?
>>
>> Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
>> impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
>> about the bush?
>
> I've been wondering why Ed insists on protecting Cec and Carl myself.

Let's ask him.

Ed, why do you insist on protecting Cecil and Carl?

>He
>never gave a code
>advocate that sort of support.
>
I think you meant "code TEST advocate".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4390. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:04:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214070402.02067.00001385@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33752

In article <3C6B2E87.76B5B96C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Will Cecil reprogram his new '756?
>>
>> Why is that so hard to answer? If there are reasons that reprogramming is
>> impossible or impractical, just say so. Why all the excuses and beating
>> about the bush?
>
>Who's beating around the bush?

You were, Cecil, until you answered "I don't plan to". Then it was clear
to me. tnx.

> The answer is obviously, "No", and your
>question was rhetorical.

Not obvious to me at all, and it wasn't rhetorical. I'm used to ham rigs where
the
firmware can be easily swapped out. With your experience in digital design, DSP
and your long experience buying ICOM products it appeared to me that you
might develop new software for the '756. Thus the question.

>All my experimentation has been done at audio
>frequencies and I will continue to do so with audio from the '756.

Or any other rig that suits your fancy.

>One doesn't even need to experiment with DSP in real time. I did a lot
>of experimentation using compiled BASIC in batch mode.

Going that route, one doesn't even need an eval board.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4391. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:04:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214070402.02067.00001386@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33753

In article <3C6B2CB7.2FBFF303@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
>> > IC-756, Cecil?
>>
>> OK, Cecil, start the dance....around the question. He'll do everything but
>answer it.
>
>I just answered the question, Dick, but I still don't understand the
>purpose of the question.

You mentioned all the DSP implemented in the '756, and your eval board, as
if the latter would influence the former. But that's not the case at all.

>I did lots of DSP experimenting without
>changing the design of my IC-706. MY DSP eval board is not fast
>enough to do IF DSP.

Nor does it have anyhting like the dynamic range needed.

>It only performs well at audio frequencies.
>That certainly doesn't keep me from experimenting with it.

Of course not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4392. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:04:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214070403.02067.00001387@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33751

In article <3C6B2C04.CC646858@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Will you make *any* firmware or software changes to your new
>> IC-756, Cecil?
>
>I don't plan to, Jim.

That's all I wanted to know.

>But I do plan to take the audio output from my IC-756
>and input it into my DSP eval board for some experimenting.

COOL!

>Virtually anyone
>can do the same thing.

They can do it with ANY rig, too. Doesn't have to be DSP equipped or
anything like that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4393. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:04:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214070403.02067.00001388@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 33899

In article <3C6B2ABA.92B76307@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a
>degreed
>> electrical engineer.
>
>Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
>you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
>Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
>of the transistors?
>--
I did, when such things were necessary to the rig's design.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4394. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:37:47 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <9dbn6u4160msj671ptks1ggc5667ms72q4@4ax.com>
Source record: 33755
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 18:51:27 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
<vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:

>Vacation?
>
>Get real Walt, take the up and coming Mellish Reef DXpedition (which I am
>involved in) for instance.
>
>Do you honestly think a rough 3 day sail each way (real puke material) then
>10 days of flat out operating to try and work as many "deserving" as
>possible under extremely harsh conditions, battling tick infestation and
>sleep depravation because of the incredible bird noise is a vacation???

ROTFLMAO!!!!

It's an adventure holiday.

73 de G3NYY

P.S. "depravation"? That too? Tee hee!"

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4395. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:43:20 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <IhOa8.7877$P21.722640@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33756

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020214011408.18406.00001419@mb-ma.aol.com...
> In article <KDFa8.5889$qt6.511708@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Ronnie
> D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020213211846.24789.00000004@mb-mm.aol.com...
> >> In article <Q3ta8.4496$qt6.372815@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> >"Ronnie
> >> D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
> >I haven't seen any examples of gepgraphic bigorty other than from you.
:(
>
> Oh, oh, look out everybody, New Gun in town looking for action!
> :-)

Sorry, not into guns there old timer ;-)

>
>
> >So how do you prepare for emergenies? Seems you leave that to others to
> >prepare and do FOR you. Maybe I'm wrong
> >but the impression is you are a taker as opposed to a giver.
>
> "Prepare for emergenies?" :-)

Well, sometimes, it seems that the spell checker on Outlook Express doesn't
want to operate. Thanks for pointing it
out. I am sure an anal rententive like you seem to be will find all the
errors that weren't
corrected.

>
> Ooops, Ronnie Rambo, you got your trigger finger caught in the
> holster again...
>

Names and spelling corrections...the sure sign of a word warrior that has
lost the battle. Appreciate the
compliment Len.

>
> >If you don;t know of any details, how can you make a logical conclusion

> >then? Seems someone so
> >wrapped up in acquiring facts would have found some and then made logical
> >statement here. Looks more like going off without any facts.
>
> Damn, all that gunfire, bullets expended and not a single one
> hit anything! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Maybe just a target not worth hitting anymore? tsk tsk tsk

>
>
>
> >You must read different news articles than most. You seem to come up
with
> >National Enquirer stories that most
> >main straem news misses.
>
> Must be interesting that "main straem news." :-)

thanks for proving my point on the anal retentive stuff.

>
> Now, take a deep breath, hold it, get a sight picture, steady
> yourself and squeeeeze that trigger without disturbing the
> sight picture. No, no, no...you did it wrong again!! How can
> anyone be so kill-eager and shoot so badly? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You a member of the NRA or what? You have a strange fixation with guns.
Oh, that's right, you're from LA,
land of the DriveBy shootings. Sorry, forgot my audience. Will adjust the
answers more in tune
with your thought processes.

>
>
>
> >Class act NOT!!!!!!!!! I have only been here a week or so and have yet
to
> >see you praise anything other than yourself.
>
> Poor baby. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Was this newsgroup created Just For
> You?!? Nooooooo.

more personal attacks. You are just a wonder at the debate skills.

>
> Several years ago this newsgroup was created (by others) to take
> the "code issue" off of rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.

SNIP FOR REASONS OF INSANITY...

whatever possed you to type that?? I don't remember seeing anything about
CW or not in this posts.

BTW, if you are so down on amateur radio, why did you bother getting a
license? Why not return it to
Gettysburg with the words..CANCEL written across it?

> >Better stay on the west caost with the other wack-jobs...ooppsss
geographic
> >bigotry. I aplopgize to all the other
> >west coast wack jobs for equating them to this poster from their area.
> >Soeey
>
> Yes, yes, now don't forget to police the brass. You've made a mess
> in here already and haven't hit a thing...

Can't hit what isn't there Len. You're knid of like a gopher that pops up
its little head, squeals a couple of times and then runs back
underground to hide from its own shadow. Hard to hit.

>
>
>
> >Sure you have. I'd be happy to review anything you might offer as
factual
> >for any particiupation you actually had
> >in any emetgenices that you claim. Ihaven't seen anything other than the,
> >how did you put it, prosteliziing, of a few weak minded fools??
>
> Ummm...care to try that again..."particiupation"..."emetgenices"...
> "prosteliziing"...? :-)
>

ANAL RETENTIVE I can spell that. You seem to be the living example.

>
>
> >I have and I see that you are not the nearly as sour as some of the
lemons
> >that have fallen off the tree..you are the king of sour.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Such phrasing, such prose! :-)

When you need to make a slow person understand, you type things they can
read. Glad it worked out.
I also typed very V E R Y slooowly, because I nedd you were not a good
reader either ;-O

>
>
> >May many befall you so that you can actively participate in them. I
think
> >we're done here. You bring nothing but
> >bitterness to the table.
> >
> >Still no regards to you.

>
> Poor baby...all that ammunition expended and still nothing hit...tsk.
>
> Try some practice shooting on a stack of dictionaries...or, if you are
> up to, try to figure out what the SUBJECTS of message threads are
> instead of twirling your three-guns and getting them caught in the
> shirt sequins again.

Better twirling my 6 guns than sitting in front of a computer screen,
looking at pictures and shooting blanks.

No cheers for you.

4396. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 12:55:11 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <PsOa8.7886$P21.724783@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33757

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020214011536.06214.00000123@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME
> >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> >Date: 2/13/2002 8:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <KDFa8.5889$qt6.511708@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> Lennie the Licenseless attempts to wom his way out of another
foot-in-mouth NG
> faux pas:
>
> >> Ronnie D., I spent the first 19 years of my life in northern
> Illinois...(SNIP)
>
> Ronnie, welcome to RRAP.

Not what I expected. Does this Len person even realize what an ass he makes
of himself when he posts what he does?

>
> His Licenselessness, Sir Bigot of West Coast, otherwise known and
"Leonard
> H. Anderson", is one of the most hateful, mistruthful and antagonizing
bastards
> to ever handle a soldering gun.

Not to mention an Anal Retentive personality if ever there was one.

>
> Lennie believes that since he was a "profesional" radio technician at
one
> time, he now has pomp and ceremony over all that is "Amateur".
>
> Lennie does not have an Amatuer Radio license (there IS a licensee by
that
> name, but it is not him...), yet he feels obligated to harass those of us
that
> do.

????? Are you kidding me? He 's here in an amateur related NG pontificating
to everyone and he isn't even licensed?

Wow, that's amazing. I've seen TROLLS in my time, but never an anal
retentive troll.

>
> Lennie is a liar. He has been caught with his britches down so many
times
> that that rag-headed shock-jock in NYC look like a rank (pardon the pun)
> amateur.

Howard got so unfunny after he went to mornings. I imagine that this Len
person and Stern are birds of a feather..so into themselves it's pathetic

>
> Although he apparently has some working knowledge of electronics, he
has
> NO apparent PRACTICAL knowledge of Amatuer Radio, although he once
authored
> some items for a now-defunt magazine in the 80's.
>
> By the way, I say "apparent working knowledge" of electronics because
I am
> not at all sure his postings here are not simply others work for which he
has
> taken in order to "impress" the denizens of this forum. He loves to cite
> countless websites as proof of his "arguments", however he has never
> demonstrated anything that vaguely approaches independent thought.

Usually the sign someone has little actually substance to add to discursion
if he needs to constantly refer to others work ;-)

>
> I also say "apparently" since he has steadfastly refused to take the
> Amateur exams. This no doubt due to the likelihood of failure, and
therefore
> public evidence of his incompetence at even rudimentary technology.
>
> That he would make so arrogant a statement as the one he did
vis-a-vis NYC
> and 9/11 is eveidence of his hatred and his callousness...And not
> surprisingly... He once spent several weeks in this forum villifying the
many
> "homefront" volunteers of WW2 such as the Civil Defense, Civil AIr Patrol,
and
> others.

Be careful, you spelled evidence wrong. I wouldn't want Len to get anal on
you.

I've heard lots worse from people about 911. My point was that to compare
areas where people know the
risks involved with something like this was despicable. Obviously Len
needs to move around allot judging from his posts.

I guess people he lives near get tired of having a pompous ass living next
door and force him to move. I pity his
family if he even has one.

>
> On a side note, I note that "The History Channel" recently did a 20
minute
> piece on the Civil Air Patrol's war-time and post-war service, and not
once did
> they mention how Lennie the Loser Anderson....Now HOW could they have
MISSED
> that!?
>
> >I haven't seen any examples of gepgraphic bigorty other than from you.
>
> Chances are you won't. Lennie the Liar keeps repeating the Big Lie
about
> ARRL secret agendas, "Lodge Hall" stories of how Extra Class licensees
conspire
> to hold back other licensee's, and spends hundreds of hours making
pages-long
> posts railing against ANYONE who shows the slightest temerity for daring
to
> defy his overwhelming intellect (yeah...BIG intellect there.)

I remember a character in the cartoon Felix the Cat... Len reminds me of the
Professor.

>
> >> What I DO have a problem with is the dead-brained imagination that
> >> some amateurs do NOT need emergency training and preparedness
> >> but can immediately jump into "action" and "save everyone" with
> >> their miraculously-surviving-all-emergencies ham gear. That's just
> >> total bullshit thinking, bragging, fantasy pipe-dreaming.
> >
> >So how do you prepare for emergenies? Seems you leave that to others to
> >prepare and do FOR you. Maybe I'm wrong
> >but the impression is you are a taker as opposed to a giver.
>
> He is, Ron...Very much so. Lennie has owned up to ONCE participating
in a
> disaster as a volunteer...having NOTHING to do with radios, by the way.
He
> currently has NO membership in ANY agency in any capacity relative to
disaster
> planning.
>
> And Lennie's rant above about "jumping in to the rescue" is so
assinine as
> to be laughable.
>
> Do you see why this guy is such a Putz?

A brooklynese term? Careful, you'll be guilty of geographic bigotry.

>
> >If you don;t know of any details, how can you make a logical conclusion
> >then? Seems someone so
> >wrapped up in acquiring facts would have found some and then made logical
> >statement here. Looks more like going off without any facts.
>
> Now you are getting the picture. Lennie's "facts" are third party
stories
> and clippings from the paper. He has NO private nor professional standing
in
> ANY emergency preparedness organization ANYWHERE.
>
> >They just want feel-good phrasing of how "heroic" they
> >> are and how they "can save the day" when "all the cell phones fail."
> >
> >You must read different news articles than most. You seem to come up
with
> >National Enquirer stories that most
> >main straem news misses.
>
> Except the FACT is that even before September 11th, the papers have
been
> ripe with just such stories. Last year there were rampant floods in NJ
and
> GUESS who was called upon to help several isolated and stranded
> communities...?!?!
>
> (hint hint...it was NOT Lennie the Creep)
>
> >Class act NOT!!!!!!!!! I have only been here a week or so and have yet
to
> >see you praise anything other than yourself.
>
> Lennie's getting closer to that stroke that he know's is coming,
Ronnie.
> At least he took about a month to get me riled up. He's getting shorted
fused
> as the months roll on. Even those here who are in favor of "no code"
policies
> distance themselves from him.

And so shall I. Trolls like Len have no place in society. Under bridges
maybe, but not society.

>
> He sent me several private e mails about his "position" on no code
> matters, and when I privately (and subsequently publicly) that I didn't
agree,
> he started in on calling me a "jack booted thug", a "nazi", "elitest",
etc.
>

There's some rule..I forget the name, that when that starts, the loser..and Len exemplifies the term, has truly lost the battle.

> >May many befall you so that you can actively participate in them. I think
> >we're done here. You bring nothing but
> >bitterness to the table.
>
> YOU NAILED IT ON THE HEAD!!
>
> Lennie made the error of trying to one-up me over a duty station I'd once
> been at where Lennie had allegedly worked under contract. I called on some
> friends who DO work there and a couple remembered him as a lack-luster,
> ill-fitting pogue.
>
> Furthermore, in the height of some of the most heated exchanges between
> His Gutlessness and I, one fellow who lives in the same neighborhood as Lennie
> dropped the dime on him to myself and several others via private e mail. He's
> as big a loser in the eyes of his neighbors as he is here.
>
> So....try to look past him. He lies, he antagonizes, and he is due for a
> stroke, so let's let him be on his way.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
> Winchester, TN

Seems that way. Thanks for the 411. I'll steer clear of OL' droop-along calamity

4397. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 13:30:01 UTC
From: qrp5@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <cce22972.0202140530.14836a40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33758

>
> > Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a
> > common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of
> > much trouble in the future.
>
> How so? Except perhaps on an internal club basis.
>
> > Even our own VE's are divided on this, as
> > well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties.
>
> Why would VE's in adjacent counties care about your
> internal club rules?

Trouble has arisen because our repeater coverage extends into other counties where Part 97 is iterpreted differently. Other clubs' VE's tell their new technicians that its okay for them to let their sister or brother use their HT to try out ham radio as long as they are present as control operators. Then when they do it on our repeater, they get into trouble and a VE confrontation comes up because their VE's gave them "Mis-information" on the FCC rules. At the last club meeting, it was reported that field day exercises would be no different in interpretation of Part 97 than the day-to-day operations. I recently changed my mind about becoming a VE because I really don't want involved in this dispute, particularly since I believe our position is wrong to begin with. Respectfully, JJ

4398. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 13:49:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202140549.7d5aee0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33759

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a4chne$47c$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020212134012.22158.00000943@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > In article <3C692DC5.5DEB8578@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >> The last point I was making is that even if we discount the Novice as
> > >> proof of 5 wpm, the Tech proves the point handily. The Tech has always
> > >> been a permanent renewable license.
> > >
> > >But back in the 50's if I remember correctly, Tech's weren't allowed on
> HF.
> >
> > That is correct.
> >
> > >Therefore, they did not fall under ï¿½25.5.
> >
> > That is not correct.
> >
> > S25.5 actually says that ALL amateurs must be code tested. Later
> amendments
> > added exceptions. At first the exception was for hams whose licenses were
> only
> > for the bands above 1000 MHz. The amendment limit has since been lowered
> to
> > 30 MHz.
> >
> > '50s and '60s Techs had to be code tested to meet the treaty because their
> > privileges extended below the limit then set by the amendments.
>
> Jim is right.

tnx, Bill.

> Does anyone recall when the exception went to 1000 MHz
> and then lowered further to 30 MHz?

The original 1000 MHz exception was adopted (I think) in 1947 at the Atlantic
City conference.

The exception was lowered to 144 MHz in 1959 (!) at the Geneva conference.

The current 30 MHz exception was adopted at WARC-79, best known for giving us
the 30, 17 and 12 meter bands.

So a nocodetest VHF only license that excluded only 6 meters was allowed by treaty as early as 1959.

WRC 2003 will likely see the exception lowered to 1 Hz.

I held back on posting this because I thought everybody knew it already.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4399. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 13:52:56 UTC
From: w9wi@linux1.localdomain
Message-ID: <slrna6nia6.rld.w9wi@linux1.localdomain>
Source record: 33761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 13 Feb 2002 16:27:36 -0500, John Passaneau <jxp16@psu.edu> wrote:
>Hi all:
>
>After reading this thread for awhile, I went to the ARRL web site, and did a
>search on "eqsl", "e-qsl" etc. and I found a few mentions of e-qsl, but
>nothing that mentions that the ARRL is doing anything but thinking about
>accepting e-qsl's. So is this really true or is someone reading more into
>ARRL thinking about it than has happened yet.

They're working on something called "Logbook of the World". I've not seen
any details yet. It looks like a similar plan to eQSL's, but different.
You might find it mentioned as "LOTW" on search engines.
--
Doug Smith W9WI
Pleasant View (Nashville), TN EM66
http://www.w9wi.com

4400. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 14:01:04 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3c6bc2b9.8988955@basic.bs.webusenet.com>
Source record: 33760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 18:51:27 +1000, "Adam MAURER"
<vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote:

>Do you honestly think a rough 3 day sail each way (real puke material) then
>10 days of flat out operating to try and work as many "deserving" as
>possible under extremely harsh conditions, battling tick infestation and
>sleep depravation because of the incredible bird noise is a vacation???

The 'deserving'. Dead give away..... Paid Vacation with big ego rush
workin' the pileups and being Da Man for a week........

If it's so friggin' puckin' awful terrible, then why in the HELL are
you going ?

73, Jim KH2D

4401. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 14:06:48 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3c6bc3ee.9297729@basic.bs.webusenet.com>
Source record: 33762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 13:52:56 GMT, w9wi@linux1.localdomain (Doug Smith
) wrote:

>They're working on something called "Logbook of the World". I've not seen
>any details yet. It looks like a similar plan to eQSL's, but different.

It is different. The eQSL plan is for the guy who runs the web site to
get your money instead of the mailman. The Logbook of the World plan
is for the ARRL to get your money instead of the mailman......

Both good plans. Especially with so many bored hams just waiting to
sign up......

73, Jim KH2D

4402. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 14:40:16 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <k%Pa8.4175$Nv5.348266@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33763

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
news:20020214055340.29946.00000024@mb-cv.aol.com:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>>> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by
>>>> a degreed electrical engineer.

[snip]

> Okay, leaving out the analysis part of Cecil's question, I am curious
> -- did you design your own rigs or did you copy the designs of others?

Since he already said that he designed his own rigs, I'd assume that he'd
say that he designed his own rigs. Dontcha think?

joshua houk
kd7pos

4403. Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:19:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6bd7d3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33764

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6C824B.5F129790@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering
with ham radio?
> > > >
> > > > How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a
technical hobby
> > > > is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
> > >
> > > Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built
by a degreed
> > > electrical engineer.
> >
> > Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's
design? Did
> > you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the
amplifiers?
> > Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic
curves
> > of the transistors?
>
> Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself
that he still
> insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions.
He'd like us
> all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly
optimised
> circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always.
Even with his
> own profession.

NO, Dick ... as ususal, YOU are the one who is totally out
of touch with reality. Cecil is not "hung up on himself" ...
```

he's merely trying to counter the ridiculous garbage you
spew about how nothing founded in technical fundamentals
and modern practice "matters" in ham radio.

As one who's been involved in designing RF gear and
chipsets for RF gear for 32+ years, I can ASSURE you
that virtually NOBODY designs "by the seat of their pants"
any more ... yes, we (who do this in the "real world") DO
"go through all the engineering motions."

Any engineer (and company) with any sense at all knows
(and this SHOULD apply to hams as well) that it is FAR
easier, cheaper, faster, and more accurate to design circuits
on the computer, simulate them, make changes in the simulated
circuit to "tweak" performance (if the simulation tool doesn't
automatically optimize for you), and THEN build the first prototype
as a "near production ready" model ... this method is also
applicable to small-volume or even "one-off" ham designs.

THAT is how it is done ... to assert otherwise, as you have
done above, merely shows that you don't have a clue as
to how things are actually done in "the real world." Cecil,
on the other hand, knows these things because he's "Been
there, done that, got the t-shirt."

It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of
equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGvVUZe+N6+q84HiEQIT3ACgoV+VvVI4COVRavNZYFpfUvWBRXsAoKKt
N7J6OnpcOFhGQ8hpvSZfR2uG
=bB2/
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4404. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:22:52 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4gkji02keu@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33769

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214060317.08497.00000100@mb-fo.aol.com...
> Cecil:
>
> Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
> by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
> mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
> say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
> little WENCH you have there!"
>
> Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
> to do so!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Again, your ignorance shows itself. Go to a Renaissance faire sometime.

4405. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:31:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BD834.AA2256E0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33765

Dick Carroll wrote:
> My,my. And you present yourself as one who is very interested in
> improving weak signal efficiency in ham radio. Vy interesting, OM

If you have a painless cure for deafness, Dick, I'm all ears - uhhh,
all eyes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4406. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:38:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4glgv02lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 33773

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214061851.08497.00000101@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> >> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in
my
> >> reply.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
> >That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious that
> >Kim read your response without opening the original message.
>
> Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's subject
> line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
> accused *me* of being the only one who opened it? The only thing
> my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
> opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing to
> bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It's called a thread. She obviously saw your name in a response, and decided
to see what you had to say. Changing or not changing the subject line
doesn't prove anything.

4407. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:39:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDA1B.65269DB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33766

Dick Carroll wrote:
> As I said, if you refuse to acknowledge that professional engineers
> routinely refer to standard circuit designs and design parameters, as
> opposed to doing all their design work from first principles, you're
> just blowing troll-smoke.

I don't refuse to acknowledge that, Dick. Engineers copy circuits all
the time. But they don't have the balls to turn around and claim that
they designed it. To do so is simply plagiarism. Who do you think originally
designed those circuits that are being copied? Odds are, it was an engineer.

I ask again: If you copied someone's poem, would you then announce
to the world that you designed the poem? Have you ever done an
original electronic design?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4408. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:43:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDB12.AFDA2B06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33767

Joshua Houk wrote:
> Since he already said that he designed his own rigs, I'd assume that he'd
> say that he designed his own rigs. Dontcha think?

Doubt it. I asked him if he drew the load lines on the characteristic
graphs, one of the things necessary during the design, and he became
very defensive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4409. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:45:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDBA4.7B26FF9A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33768

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> >you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> >Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> >of the transistors?

> I did, when such things were necessary to the rig's design.

I guess most real design is done on computers nowadays, eh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4410. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:47:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDC1D.9B6B9D9D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33770

N2EY wrote:
> You mentioned all the DSP implemented in the '756, and your eval board, as
> if the latter would influence the former. But that's not the case at all.

You misunderstood. All my DSP experimentation is at audio frequencies.
I just mentioned the '756 because it's my new toy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4411. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:50:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDCB7.2AAB0821@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33771

N2EY wrote:
> Ed, why do you insist on protecting Cecil and Carl?

I'm the guy with the CCP/CHL. I should be protecting Ed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4412. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 15:54:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BDDC4.7FF339D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33772

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
> by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
> mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
> say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
> little WENCH you have there!"
>
> Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
> to do so!

Why should I risk exposing myself to stupid, ignorant people who
don't even know how to open a book?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4413. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 16:51:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D2F1C.C1DE6395@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33774

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >>> Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a
> >>>degreed electrical engineer.
>
> >> Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> >> you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> >> Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> >> of the transistors?
>
> > Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he
> >still insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions.
> >He'd like us all to believe they don't rely on standard references
> >and uniformly optimised circuits for their equipment design.
>
> Okay, leaving out the analysis part of Cecil's question, I am curious -- did
> you design your own rigs or did you copy the designs of others?

I relied on standard circuits and references. You know, the sort of stuff found in the ARRL handbook and a variety of other sources, of course. No, I am not an engineer, and I know that. I have also known some engineers who designed junk. I have had the job of correcting some poor engineeering designs. Cecil's assertions that none but engineers are competant to design is as flawed as his other trolls.

4414. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 17:08:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D32FA.FDC9A03@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33775

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

(ream of commercial manufacturing prodecure deleted as
irrelevant to ham radio)

>It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of

> equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
> method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.
>

Crawl back under your rock Squiggy, who let you out this time?

You do it however you like, ignore standard references and commonly
published circuits if you wish (or claim that you do
to avoid truths on newsgroups). I'll do as I wish to make my one-
only ham gear.
The lame claim that one has to do all the basic
research to actual design a ham rig is ludicrous and you ALL know
it.

>
> Carl - wa6vse
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPGvVUZe+N6+q84HiEQIT3ACgoV+VvVI4COVRavNZYFpfUvWBRXsAoKKt
> N7J6OnpcOFhGQ8hpvSZfR2uG
> =bB2/
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4415. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 17:10:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D3381.732E0660@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33776

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > My,my. And you present yourself as one who is very interested in
> > improving weak signal efficiency in ham radio. Vy interesting, OM
>
> If you have a painless cure for deafness, Dick, I'm all ears - uhhh,
> all eyes.

Download Digipan (better yet, MIXwin, and get 'em all) and play with
that visual "waterfall" display under varying conditions of RF gain.
Probably second best to good hearing.

4416. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 17:20:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D35C3.826AF8C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33777

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > As I said, if you refuse to acknowledge that professional engineers
> > routinely refer to standard circuit designs and design parameters, as
> > opposed to doing all their design work from first principles, you're
> > just blowing troll-smoke.
>
> I don't refuse to acknowledge that, Dick. Engineers copy circuits all
> the time. But they don't have the balls to turn around and claim that
> they designed it. To do so is simply plagiarism. Who do you think originally
> designed those circuits that are being copied? Odds are, it was an engineer.

So when one refers to a comprehensive source to check on an oscillator
circuit, then he is plagarizing if he decides to incorporate that circuit into a
rig he is DESIGNING and building? You sure are
running out of valid arguments, aren't you? (Of course you've been
out for a long time anyway).
And there is NO WAY you can show
that any of the standard circuits were engineer-only designed. Was Mr Colpits an
engineer? Mr. Hartley? Was Mr. Pullen? Want to prove that all the standard
references have had no input from non-engineers? Have at it. I live in the real
world.

Most non-engineers who have had extensive experience in
electronics
have seen multiple cases where design engineers really screwed up
to the point that some non-engineer with EXPERIENCE had to clean
up the resulting mess. That group includes me.

4417. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 17:20:12 UTC
From: Bill Aycock <baycock@hiwaay.net>
Message-ID: <3C6BF1CC.8B9F1D07@hiwaay.net>
Source record: 33778
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt- Thank you!! I missed that gem on the first reading, and I can
usually spot a bad spelling a mile off. May I roll with you?
Bill-W4BSG

Walt Davidson wrote:

>
> ROTFLMAO!!!!
>
> It's an adventure holiday.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> P.S. "depravation"? That too? Tee hee!"
>
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4418. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 17:32:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D38B7.775A968C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33779

Jim Kelley wrote:

> You remember back as a school kid how the guy who was always getting razzed
> the most was the one who let it get to him the most? Now move to the 21st
> century internet newsgroups. The only points Carl and Cecil really score are
> for logical points. Concentrate on them. If you can't come up with a
> logical counterpoint, then, maybe they were right?

Are you serious? What would be the
logical counterpoint for lying-outright
total fabrication- about someone simply
because the someone happensfrom long
experience on the subect of RADIO
COMMUNICATIONS to understand that
basic radiocommunications, as in
radiotelegraphy, can be
important to ham radio operators?
Because of that singular fact, they
-both- have lied extensively
about both my motivations and
qualifications in radio. They have
-both- accused
me of insisting that ham radio 'stay in
the dark ages' because I insist all hams
should use only CW -an Absolutely false
assertion- when all the while it is ME
who actually is using the digital
modes on the air while Carl yaks into
his microphone and Cecil plays with his
DSP evaluation board! It's ALL a damn
lie, and they know it. You should know
it as well.
They keep hammering at the same lies
over and over until YOU believe
them! It's amazing!
That makes them -both- a total insult
to ham radio, and you, I'm sorry to
say, an accessory. Deceiving liars can't
be trusted with the future of ham
radio. Do you disagree?

> Don't try to argue
> against arguments that don't have a logical counterargument. That's my best
> advice.

So then it isn't logical that
radiotelegraphy is the most basic mode
of radio
yet devised, usable under conditions
where other modes may not be available
or
those which may be available won't get
the job done. I see. For, you see, that
is and has always been my contention,
and for that contention, which they can
NOT counter realistically nor
effectively, they mount a most personal
campaign
of falsehood to show me as unqualified
to hold ANY valid technical opinion. You
are proof that it seems to be working.
That's too bad.
You are a relative newcomer to the
hobby, and I appreciate that you might
be
interested in the experiences of older
hams. But that won't counter Cecil and
Carl and their falsehoods. So long as
you ignore their efforts and then
proceed
to send out messages like that one, it
appears that they win.

Good luck. With friends like them you
won't need enemas.

4419. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:04:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6bfed6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 33780

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6D32FA.FDC9A03@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> (ream of commercial manufacturing prodecure deleted as
> irrelevant to ham radio)

Again, Dick insists that anything resembling modern
design techniques, practices, and principles are
"irrelevant to ham radio" ...

This seems to me to be a perfect example, on Dick's
part, illustrating the "dumbing down" of ham radio
that Dick so frequently laments ... the refusal to learn
and take advantage of technological progress. Too
bad he can't recognize that he's a part of the problem,
not a part of the solution ...

> >It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of
> > equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
> > method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.
> >
>
> Crawl back under your rock Squiggy, who let you out this time?

Your gratiuitous insults still don't (and never will) change
realities, Dick ... no matter how steadfastly YOU refuse
to accept reality.

> You do it however you like, ignore standard references and
commonly
> published circuits if you wish (or claim that you do
> to avoid truths on newsgroups). I'll do as I wish to make my one-
> only ham gear.
> The lame claim that one has to do all the basic
> research to actual design a ham rig is ludicrous and you ALL know
> it.

Nobody's talking about "basic research" ... that's an entirely
different field from day to day equipment design. However,
since you don't understand the difference between doing your

own original design and copying someone else's circuit, I
wouldn't expect you to understand that distinction either.

As Cecil pointed out, your approach of copying circuits
or projects published in books, magazines, etc. is NOT
"design."

In fact, as Cecil stated, it's no more "design" than plagerizing
someone else's poem from a book is "writing poetry."

You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
by copying circuits published by others ... however doing
so does not qualify as "designing your own gear" any more
than building a kit designed by someone else does ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPGv8GZe+N6+q84HiEQL61QCeMH1wmWIHTiwozAlCHe3uQG0kJDoAnivB
CT4JZTR9CqbMVqDa1NqQtkiL
=zFIH
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4420. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:12:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6BFE01.717F04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33781

Dick Carroll wrote:
> They keep hammering at the same lies over and over until YOU believe
> them! It's amazing!

Trying to crawfish your way out is not going to work, Dick. People
are basing their opinions of you upon what you posted, not upon
what we said you posted. What you need to do is retract some of
the statements you have previously made.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:21:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6C000E.EF2C4E86@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33783

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So when one refers to a comprehensive source to check on an oscillator
> circuit, then he is plagarizing if he decides to incorporate that circuit into a
> rig he is DESIGNING and building?

Not if he gives credit to the designer. But when you say you designed a rig,
without giving rightful credit to the actual designer(s), that is plagiarism.
Virtually anyone can copy circuits from "a comprehensive source" and that is
not "design".

> And there is NO WAY you can show
> that any of the standard circuits were engineer-only designed. Was Mr Colpits an
> engineer? Mr. Hartley? Was Mr. Pullen? Want to prove that all the standard
> references have had no input from non-engineers? Have at it. I live in the real
> world.

Dick, have you any idea what, "Odds are", means? I said, "Odds are, it was
an engineer" who originally designed those circuits. And, as usual, you
take someone's statement and twist it to imply something that was not
originally implied. You are your own worst enemy.

> Most non-engineers who have had extensive experience in electronics
> have seen multiple cases where design engineers really screwed up
> to the point that some non-engineer with EXPERIENCE had to clean
> up the resulting mess. That group includes me.

Yes, Dick, we know you feel superior to all engineers and we know
what psychological state requires you to feel that way.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4422. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:23:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202141023.2013d22b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33782

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C6BDBA4.7B26FF9A@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
> > >you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
> > >Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
> > >of the transistors?
>
> > I did, when such things were necessary to the rig's design.
>
> I guess most real design is done on computers nowadays, eh?

Nowadays most drafting is done on computers. Also most calculations.

What my previous answer indicates is that I only calculated things like delay
and phase shift when it was necessary to a rig's design. Always looked at the
device characteristics, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

designer of many amateur radio projects

4423. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:25:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6C0118.5D677707@IEEE.org>
Source record: 33784

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil's assertions
> that none but engineers are competant to design is as flawed as his other trolls.

That is a lie, Dick, and anyone who has been following this thread knows that
is a lie. Lies like this one is why you have no respect on this newsgroup.
If you simply stop lying, maybe you could gain some respect.

For the record, I said, "Odds are, it was engineers" who originally designed
most electronic circuits. You then twist it into a lie using "none but
engineers". It is no wonder that no one can trust what you post.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4424. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:40:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grj4dc6.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33785

On Wed, 13 Feb 2002 22:42:44 -0500, Ronald Sims wrote:

> Who were Hundt's "bag carriers" at that time? Were they
>Hundt's own people (staff) that he brought to the agency with
>him?

Mostly.

>From what I heard, many senior and junior FOB staff at the
>Washington HQ turned on, make that back-stabbed, their own
>friends in the field, just to save their own skins from Hundt's
>chopping block.

There were some of that category, too, but we could spot them a
mile away. Some were imported from the outside or from other
Bureaus for just that. I know who in WA I could deal with and
who not, and it wasn't confined to WA either.

>I also heard the union was dealt with early on
>by promising top union officers that their jobs would be protected,
>in return for them not calling an impasse or throwing down any
>other legal obstacles in the way of the Hundt steam rollers.

The top folks' jobs were "protected" by bumping rights ("seniority"
in the private sector), not by making such promises.

>What a hell of a way to conduct the business of government, but
>it is also the norm for life in the beltway.

I could have gone to WA as a branch chief in the 1980s but I knew
better.....

I'm not a political animal. Never have been.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4425. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 18:47:08 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <d10o6u8ta6s0d68dks2m5dfc9tf09u856d@4ax.com>
Source record: 33786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 14:01:04 GMT, kh2d@my-deja.com (Jim Kehler) wrote:

>The 'deserving'. Dead give away..... Paid Vacation with big ego rush
>workin' the pileups and being Da Man for a week........
>
>If it's so friggin' puckin' awful terrible, then why in the HELL are
>you going ?
>
>73, Jim KH2D

This is getting pretty serious, Jim .... you and I seem to be in total agreement about something - yet again! :-)))

73 de W6/G3NYY (San Diego)

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4426. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 19:04:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6C0A50.96A76468@uci.edu>
Source record: 33788

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C6AD36E.525982EC@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

> >He's the kind of guy who would cut off your nose to spite your face as
> >long as it wouldn't get him all messy.
>
> Jimmie K., what is "messy" about explaining what happened to about
> 10 million folks 8 years ago?

Such a silly man. Cutting someone's nose off would be messy.

4427. Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 19:10:10 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33787

Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular argument in this thread.)

Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?

I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated, interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to turn to CW.

In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a testing requirement to "support" it. Given the popularity of CW, especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can. After all, SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being mandatory for license privileges.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
jason_hsu_802701@@@@yahoo.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio.html

4428. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 19:28:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6C0FCD.5EAA8C4@uci.edu>
Source record: 33789

Jason Hsu wrote:
>
> Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> argument in this thread.)
>
> Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?

Because those people know how to use code.

> I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
> interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
> the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
> would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
> become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
> turn to CW.

Could be. I used that argument for dropping the requirement from 13
down to 5 WPM. We should already be seeing some of the increased
interest in CW. Anybody know if we are?
> In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
> testing requirement to "support" it. Given the popularity of CW,
> especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can. After all,
> SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> mandatory for license privileges.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> jason_hsu_802701@@@@yahoo.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio.html

4429. email from ARRL - president - eqsl's and DXCC !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 21:26:37 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c2b8c$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 33790
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Hello interested Hams...

I have had some interesting, courteous, and informative emails with the ARRL president Jim Haynie, W5JBP concerning the recent flap about eQSL acceptance for DXCC.

Jim was also nice enough to forward to me in-house ARRL email from Bill Moore to Jim which goes a long way to further explain the likelihood of eqSL cards being accepted for DXCC as eQSL web site now states. Jim has asked me not to include the actual verbatim email from Bill..but has encouraged me to post "just the facts as Bill has laid them out" (Jim's words to me) .... and so to the best of my abilities I'll do that now....if you want to skip ahead I can tell you it still looks like eQSL cards can be and will be accepted by the ARRL as long as some important steps are taken....

Here are cut and paste excerpts from Bill's email to Jim....
---
1. It seems people have not read the entire message, especially the part that says "acting as QSL manager". On his site I see where he has OK for sending e-QSLs, not paper QSLs.In order for us to accept anything from him we would need a letter from each station he "manages" authorizing this

2. Then, we'd need something better than his word that he is verifying logs each time a request comes in (something we do not think he will be willing to do with all the stations he has logs for).

3. The requesting station must send information listing the specific QSL information then the manager must check the log for it. I believe the term for not doing this is pre-emptive QSLing.

4. As I have mentioned to all who have written, that ARRL has not changed its policy in any way regarding electronic QSLs.

---
end of cut and paste.....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

4430. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 21:48:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214164834.12135.00000038@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 33791

In article <3C6D32FA.FDC9A03@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> (ream of commercial manufacturing prodecure deleted as
>irrelevant to ham radio)
>
>>It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of
>
>> equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
>> method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.
>>
>
> Crawl back under your rock Squiggy, who let you out this time?
>
> You do it however you like, ignore standard references and commonly
>published circuits if you wish (or claim that you do
>to avoid truths on newsgroups). I'll do as I wish to make my one-
>only ham gear.
> The lame claim that one has to do all the basic
>research to actual design a ham rig is ludicrous and you ALL know
>it.

Is this how Art Collins did it? Did Bill Haligan do it that way?

Gosh, this "simplified method" ought to be promoted everywhere in
the radio world, a genuine gold-plated guaranteed contribution to the
state of the radio art!!!

More power to you. I think you are on something there!

Len

4431. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 21:48:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214164837.12135.00000039@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 33792

In article <3c6bd7d3_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C6C824B.5F129790@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > >
>> > > CAM wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering
>with ham radio?
>> > > >
>> > > > How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a
>technical hobby
>> > > > is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
>> > >
>> > > Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built
>> > > by a degreed electrical engineer.
>> >
>> > Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's
>design? Did
>> > you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the
>amplifiers?
>> > Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic
>curves
>> > of the transistors?
>>
>> Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself
>that he still
>> insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions.
>He'd like us
>> all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly
>optimised
>> circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always.
>Even with his
>> own profession.
>
>NO, Dick ... as ususal, YOU are the one who is totally out
>of touch with reality. Cecil is not "hung up on himself" ...
>he's merely trying to counter the ridiculous garbage you

>spew about how nothing founded in technical fundamentals
>and modern practice "matters" in ham radio.
>
>As one who's been involved in designing RF gear and
>chipsets for RF gear for 32+ years, I can ASSURE you
>that virtually NOBODY designs "by the seat of their pants"
>any more ... yes, we (who do this in the "real world") DO
>"go through all the engineering motions."

Quite true and usually unknown by those who have never done the actual work for pay (professionals) or for themselves (hobbyists). While I've never been able to work on the chip level (does thin-film count? :-), forty-two years ago when I did my first design work and 82 years ago when the very old-timers did their first radio design work there were only three basic configurations of amplifiers: Grounded-cathode/emitter/source; grounded-grid/base/gate, and grounded-plate/collector/drain (aka "cathode follower"). Nothing basic changed during the introduction of the transistor and then the field-effect transistor. Basics are basics. I'll "flesh out" some items for the benefit of other readers, Carl, we and Cecil and a few others here know how it is done.

Oscillators have only three basic configurations, named for those who first wrote them up as academic papers: Pierce, Colpitts, and Hartley. Some variations appeared later as the Clapp and Butler; the Butler much later as quartz crystal technology improved for reliable overtone operation. An oscillator is basically a self-limiting amplifier of gain just above unity having positive feedback.

All the diagrams have appeared in texts from many sources for years, enough so that those who bother to learn their appearance can recognize them visually on paper. From there to actual working hardware is an ENORMOUS area of effort involving many different sub-disciplines in electronics to achieve bandwidth, feedback, gain in both magnitude and phase, stability, power demand, noise criteria necessary to fit the overall system specifications. THAT is the design process. No designer need go to "first principles" and do an amplifier stage design from total scratch; those "first principles" have been worked out long ago. The design process needs knowledge of dozens of sub-disciplines to translate those "first principles" into working hardware.

Case in point, an octave bandwidth amplifier at HF (2:1 frequency range): How to achieve the bandwidth is basically a choice between broadband transformer coupling or by a "wide" bandpass network (there are some other ways but this isn't a book). For either requires knowledge of the active device impedance or admittance, the source and load Z or Y, the coupling network Z

or Y. [S-parameters utilize Z and Y] To achieve a required gain requires matching all the Zs and Ys for maximum power transfer. The active device characteristics, whether manufacturer's "typical" data or measured-separately, need to be known to determine the power supply requirements, voltage breakdowns, maximum current handling ability (minimum current necessary for portable, battery applications). Add to that the strays and parasitics from the need to physically mount and hold the components, which affects the mechanical-environment requirments. On top of all that is the temperature environment and its affects on all the electrical parameters of everything...which must all fit together ("room temperature" is simply a baseline thermal point since working temperature may be remarkably different within an enclosure).

For relatively narrowband amplifers there are many "first principle" networks (already worked out) to use as coupling but even those cannot be applied directly without considering the changes from different Z and Y characteristics of ALL immediately-associated components and active devices, including "chassis strays" and possible changes over temperature. Physical inductor Q is low enough to affect some networks more, some networks less; the designer has to account for which network and know the range of available inductor Q values.

The simple biasing of a single transistor stage needs to consider all factors such as the base-emitter junction varying 2 mV per degree C and the resistance tolerance and effect of that tolerance in regards to which bias configuration. Those bias resistors will cause some change in the stage's input impedance which reflects on the driving stage. Each bias resistor has some end-to-end capacity which has an effect on total interstage Z at higher frequencies.

>Any engineer (and company) with any sense at all knows
>(and this SHOULD apply to hams as well) that it is FAR
>easier, cheaper, faster, and more accurate to design circuits
>on the computer, simulate them, make changes in the simulated
>circuit to "tweak" performance (if the simulation tool doesn't
>automatically optimize for you), and THEN build the first prototype
>as a "near production ready" model ... this method is also
>applicable to small-volume or even "one-off" ham designs.

I think it's fair to point out here that designers using computers in CAE applications have first to know what affects what in a circuit before doing any virtual tweaking of values. There are NO computer programs YET that "do the design for you (us)" regardless of the software claims. [this includes programs such as National Semiconductor's "Simple Switcher" buck-boost IC "design program" that finds component values for a specific switching IC...a free for download package by the way]

The designer must input the circuit that he or she designed. Circuit simulation is a tool for verifying operation, good or bad. Optimization is a necessity for large production runs where all component tolerances must be considered for subsystems that do not allow a multitude of trimmer adjustments to handle those variables. Computer programs handle the rote tasks of sometimes-gigantic calculations to find frequency/time responses, doing in seconds what would take a designer days and weeks of pad-pencil-pocket-calculator work.

>THAT is how it is done ... to assert otherwise, as you have
>done above, merely shows that you don't have a clue as
>to how things are actually done in "the real world." Cecil,
>on the other hand, knows these things because he's "Been
>there, done that, got the t-shirt."

The professional world has a nasty thing called a "design review," a periodic meeting where an assigned designer has to explain and show his/her work before a panel of experienced higher-level staff who have also gotten plenty of "t-shirts." My first one was years ago with a simple assignment that was straightforward, no problem. I watched a long-timer trying to bluff his way through part of the explanation only to get nailed almost immediately by the reviewers (they had seen this sort of thing before). Let's just say his t-shirt got rather ripped in the process, a damn good object lesson for everybody else to learn. Bluffing, tall tales, and smokescreening doesn't work there. On a following project I had a larger assignment, had some difficulty with one part of the work, admitted it, could explain the problem, and got help almost right away with several useful suggestions plus a mini-review in the lab that found an alternate solution.

Fraternal orders have a tradition of copious quantities of tall tales, bluffing, and outright bullshitting others. Might work with people but physics and the hardware can't be fooled. :-)

>It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of
>equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
>method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.

Carl, if we have to coexist in an environment where a bus driver must be called a "paratransit operator," the above method has to be called "empirical data derivation" or other multi-syllabic BS. :-)

Either way, if we don't love and cherish morse code nor respect, admire, or revere the morsemen we get labels of "dumbed-down, stupid, ignorant" and "don't deserve to be in ham radio." :-)

I'm not sweating the last...got too many t-shirts already. :-)

Len

4432. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 22:21:43 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a4hd9n$2imq$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 33793

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>CAM wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> >
>> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > So why do you continue to equate electrical engineering with ham radio?
>> > >
>> > > How you can avoid correlating technical engineering with a technical hobby
>> > > is beyond comprehension. EE's designed almost every ham radio.
>> >
>> > Nonsense. Not a single rig that I designed and built was built by a degreed
>> > electrical engineer.
>>
>> Did you design the rig, Dick, or did you copy someone else's design? Did
>> you actually calculate the delays and phase shifts through the amplifiers?
>> Did you actually study the amplification factor and characteristic curves
>> of the transistors?
>
> Well folks, there you have it. Cecil is so hung up on himself that he still
>insists that even engineers go through all the engineering motions. He'd like us
>all to believe they don't rely on standard references and uniformly optimised
>circuits for their equipment design. He's as out of touch as always.
>Even with his
>own profession.

It actually is the case that "engineers normally go through all the engineering motions" when doing a new hardware design. While engineers are as prepared as anyone to copy when they can, if they're doing a new design it is usually because the semiconductors available have gotten better, or they're trying to get higher density if they are doing ICs, and changing these constraints has a way of changing everything else. Note that optimizing your own circuit designs is easier than it used to be since computers do a lot of the heavy lifting, though the cost of the design packages I see them using is such that it would by hard to justify for anything other than commercial design work.

Software engineering isn't like this, actually, not only are the tools usually cheap but there the art is to write it so you can reuse as much as possible for as long as possible. Hardware guys seem to end up doing everything from scratch, and are high maintenance in terms of the tools they need.

Dennis Ferguson

4433. Gee, the President of the USA recognizes the ARS for what it is

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 22:41:22 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <m2Xa8.7834$qt6.714606@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33794

From the ARRL Amateur Radio News 2/13

Florida amateurs recognized for role in President's ham radio appearance: ARRL Northern Florida Section Manager Rudy Hubbard, WA4PUP, has awarded plaques to the amateurs involved in arranging for President George W. Bush to speak via ham radio January 31. Recognized for their contributions were Cliff Fraser, KE4HIY; Volusia County Emergency Coordinator Joette Barnett, KG4HPN; and John Schmidt, AF4PU, who operated the station over which Bush spoke. The plaques commend the three for providing or assisting in providing the station. Bush addressed members of the Northern Florida Amateur Radio Emergency Service Net (NFAN) on 75 meters while he was in Florida to spotlight five volunteer groups--including the Volusia County Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES)--for their value to the new Office of Homeland Security. "I want to thank all the volunteers who help make sure that Florida is prepared for any kind of emergency," the president said in part.

But of course,there will be some nameless west coast types who won't recognize this as factual because it's not main stream news...

4434. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:28:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214182823.22636.00000110@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33795

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>We should already be seeing some of the increased
>interest in CW. Anybody know if we are?

A reasonable way to guage that might be to do a listening survey of the HF bands. How much 5-10 WPM activity is there? If none, then I think it safe to say that the 5 wpm test is not attracting much CW use.

One might argue that some 5 wpm folks are put off by the 20+ wpm that many of the CW ops use, but there are now enough 5 wpm tested hams with significant HF priveleges that they could be on the air talking to each other on CW if they wanted to try the mode.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4435. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:33:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214183344.22636.00000111@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33796

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>You sure are
>running out of valid arguments, aren't you?

Well, he did bring out the "crawl back under the rock" valid argument. :-)

Hey, at least he didn't have to resort to "go soak your head" to win his point!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4436. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:38:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214183814.22636.00000112@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33797

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Let's ask him.

>Ed, why do you insist on protecting Cecil and Carl?

Didn't think I was. Although it hasn't happened as often, I have tried to point out to some who I believe misunderstood what Dick has said why I think they misunderstood what Dick has said.

Where did this protection racket come from? Can I get some money out of it for the ARRL Lab test equipment fund? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4437. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:41:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214184103.22636.00000113@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33798

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>Since he already said that he designed his own rigs, I'd assume that he'd
>say that he designed his own rigs. Dontcha think?

Some of the followup by Dick and others seemed to have muddied the waters.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4438. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:45:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214184503.22636.00000114@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33799

From: kh2d@my-deja.com (Jim Kehler)

>The Logbook of the World plan
>is for the ARRL to get your money instead of the mailman......

Just to clarify a couple of points. The ARRL does not intend that there be any charges to upload the data.

The charge to use a datum for an award is going to be less than the postal service would get, and a LOT less that the customary number of greenstamps.

I don't think this will end up being the proverbial cash cow. Even if it is, as long as they buy the ARRL lab the new oscilloscope I will think the money well spent. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4439. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-14 23:48:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214184855.22636.00000115@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 33800

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Hello Ed, same stuff, different year. Since you seem to know where it all
>ends up, why do you stick around?

I took a vacation, but no one noticed. :-)

>How's the ARRL?

Same stuff, different year. :-) This week, it the Savi 70 cm petition. They had the nerve to tell the FCC that the calculations in ARRL's Ex Parte presentation were off by 30 dB. Scared me nearly to death, I will have you know. I am working on the response. :-)

>The antenna modeling class looks like a winner.

That course filled up fast. They actually opened a second one, and reached 100+ students the first day. I think that when Dean Straw, the ARRL Antenna Book editor, said he learned things from being a beta tester, that clinched it. :-) I signed up within a few minutes of the course opening and was #31.

>How was the RFI class?

???

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 00:21:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <uwYa8.8987$eV4.1281934496@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 33901

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020213224523.17971.00001342@mb-fg.aol.com...
> In article <nTEa8.3085$%T7.581783722@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >73,
> >Brian/N0iMD
> >
> >ps: Hello gang.
> >Len, why? Stay well.
>
> Hay Brian! Goodaseeya! Hope you are done with all the moving and
> the family is in good health and spirits. How do you like the old Chat
> Room? :-) :-) :-)
>
> You ask why? I answer "Why not?" :-)
>
> Hang in there...:-)

Len, I might check in once in a while, but this is not where I want to be. I'm busy with my son's scouting group and trying to spin up some consulting work. Life is much better without this little black spot on my x-ray.

73, Brian

4441. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 00:30:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <HEYa8.8993$k55.1282712785@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 33902

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020214184855.22636.00000115@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Hello Ed, same stuff, different year. Since you seem to know where it
all
> >ends up, why do you stick around?
>
> I took a vacation, but no one noticed. :-)
>
> >How's the ARRL?
>
> Same stuff, different year. :-) This week, it the Savi 70 cm petition.
They
> had the nerve to tell the FCC that the calculations in ARRL's Ex Parte
> presentation were off by 30 dB. Scared me nearly to death, I will have
you
> know. I am working on the response. :-)
>
> >The antenna modeling class looks like a winner.
>
> That course filled up fast. They actually opened a second one, and
reached
> 100+ students the first day. I think that when Dean Straw, the ARRL
Antenna
> Book editor, said he learned things from being a beta tester, that
clinched it.
> :-) I signed up within a few minutes of the course opening and was #31.
>
> >How was the RFI class?
>
> ???
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, when you gaduate you'll be able to get on r.r.a.a. with the big boys (just kidding). There are plenty of OF's there as well. The last thing I read on rraa was some negative stuff about "flag waving" and "flag wavers." Now everyone wants to wave the flag. Probably frustrates the hell out of them.

Sorry about missing your vacation. How long were you gone? I think I've been gone about a year. And from the look of things I haven't missed too much.

73, Brian

4442. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 02:08:53 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C6DA8.60C35B3B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33903

Phil Kane wrote:
>
>
>
> He and the folks with which he surrounded himself had no idea what
> the nuts and bolts of communications regulation was all about, and
> not only refused to be guided by those of us who did but considered
> those of us who believed that we were doing something important as
> just so much Kleenex to be crumpled up and discarded.
>
> 86 out of 97 of us who were eligible field enforcement veterans with
> lots of skill and experience took the voluntary early retirement
> option in September 1995. What does that say? Hundt finished the
> trashing of the field with involuntary layoffs of 160+ others a year
> later. By your theory every one of us was out of step but Jack, or
> in this case, Reed.
>
>
> We have different ideas about what communication regulation is
> all about.

Well said. Your experience seems very familiar. Your
response to the situation is very familiar. I would bet
that Hundt's crew probably hired Arthur Anderson to tell
them and congress what a good job they were doing also.

One point of disagreement, the fall of the FCC was a
bipartisan effort. Hundt was an operative trying to satisfy
Gore, Tauzan, Gingrich, et.al. After the 911 affair I would
bet that the "new" field group stays busy scurring around
trying to get federal warrants to tap our internet and cell
phone traffic. From some of the behind the scenes stuff I
have heard about, even R.R.A.P. is probably considered a
subversive breeding ground. ;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

4443. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 02:50:05 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C7750.70E7F905@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33904

Good luck with the Savi work. I see this as the greater
threat to 70 cm surpassing the Little LEO attempted grab.
The ARRL had better dip into that $400,000 war chest or
there could be big trouble.

As you know interference is a two way street. If they get
70 cm for RFID, which is very likely, and my VHF DXer friend
down the street turns his 70 cm 10,000 W ERP beams toward
the airport, and several bags are left laying on the tarmac
as the plane taxis out, guess what? Oops there goes another
band necessarily sacrificed to "homeland defense".

Many of your current members are too young to remember that
Part 97 was entirely suspended during WWII, and some of it
was long time coming back.

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> Same stuff, different year. :-) This week, it the Savi 70 cm petition. They
> had the nerve to tell the FCC that the calculations in ARRL's Ex Parte
> presentation were off by 30 dB. Scared me nearly to death, I will have you
> know. I am working on the response. :-)
>
>

4444. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 02:59:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202141859.4a8cc802@posting.google.com>
Source record: 33905
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a49qi2$f5r$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0202111659.20c85e4e@posting.google.com...
> > "Adam MAURER" <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:<Gnk98.4130$BE4.11235@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>...
> > > Yeah, and watch this "convenience" see the demise of DXpeditions!
> > > DXpeditions rely heavily on income & donations that is included with the
> > > request for a good ol QSL card.
> > >
> > > I hope you advocates of e-QSLing have already worked the rare ones on
> all
> > > band/mode combos, coz it'll be a different ball game now.
> > >
> > >
> > Don't bet on that. This thing is another techie brainfart whose time
> > will never come. Just like all those "e-commerce" brainfarts crashed
> > and burned a couple years back and dropped the tech stock markets thru
> > the cellar floors. There is no "law" which sez that the expeditions
> > "must" post their logs. Back to bizness as usual.
> > >
>
> Yeah. Get a horse!
>
>
Don't need a horse to carry my cards and the well-earned & deserved
green stamps to the expeditioneers, just the postage and an SASE. Hams
have DIED trying to give us a New One. How do ya pass along the green
stamps via e-QSLs?
>
>
Or maybe you figger they somehow "owe" you the card just because they
had the "honor" of working you?
>
>
w3rv

4445. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:06:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7b10$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33907

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020213212824.26903.00000073@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've
certainly
> >> made it as total wankers!
> >>
> >> And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole newsgroup
who
> >opened the message, Larry...
> >
> >No surprise there.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in my
> reply.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Bigger liar? Larry, when when when have I ever lied? Suppose you can't
come up with an example of that, either, among all of your ridiculous
claims.

As to your being the only to respond to the "pornstar" message, yes you
were. I don't know anything about the subject line changing, because my
post was a direct reply to *your* response to the original message. I
skipped that message the first night I noticed it on the newsgroup. Then
(as expected), opened it when I saw your name as a poster to the first Re:
message. You do know that Re: means "referencing" or "in response to,"
don't you? Gosh, maybe you don't.

Yep, you were the first and the *only* newsgroup person in RRAP to respond
to that message. Uh huh. Sorry you can't accept it...hell, you're the one
who did it, what ya want me to do 'bout it?

Kim W5TIT

4446. Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:06:48 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6C7B3A.F57CE95A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33906

As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of management to their own employees and shareholders. Now, according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that falling revenues and increased postage requires cost cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how many of the membership have handy internet access or use internet access to keep up with the BOD?

73,
Clay N4AOX

4447. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:07:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7b50$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33908

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020213212825.26903.00000075@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c69cc81_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Might want to try it on a can of Ken-L ration first, though...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but I don't share your dietary preferences.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, I can assure you that you need the training, though.

Kim W5TIT

4448. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:08:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7baa$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33909

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020213212826.26903.00000077@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c69ca58$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >I doubt every word you just wrote above. Every word. More, you are
> > >beginning to sound a lot like good 'ol Mr. Misery: Vince Fiscus I think
his
> > >name is. How much misery you gonna take?
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
>
> I dunno, Kim -- how much misery are you gonna make?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I never make misery, Larry. You are the one making it...take responsibility
for your own actions, would ya?

Kim W5TIT

4449. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:14:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7ce6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33910

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020213212824.26903.00000073@mb-md.aol.com...
> > In article <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole
newsgroup
> who
> > > >opened the message, Larry...
> > > >
> > > >No surprise there.
> > > >
> > > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> > liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in
my
> > reply.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious that
> Kim read your response without opening the original message.
>
>

I really don't think it's that obvious to Larry, Krell... :)

Kim W5TIT

4450. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:20:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7e64$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33912

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020214012332.06214.00000124@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/13/2002 5:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020213184109.18897.00000977@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
> >The cards that come through the buro do not have postmarks.
>
> Every card that I have has SOME sort of original signature, mark, or
> evidence of handling by some party that can be VERIFIED!. We can whittle
this
> stick real thin, Ed, but the point is that while "eQSLs" may be
"convienient",
> they are forgeable and not reliable.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Ooooo, hey, speaking of QSL cards: Cliff (my hubby) just got a "batch" today from the--what is it called, QSL bureau or whatever at the ARRL. Not only did he get one card that the QSO was from back in 1999, the others were from the year 2000!!!!! Man, remember when Jim was asking me about whether I logged the US stations I contacted during the one weekend where I worked all but about 3 states in the US...I guess for some kind of proof?! I could go for the logging, but anyone could lie on a log, right? If QSL cards are used as some kind of "proof" about getting a station, one could be DEAD before they ever see a card...LOL

Kim W5TIT

4451. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:21:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4huumhhh1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33911

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6C84DE.E8BF2A7D@worldnet.att.net...

> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > So us, o genius, just how do *you* use a ham radio station to
determine that a
> > > > > band is dead?
> > > >
> > > > MUF, of course. No station required.
> > >
> > > Yup, and since virtually allo hams lack the gear needed to make MUF
tests, they
> > > almost universaly check for band conditions by
> > > tuning around and listening for band activity. I guess when you find
no activity you,
> > > like most hams, consider the band "Dead" without
> > > actually confirming it through MUF tests. And often you'd be wrong,
the band isn'te
> > > dead at all, but marginally usable but unused because most hams
checking it assume
> > > it's dead!
> >
> > I have observed a tech wasting his life listening for a signal on 6m
>
> Well that may help explain Carl Stevenson and Bill Sohl....

I dunno, I've worked across country on 6m. 6m is
"the magic band".

> > at a time
> > when the MUF was 10MHz.
>
> And just how did YOU know? Do you have radiosounding equipment set up to
test the
> ionosphere?
>
> > If you want to do that, Dick, be my guest.
>
> Sure, Cecil, and in the process I'll be finding weak rare ones on 20

meter CW while you
> 'guess' the band is dead, since you relied on guessing the MUF based on
the lack of the
> usual signal activity..

Another neat thing about 6m....it defies the routine indicators
at times and offers great DX when no one is expecting it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4452. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:22:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7ef4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33913

"Adam MAURER" <vk4cp@bigpond.comNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:bQKa8.1863$wG3.14929@newsfeeds.bigpond.com...
> Vacation?
>
> Get real Walt, take the up and coming Mellish Reef DXpedition (which I am
> involved in) for instance.
>
> Do you honestly think a rough 3 day sail each way (real puke material)
then
> 10 days of flat out operating to try and work as many "deserving" as
> possible under extremely harsh conditions, battling tick infestation and
> sleep depravation because of the incredible bird noise is a vacation???
>
> ...while you operate in the comfort of your shack.
>
> --
> Adam, VK4CP
>
> Website: http://www.qsl.net/vk4cp/
>

Sheesh, guess whose sanity we'll be wondering more about? Tell ya what,
forego the misery, stay home. I won't even ask about the "deserving"
comment :|

Kim W5TIT

4453. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:26:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c7fb7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33914

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214060317.08497.00000100@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3C69D9F0.508F278E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Dang, Larry, don't you ever crack open a dictionary? From Webster's:
> >"wench - 1 a: a young woman: GIRL" Larry, that's the the ***FIRST***
> >definition!
>
> Cecil:
>
> Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
> by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
> mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
> say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
> little WENCH you have there!"
>
> Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
> to do so!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Good grief, Larry, Steve (to whom your original offense was directed) was
talking about *his* daughter...not some strange kid in a store somewhere.
Are you *that* offensive that you think it's OK to experiment with getting
that familiar with a complete stranger?!

Kim W5TIT

4454. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:32:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4i0n4$r2b$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33918

"JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:cce22972.0202140530.14836a40@posting.google.com...
> >
> > > Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a
> > > common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of
> > > much trouble in the future.
> >
> > How so? Except perhaps on an internal club basis.
> >
> > > Even our own VE's are divided on this, as
> > > well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties.
> >
> > Why would VE's in adjacent counties care about your
> > internal club rules?
>
> Trouble has arisen because our repeater coverage extends into other
> counties where Part 97 is iterpreted differently. Other clubs' VE's
> tell their new technicians that its okay for them to let their sister
> or brother use their HT to try out ham radio as long as they are
> present as control operators. Then when they do it on our repeater,
> they get into trouble and a VE confrontation comes up because their
> VE's gave them "Mis-information" on the FCC rules.

Interesting...and just HOW do "they get in trouble?" If I
was in your neighborhood driving with my child in my car,
just HOW does anyone from your club know if the
speaker is the licensed party or not. Even assuming your
club did, the report to the FCC would be a joke.

> At the last club
> meeting, it was reported that field day exercises would be no
> different in interpretation of Part 97 than the day-to-day operations.

As before...your club can enforce ANY limits it wants on
its own operations...I'd laugh hysterically if your club
tried to enforce the same limits on other operators at
other field day sites.

So I'll ask again...has your club actually "reported"
anyone based on your club's self determination as to
what constitutes the violation if a non-licensed person
calls CQ and IDs as the station?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> I recently changed my mind about becoming a VE because I really don't
> want involved in this dispute, particularly since I believe our
> position is wrong to begin with. Respectfully, JJ

4455. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:38:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c829a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33915

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214061851.08497.00000101@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> >> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in
my
> >> reply.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
> >That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious that
> >Kim read your response without opening the original message.
>
> Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's subject
> line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
> accused *me* of being the only one who opened it?
>

Oh GAWD, Larry, how stupid are you anyway? The reason *YOU* were the only
one who'd opened it when I responded to you, you were the *ONLY* listed RE
poster to the message....GOOD GRIEF I had seen the message the night before
and went right past it...those messages are HIGHLY likely to contain viruses
for one reason and, for another, they're usually filled with some kind of
filthy CRAP

>
> The only thing
> my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
> opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing to
> bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Maybe this will help you, Larry. My "newsreader" is the newsreader provided
by Outlook Express. When I open Outlook Express, I check my mail messages
first. The only newsgroup I am subscribed to is rec.radio.amateur.policy,
of which the name appears in a list. I have the CURRENT VIEW setting set to
"Hide Read Messages." When I go down to the name, rec.radio.amateur.policy,
my newsreader "logs on" to the group and downloads unread messages. So, if
you can stretch your imagination just enough, I get a "list" of new, unread
messages. I have the messages sorted by "Sent" and they are nested by

thread or anything like that. So, when I look at my list I see the Subject Line, From, and Sent, in that order.

Stay with me here. The first night that message appeared...at least on my newsreader...at oh, I guess around 10:00PM, there was ONLY that message. I skipped reading it. I skip a LOT of messages. Before I exit my newsreader each time, I choose EDIT "Mark All Read" so that the same damned messages I deliberately skip don't show up again the next time I download.

Ya got it so far? So, I skipped the first night. The NEXT night, I see *YOUR* name, Larry Roll K3LT, in the "FROM" column, next to that same message Subject line, EXCEPT...the Re: has been added because you REsponded or REplied to the post.

I don't know how to get much clearer than that. I did open the message when I saw that you had replied to it...which meant you *HAD* to have opened it in its original form. By the way, as I was clicking on your post, I was ROFLMAO....

Kim W5TIT

4456. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:42:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c8396_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33917

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a4gkji02keu@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020214060317.08497.00000100@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > Cecil:
> >
> > Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
> > by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
> > mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
> > say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
> > little WENCH you have there!"
> >
> > Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
> > to do so!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Again, your ignorance shows itself. Go to a Renaissance faire sometime.
>
>

He and Dick probably believe those are some kind of SATAN worship gathering
and would have them outlawed before going...

Kim W5TIT

4457. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:48:29 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <hy%a8.7266$Nf3.461818@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33916

Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in
news:3C6C7B3A.F57CE95A@worldnet.att.net:

> As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown
> that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of
> management to their own employees and shareholders. Now,
> according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided
> to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save
> APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that
> falling revenues and increased postage requires cost
> cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states
> minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be
> that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly
> successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest
> company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how
> many of the membership have handy internet access or use
> internet access to keep up with the BOD?

According to polling (filtered my increasingly unreliable memory) somewhere
arond 90-95% of ARRL members have internet access. As for the second part
of the question, I'd ask how many people use actually *QST* to keep up with
the BOD?

QST is in the unfortunate position of having to trim costs out of
somewhere. DXers had their portion cut a couple years ago, and currently
the ARRL is eyeing cutting out Section News and some contesting content
(linescores and rules in particular), moving those over to the web. There's
been loud wailing and gnashing of teeth out of both camps.

But taking the minutes out - you'd think that'd be fairly non-controversial
and also one of the easiest ways to start cutting costs (I'd also suggest
going back to B&W and smaller type, but I digress). And, truly, it is.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4458. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:48:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c84f9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33919

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a4glgv02lff@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020214061851.08497.00000101@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > In article <a4fb8n01nk1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell"
<krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> > >> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line
in
> my
> > >> reply.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > >
> > >That shows how much you know about newsreader software. It's obvious
that
> > >Kim read your response without opening the original message.
> >
> > Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's
subject
> > line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
> > accused *me* of being the only one who opened it? The only thing
> > my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
> > opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing
to
> > bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> It's called a thread. She obviously saw your name in a response, and
decided
> to see what you had to say. Changing or not changing the subject line
> doesn't prove anything.
>

Hey, Krell, did the subject line change? I have no idea... Oh, wait, let
me change my view to Show All Messages and I'll sort them by date (baffling
the Hell out of Larry now, I bet), BRB

Nope! Original post: "We want to be pornstars" posted by
nicky18@freesex.net on 2/11/02 at 3:33PM. Where is Larry getting that the

Subject Line changed?! He doesn't *really* think that *I* changed and added the "Re:" to it, does he? ROFLMAO if he does! Maybe he just learned something new.

Kim W5TIT

4459. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 03:57:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4i1hg$1gk$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33924

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6D38B7.775A968C@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > You remember back as a school kid how the guy who was always getting
razzed
> > the most was the one who let it get to him the most? Now move to the
21st
> > century internet newsgroups. The only points Carl and Cecil really
score are
> > for logical points. Concentrate on them. If you can't come up with a
> > logical counterpoint, then, maybe they were right?
>
> Are you serious? What would be the
> logical counterpoint for lying-outright
> total fabrication- about someone simply
> because the someone happensfrom long
> experience on the subect of RADIO
> COMMUNICATIONS to understand that
> basic radiocommunications, as in
> radiotelegraphy, can be
> important to ham radio operators?

Dick,
I'll even give you that one...BUT, the next
bit of logic is to apply the relative importance
of code in general...and that is where the FCC
and many others are totally unconvinced that
code has any continued need for a test as a
requisite element to operate HF (IMHO).

> Because of that singular fact, they
> -both- have lied extensively
> about both my motivations and
> qualifications in radio. They have
> -both- accused
> me of insisting that ham radio 'stay in
> the dark ages' because I insist all hams
> should use only CW -an Absolutely false
> assertion- when all the while it is ME
> who actually is using the digital
> modes on the air while Carl yaks into
> his microphone and Cecil plays with his
> DSP evaluation board! It's ALL a damn

> lie, and they know it. You should know
> it as well.

Assuming its all a lie...how does that justify
continued code testing?

> They keep hammering at the same lies
> over and over until YOU believe
> them! It's amazing!
> That makes them -both- a total insult
> to ham radio, and you, I'm sorry to
> say, an accessory. Deceiving liars can't
> be trusted with the future of ham
> radio. Do you disagree?

Just when did Carl and Cecil become entrusted
with the future of ham radio?

> > Don't try to argue
> > against arguments that don't have a logical counterargument. That's my
best
> > advice.
>
> So then it isn't logical that
> radiotelegraphy is the most basic mode
> of radio
> yet devised, usable under conditions
> where other modes may not be available
> or
> those which may be available won't get
> the job done.

Assuming both points are valid...neither,
nor both sustains a sufficient rational to
keep code testing as an amateur requirement.
THAT is the issue. You are free to believe otherwise...
and you are free to make that case to the FCC.
Those that differ with you (as I do) are also
free to disagree and make counter claims/arguments.

> I see. For, you see, that
> is and has always been my contention,
> and for that contention, which they can
> NOT counter realistically nor
> effectively,

I guess your "contention" didn't hold sway
with the FCC NPRM 98-143.

> they mount a most personal campaign
> of falsehood to show me as unqualified
> to hold ANY valid technical opinion.

Strange, I don't recall any such personal campaign
being submitted to the FCC to show you as being
unqualified to comment.

> You are proof that it seems to be working.
> That's too bad.

Frankly, Dick, your own words do you more
harm than anyone else's (IMHO of course).

> You are a relative newcomer to the
> hobby, and I appreciate that you might
> be
> interested in the experiences of older
> hams. But that won't counter Cecil and
> Carl and their falsehoods. So long as
> you ignore their efforts and then
> proceed
> to send out messages like that one, it
> appears that they win.

Logic alert, logic alert...

They (Carl & Cecil) win because
he (Jim) has ignored their efforts yet he (Jim) sends out
the message he did? Cause/effect there seems to
be significantly missing.

> Good luck. With friends like them you
> won't need enemas.

As I said....
Dick, your own words do you more
harm than anyone else's (IMHO of course).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4460. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:01:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214230123.01033.00000048@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33922

In article <a4glgv02lff@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's subject
>> line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
>> accused *me* of being the only one who opened it? The only thing
>> my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
>> opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing to
>> bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>It's called a thread. She obviously saw your name in a response, and decided
>to see what you had to say. Changing or not changing the subject line
>doesn't prove anything.

Krell:

You've proved nothing, either. The subject line was still about
"pornstars." Kim accused me of opening the message, then did
the exact same thing. It doesn't matter if she recognized my
name or not -- she did the same thing she accused me of doing,
and probably opened the original message and went to their
web site just to see what they had to offer! All I did was give
them a quick slam-dunk, and predicted Kim's response almost
to the letter. However, I'm sure Kim appreciates your ardent
support.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4461. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:01:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214230124.01033.00000049@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33921

In article <20020214182823.22636.00000110@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>We should already be seeing some of the increased
>>interest in CW. Anybody know if we are?
>
>A reasonable way to guage that might be to do a listening survey of the HF
>bands. How much 5-10 WPM activity is there? If none, then I think it safe
>to say that the 5 wpm test is not attracting much CW use.

Ed:

From my own experience, I'd say that there is little or no 5-10 WPM CW activity. Many times I make a 5-10 WPM CQ (on the FISTS calling freqs., since the Novice/Tech segments are essentially vacant these days) and usually get answered by some octogenarian in Florida with a W2- or a W8- call sign, running his words together with a mal-adjusted Vibroplex bug at around 30 WPM. What is *your* assessment of 5-10 WPM activity?

>One might argue that some 5 wpm folks are put off by the 20+ wpm that many of
>the CW ops use, but there are now enough 5 wpm tested hams with significant
>HF priveleges that they could be on the air talking to each other on CW if
they
>wanted to try the mode.

Yup. Wish I could find some of them, I'd really like to crank down my keyer and work them, if only to encourage them to keep it up.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4462. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:01:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214230125.01033.00000050@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33923

In article <f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
>if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
>argument in this thread.)

Jason:

Under the former licensing requirements, more hams became regular
CW users because learning the Morse code at a useful proficiency
level was unavoidable, if maximum HF privileges were desired.

>Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
>the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000?

I'd say it has reached a fairly stable plateau. However, in the absence
of a mandatory 13- or 20-WPM code test requirement, it will fall off
in the future.

>If the
>test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
>popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?

Because, at this point in time, there are still a lot of hams who possess
Morse code skills, as a result of the former testing requirements.
Certainly, a number of newcomers will learn and adopt CW as a
regular operating mode, but not in the same high percentage as was
the case in the Pre-Restructuring Era. In the fullness of time, I'm sure
we will see CW usage diminished to a fraction of it's present number
of participants.

>I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
>interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
>the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
>would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
>become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
>turn to CW.

Let's hope you're right -- but I for one am quite agnostic on the notion
that any significant number of future hams will be drawn to CW without
the incentive of a licensing requirement.

>In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
>testing requirement to "support" it.

I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own

initiative.

>Given the popularity of CW,
>especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can. After all,
>SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
>mandatory for license privileges.

Are YOU a regular CW user, Jason? What is your present speed for
"comfortable" CW operation? How many CW QSO's do you make,
compared to phone or other modes? If the "medical waiver" issue
had never been imposed upon the FCC by the inappropriate meddling
of a now deceased head of state with a ham callsign, and the ARRL
had steadfastly refused to support any reduction/elimination of the
former 5/13/20 WPM code testing regime, would YOU have learned
the code well enough to pass the 20 WPM test for your Extra-class
license?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4463. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:01:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020214230126.01033.00000051@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 33920

In article <a4gkji02keu@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Cecil:
>>
>> Do us a favor, would you? Go to almost any public place frequented
>> by mothers and their young daughters. Pick out a likely-looking
>> mother/daughter combo, walk up, politely introduce yourself, and
>> say, "My goodness, Mrs. [insert name], that's a very fine looking
>> little WENCH you have there!"
>>
>> Please report the results here, assuming you're not too embarrassed
>> to do so!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Again, your ignorance shows itself. Go to a Renaissance faire sometime.

I went to one in England when I was stationed there, took my
American YL friend. Some bloke there called her a "wench," and
I had to restrain her from decking him! I guess she didn't see the
humor in being called a "wench." And seeing as how our language
has evolved since the Middle Ages, neither do I.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4464. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:03:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c8870_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33927

Here, Larry...does this help you out? As it looks right now (my current downloaded list of news messages), *I* am the first person to REspond/REply to this post...

Feel better?

Kim W5TIT

<angel@wanadoo.fr> wrote in message news:_oTa8.35424$vg2.1139546170@hestia.telenet-ops.be...
> http://clik.to/freepornsites
>
> LAST DAYS !!!!
>
> Hurry up : it's now or never !
> 10 000s of pics, 1 000s of video's and lots of live shows : all 4 free for life !
> You don't need a card, you don't have to download software. Just enter a valid e-mail adress and that's it !!! Unbelievable, but really true !
> Amateur, Asian, Fetish, Gay, Lesbian, Mature, Hardcore and Teens : 8 topsites, all 4 free !
>
> http://clik.to/freepornsites
>
> Remember : this offer will expire in a few days...
>

4465. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:05:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4i1hh$1gk$2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33925

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6D32FA.FDC9A03@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> (ream of commercial manufacturing prodecure deleted as
> irrelevant to ham radio)
>
> >It's simply easier to arrive at a clean, functional piece of
> > equipment that performs as desired/expected by using this
> > method than using the old "cut and try," guesswork method.
>
> Crawl back under your rock Squiggy, who let you out this time?

Play it again Sam....
Dick, your own words do you more
harm than anyone else's (IMHO of course).

> You do it however you like, ignore standard references and commonly
> published circuits if you wish (or claim that you do
> to avoid truths on newsgroups). I'll do as I wish to make my one-
> only ham gear.
> The lame claim that one has to do all the basic
> research to actual design a ham rig is ludicrous and you ALL know
> it.

Dick,
Do you even read what other people actually said before
you pop off your exagerrated replies?

Cheers and ROTFLMAO!
Bill K2UNK

4466. Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:10:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020214231030.13786.00000166@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33926

>Subject: Re: NO-CODE: THE END-GAME
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/14/2002 6:55 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <PsOa8.7886$P21.724783@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Seems that way. Thanks for the 411. I'll steer clear of OL' droop-along
>calamity

My pleasure. I have taken to trying to ignore his usual jabs, slaps and otherwise uncivil and arrogant slurs. Just thought I'd help you cut to the chase.

He's a scumbag...no apologies from me on my choice of adjectives, either.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4467. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:18:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c8dfc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33929

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214230123.01033.00000048@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <a4glgv02lff@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Anyone can do that, Krell -- but if I didn't change the message's
subject
> >> line, why did *she* open a message about "pornstars" that she just
> >> accused *me* of being the only one who opened it? The only thing
> >> my reply would have done is ad "Re:" to the Subject line. She still
> >> opened it, while implying that I was the only one who did! I'm willing
to
> >> bet that I know at least as much about newsreaders as Kim does!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >It's called a thread. She obviously saw your name in a response, and
decided
> >to see what you had to say. Changing or not changing the subject line
> >doesn't prove anything.
>
> Krell:
>
> You've proved nothing, either. The subject line was still about
> "pornstars." Kim accused me of opening the message, then did
> the exact same thing. It doesn't matter if she recognized my
> name or not -- she did the same thing she accused me of doing,
> and probably opened the original message and went to their
> web site just to see what they had to offer! All I did was give
> them a quick slam-dunk, and predicted Kim's response almost
> to the letter. However, I'm sure Kim appreciates your ardent
> support.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Psssst, Larry. You're regaling over nothing if you think you "slam dunked"
anyone. You think the poster of a (probable) broadcasted message to
newsgroups is going to then go back and see if there were any responses?
Get real. They're looking for page hits.

Kim W5TIT

4468. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:26:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4i2oc$t4b$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 33928

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com...
> Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> argument in this thread.)
>
> Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?

The validity of the DX example can be viewed much the
same as many "old technology" pursuits in many unlicensed areas:
1. Manual gearbox autos are still sold and enjoyed by many
2. Archery is still a popular sport and mode of hunting.
3. Many people make their own furniture.
etc...

> I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
> interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
> the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
> would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
> become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
> turn to CW.

Interesting line of thought...you might just be right.

> In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
> testing requirement to "support" it.

Agree completely.

> Given the popularity of CW,
> especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can.

Agree again.

> After all,
> SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> mandatory for license privileges.

Isn't it amazing how many things, hobbys, sports,
organizations, etc manage to exist based solely on
volunteers?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4469. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 04:28:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6c904d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 33930

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020213212824.26903.00000073@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c69c9a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> I don't think you'll ever make a dime as pornstars, but you've
certainly
> >> made it as total wankers!
> >>
> >> And no, Kim -- I *didn't* look at their website!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Uh, yeah, but it looks like you're the *only* one in the whole newsgroup
who
> >opened the message, Larry...
> >
> >No surprise there.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> The "only" one, Kim? Don't look now, but you've just made a bigger
> liar out of yourself. You'll note I didn't change the subject line in my
> reply.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Hmmmm, here I am responding to your original denial, Larry. OK, I'll renig and say instead: It looks like you were the *first* (and only) RRAPer to reply to the original post, Larry. If you look at this in the threaded view, all other responses (including this one) are posts to *your* RE message...not posts to the original.

You got the award on being the first (and only) RRAPer to reply to the original post. I should have worded it thusly.

And, I'd bet dollars to donuts that I wasn't the only other person who skipped over the original message. Seems most of us did. At least I hope most people skip over messages like that. They're so very likely to contain viruses.

Kim W5TIT

4470. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 05:44:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6DE439.705FAAD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33931

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> As Cecil pointed out, your approach of copying circuits
> or projects published in books, magazines, etc. is NOT
> "design."

That's yer story and yer stickin' to it...

>
> In fact, as Cecil stated, it's no more "design" than plagerizing
> someone else's poem from a book is "writing poetry."

Crawl back in there and "design" us another cordless phone, Squigg,
just because they're selling for $4.95 these days doesn't mean the
world can't use a few more.

And oh- I suppose Cecil plaigerizes words from Websters every day.

What a real pair of dolts.

4471. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 05:49:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6DE55F.4CBBCE31@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33932

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So when one refers to a comprehensive source to check on an oscillator
> > circuit, then he is plagarizing if he decides to incorporate that circuit into a
> > rig he is DESIGNING and building?
>
> Not if he gives credit to the designer. But when you say you designed a rig,
> without giving rightful credit to the actual designer(s), that is plagiarism.

Wrong. I may use some circuit -either as found or modified to my own specifications- as a subcomponent of a system, integrating several such various subsystems, partially or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as I see fit, and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.

If you think otherwise, that just shows your ignorance of reality.

4472. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 05:53:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6DE644.A532FC86@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33933

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil's assertions
> > that none but engineers are competant to design is as flawed as his other trolls.
>
> That is a lie, Dick, and anyone who has been following this thread knows that
> is a lie. Lies like this one is why you have no respect on this newsgroup.
> If you simply stop lying, maybe you could gain some respect.
>
> For the record, I said, "Odds are, it was engineers" who originally designed
> most electronic circuits. You then twist it into a lie using "none but
> engineers". It is no wonder that no one can trust what you post.
> --

Damn, it sure is heck to be served with the same gruel you so willing serve, isn't it?

BTW just for the record, I spent the last ten years I worked employed as a Field Engineer. So it may be that I was wrong after all, some of the gear I built WAS designed by an engineer!

4473. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 06:15:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6DEB85.D50064E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33934

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >You sure are
> >running out of valid arguments, aren't you?
>
> Well, he did bring out the "crawl back under the rock" valid argument. :-)
>
> Hey, at least he didn't have to resort to "go soak your head" to win his point!

And that point was what? That I didn't design a piece of ham gear I built because I didn't do the basic research on each and every subcircuit, but instead used the ARRL handbook (and others) as a research tool?
That I may have consulted standard reference texts for basic circuits, making modifications to them as needed and integrating a number of them into a unique piece of gear that *I* designed?

You sure are helping prove my point- that Cecil and Carl are allied in their effort to pick every possible nit in their quest to "prove" to the rest of ham radio something that they just can't quite get over.
And that you are obviously committed to help

Obviously you still haven't had that headsoak.

4474. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 06:24:26 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2E7DCB85827B1FDD.2527EAAF5C0E2C22.4652340ECDD997CB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33935

On Wed, 13 Feb 2002 22:32:25 -0500, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>Have you ever actually reported one of your own...and if
>yes, what was the FCC response?

Why would the FCC respond? They'll assume that whatever illiterate
sent the complaint wouldn't be able to read the response.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4475. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 06:39:14 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0A4E5CBE741F55B9.07D1E98CBDA4DDCF.EB92CC041DAE4A64@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 33936

On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 18:04:12 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

>You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
>by copying circuits published by others ...

How far are you willing to go with that? Do I have to develop new ways of making AC into DC, so I can avoid 'copying' the bridge rectifier? Do I have to find some other way of getting the audio amp matched to the speaker's impedance, so I don't copy the impedance matching transformer already published in hundreds of places? What about Darlingtons? That's published...guess I need to find a whole new set of ways to use transistors...nope, the inner workings of transistors are published, too. So I have to some up with all new components.

And, of course, I'll need to find an unpublished antenna design to hook it up to.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4476. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 07:12:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6DF8D6.6E265615@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 33937

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > They keep hammering at the same lies over and over until YOU believe
> > them! It's amazing!
>
> Trying to crawfish your way out is not going to work, Dick. People
> are basing their opinions of you upon what you posted, not upon
> what we said you posted. What you need to do is retract some of
> the statements you have previously made.

You have been full of bullshit from day one and everyone reading here for long realizes it.

4477. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 10:59:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215055906.18959.00001085@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33938

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You sure are helping prove my point- that Cecil and Carl are allied in their
>effort to pick every possible nit in their quest to "prove" to the rest of
>ham radio something that they just can't quite get over.

Is this another one of those

4478. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:00:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215060013.18959.00001086@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33939

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You sure are helping prove my point- that Cecil and Carl are allied in their
>effort to pick every possible nit in their quest to "prove" to the rest of
>ham
>radio something that they just can't quite get over.
>And that you are obviously committed to help

Is this another one of those conspiracy things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4479. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:02:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215060250.18959.00001087@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33940

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Wrong. I may use some circuit -either as found or modified to my own
>specifications-
>as a subcomponent of a system, integrating several such various subsystems,
>partially
>or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as I
>see fit,
>and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.

I'd defend you here, Dick, but I am still smarting from your last childish
"head-soak" outburst. Maybe next time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4480. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:05:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215060525.18959.00001088@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33941

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>So I'll ask again...has your club actually "reported"
>anyone based on your club's self determination as to
>what constitutes the violation if a non-licensed person
>calls CQ and IDs as the station?

Oh, I think that we need to rethink our decision about the number of troll points the original post should have received. It if sucked Bill in, it must have been pretty good. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4481. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:12:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215061225.18959.00001089@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33942

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown
>that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of
>management to their own employees and shareholders. Now,
>according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided
>to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save
>APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that
>falling revenues and increased postage requires cost
>cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states
>minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be
>that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly
>successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest
>company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how
>many of the membership have handy internet access or use
>internet access to keep up with the BOD?

Actually, Clay, it was the ARRL Board of Directors, not the "Newington crowd" that decided to remove a number of ill-read things from QST. The detailed and boring Board and committee minutes were among them. None of the Board members live in Newington, and the meeting was held near Dallas.

I think the last time ARRL surveyed its membership on web access, the number was in the upper 70%. Those that want to receive paper copies of the Board minutes only need ask.

I personally think the decision was the correct one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4482. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:17:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215061728.18959.00001091@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33943

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>QST is in the unfortunate position of having to trim costs out of
>somewhere. DXers had their portion cut a couple years ago, and currently
>the ARRL is eyeing cutting out Section News and some contesting content
>(linescores and rules in particular), moving those over to the web. There's
>been loud wailing and gnashing of teeth out of both camps.

As to Section news, I believe that publishing that information on the web page is a much better alternative than publishing it in QST. Back when QST was the only alternative, it made sense, but the web is a much better publishing mechanism for news type information. On the web, it will not be limited in size to nearly the extent it is in QST; it will not use mouse print; it can contain photos, sound clips and hyper links and its text content will let it appear on search results using the internal and external search engines.

>But taking the minutes out - you'd think that'd be fairly non-controversial
>and also one of the easiest ways to start cutting costs (I'd also suggest
>going back to B&W and smaller type, but I digress). And, truly, it is.

When it comes to ARRL, Clay seeks every controversy he can find. I bet if the Board had voted to keep the minutes in QST, we would have seen a post from him that said that the Board had done something wrong there, too. And there would have been some great conspiracy theory tossed in there for good measure. :-)

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

4483. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:25:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215062532.18959.00001092@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 33944

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Good luck with the Savi work. I see this as the greater
>threat to 70 cm surpassing the Little LEO attempted grab.
>The ARRL had better dip into that $400,000 war chest or
>there could be big trouble.

Actually, this is but one of several things that ARRL's "Defense fund" gets spent on. The number of such threats to our use of spectrum has increased signficantly over the years, and what once was funded solely by membership dues could not continue to be funded only from that source. Fortunately, many hams have stepped up to the plate and added support to this part of ARRL's work, member or not.

>As you know interference is a two way street. If they get
>70 cm for RFID, which is very likely, and my VHF DXer friend
>down the street turns his 70 cm 10,000 W ERP beams toward
>the airport, and several bags are left laying on the tarmac
>as the plane taxis out, guess what?

In their filings with the Commission on this one, hams have offered a number of reasons that 70 cm is not a good choice.
That homeland-security tie-in is a good one. I am glad you made it. I will point it out to the DC guys and suggest that they support the Comments you filed.

But never mind your friend with his 10,000 W EIRP. What about the 70 cm radar operating at some airports? Those might leave a few bags on the tarmac, too. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4484. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 11:41:36 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Qt6b8.9799$qt6.852847@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 33945

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c6c7e64$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020214012332.06214.00000124@mb-cq.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> > >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> > >Date: 2/13/2002 5:41 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <20020213184109.18897.00000977@mb-mf.aol.com>
> >
> > >The cards that come through the buro do not have postmarks.
> >
> > Every card that I have has SOME sort of original signature, mark,
or
> > evidence of handling by some party that can be VERIFIED!. We can
whittle
> this
> > stick real thin, Ed, but the point is that while "eQSLs" may be
> "convienient",
> > they are forgeable and not reliable.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> Ooooo, hey, speaking of QSL cards: Cliff (my hubby) just got a "batch"
today
> from the--what is it called, QSL bureau or whatever at the ARRL. Not only
> did he get one card that the QSO was from back in 1999, the others were
from
> the year 2000!!!!! Man, remember when Jim was asking me about whether I
> logged the US stations I contacted during the one weekend where I worked
all
> but about 3 states in the US...I guess for some kind of proof?! I could
go
> for the logging, but anyone could lie on a log, right? If QSL cards are
> used as some kind of "proof" about getting a station, one could be DEAD
> before they ever see a card...LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT

Hi Kim, it was probably from the the W5 group (Magnolia DX Club). They
oversee the incoming QSL buro.

As to the date, not surprising. I've received cards after 3+ years. It's slow but cheaper than qsling direct. They don't call it the QSL BURRO for nothing.

Not sure how one lies on a log though. You're either in there or your not. If you work a station, you log it in.
If they send a card, you check your log. If they're not, you send in back (hopefully it came in a SASE) with NIL written on it...NOT IN LOG.

Same thing if you work a station. Can't fudge that type of thing unless there's some collusion afoot wink wink nudge nudge sayyy nooo more

And yes, finally, I have gotten a few burro cards back, after a couple of years marked SK. It happens.

Some of the cards I've gotten in the past are beautiful..scenes of the area. Some are cartoons. Some, primarily from African countries for some reason, have pictures of naked wenches on the front (gasppp..don't tell Larry for heaven sakes)

First time I ever got one, I opened the envelope and was reading the back. My wife came in and sat down,
saw the front of the card and started laughing wanting to know just what I was getting into (It was one of my first qsl cards).
I told her about getting these cards and see started turning red from laughter and telling me about not letting the kids see them. When I flipped the card and saw the naked
African wench carrying a water ...yummm... jug on her head
I turned RED!!!!!!!!

Oh well, sorry for the tangent.

73,

Ronnie

4485. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:21:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215072114.19482.00000037@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33948

In article <20020214183814.22636.00000112@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Let's ask him.
>
>>Ed, why do you insist on protecting Cecil and Carl?
>
>Didn't think I was.

Seems like you were.

>Although it hasn't happened as often, I have tried to
>point out to some who I believe misunderstood what Dick has said why I think
>they misunderstood what Dick has said.

The "as often" part tells the story.
>
>Where did this protection racket come from?

I dunno. Do they serve lobster at the BaDaBing?

>Can I get some money out of it
>for
>the ARRL Lab test equipment fund? :-)
>
"Leave the gun. Take the cannoli".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4486. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:21:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215072115.19482.00000038@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33949

In article <3C6C000E.EF2C4E86@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>But when you say you designed a rig,
>without giving rightful credit to the actual designer(s), that is plagiarism.
>Virtually anyone can copy circuits from "a comprehensive source" and that is
>not "design".

All right, how about this:

A dozen or so years ago, I found a guy selling crystal filters at a hamfest. Fifty
cents each, 1400 kHz center frequency. No data sheets. I bought four, because
sometimes such items are junk. I shoulda bought the whole milk-crate full.

Brought the things home, made some phone calls, discovered they were really
nice 8 pole jobs. Haywired together a bunch of circuits to make a crude 80
meter receiver. WOW - these things are GOOD! So now the serious work begins.

First problem is to come up with a heterodyning scheme. Lots of calculations
gives a set of VFO and xtal oscillator freqs that cover 80/40/20 without too many
spurs or birdies AND permits transceive operation. The transmit
heterodyne scheme is different from the receive scheme on 40 and 20, btw.

Then I begin drawing circuits - RF amplifier, mixer, xtal filter impedance
matching, 2 stages of IF, product detector, BFO, audio stages, sidetone
oscillator, VFO, VFO buffers, premixer, heterodyne oscillator, to name a few.
Also mechanical/chassis/panel layout, wiring harness, etc. VFO is a
subassembly in a homemade box of thick aluminum plates.

Had to figure out all of the tuned circuits and the various control schemes. Also
signal levels, impedance matching and dial calibration. Most of the individual
stage circuits (like the product detector) are adaptations of tried-and-true ones,
but they required adaptation to work on the desired frequency ranges and using
available parts.

No fancy test gear or tools. I was lucky to have an old drill press and lots of
parts. Also a VTVM, VOM, GDO, Q meter, freq meter and an old signal generator.

End result worked really well and became my station receiver for over a decade.
Shortly after it was completed, a matching transmitter system was added so that
the end result is a transceiver. New power supplies and cabling were assembled
from available parts.

Concepts and parts from many different sources were combined to produce a one-of-a-kind rig. It's the latest in a series of homebrew rigs that goes back to 1967. The last manufactured rig I had was a Ten Tec Argosy that I sold in 1984.

Now I ask you - did I design anything in the production of this rig? I think I did.
Is this a "homebrew" rig? I think so. Has anybody else in this NG done "homebrew" and "design" of an amateur station as an amateur (meaning at home on their own time) like this?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4487. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:21:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215072116.19482.00000039@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33946

In article <f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
>if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
>argument in this thread.)
>
>Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
>the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000?

I don;t know about the Tech. Too soon to tell about the restructuring.

>If the
>test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
>popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?

As AC6XG notes, those folks already know it.

More important, there is a large group of hams who know and use Morse today,
and will keep doing so regardless of any test. Whether new hams will be
attracted to
Morse use on the air is a different question.

>I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
>interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
>the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
>would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
>become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
>turn to CW.

Maybe - I know I sure hope so.

However, if the 'phone subbands on HF are widened, there will be less and less
room for the Morse folks to operate in accordance with good amateur practice.
(Although Morse is legal in the 'phone subbands, the routine use of Morse in
those subbands is not got operating practice).
>
>In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
>testing requirement to "support" it.

Would you say the same thing about the technical parts of the written test?

>Given the popularity of CW,
>especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can.

I agree - but only if it is popularized actively.

>After all,
>SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
>mandatory for license privileges.
>
Those activities do not require the acquisition of a new skill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4488. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:21:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215072116.19482.00000040@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 33947

In article <3C6C7750.70E7F905@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Many of your current members are too young to remember that
>Part 97 was entirely suspended during WWII, and some of it
>was long time coming back.

Besides 160 meters, what part was a long time coming back, Clay?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4489. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:36:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215073633.13782.00000159@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 33950

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Whether new hams will be
>attracted to
>Morse use on the air is a different question.

Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode tell people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are because they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before becoming hams.

I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they said here. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4490. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 12:39:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215073906.13782.00000160@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34101

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Although it hasn't happened as often, I have tried to
>>point out to some who I believe misunderstood what Dick has said why I think
>>they misunderstood what Dick has said.

>The "as often" part tells the story.

In what way? Kinda hard to misunderstand "go soak your head..."

I agree with Cecil and Carl a lot more than I agree with Dick. That doesn't
make a conspiracy. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4491. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 13:13:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202150513.e2d03fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34102

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 14, 2002:

Novice - 39,722 (decrease of 9,607)
Tech - 235,907 (increase of 30,563)
Tech Plus - 83,494 (decrease of 45,366)
General - 138,748 (increase of 26,071)
Advanced - 86,265 (decrease of 13,487)
Extra - 98,608 (increase of 19,858)
Total - 682,744 (increase of 7,952)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4492. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 14:09:11 UTC
From: Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6D1687.665A4FA2@umich.edu>
Source record: 34103
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> ... Hams
> have DIED trying to give us a New One.

Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...

"I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"

You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!

Bob, KI8AB

4493. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 14:40:10 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <e59b8.40$tu6.11933@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34104
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Lyons" <boblyons@umich.edu> wrote in message
news:3C6D1687.665A4FA2@umich.edu...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > ... Hams
> > have DIED trying to give us a New One.
>
>
> Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...
>
> "I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
> our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
> Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"
>
>
> You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!
>
> Bob, KI8AB

Bob meet Leonard H Anderson Len meet Bob. The two of you should be shut in a dark room and beat each other. I thought Len topped the cake when he trivialized the 911 events, but Bob you take a close 2nd. Back in the 80's several amateurs did die will going on a DXpedition. If memory serves, they were shot during a dispute between Taiwan and China over some piece of coral reef. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time But of course, you'd have known that if you bothered to look into the situation before proving to the NG's that you and the West Coast wacko are cut from the same piece of stank cloth. :(

No cheers or regards for you either

4494. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 15:28:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D290D.9050806@ieee.org>
Source record: 34108

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
> the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own
> initiative.

I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
survive.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4495. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 15:36:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D2AF5.4020601@ieee.org>
Source record: 34110

Dick Carroll wrote:

> And oh- I suppose Cecil plaigerizes words from Websters every day.

Sounds like you need to pop open a dictionary and look up the word,
"plagiarism". When I say. "From Webster's:", I am giving the
dictionary the credit for the definition. If you would simply
give the references for the circuits you copied, you wouldn't
be on such thin ice.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4496. 14.313.00 @1521 UTC Feb. 15, 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 15:38:24 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215103824.18245.00001384@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 34105

The McKeesport Moron aka K3QAM said."I can't wait for TR (KT4TR) to get back on the air".

Try this Queenie (imagine a grown man called Queenie), hold your breath until TR get back on the airwaves.

Then, the amateur bands will be rid of two pieces of trash.

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

4497. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 15:41:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4ja2501896@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34107

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020214230126.01033.00000051@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Again, your ignorance shows itself. Go to a Renaissance faire sometime.
>
> I went to one in England when I was stationed there, took my
> American YL friend. Some bloke there called her a "wench," and
> I had to restrain her from decking him! I guess she didn't see the
> humor in being called a "wench." And seeing as how our language
> has evolved since the Middle Ages, neither do I.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It's interesting how you accept the evolution of language, but you won't
accept evolution of amateur radio away from worthless hazing rituals.

4498. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:03:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D3139.7000505@ieee.org>
Source record: 34112

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Wrong. I may use some circuit -either as found or modified to my own specifications-
> as a subcomponent of a system, integrating several such various subsystems, partially
> or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as I see fit,
> and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.
>
> If you think otherwise, that just shows your ignorance of reality.

Dick, if you were an engineer and claimed credit for a circuit designed
by your co-worker, you would be fired. When I was at Intel and suggested
an on-chip oscillator design, I told the reviewing committee that I
obtained the design from Dr. Williamson, you know, the nocode tech
with a PhD in EE.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4499. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:05:00 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D31A2.9F4025B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34106

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
>
> QST is in the unfortunate position of having to trim costs out of
> somewhere. DXers had their portion cut a couple years ago, and currently
> the ARRL is eyeing cutting out Section News and some contesting content
> (linescores and rules in particular), moving those over to the web. There's
> been loud wailing and gnashing of teeth out of both camps.

>
> But taking the minutes out - you'd think that'd be fairly non-controversial
> and also one of the easiest ways to start cutting costs (I'd also suggest
> going back to B&W and smaller type, but I digress). And, truly, it is.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

12 pages per year.??? - one page per issue? To what
extent will the Newington crowd go to keep the QST money
pump fine tuned and ignore the membership? Nevermind, I
think we got the answer to that question on the CW testing
issue. I agree with the poster that the ARRL needs to find
a cheap printer, go back to two color if necessary, but stop
throwing content overboard. Otherwise this looks like some
kind of Machevalian management maneuver, to further
disconnect the workings of the BOD and control of the
Newington Crowd from the rank and file.

73,
Clay N4AOX

4500. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:16:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D3460.7090207@ieee.org>
Source record: 34114

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
>>You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
>>by copying circuits published by others ...
>
> How far are you willing to go with that? Do I have to develop new
> ways of making AC into DC, so I can avoid 'copying' the bridge
> rectifier? Do I have to find some other way of getting the audio amp
> matched to the speaker's impedance, so I don't copy the impedance
> matching transformer already published in hundreds of places? What
> about Darlingtons? That's published...guess I need to find a whole
> new set of ways to use transistors...nope, the inner workings of
> transistors are published, too. So I have to some up with all new
> components.

The difference between copying a design and designing it yourself
is pretty self evident. A couple of days ago, I designed a circuit
to turn on my IC-706's tune circuit when I pushed the tune button
on my HS-1600 screwdriver antenna. I recognized that I needed to
'OR' the voltages from the two antenna tuning wires and drive the
base of an NPN transistor with the resulting signal. That meant
a series resistor to limit the base current. 2N2222 transistors
are NPN. This was a very simple design but I didn't copy anyone
else's design in the process. In the process of this design, I
came up with a couple of other useful similar designs.

When I publish this design, anyone who copies it will not have
done the design work. They will have done the production work.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4501. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:17:59 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D34AD.48458FA3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34109

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> Actually, Clay, it was the ARRL Board of Directors, not the "Newington crowd"
> that decided to remove a number of ill-read things from QST.

Fine, just cite the minutes that have that action in the
record.

> The detailed and
> boring Board and committee minutes were among them. None of the Board members
> live in Newington, and the meeting was held near Dallas.
>
> I think the last time ARRL surveyed its membership on web access, the number
> was in the upper 70%.

Of course, over the years we have learned not to trust any
such "survey". Probably the question was: "Do you have a
computer and a telephone?". If the answer is yes and yes
then the member obviously has web access (never mind he has
no modem or is subscribed to an ISP).

> Those that want to receive paper copies of the Board
> minutes only need ask.

Then send them to me no later than 1 month after BOD
meetings and first class please. The anthrax mail machines
chew up third class stuff too bad now. Thank you very much
for offering this service.

>
> I personally think the decision was the correct one.

Why are we not surprised? Let's see, oh, this is the other
Ed Hare. Sorry.

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4502. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:20:02 UTC
From: Nate Bargmann <n0nb@networksplus.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D3532.4030007@networksplus.net>
Source record: 34111

N2EY wrote:
> However, if the 'phone subbands on HF are widened, there will be less
and less
> room for the Morse folks to operate in accordance with good amateur
practice.
> (Although Morse is legal in the 'phone subbands, the routine use of
Morse in
> those subbands is not got operating practice).

At this point no one is proposing any phone expansion that encroaches on any portion of the band where Morse Code is routinely used. Exceptions are code contests, but even then the activity does not extend to where the new phone subband limits are proposed. The new phone extensions may be unwise depending on how popular the digital modes become. "Wideband" digital modes such as packet radio are giving way to more spectrally efficient modes such as PSK31.

> Would you say the same thing about the technical parts of the written
test?

It is arguable that the technical portion of the exams hasn't already met the same fate. However, the exams must be geared toward the needs of the day. At one time it was critical to understand the proper workings of a PI output circuit. While it is still important knowledge for the serious home brew artist, it is less important as most hams tend to use premanufactured equipment with wideband output circiutry.

> I agree - but only if it is popularized actively.

The General and Extra exams should include a few questions about Morse timing and good operating practices after the Morse requirement is dropped. I think the popularity of QRP along with home brewing and the new activities of backpack and survival radio will encourage a knowledge of Morse. Add to that the current popularity contesting enjoys and Morse has a bright future on the ham bands for the next decade or more even if S25 is struck next year.

>>After all,
>>SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
>>mandatory for license privileges.
>>
>>
> Those activities do not require the acquisition of a new skill.

Oh, really? Then why are emergency simulation drills held so frequently? Why is traffic handling repeatedly practiced. Please don't

imply these activities require no new skills. To do so takes away from the time and effort hams perform in public service.

73, de Nate >>

4503. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:26:25 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D36A7.8896729A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34113

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> When it comes to ARRL, Clay seeks every controversy he can find. I bet if the
> Board had voted to keep the minutes in QST, we would have seen a post from him
> that said that the Board had done something wrong there, too. And there would
> have been some great conspiracy theory tossed in there for good measure. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare,W1RFI

This blatant attempt to marginalize the issue and smear the
poster does not seem in character. Please accept my pardon,
lets get back to the mainstream issues (W5TIT stuff,etc.).

Oh, wait a minute, this is the other Ed Hare. Sorry.

73,
Clay N4AOX

4504. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:32:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E7C34.55386CA6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34115

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Wrong. I may use some circuit -either as found or modified to my own
> >specifications-
> >as a subcomponent of a system, integrating several such various subsystems,
> >partially
> >or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as I
> >see fit,
> >and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.
>
> I'd defend you here, Dick, but I am still smarting from your last childish
> "head-soak" outburst. Maybe next time.

Ed, I hereby publicly apologize to you for all of that. For some reason I still don't grasp it seemed necessary to jolt you to get your attention off Cecil and Carl's jihad. Why did they decide to single me out as their target on which to heap layer after layer of insults all related to my alleged rejection of technology? Clearly it's because I still believe that hams won't learn Morse code unless it is required for licensing, at least in numbers sufficient to retain it as a viable mode within ham radio. The reasons why it needs to be retained are well established and need not be repeated yet again. As a simple curiousity it just won't make it. It's too "hard".

4505. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:35:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E7CEC.F086BE17@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34116

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown
> >that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of
> >management to their own employees and shareholders. Now,
> >according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided
> >to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save
> >APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that
> >falling revenues and increased postage requires cost
> >cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states
> >minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be
> >that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly
> >successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest
> >company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how
> >many of the membership have handy internet access or use
> >internet access to keep up with the BOD?
>
> Actually, Clay, it was the ARRL Board of Directors, not the "Newington crowd"
> that decided to remove a number of ill-read things from QST. The detailed and
> boring Board and committee minutes were among them. None of the Board members
> live in Newington, and the meeting was held near Dallas.
>
> I think the last time ARRL surveyed its membership on web access, the number
> was in the upper 70%. Those that want to receive paper copies of the Board
> minutes only need ask.
>
> I personally think the decision was the correct one.

Considering that all the important details of upcoming issues and the alliances
needed to gain a majority of votes on those issues are worked out in private
conversations in advance of BOD meetings, I certainly agree.

4506. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:36:49 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D3917.2FF509B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34117

160 meters was what I mainly had in mind. For US ARS I
believe there are still restrictions on VHF and UHF
frequencies use along parts of the Canadian Border for
security purposes. Of course in the 40's, VHF and UHF were
not as cherished by the ARS as they are today.

73,
Clay N4AOX

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C6C7750.70E7F905@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
> <wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Many of your current members are too young to remember that
> >Part 97 was entirely suspended during WWII, and some of it
> >was long time coming back.
>
> Besides 160 meters, what part was a long time coming back, Clay?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4507. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:46:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D3B7D.9040607@ieee.org>
Source record: 34118

N2EY wrote:

> Now I ask you - did I design anything in the production of this rig? I think I
> did.

In the engineering world, "design" is pretty much synonymous with "original design". When one writes some computer code, one is designing. If one borrows a sub-routine from someone else and makes a few modifications, that is usually not called design work. It is usually called integration work. The same applies to hardware. Probably most of what you did was integration. So do you think there was anything original in your "design"? Did your "design" perform a task better or different from known designs?

Contrast that to my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning system. It is very simple but I don't know of anybody else who has ever done it that way. I have searched the net and found no similar designs. So, until I find out otherwise, I can say I designed the circuit. I took the components and arranged them to perform an original (as far as I know) function. As far as I know, my Ladder-Line Length Selector is an original design.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4508. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:48:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6d417d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34125

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:0A4E5CBE741F55B9.07D1E98CBDA4DDCF.EB92CC041DAE4A64@lp.airnews.net.
..
> On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 18:04:12 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
> >You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
> >by copying circuits published by others ...
>
> How far are you willing to go with that? Do I have to develop new
> ways of making AC into DC, so I can avoid 'copying' the bridge
> rectifier? Do I have to find some other way of getting the audio
amp
> matched to the speaker's impedance, so I don't copy the impedance
> matching transformer already published in hundreds of places? What
> about Darlingtons? That's published...guess I need to find a whole
> new set of ways to use transistors...nope, the inner workings of
> transistors are published, too. So I have to some up with all new
> components.
>
> And, of course, I'll need to find an unpublished antenna design to
> hook it up to.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Joe ...

Please re-read the thread ... I have NO issue with
hams building gear for their own use by copying
existing designs.

The issue was that Dick is always the one to claim
that virtually everything (except Morse skill) from modern
technology, to modern design practice, to the most
basic principles of communications theory is "irrelevant"
to amateur radio. THEN he starts spouting about all
of the gear that he's "designed" ... when in fact it appears
that he has done essentially NO original design, merely
copied the designs of others.
```

Again, there's nothing wrong with copying a good design
(as long as it's not violating someone's intellectual property
rights ... as in patents ...), however to copy someone else's
design and claim it as one's own "design" is tantamount
to copying some else's poem and claiming to have written
it.

Those of us who have been after Dick are just trying
(though it seems an almost impossible task) to "keep
him honest" in his claims and to debunk his absurd
assertions that "all that other stuff is irrelevant to ham
radio."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG073Je+N6+q84HiEQIUAwCgi/jbvYL/SMZ45fQXHmoKUC7ju8QAoJYn
TSBSrc20QdyoQBQ0pca5gkLl
=hVuP
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4509. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 16:53:04 UTC
From: Nate Bargmann <n0nb@networksplus.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D3CF0.4040408@networksplus.net>
Source record: 34119

Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> Joshua Houk wrote:
>>But taking the minutes out - you'd think that'd be fairly non-controversial
>>and also one of the easiest ways to start cutting costs (I'd also suggest
>>going back to B&W and smaller type, but I digress). And, truly, it is.
>
> 12 pages per year.??? - one page per issue? To what
> extent will the Newington crowd go to keep the QST money
> pump fine tuned and ignore the membership?

The 12 pages are the BOD meeting minutes. I'm an avid reader of QST,
but I've rarely been so bored as to actually sit and read through the
minutes. Ocassionally I have read a particular minute that was
referenced in the meeting overview text, but not much more. I don't see
the harm in dropping the minutes and using that space for more general
interest articles.

Putting the minute on the Web has the potential to be able to
catergorize the minutes and link to them in such a way so interesting
portions can be found and read without wading through the uninteresting
stuff. Same thing for the Section News.

As it is my section (Kansas) currently receives very little column
space. But there is much more going on than my SM can report in QST.
As a result he has a monthly email newsletter to keep everyone informed.
Folding this into the ARRL.org site means uniformity with the other
sections and the ability of other sections to get a better idea of
what's happening in their neighboring sections.

> Nevermind, I
> think we got the answer to that question on the CW testing
> issue.

Groooaaannnn!

> I agree with the poster that the ARRL needs to find
> a cheap printer, go back to two color if necessary, but stop
> throwing content overboard.

How long do you think QST would last as a leading amateur radio
publication if it went back to two color?

Actually, I believe the content being proposed to be moved out currently
causes better content to be left out of QST.

> Otherwise this looks like some
> kind of Machevalian management maneuver, to further
> disconnect the workings of the BOD and control of the
> Newington Crowd from the rank and file.

Exactly how? It's arguable that making such content Web accessable potentially exposes it to a much larger audience than QST can currently reach.

I think this is the BoD's attempt to direct QST's content more toward the interests of the newer hams and offer a more diverse coverage of the operational aspects of amateur radio.

Don't like what "they" are doing, run for director. Shrug.

73, de Nate >>

4510. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:00:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D3EAC.2040907@ieee.org>
Source record: 34121

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Why did they decide to single me out as their target on which to
> heap layer after layer of insults all related to my alleged rejection of
> technology?

Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
get through when all other modes fail. Shannon's theorem does
matter. Extras should not rest on their laurels. Your "designs"
are probably not primarily original. And you have not been singled
out. Everyone else who utters technical falsehoods is chastised.

If you would try to be a nicer person, not nearly as many of
your nits would be picked.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4511. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:01:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E82FA.FDD17FAF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34120

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Whether new hams will be
> >attracted to
> >Morse use on the air is a different question.
>
> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode tell
> people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are because
> they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before becoming
> hams.
>
> I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they said
> here. :-)

If you're referring to me, let me make it clear- I sure won deny that I've said that Carl Stevenson and his type are discredited for their attitudes and lack of initiative in that they laid around and whimpered for all those years when most of us just did what was required to get the license and got on without lives.

Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency in CW operations now that no one is required to do it?
Why in the world would they? Sure, a few will find enough reason to, just as a few always found enough interest in doing so before there was any added official privilege in it. For example when Incentive Licensing came out in 1968 there were fewer than 5,000 Extra class licensees. Soon the number began to climb due to the incentives involved; learn and pass the tests and as your reward you got extra frequency previliges. Today no such incentive exists. Also the higher speed code tests, as they have existed for most of the period of some 18 years since the beginning of VE testing, are considerably easier to pass than when it required a solid minute of five at the FCC office. This has greatly enhanced the number of higher grade licensees.
Today all privileges are awarded for what is only the most elementary level of code training, and to become proficient in the mode requires the same commitment of time and interest that was found to be far "too much" for so many necomers.
Where does anyone find any indication suggesting a change in that attitude?
Just because it is no longer demanded as a test requirement, does anyone really believe that now it will be so attractive that newcomers will flock to it? I think that is a daydream.

4512. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:07:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E845A.38BF1663@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34122

Krell wrote:

>
> It's interesting how you accept the evolution of language, but you won't
> accept evolution of amateur radio away from worthless hazing rituals.

You code haters clearly duhn't realize what you say about yourselves when you label the most basic radiocommunications mode, clearly useful even in some high tech applications, and more clearly useful under the most stark conditions of communications need, as a "hazing ritual". You're no more than phraseologists, certainly not communicators.

4513. K3QAM = Clueless in McKeesport!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:08:08 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215120808.02445.00001421@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 34123

He continues to think TR as he calls that sawed off, pot bellied, drunken, lying asshole is getting back on the airwaves.

Keep dreamin' Queenie....(imagine a grown man called Queenie).

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

4514. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:12:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E857B.6AB600C0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34124

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
> > the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own
> > initiative.
>
> I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
> the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
> Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
> survive.

Interesting philosophy there, Troll. By that standard the ARS
itself is a goner, for it isn't "standing on its own merits" rather
had to have its licensing qualifications downgraded to remain
attractive to newcomers. And it is certainly not clear that the
move has helped maintain serious interest in the face of the internet..

4515. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:16:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6D4252.6DD02546@uci.edu>
Source record: 34127

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Whether new hams will be
> >attracted to
> >Morse use on the air is a different question.

> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode tell
> people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are because
> they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before becoming
> hams.

Well Ed, if young people today are anything like I was, it won't matter
very much what old timers have to say.

4516. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:16:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E8676.E176E14E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34126

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > And oh- I suppose Cecil plaigerizes words from Websters every day.
>
> Sounds like you need to pop open a dictionary and look up the word,
> "plagiarism". When I say. "From Webster's:", I am giving the
> dictionary the credit for the definition. If you would simply
> give the references for the circuits you copied, you wouldn't
> be on such thin ice.

There you go again, Mister Twister. I said I used standard circuits FOR
REFERENCE and made modifications as I found desirable for
the intended use. That is NOT "copied", thank you. But you already knew
that.

4517. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:21:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E8792.1D14EAC2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34128

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Wrong. I may use some circuit -either as found or modified to my own specifications-
> > as a subcomponent of a system, integrating several such various subsystems, partially
> > or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as I see fit,
> > and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.
> >
> > If you think otherwise, that just shows your ignorance of reality.
>
> Dick, if you were an engineer and claimed credit for a circuit designed
> by your co-worker, you would be fired. When I was at Intel and suggested
> an on-chip oscillator design, I told the reviewing committee that I
> obtained the design from Dr. Williamson, you know, the nocode tech
> with a PhD in EE.

Do we *really* need to remind you yet again that this is

AMATEUR RADIO????

4518. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:25:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E8873.AC4559DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34129

CAM wrote:

> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >
> >>You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
> >>by copying circuits published by others ...
> >
> > How far are you willing to go with that? Do I have to develop new
> > ways of making AC into DC, so I can avoid 'copying' the bridge
> > rectifier? Do I have to find some other way of getting the audio amp
> > matched to the speaker's impedance, so I don't copy the impedance
> > matching transformer already published in hundreds of places? What
> > about Darlingtons? That's published...guess I need to find a whole
> > new set of ways to use transistors...nope, the inner workings of
> > transistors are published, too. So I have to some up with all new
> > components.
>
> The difference between copying a design and designing it yourself
> is pretty self evident. A couple of days ago, I designed a circuit
> to turn on my IC-706's tune circuit when I pushed the tune button
> on my HS-1600 screwdriver antenna. I recognized that I needed to
> 'OR' the voltages from the two antenna tuning wires and drive the
> base of an NPN transistor with the resulting signal. That meant
> a series resistor to limit the base current. 2N2222 transistors
> are NPN. This was a very simple design but I didn't copy anyone
> else's design in the process. In the process of this design, I
> came up with a couple of other useful similar designs.
>
> When I publish this design, anyone who copies it will not have
> done the design work. They will have done the production work.

And you insist that no one except an engineer is capable of
doing any such thing.
If I take your circuit and find that I can
improve on it by a change that adapts it for my particular use, that
counts for nothing. We see.

4519. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:42:45 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D4889.1CD584B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34130

Nate Bargmann wrote:
>
>
>
> Exactly how? It's arguable that making such content Web accessable
> potentially exposes it to a much larger audience than QST can currently
> reach.

My interpretation of the article is that the minutes are
currently accessible in both arrl.org and QST. Is that not
true? The article, IMHO, points to reducing exposure of the
BoD minutes, by removing it from QST, not increasing it.

>
> I think this is the BoD's attempt to direct QST's content more toward
> the interests of the newer hams and offer a more diverse coverage of the
> operational aspects of amateur radio.

The blurb also stated that the editors have been authorized
to reduce the number of pages in QST per month. I don't
think this supports the above assertion.

73,
Clay N4AOX

>
> Don't like what "they" are doing, run for director. Shrug.
>
> 73, de Nate >>

4520. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 17:50:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6E8E4E.5A013959@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34131

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Why did they decide to single me out as their target on which to
> > heap layer after layer of insults all related to my alleged rejection of
> > technology?
>
> Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
> get through when all other modes fail.

CW *does* gete through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail. But you already knew that. Not many ham out there in radio land around the globe use your advanced DSP modes, or even lesser digital modes. And EVERY HF ham rig made still incorporates radiotelegraphy, which can be utilized at any time by any *qualified* ham radio operator.

> Shannon's theorem does
> matter.

Not at all to the case that was present, which was that PSK31 could not be printed when its own CWID was clearly copyable. You told me that a fair comparison couldn't be made unless I constricted the CWID to the same 31hz bandpass. When I said that "Shannon doesn't matter" that is exactly what I meant. Shannon doesn't matter in such an operational situation. Where one has to get the message through and a lesser efficiency mode works where one of higher efficienty does not, all the theory you can present doesn't matter.

> Extras should not rest on their laurels.

Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can now rest on YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the Extra Lite. Just like me, you will never again have to concern yourself with another amateur radio test. It you're implying that I dropped all interest in anything technical when I passed the Extra class exam in 1969 you're an even larger fool that you have so far presented.

> Your "designs"
> are probably not primarily original.

O I think they were. My "designs" were totally original, if the subelements known as circuits may have not been. About 30 years ago I designed and built a very compact high powered linear amplifier using a pair of 813 tubes mounted horizontally, including
an on-board solid state power supply that was little more than a
cubic foot on the desktop. Something on the order of a SB200
by Heath, but certainly different in most all detail. Was that piece of gear

"my original design"? Sure was, I even built the cabinet. I have a friend who is a ham who owns a sheet metal shop he lets me use.

> And you have not been singled
> out. Everyone else who utters technical falsehoods is chastised.
>

And you have long proven yourself the master of picky, picky, picky to the Nth degree. So you closely scrutinize each and every word for anything you can find to rearrange or reconfigure into a context that you can criticize. Like you "took both sides of the debate in high school and "won". We know, we've seen you at work here.

>
> If you would try to be a nicer person, not nearly as many of
> your nits would be picked.

So I should just allow you and the rest of the anticoders to bulldoze your way all over anything I say with impunity. That would make me "nicer". Right.

4521. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:05:13 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D4DCD.F979FF2B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34132

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> > I personally think the decision was the correct one.
>
> Considering that all the important details of upcoming issues and the alliances
> needed to gain a majority of votes on those issues are worked out in private
> conversations in advance of BOD meetings, I certainly agree.

Hi Dick,
Your assessment of the meetings may be true. But, how could you have made that assessment if the minutes were not available to you? My point is that they are going to be made less available by eliminating them from membership's journal. One can go back two years and read K1ZZ's view of the future for the ARRL, in a report he made to the BoD. One would not be able to do that if he did not have it in hard copy, and know that it is duplicated in hardcopy throughout the land. Again, pointing to ENRON's new examples of doing business, electronic files of minutes are easy to control, modify, and delete.

By the way, I am looking for pointers to w1rfi's blue ribbon committee on modes of the future - interim, or final - report to the BoD. Do you know where it is?

73,
Clay N4AOX

4522. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:08:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202151008.7dde8109@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34133

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020215073633.13782.00000159@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Whether new hams will be
> >attracted to
> >Morse use on the air is a different question.
>
> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode tell
> people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are because
> they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before becoming
> hams.

Sure. You EVER see me write anything like that, Ed?
>
> I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they said
> here. :-)

Sure. As will those on the other side of the fence.

How about those who describe other amateurs as "twits", "idiots",
"lazy mooch", "luddites", "olde fartz", "assholes", "Tennesee
Taliban", "stuck in
the past" and a host of other pejoratives? Are they the folks we
should look
to for leadership into the future?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4523. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:34:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D54B6.4020607@ieee.org>
Source record: 34135

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency in CW
> operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world would they?

Because Morse/CW has merits?
Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?
Because Morse/CW is fun for some people?
Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?
Because hams like you and me promote the mode?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4524. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:38:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D5589.1070706@ieee.org>
Source record: 34136

Dick Carol wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>>I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
>>>the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own
>>>initiative.
>>>
>>I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
>>the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
>>Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
>>survive.
>
> Interesting philosophy there, Troll. By that standard the ARS
> itself is a goner, for it isn't "standing on its own merits" rather
> had to have its licensing qualifications downgraded to remain
> attractive to newcomers. And it is certainly not clear that the
> move has helped maintain serious interest in the face of the internet..

If the AS doesn't have enough merit to survive, it doesn't deserve
to survive. I believe the FCC keeps the AS around primarily for the
purpose of emergency communications.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4525. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:40:14 UTC
From: Nate Bargmann <n0nb@networksplus.net>
Message-ID: <3C6D560E.2070803@networksplus.net>
Source record: 34134

Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> My interpretation of the article is that the minutes are
> currently accessible in both arrl.org and QST. Is that not
> true? The article, IMHO, points to reducing exposure of the
> BoD minutes, by removing it from QST, not increasing it.

I had to do a search on the ARRL site to find the latest BoD minutes, but find them I did at http://www.arrl.org/announce/board-0201/ they are also in March 2002 QST beginning on page 63. So yes it's true (why this matters, I'm unsure).

What article? I assume you mean the "It Seems to Us..." editorial by Dave Sumner K1ZZ? That is opinion as held by the Executive Vice President who oversees the day-to-day operations.

Now, I did not get the impression the HQ staff nor the BoD are trying to reduce the exposure of the minutes from Mr. Sumner's editorial. Rather the Board recognizes they have a problem and are trying to repair it (not in the vein of Enron).

> The blurb also stated that the editors have been authorized
> to reduce the number of pages in QST per month. I don't
> think this supports the above assertion.

The retraction of pages basically takes QST back to a size it was two years ago and reducing the lowest read content leads to a better publication all the way around. Keep in mind the bump-up in page count was mandated in mid-2000; a time when the Dot Bomb bubble had yet to burst and the economy was still riding high. Now advertising dollars are fewer in all areas of Tech.

QST is not the only magazine forced to reduce page count. Other Tech publication have done the same thing in the past year. The only difference is that QST has a membership base with differing opinions on how best to weather the storm.

I noticed in this latest issue quite a bit of white space in the advertising section. I think its obvious the editorial staff should be able to adjust the page count as necessary to avoid wasting paper and money.

73, de Nate >>

4526. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:43:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D56B6.7090603@ieee.org>
Source record: 34139

Dick Carroll wrote:

> There you go again, Mister Twister. I said I used standard circuits FOR
> REFERENCE and made modifications as I found desirable for
> the intended use. That is NOT "copied", thank you. But you already knew
> that.

Modifying standard circuits comes under the heading of "integration",
Dick, not "design". Technically speaking, you probably integrated your
rig. If you changed an existing poem, would you say you wrote the poem?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4527. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:44:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215134409.05201.00002050@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34137

In article <20020215060250.18959.00001087@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>or essentially based on standard published designs, making modifications as
>I
>>see fit,
>>and the final result is a piece of equipment designed by ME.
>
>I'd defend you here, Dick, but I am still smarting from your last childish
>"head-soak" outburst. Maybe next time.

Dick has an ME degree? :-)

4528. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:44:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215134409.05201.00002049@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34138

In article <0A4E5CBE741F55B9.07D1E98CBDA4DDCF.EB92CC041DAE4A64@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Thu, 14 Feb 2002 18:04:12 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>
>>You are certainly free to build ham gear for your own use
>>by copying circuits published by others ...
>
>How far are you willing to go with that? Do I have to develop new
>ways of making AC into DC, so I can avoid 'copying' the bridge
>rectifier? Do I have to find some other way of getting the audio amp
>matched to the speaker's impedance, so I don't copy the impedance
>matching transformer already published in hundreds of places? What
>about Darlingtons? That's published...guess I need to find a whole
>new set of ways to use transistors...nope, the inner workings of
>transistors are published, too. So I have to some up with all new
>components.

You've turned this into a reducto ad absurdum exchange, perhaps
not understanding what "design" is about. Let me clarify some of
the steps needed when you cannot get the exact parts stated in
publications. Let's take the "bridge rectifier" you mentioned.

You have a DC load resistance, a filter capacity, and an AC input.
Some details need to be fleshed out. The peak inverse voltage
(PIV) rating of the full-wave bridge rectifier diodes must be known so
that they can withstand the expected peak AC voltage under all
conditions (high line voltage, surges and spikes expected or
observed). You should get diodes which can take the surge current
on turn-on that comes from initial charging of the filter capacitance;
unless you have an elaborate zero-crossing "detector-trigger" ahead
of the diodes the AC input may be at any part of its cycle. That
surge current may be limited by the AC transformer winding and/or
an added series resistance. All of those factors will determine
what kind of AC ripple will exist on the DC output...and the allowed
ripple may have to be filtered further...which then leads to a re-
examination of everything to account for turn-on charging of a
second capacitor depending on whether the added filtering is R-C
or L-C. The design can be completed by worst-casing peaks and
surges against manufacturer's value tolerances.

None of that NEEDS to be done if you are just copying a circuit
out of a publication. You can just copy it, forget about checking
anything...or the possibility that a misprint/typo or outright mistake

happened that could make the circuit useless. If it works the first time and continues to work (supposedly under all conditons claimed), you can crow about "designing your own" and start looking around for praise and respect from peers on how good a "designer" you are. [that does happen with others] The alternate is the common-sense approach as it is done in the industry and by knowledgeable hobbyists: Check everything according to published design guides and formulas [General Electric put out a neat little freebie book on power supplies in the late 1960s which is ideal for that sort of thing], check the manufacturer's data on PIV, steady-state current, surge current of the diodes. Then you get the ESR of the filter capacitors (easy to measure with simple equipment if you don't have published data) to make sure the electrolytics don't overheat (if you use electrolytics). If you use a C-L-C filter you must make sure you don't have a "resonance" condition at the ripple frequency which makes the filtering ineffective.

A full-wave "bridge" recitifier is very basic and nobody in the industry "re-invents" it as part of the design process. Designers there use the basic circuit and then spend the majority of design time getting all the details, specifications, criteria met such that it is reproducible in any quantity (one to thousands) given certain part tolerances.

No real designer "reinvents" an impedance matching transformer. It is basic. What the designer does is to ascertain the driving device steady-state currents and voltages and the peak signal currents and voltages, the load impedance nominal value and value over whatever frequency range is required. If that transformer must match a speaker, it cannot be assumed that "all" speakers are "4 Ohms" (as it was prior to 1970 or so) or even that older speakers are 4 Ohms impedance over even part of their frequency response (few are).

It gets interesting when anyone copies "representative" stages having dissimilar supply voltages and then tries to approximate rebiasing active devices for the same supply voltage without doing any checking or calculation of that bias. In rare, very rare cases, such cobbling together may work (sort of) but tossing things together based on "feel" is not design.

>And, of course, I'll need to find an unpublished antenna design to
>hook it up to.

That IS an area which is wide-open for real, actual, NEW design. There are at least three major NEC computer programs to help the experimenter (EZNEC is good, Roy Lewallen's nice package). L. B. Cebik, W4RNL, has a whopping large collection of aids, tutorials, examples, etc., on his personal website and is a regular columnist at the Antennex site (an organization of antenna-oriented experimenters, mostly radio amateurs).

4529. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:46:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D576C.6060307@ieee.org>
Source record: 34140

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Do we *really* need to remind you yet again that this is
>
> AMATEUR RADIO????

But hopefully, it is not DUMBSHIT RADIO. Do we really need
to remind you that amateur radio has technical roots?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4530. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:49:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D583B.1070403@ieee.org>
Source record: 34141

Dick Carroll wrote:

> And you insist that no one except an engineer is capable of
> doing any such thing.

That's a lie, Dick, and lies like that are the reason you get
no respect on this newsgroup. I said "Odds are" that a circuit
was first designed by an engineer. If 51% of circuits are
designed by engineers, my statement is true. So Dick, do you
think amateurs design more circuits than engineers? That's
what you are arguing.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4531. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:59:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grkylbb.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34142

On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 02:08:53 GMT, Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
>Well said. Your experience seems very familiar. Your
>response to the situation is very familiar. I would bet
>that Hundt's crew probably hired Arthur Anderson to tell
>them and congress what a good job they were doing also.

It was in fact Booz-Allen-Hamilton. I spent a week at a seminar conducted by them about "Bureau reorganization" and emerged, as did my peers, feeling that this was a great waste of government money and time, and that The Bozos hadn't clue one about what we were 'sposed to be doing for a living - compliance evaluation and enforcement.

They spent one whole day on "what shall we rename the Bureau" (at the insistance of a specific Commissioner who felt that the Bureau's initials were an ethnic slur, which they weren't) and came up with a most god-awful name that was liked by no one with any experience in the agency.

THAT was more important to "the powers that be" than coming up with practical solutions for real problems, like getting more enforcement agents on board, trained, and in the field (we wound up with far less....).

>One point of disagreement, the fall of the FCC was a
>bipartisan effort. Hundt was an operative trying to satisfy
>Gore, Tauzan, Gingrich, et.al.

Like trying to ride two horses while sitting on one saddle.....

I was always disappointed that Hundt didn't have the Brass Ones to stand up to The Congress and pound the table for proper funding - for the agency, which was miniscule in the Federal scheme of things. So much for "support your troops".

>After the 911 affair I would
>bet that the "new" field group stays busy scurring around
>trying to get federal warrants to tap our internet and cell
>phone traffic.

Thanks to JEdgar Hoover and the late Congressman John Moss, the FCC is kept out of that loop. The Director would spin in his grave if anyone except his folks did any of that sort of work.

>From some of the behind the scenes stuff I have heard about, even
>R.R.A.P. is probably considered a subversive breeding ground. ;-)

The wurst of the wurst.,.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4532. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 18:59:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grl0boc.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34143

On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 16:17:59 GMT, Clay N4AOX wrote:

>> Those that want to receive paper copies of the Board
>> minutes only need ask.
>
>Then send them to me no later than 1 month after BOD
>meetings and first class please. The anthrax mail machines
>chew up third class stuff too bad now. Thank you very much
>for offering this service.

I get mine that way. No problem.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

4533. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 19:00:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C6D5AC4.4090702@ieee.org>
Source record: 34144

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>>Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
>>get through when all other modes fail.
>
> CW *does* gete through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.

No it doesn't, Dick. That statement says CW always gets through.
CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.

>>Shannon's theorem does matter.
>
> Not at all to the case that was present, ...

Sorry, Dick, theory always matters. Anyone who seeks to dismiss theory
is anti-science.

>>Extras should not rest on their laurels.
>
> Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can now rest on
> YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the Extra Lite.

Nope, I'm not resting on my laurels, Dick. I am working on a new web page
describing my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning technique.

>>If you would try to be a nicer person, not nearly as many of
>>your nits would be picked.
>
> So I should just allow you and the rest of the anticoders to bulldoze your way
> all over anything I say with impunity. That would make me "nicer". Right.

Dick, the few times I have tried to be nice to you, you have come back and
spit in my face. You get exactly the responses that you deserve. You can
dish out obscenity after obscenity but you just can't take a little criticism.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4534. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 19:03:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <dYcb8.6510$Nv5.548816@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34145

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6C7B3A.F57CE95A@worldnet.att.net...
> As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown
> that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of
> management to their own employees and shareholders. Now,
> according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided
> to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save
> APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that
> falling revenues and increased postage requires cost
> cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states
> minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be
> that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly
> successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest
> company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how
> many of the membership have handy internet access or use
> internet access to keep up with the BOD?
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Clay, it probably helps to have been around a while. At one point before dementia set in, Wayne Green outsold everyone else combined and that was CQ, QST, HR in the 70s. He would regularly opine about how QST was a collection of traffic reports, minutes of meetings, and the monthly page-turner Silent Keys along with Doug DeMaw whose writing style drove me to distraction not to mention not being particularly into the doings of W1BB on 160. He was right! My shack had a lot of stuff built from 73 articles, some from HR, and not a damned thing out of Q-Street.

Like it or not the League is in the publishing biz and by and large does it well so this change reflects both the need to be more of an all things to all people magazine in the face of some changing and brutal economics in the biz; a non-profit 2nd class permit don't buy what it once did. So don't be quite so harsh about eliminating what is an easily-accessable and frankly perishable bit of news from the paper-and-ink medium. Q-Street is rarely pitched by its subscribers but few of them look up board minutes and Silent Keys from a month ago let alone a year or several years. And the reality is that news of that kind is a lot fresher off of bulletins and the Internet than the usual delay in getting it in a member mag.

I don't know the circumstances but hiding things is almost certainly not the motivation.

BTW, I have not been a member of ARRL for a number of years.

Dick NBK

4535. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 19:32:13 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <83oq6u804a65dm6a485spldk1rfbon9cr7@4ax.com>
Source record: 34146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 09:09:11 -0500, Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
wrote:

>Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...
>
> "I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
> our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
> Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"
>
>
>You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!

"One small step for a ham ..... one giant leap ...... etc etc"

:-)
73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4536. Re: N O C O D E = N O H A M .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 19:36:45 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0202151136.428be7eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34147

kc2hmn@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<beb0a48b.0202121144.22217d49@posting.google.com>...
> Realham <drwellnd@srynet.com> wrote in message news:<3C6577F7.A152D89B@srynet.com>...
> > NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
> >
> > Moan CBers moan.
>
> Moan...another troll.
>
> ====================
> 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
> ||||||||||
> ====================
> Digital Troll-O-Meter
>
> Hey what's this?
>
> http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1332041251
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Additional material. ;-)

http://www.dxring.net/11beacon.htm

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4537. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 22:54:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215175458.10835.00000348@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34148

From: Nate Bargmann n0nb@networksplus.net

>At this point no one is proposing any phone expansion that encroaches on
>any portion of the band where Morse Code is routinely used.

To my knowledge, no one has made that proposal before the FCC, although the ARRL "Novice refarming" proposal does seek to allocate part of the current Novice/Tech+ bands to radiotelephone/image use. It is arguable whether Morse code is "routinely used" in those parts of the band. Those bands certainly are much less heavily occupied when I was a Novice, receiver selectivity issues notwithstanding.

I have seen some propose here that sub-band mode allocations be dispensed with altogether. In many areas of the world, that is already the case.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4538. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 22:56:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215175656.10835.00000349@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34149

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Sure, a few will find enough reason to, just as a few
>always found enough interest in doing so before there was any added official
>privilege in it.

As a General in 1964, I was given access to all HF spectrum for 13 wpm. About a year later, I could handily do 25 wpm. There are no additional privlege in it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4539. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 22:59:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215175948.10835.00000350@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34150

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Well Ed, if young people today are anything like I was, it won't matter
>very much what old timers have to say.

That may apply to the 13 year old, but as I recall, we cared about what our elders said a LOT more than we let on. A word of praise got the shrug of the shoulders, but inside, it made a big difference.

Besides, from what I see, people are entering ham radio in their twenties, thirties and older. I think it is because as a 13-year old, I was willing to study 4 pages of study guide instead of 200+ pages required today, but what do I know. :-)

In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy and no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4540. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:04:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215180404.10835.00000351@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34051

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode
>>tell people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are
>>because they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated
>>before becoming hams.

>Sure. You EVER see me write anything like that, Ed?

Not even once. If code testing is removed, you won't have to take anything
back. :-)

>> I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they
>>said here. :-)

>Sure. As will those on the other side of the fence.

Amen, though Carl does reluctantly admit that he said some rather nasty things
a few years back. :-)

>How about those who describe other amateurs as "twits", "idiots",
>"lazy mooch", "luddites", "olde fartz", "assholes", "Tennesee
>Taliban", "stuck in
>the past" and a host of other pejoratives? Are they the folks we
>should look
>to for leadership into the future?

While I don't see "stuck in the past" as being in the same league as "asshole,"
there are many on that side of the fence I don't look to for leadership,
either, even if I agree with some of their points.

I bet if this could be decided by you and Bill Sohl, some sort of agreement
would be reached if we sat you two in a room together and didn't let you out
until an agreement was reached. The coffee would not be decaf. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4541. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:08:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215180807.10835.00000352@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34052

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org

>If you would simply give the references for the circuits you copied,
>you wouldn't be on such thin ice.

Now, Cecil, can you say that you have always given references to Hartley if you used one of his oscillator designs in your designs, or if you drew heavily from an IC manufacturer's app note?

Dick has clarified what he meant by design -- that he took a number of blocks and put them together in a way that he thought up. I accept his clarification and agree that doing so is a form of design.

I would disagree with him if he were to say that designing from scratch, using modern design tools such as CAE software is not a better way, but he clarified that he had fun and that was his primary goal.

What is wrong with live and let live? He really didn't do anything wrong, except for perhaps not initially explain what he meant by "design." Do any of the dictionary definitions of "design" not fit what he described?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4542. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:09:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215180913.10835.00000353@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34053

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org

>Dick, if you were an engineer and claimed credit for a circuit designed
>by your co-worker, you would be fired.

How about if you took a part of your design from an app note, or the ARRL Handbook. I do the latter from time to time and my boss has not threatened to fire me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4543. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:09:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C6D9533.D289F1CF@uci.edu>
Source record: 34055

W1RFI wrote:
> In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy and
> no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.

Did fear of getting a low grade motivate you to do anything?

4544. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:19:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215181905.10835.00000354@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34054

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>W1RFI wrote:

>> Actually, Clay, it was the ARRL Board of Directors, not the "Newington
>crowd"
>> that decided to remove a number of ill-read things from QST.

>Fine, just cite the minutes that have that action in the
>record.

You are correct; the action was deferred. See minute 41 from the minutes of the January 2002 Board meeting.

My apologies for creating a bit of confusion.

>> Those that want to receive paper copies of the Board
>> minutes only need ask.

>Then send them to me no later than 1 month after BOD
>meetings and first class please.

To my knowledge, the ARRL doesn't take "standing orders" for Board minutes. But they will send them on request, and, yes, it would be via one form or another of First Class mail.

Seeing as I know that you have web access, though, I will consider that your request was rhetorical.

Would you like to to post the URL, or can you find them okay on the ARRL Web site?

>> I personally think the decision was the correct one.

>Why are we not surprised? Let's see, oh, this is the other
>Ed Hare. Sorry.

I don't understand the snip. But you are right -- you should not be surprised, because not printing something in QST that very few people read, that has been well publicized through articles on the web and in QST and has been read by most of those who want to read it, much sooner than it could be published in QST, is, IMHO, a correct decision.

You are free to disagree.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4545. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:26:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215182644.10835.00000355@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34056

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> Considering that all the important details of upcoming issues and the
>alliances
>> needed to gain a majority of votes on those issues are worked out in
>private
>> conversations in advance of BOD meetings, I certainly agree.

> Your assessment of the meetings may be true. But, how
>could you have made that assessment if the minutes were not
>available to you?

But the minutes are available to him, Clay -- sooner than they would be if they were published in QST.

And I agree with his assessment of the meetings.

> By the way, I am looking for pointers to w1rfi's blue
>ribbon committee on modes of the future - interim, or final
>- report to the BoD. Do you know where it is?

W1RFI does not chair any committees, Clay. But reading between the dripping sarcasm, I think that you are referring to the Technology Task Force. There is a report from that Committee on the ARRL web page -- I found it by typing "report" in the search box on the ARRL page.

The TTF is now under new leadership -- Howie Huntington is now the chairman. I have been a bit disappointed in the relative lack of activity of the TTF over the past months and I am looking forward to working with Howie to see what can be done.

Another related committee is the Spectrum Strategy Committee. It has wound down its work and issued a final report at the January meeting. I think that the Jan 2001 report of Stratcom was about as in depth as I can imagine a report to be, btw -- that is probably a better report to read to get the gist of Stratcom's work.

Since the report, the High Speed Digital & Multimedia Working Group and the Software Define Radio Working Group have been formed and they are just now getting ramped up.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4546. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:29:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215182950.10835.00000358@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34057

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
>> the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
>> Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
>> survive.

> Interesting philosophy there, Troll.

Do you really think that Cecil said that just to get a reaction out of you, or
do you think he believes what he says?

>And it is certainly not clear that the
>move has helped maintain serious interest in the face of the internet..

The move is about a year old. How did the Amateur Radio Service fare in growth
over the past 10 years as the internet was ramping up?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4547. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:32:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215183201.10835.00000359@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34058

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Otherwise this looks like some
>kind of Machevalian management maneuver, to further
>disconnect the workings of the BOD and control of the
>Newington Crowd from the rank and file.

Do you think that is why they have published all of the minutes on the web,
much sooner than they could be published in QST?

I think you are seeing the Devil behind every bush, Clay.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4548. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-15 23:36:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215183619.10835.00000360@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34059

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>The blurb also stated that the editors have been authorized
>to reduce the number of pages in QST per month. I don't
>think this supports the above assertion.

This stems from a previous mandate from the Board that the size of QST was to be fixed at a certain number of pages. That didn't work out, so the Board went back to what it has always been -- the number of pages are determined by the amount of advertising sold.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4549. Re: N O C O D E = N O H A M .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 00:46:55 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c6daba2.1136689@news.bright.net>
Source record: 34060

On 15 Feb 2002 11:36:45 -0800, kc2hmn@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote:

>kc2hmn@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<beb0a48b.0202121144.22217d49@posting.google.com>...
>> Realham <drwellnd@srynet.com> wrote in message news:<3C6577F7.A152D89B@srynet.com>...
>> > NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>> >
>> > Moan CBers moan.
>>
>> Moan...another troll.
>>
>> ====================
>> 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
>> ||||||||||
>> ====================
>> Digital Troll-O-Meter
>>
>> Hey what's this?
>>
>> http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1332041251
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> KC2HMN
>
>Additional material. ;-)
>
>http://www.dxring.net/11beacon.htm
>
>73 de Bert
>KC2HMN

I missed the first post about the walkie talkie, heck I just might buy
it, I used to have a pair of those as a kid. But now that I passed my
tech test, I can practice code on 2m too.

Keith
Vice President: REACT of Hebry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

4550. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 01:01:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215200152.05201.00002068@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34061

In article <9f4bfe89.0202151008.7dde8109@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020215073633.13782.00000159@mb-dd.aol.com>...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >Whether new hams will be attracted to
>> >Morse use on the air is a different question.
>>
>> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode
tell
>> people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are
because
>> they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before
becoming
>> hams.
>
>Sure. You EVER see me write anything like that, Ed?
>>
>> I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they
said
>> here. :-)
>
>Sure. As will those on the other side of the fence.
>
>How about those who describe other amateurs as "twits", "idiots",
>"lazy mooch", "luddites", "olde fartz", "assholes", "Tennesee Taliban", "stuck
in
>the past" and a host of other pejoratives? Are they the folks we should look
>to for leadership into the future?

Apparently so considering that all those words in quotation marks were written by ALREADY LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS. Go do the famous N2EY Google search to see who they are.

N2EY is a "ham historian" claimant who has consistently made known his love for the PAST in terms of equipment, technology, tradition, operating skills. N2EY has also consistently ignored the rest of the radio world in regards to technological advances made outside of amateur radio. This is apparent in the sum total of N2EY's messaging over the past years.

N2EY is an advocate of morse methods in amateur radio...and was an outright PCTA who could not effectively "sell" the "need" for morse skills for a US amateur radio license. N2EY has now become somewhat

ambivalent in morse testing, claiming that "morse testing is a 'closed issue' and a 'done deal'" and that "no further discussion on that is needed." N2EY has claimed foreknowledge of the FCC intentions and motivations as if he had "inside information" not accessible by the public...said "knowing of intentions" being rather fanciful claims which are rather colored by his particular personal desires.

The facts from the FCC in regards to the code testing issue(s) are accessible to the US public and anyone who has Internet access capability. As to "the code issue being a 'done deal,'" the FCC International Bureau Informal Working Group Six (IWG-6) has effectively tabled or DONE NOTHING about S25.5 insofar as establishing any direct statement one way or another. The IWG-6 has also tabled the "40 m issue" after a year's time in at least six meetings; the 40 m issue of SW BC v. amateurs has been going on since WARC-1979.

Reading EVERYTHING about the IWG-6 can reveal some additional data that the code test issue is NOT a "done deal." The minutes of the September 2001 meeting of IWG-6 were not released until FOUR MONTHS LATER. Some may rationalize that as due to the 9-11 Attack on America but OTHER IWGs got their old meeting minutes released before the extraordinary delay of FOUR MONTHS to write up two pages of copy. The fine detail also reveals that the "scribe" for IWG-6 is Walt Ireland, a representative of the ARRL, the person responsible for getting those minutes written up.

All that is publicly accessible. No "mind reading" is needed or whatever metaphysical powers are claimed to "know what the FCC intends." The FCC's IWG-6 has not yet formed a position on amateur radio license code testing after over a year's time on action items that were formed over two years ago. The NTIA has already established their position on code testing, also publicly accessible. The US administration to WRC is made up of Department of State, FCC, and NTIA. As a group those can vote for the USA. Neither the ARRL nor IARU has any vote at any WRC despite the IARU finally reaching some sort of position on code testing (ambivalent, can only be interpreted as rather moderately not for it).

What kind of "looking to the future" is that? Nothing. IWG-6 seems to be stonewalling even though they have the least-technical action items of any IWG. One doesn't need to be a gifted seer to read the IWG-6 minutes and members affiliations and come to a conclusion there. It's all public.

Ah, but, N2EY will now segue to the "charges of name-calling," go into the "go search Google" routine, and attempt to bend pointing fingers back to the pointer. He will insist that He did no wrong, supports the future despite a romantic attachment to the past where the transistor and IC were not yet a part of amateur radio. He will also insist on code testing "because so many hams use code, love it, etc., etc." and still insist that the "code test is a done deal."

By the desperate ploy of trying to bend pointing fingers AND totally ignoring what has been written in here by rather obvious PCTAs (the most infamous being KH2D followed by the ever-popular Eric June), he tries to exhonerate the PCTAs as ALWAYS being the "good guys." They can do NO WRONG

for they love and cherish morsemanship, and seem to think they are "fully qualified" to behave in whatever way they choose.

The PCTAs think that the PAST is the "future." They want the present to revere, respect, and acknowledge their "superiority" in radio for "retaining the
cherished traditions (most prominent being morse code ability)" as if that were a Divine Attribute. It isn't divine but the delusion exists.

The present isn't falling for that and hasn't "flocked" to an amateur radio that
seems stubbornly, vainly trying to hold onto the past. All the PCTA denial and spin and name-calling and attempts to bar some citizens from commenting to their government does no good in making the past the future.

4551. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 01:18:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DB350.57D9E661@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34062

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org
>
> >Dick, if you were an engineer and claimed credit for a circuit designed
> >by your co-worker, you would be fired.
>
> How about if you took a part of your design from an app note, or the ARRL
> Handbook. I do the latter from time to time and my boss has not threatened to
> fire me.

Did you lie to your boss and tell him that you designed it all by yourself?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4552. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 01:22:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DB465.90BEA83A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34063

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org
>
> >If you would simply give the references for the circuits you copied,
> >you wouldn't be on such thin ice.
>
> Now, Cecil, can you say that you have always given references to Hartley if
> you used one of his oscillator designs in your designs, or if you drew heavily
> from an IC manufacturer's app note?

I never claimed that the oscillators I used were original designs. In fact,
I borrowed the designs from Dr. Williamson, a nocode tech with a PhD degree
in EE, and I gave him full credit for the design. At Intel, if I said I had
done an original design, they would promptly send me to the patent attorney.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4553. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 01:54:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020215205418.02067.00001419@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 34064

In article <3C6D3B7D.9040607@ieee.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Now I ask you - did I design anything in the production of this rig? I
>think I
>> did.
>
>In the engineering world, "design" is pretty much synonymous with "original
>design".

I disagree. It may be that way at Intel, but that's not the entire engineering
world.

It's interesting that you avoid Webster on the definition of "design".

>When one writes some computer code, one is designing.

Only if the code is new and unique.

>If one
>borrows a sub-routine from someone else and makes a few modifications,
>that is usually not called design work. It is usually called integration
>work.

At Intel, maybe. Not everywhere.

> The same applies to hardware.

Nope. By that definiton, almost nobody designs computers today, because they
are almost all classic Von Neumann machines.

>Probably most of what you did was
>integration.

Nope. Most of what I did was design.

> So do you think there was anything original in your "design"?

Yep. Lots of things. The heterodyne schemes, the RIT method, the dial, and
lots more.

>Did your "design" perform a task better or different from known designs?

Yup. It also met all of the design criteria set for it.
>
>Contrast that to my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning system. It is very simple but
>I don't know of anybody else who has ever done it that way.

What does it involve?

>I have searched
>the net and found no similar designs.

So? Most designs are not on the net.

>So, until I find out otherwise, I
>can say I designed the circuit. I took the components and arranged them
>to perform an original (as far as I know) function. As far as I know,
>my Ladder-Line Length Selector is an original design.

The same is true of my Southgate Type 7 transceiver. - and its predecessors.

What I find interesting is that nobody else has stepped up and described actual
amateur radio RIGS (receivers, transmitters, transceivers) they have designed
or
homebrewed from scratch. Lots of talk about "new technologies" but I don't see
any RADIOS being designed. Sad, really.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>--

4554. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 01:57:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grljnie.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34065

On 15 Feb 2002 23:19:05 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>To my knowledge, the ARRL doesn't take "standing orders" for Board minutes.

AFAIK they are sent ny mail to all field volunteer/appointees.
That's how I get mine (I'm a VC, VCE, and former Assistant Director).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4555. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:08:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DBF00.26B84664@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34066

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> writes:
> >When one writes some computer code, one is designing.
>
> Only if the code is new and unique.

If one is writing code from scratch, it is new and unique and can be
copyrighted.

> > The same applies to hardware.
>
> Nope. By that definiton, almost nobody designs computers today, because they
> are almost all classic Von Neumann machines.

You have misunderstood the concept. A new chip is a new design.

> > So do you think there was anything original in your "design"?
>
> Yep. Lots of things. The heterodyne schemes, the RIT method, the dial, and
> lots more.

Did you patent your inventions?

> >Contrast that to my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning system. It is very simple but
> >I don't know of anybody else who has ever done it that way.
>
> What does it involve?

Click on my web page. I just got through posting it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4556. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:11:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dc1b0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34067

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6DE644.A532FC86@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Cecil's assertions
> > > that none but engineers are competant to design is as flawed as his
other trolls.
> >
> > That is a lie, Dick, and anyone who has been following this thread knows
that
> > is a lie. Lies like this one is why you have no respect on this
newsgroup.
> > If you simply stop lying, maybe you could gain some respect.
> >
> > For the record, I said, "Odds are, it was engineers" who originally
designed
> > most electronic circuits. You then twist it into a lie using "none but
> > engineers". It is no wonder that no one can trust what you post.
> > --
>
> Damn, it sure is heck to be served with the same gruel you so willing
serve, isn't it?
>
> BTW just for the record, I spent the last ten years I worked employed as
a Field
> Engineer. So it may be that I was wrong after all, some of the gear I
built WAS
> designed by an engineer!
>

Yeah. And I've been a domestic engineer for some number of years...I gave
up field engineering when I left the farm...

Kim W5TIT ;)

4557. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:18:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dc345_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34069

"Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Qt6b8.9799$qt6.852847@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> Hi Kim, it was probably from the the W5 group (Magnolia DX Club). They
> oversee the incoming QSL buro.
>
> As to the date, not surprising. I've received cards after 3+ years. It's
> slow but cheaper than qsling direct. They don't call it the QSL BURRO
> for nothing.
>
> Not sure how one lies on a log though. You're either in there or your
not.
> If you work a station, you log it in.
> If they send a card, you check your log. If they're not, you send in
back
> (hopefully it came in a SASE) with NIL written on it...NOT IN LOG.
>
> Same thing if you work a station. Can't fudge that type of thing unless
> there's some collusion afoot wink wink nudge nudge sayyy nooo more
>
> And yes, finally, I have gotten a few burro cards back, after a couple of
> years marked SK. It happens.
>
> Some of the cards I've gotten in the past are beautiful..scenes of the
area.
> Some are cartoons. Some, primarily from African countries for some
reason,
> have pictures of naked wenches on the front (gasppp..don't tell Larry for
> heaven sakes)
>
> First time I ever got one, I opened the envelope and was reading the back.
> My wife came in and sat down,
> saw the front of the card and started laughing wanting to know just what I
> was getting into (It was one of my first qsl cards).
> I told her about getting these cards and see started turning red from
> laughter and telling me about not letting the kids see them. When I
flipped
> the card and saw the naked
> African wench carrying a water ...yummm... jug on her head
> I turned RED!!!!!!!!
>
> Oh well, sorry for the tangent.
>
> 73,

>
> Ronnie
>
>

heh heh heh! Thanks for the story, Ronnie! You should have XXX-rated it, though, so that Larry'd avoid ope...well, let's not go there!

I have received a couple of QSL cards, literally just a couple. I usually get asked if I QSL and I just tell them "someday." I design QSL cards and, just like a mechanic whose car is never fixed, I've yet to do my own.

So, nude ladies, eh? ;)

Kim W5TIT

4558. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:24:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F06D8.39E4BCB7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34068

Clay N4AOX wrote:

>, I am looking for pointers to w1rfi's blue

> ribbon committee on modes of the future - interim, or final
> - report to the BoD. Do you know where it is?

Clay, if you're asking me, I do not know.

4559. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:25:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dc4ca_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34070

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:3C6D2AF5.4020601@ieee.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > And oh- I suppose Cecil plaigerizes words from Websters every day.
>
>
> Sounds like you need to pop open a dictionary and look up the word,
> "plagiarism". When I say. "From Webster's:", I am giving the
> dictionary the credit for the definition. If you would simply
> give the references for the circuits you copied, you wouldn't
> be on such thin ice.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

Yeppers, I am pretty sure Dick's been had. He was had when you asked this;
he was had when I asked him to 'splain spread spectrum technology...been
had, had, had

But, he'll never admit it

Kim W5TIT

4560. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:31:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dc654_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34072

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6E845A.38BF1663@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> >
> > It's interesting how you accept the evolution of language, but you
won't
> > accept evolution of amateur radio away from worthless hazing rituals.
>
> You code haters clearly duhn't realize what you say about yourselves
when
> you label the most basic radiocommunications mode, clearly useful even in
some
> high tech applications, and more clearly useful under the most stark
> conditions of communications need, as a "hazing ritual". You're no more
than
> phraseologists, certainly not communicators.
>

A hazing ritual has nothing to do with the wonderful merit of CW, Little Dick. The hazing ritual has everything to do with your term--one of many--"code haters," Little Dick.

We are more communicators--and ham operators--than you've ever had the capacity to understand.

Kim W5TIT

4561. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 02:40:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F0A8C.4664CB94@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34071

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency in CW
> > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world would they?
>
> Because Morse/CW has merits?

And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
to do anything but urge newcomers
to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?

>
> Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?

Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
solved by the latest technology!

>
> Because Morse/CW is fun for some people?

Almist invariably those are people who learned Morse code for
licensing or use at work in the case of oldtimers. Should we expect
any serious number of newcomers who just can't find time to study
to learn it just because someone said "Hey, that sounds like fun"
when so many Cecils and Carls out there relegate it to the status
a novelty?

>
> Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?

Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
know the code? Do you REALLY think that CBers like Kim are
gonna say "Oh, geez I could really get off on learning that Morris
code and doing it on Qrp!!!" Yeah, verily!

>
> Because hams like you and me promote the mode?
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!

> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4562. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:00:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F0F3F.3BDD0523@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34073

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >>Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
> >>get through when all other modes fail.
> >
> > CW *does* gete through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.
>
> No it doesn't, Dick. That statement says CW always gets through.
> CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
>

IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
gets through when other modes.....". NO mode gets through when
there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???

>
> >>Shannon's theorem does matter.
> >
> > Not at all to the case that was present, ...
>
> Sorry, Dick, theory always matters. Anyone who seeks to dismiss theory
> is anti-science.
>

It's clear you don't know what you're talking about here. When
communications are desperately needed, RESULTS is what matters.

> >>Extras should not rest on their laurels.
> >
> > Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can now rest on
> > YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the Extra Lite.
>
> Nope, I'm not resting on my laurels, Dick. I am working on a new web page
> describing my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning technique.
>

Then you're sending FCC a petition to create new class of ham license so you can
prepare for another FCC test?

> >>If you would try to be a nicer person, not nearly as many of
> >>your nits would be picked.

> >
> > So I should just allow you and the rest of the anticoders to bulldoze your way
> > all over anything I say with impunity. That would make me "nicer". Right.
>
> Dick, the few times I have tried to be nice to you, you have come back and
> spit in my face.

You really should show some evidence in support of such a
statement as that, it sure won't stand on its own. You are an absolute
master at twisting meanings and altering contexts for the express
purpose of gouging, for some reason me in particular, and the only
reason existant is that I support code testing for hams. That's more
than enough for you.

4563. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:12:15 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kimf$d8h$0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34074

Kim:

Yep, you sure were! But it doesn't make me "feel" one way or the other;
you have a perfect right to reply to any message you want to! I'm the
last person who would make a stink over it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> Here, Larry...does this help you out? As it looks right now (my current
> downloaded list of news messages), *I* am the first person to REspond/REply
> to this post...
>
> Feel better?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

4564. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:16:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F12FE.89C03C9B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34075

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Sure, a few will find enough reason to, just as a few
> >always found enough interest in doing so before there was any added official
> >privilege in it.
>
> As a General in 1964, I was given access to all HF spectrum for 13 wpm. About
> a year later, I could handily do 25 wpm. There are no additional privlege in
> it.

Gee, Ed. I thought you'd know about band segments by license grade.

4565. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:21:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F1425.C5A772B0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34076

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Well Ed, if young people today are anything like I was, it won't matter
> >very much what old timers have to say.
>
> That may apply to the 13 year old, but as I recall, we cared about what our
> elders said a LOT more than we let on. A word of praise got the shrug of the
> shoulders, but inside, it made a big difference.
>
> Besides, from what I see, people are entering ham radio in their twenties,
> thirties and older. I think it is because as a 13-year old, I was willing to
> study 4 pages of study guide instead of 200+ pages required today, but what do
> I know. :-)
>
> In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy and
> no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.

Evidently you misunderstood what you read. It was specifically
stated that no one blames newcomers for the requrements they find
when they arrive. The criticism was directed at the Carl Stevensons
who spend their best 25 years moaning and protesting instead of
getting on with it. NCI is loaded with 'em.

4566. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:30:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34081

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F0A8C.4664CB94@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve
proficiency in CW
> > > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world
would they?
> >
> > Because Morse/CW has merits?
>
> And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
> Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
> to do anything but urge newcomers
> to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?
>

The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor that hams should be forbidden from using CW.

It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW testing. The merit of CW to prove technical aptitude is questionable, at best, so has no place in the realm of testing for technical aptitude or applicability.

> >
> > Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?
>
> Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
> solved by the latest technology!
>

I can't speak for Carl, but I have never seen Cecil do anything but remind folks that CW is not the *only* mode of merit in ham radio. Remember that, often, when someone even begins going down the path of taking CW testing out of the ham radio arena, they are suddenly akin to dumb, sleazy, fat, knuckle-dragging, etc. I do not believe CW has any place in the testing arena--though I don't care one way or the other (I already have my ticket).

I daresay, Little Dick, that you do less for the merit of CW, the fun of CW, or the practicality of CW, than Cecil, myself, Carl, or any other NCTA (as the acronym goes).

> >
> > Because Morse/CW is fun for some people?
>
> Almist invariably those are people who learned Morse code for
> licensing or use at work in the case of oldtimers. Should we expect
> any serious number of newcomers who just can't find time to study
> to learn it just because someone said "Hey, that sounds like fun"
> when so many Cecils and Carls out there relegate it to the status
> a novelty?
>

That is *your* sneering adaptation to expressions of balance that have been expressed about CW in comparison to other modes, Little Dick. Of nearly all the "new hams" I've heard on VHF/UHF the past couple of years, most are eager and excited by CW. Most are as "rabid" as you are about its value to the service.

> >
> > Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?
>
> Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
> know the code? Do you REALLY think that CBers like Kim are
> gonna say "Oh, geez I could really get off on learning that Morris
> code and doing it on Qrp!!!" Yeah, verily!
>

If you'd move your crappy attitude out of the way, Little Dick, you'd actually be believed as someone who really cares. By the way, I'll remind you again: the above is the hazing part.

> >
> > Because hams like you and me promote the mode?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >

Kim W5TIT

4567. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:30:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F1668.7BE008DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34077

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org
> >
> > >Dick, if you were an engineer and claimed credit for a circuit designed
> > >by your co-worker, you would be fired.
> >
> > How about if you took a part of your design from an app note, or the ARRL
> > Handbook. I do the latter from time to time and my boss has not threatened to
> > fire me.
>
> Did you lie to your boss and tell him that you designed it all by yourself?

No he didn't, I gather, and neither did I. Nor did I say I did. I said
"Ham radio gear that I designed and built....".

I'd bet you have worked as an engineer where it was a given that
engineers did the same. By the standard you insist on applying to me you could never
use a standard IC and claim the complex finished device that included it was your
design. Nonsense.

4568. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:31:17 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kjq5$g1f$0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34078

> Maybe this will help you, Larry. My "newsreader" is the newsreader provided
> by Outlook Express.

Kim:

Outlook Express? OIC, the "dumbed-down," 5 WPM maximum. "Restructured"
version of Microsoft Outlook. I've been using Outlook for years, as
well
as Netscape's Mail and News clients.

>When I open Outlook Express, I check my mail messages
> first. The only newsgroup I am subscribed to is rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> of which the name appears in a list.

I see.

>I have the CURRENT VIEW setting set to
> "Hide Read Messages." When I go down to the name, rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> my newsreader "logs on" to the group and downloads unread messages. So, if
> you can stretch your imagination just enough, I get a "list" of new, unread
> messages. I have the messages sorted by "Sent" and they are nested by
> thread or anything like that.

Really?

>So, when I look at my list I see the Subject
> Line, From, and Sent, in that order.

My goodness, what won't they think of next?

> Stay with me here.

I'm hanging breathlessly on your every word!

>The first night that message appeared...at least on my
> newsreader...at oh, I guess around 10:00PM, there was ONLY that message. I
> skipped reading it. I skip a LOT of messages. Before I exit my newsreader
> each time, I choose EDIT "Mark All Read" so that the same damned messages I
> deliberately skip don't show up again the next time I download.

Brilliant!

> Ya got it so far?

I'm struggling a bit, but I think I'm keeping up with you, Kim.
Please, go on...

>So, I skipped the first night. The NEXT night, I see
> *YOUR* name, Larry Roll K3LT,

Hey, that's ME! Wow! How exciting!!!

>in the "FROM" column, next to that same
> message Subject line, EXCEPT...the Re: has been added because you REsponded
> or REplied to the post.

That's REmarkable, Kim!

> I don't know how to get much clearer than that. I did open the message when
> I saw that you had replied to it...which meant you *HAD* to have opened it
> in its original form. By the way, as I was clicking on your post, I was
> ROFLMAO....

LOL, LOL, LOL2!!!! I'm really ROFLMAO too, Kim :-) I'm really not, but
I just thought I'd post a reply you'd understand and appreciate!

Actually, I must say that this is one of the best messages you've ever
posted on the newsgroup, since it was actually amusing to see your
meager attempt to patronize me! However, you did do a good job of
explaining the basics of newsreader operation -- who helped you with
the technical details?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4569. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:32:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dd4a5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34082

Glad to see my lessons helped you out.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kimf$d8h$0@216.155.33.80...
> Kim:
>
> Yep, you sure were! But it doesn't make me "feel" one way or the other;
> you have a perfect right to reply to any message you want to! I'm the
> last person who would make a stink over it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > Here, Larry...does this help you out? As it looks right now (my current
> > downloaded list of news messages), *I* am the first person to
REspond/REply
> > to this post...
> >
> > Feel better?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >

4570. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:32:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dd2e7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34079

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020215200152.05201.00002068@mb-fa.aol.com...
>
> The facts from the FCC in regards to the code testing issue(s) are
accessible
> to the US public and anyone who has Internet access capability. As
to "the
> code issue being a 'done deal,'" the FCC International Bureau
Informal Working
> Group Six (IWG-6) has effectively tabled or DONE NOTHING about S25.5
insofar
> as establishing any direct statement one way or another.

Len,

You are mistaken ...

IWG-6 produced a Draft US Proposal for the revision of S25,
which included the "suppression" of S25.5. (eliminating Morse
testing from the ITU Radio Regs) ... I know because I was there
personally on behalf of NCI and was part of the discussion.

> Reading EVERYTHING about the IWG-6 can reveal some additional data
that
> the code test issue is NOT a "done deal." The minutes of the
September
> 2001 meeting of IWG-6 were not released until FOUR MONTHS LATER.
> Some may rationalize that as due to the 9-11 Attack on America but
OTHER
> IWGs got their old meeting minutes released before the extraordinary
delay
> of FOUR MONTHS to write up two pages of copy. The fine detail also
reveals
> that the "scribe" for IWG-6 is Walt Ireland, a representative of the
ARRL, the
> person responsible for getting those minutes written up.

While in all honesty, I have to admit that I wish Walt would
produce the minutes of IWG-6 meetings more promptly,
I also have to come to his defense to some degree as well,
as I know he has many other responsibilities and spends
a good deal of time in Geneva at ITU meetings as well.

> All that is publicly accessible. No "mind reading" is needed or
whatever
> metaphysical powers are claimed to "know what the FCC intends." The
FCC's
> IWG-6 has not yet formed a position on amateur radio license code
testing
> after over a year's time on action items that were formed over two
years ago.

That is not correct ... IWG-6 produced and approved a DRAFT US
Proposal on Agenda Item 1.7 and that Proposal was approved by
the WAC (the FCC's WRC Advisory Committee).

> The NTIA has already established their position on code testing,
also publicly
> accessible. The US administration to WRC is made up of Department
of
> State, FCC, and NTIA. As a group those can vote for the USA.
Neither the
> ARRL nor IARU has any vote at any WRC despite the IARU finally
reaching
> some sort of position on code testing (ambivalent, can only be
interpreted as
> rather moderately not for it).
>
> What kind of "looking to the future" is that? Nothing. IWG-6 seems
to be
> stonewalling even though they have the least-technical action items
of any
> IWG. One doesn't need to be a gifted seer to read the IWG-6 minutes
and
> members affiliations and come to a conclusion there. It's all
public.

What you see is not always all you get ... the ARRL was represented
in IWG-6, but so was NCI ... the mutually-agreed (and approved)
result was a draft proposal to change S25 to eliminate the Morse
requirement from the ITU Radio Regs.

I spoke with the lead person in the FCC's international bureau
just the other day and was told that it was NTIA that was holding
up the final release of a formal "agreed by all" (FCC/NTIA/State)
US Proposal ... but not over the Morse issue, but over some
apparent confusion or missunderstanding about some other
aspect of the revision of S25 ... and that it was expected that
the matter would be resolved shortly.

- - --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

- - --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- - --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG3SwZe+N6+q84HiEQIkTwCcDmNt3uPxdUsKqjhnSHnkH7ggUjEAnAy+
zoZWgOULYupKEzXpTzNder04
=SGZ+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4571. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:35:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F1796.13EB06B0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34080

CAM wrote:

>If I said I had

> done an original design, they would promptly send me to the patent attorney.

See what I mean? You are *forever* adding verbiage then attributing it to something that *I* said, that I did NOT say.

Nowhere in my posts will you find that I claimed that I did any
"original design", and I did not except for the design of the overall unit itself.
That's your extreme trolling coming to the fore yet one more time, of a great many over the past few years.
You, Sire are a Troll Extraordinaire. And Stevenson is your buttboy.

4572. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:39:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6dd66a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34084

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kjq5$g1f$0@216.155.33.80...
>
> LOL, LOL, LOL2!!!! I'm really ROFLMAO too, Kim :-) I'm really not, but
> I just thought I'd post a reply you'd understand and appreciate!
>
> Actually, I must say that this is one of the best messages you've ever
> posted on the newsgroup, since it was actually amusing to see your
> meager attempt to patronize me! However, you did do a good job of
> explaining the basics of newsreader operation -- who helped you with
> the technical details?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

No one, Larry. You're just beginning to realize how smart I am.

Kim W5TIT

4573. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:42:57 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kkg1$ha1$0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34083

> You've proved nothing, either. The subject line was still about
> "pornstars." Kim accused me of opening the message, then did
> the exact same thing. It doesn't matter if she recognized my
> name or not -- she did the same thing she accused me of doing,
> and probably opened the original message and went to their
> web site just to see what they had to offer! All I did was give
> them a quick slam-dunk, and predicted Kim's response almost
> to the letter. However, I'm sure Kim appreciates your ardent
> support.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

>Pssst, Larry. You're regaling over nothing if you think you "slam dunked"
>anyone.

Kim:

No, I don't think I've "slam dunked" anyone. I don't get my jollies by
doing that kind of thing; I wouldn't want to intrude on the only fun
you get in your obviously miserable life!

>You think the poster of a (probable) broadcasted message to
>newsgroups is going to then go back and see if there were any responses?
>Get real. They're looking for page hits.

Yup, and I'm sure you gave 'em at least one!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4574. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:50:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DD70D.4C539540@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34086

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
>
> IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> gets through when other modes.....". NO mode gets through when
> there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???

When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly implies always, Dick. When all other modes are working and when all other modes have failed *is* always since there is no other possible condition. I suggest you change the statement to, "CW often gets through after most other modes have faded" so that you will avoid misleading newcomers.

> When communications are desperately needed, RESULTS is what matters.

And those results depend upon a lot of physics including Shannon's Theorem. If you don't believe it, try copying 20 wpm CW through the 31 Hz filter used by PSK31.

> You really should show some evidence in support of such a
> statement as that, it sure won't stand on its own.

Anyone reading this newsgroup for a few days has witnessed your sophomoric tantrums. Why don't you just get control of yourself and make this newsgroup a better place.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4575. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:51:04 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kkv8iba0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34085

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Hmmmm, here I am responding to your original denial, Larry. OK, I'll renig
> and say instead: It looks like you were the *first* (and only) RRAPer to
> reply to the original post, Larry. If you look at this in the threaded
> view, all other responses (including this one) are posts to *your* RE
> message...not posts to the original.

That's right, Kim -- which raises the eternal question: So what?

> You got the award on being the first (and only) RRAPer to reply to the
> original post. I should have worded it thusly.

I didn't know there was a contest!

> And, I'd bet dollars to donuts that I wasn't the only other person who
> skipped over the original message. Seems most of us did. At least I hope
> most people skip over messages like that. They're so very likely to >contain viruses.

Which is why I read them on AOL or Netscape, and not on Microsoft
Outlook or OE, the usual target of the virus-mongers.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4576. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 03:53:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DD7A1.8A05FECF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34087

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'd bet you have worked as an engineer where it was a given that
> engineers did the same. By the standard you insist on applying to me you could never
> use a standard IC and claim the complex finished device that included it was your
> design. Nonsense.

Using a standard IC in a new design and copying an existing design are
two different things, Dick, but I wouldn't expect you to understand
the difference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4577. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:02:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DD9BB.AC387915@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34088

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency in CW
> > > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world would they?
> > >
> > Because Morse/CW has merits?
>
> And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> other than to learn it?

If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.

> > Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?
>
> Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
> solved by the latest technology!

Different strokes for different folks, Dick. A free market of modes
is good for the ARS.

> > Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?
>
> Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
> know the code?

Sure sounds like you believe that Morse/CW is really unattractive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4578. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:16:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DDD19.C0932EF9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34091

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >If I said I had
> > done an original design, they would promptly send me to the patent attorney.
>
> See what I mean? You are *forever* adding verbiage then attributing it to something
> that *I* said, that I did NOT say.

It's not rocket science, Dick. You either integrated existing design blocks or
you designed your own. Jim explained his areas of homebrew design but you never
have.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4579. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:17:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F2149.F1BFDFEA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34089

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> >
> > IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> > stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> > gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when
> > there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
>
> When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> implies always, Dick.

Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the air.
When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be copied -that
is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
"Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.
Surely your vast experience as an engineer and a longtime ham has
included this ordinary but definitive experience.

4580. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:19:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F21C6.3CF4604B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34090

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I'd bet you have worked as an engineer where it was a given that
> > engineers did the same. By the standard you insist on applying to me you could never
> > use a standard IC and claim the complex finished device that included it was your
> > design. Nonsense.
>
> Using a standard IC in a new design and copying an existing design are
> two different things, Dick, but I wouldn't expect you to understand
> the difference.

That's good, because I don't, in your context. Of course I've never
worked as a design engineer, either.

4581. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:30:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DE059.297AD871@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34093

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > implies always, Dick.
>
> Nonsense!

Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and when other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.

1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
2. CW gets through when other modes fail.

Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion given the two above premises.

It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true so Premise number 2 has to be false.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4582. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:31:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F2499.C4E7F86B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34092

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency in CW
> > > > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world would they?
> > >
> > > Because Morse/CW has merits?
> >
> > And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> > other than to learn it?
>
> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>

If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
mechanism?

> > Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?

> >
> > Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
> > solved by the latest technology!
>
> Different strokes for different folks, Dick. A free market of modes
> is good for the ARS.
>
> > > Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?
> >
> > Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
> > know the code?
>
> Sure sounds like you believe that Morse/CW is really unattractive.

I think that NCI and the code bashers in general have done a more
than adequate job of describing what they think, and for sure they have made an effort to
spread their opinon around. Sure, a special
gifted few newcomers will see through all the NCI buffoonery, but most will do as so many
have already - swallow it hook, line and sinker. No one "has the time..." NCI has decided
to do a trash job on the mode from the start, and insists on "dragging the ARS into the
future" and away from the dastardly "hazing ritual", to quote
The Squig. Such rhetoric doesn't bode well for the viability of CW, as you well know. And

you couldn't care less, of course. You'd
prefer ham radio to be just like CB.

4583. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:34:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DE14A.C8CE0999@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34095

Larry Roll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
> > the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
> > Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
> > survive.
>
> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> Cecil.

On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
pushing up daisies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4584. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:34:33 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kngp$9p1$0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34094

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
> > the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own
> > initiative.
>
> I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
> the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
> Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
> survive.

This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
Cecil. It has to do with the willingness of people who have
no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level. 5 WPM
is NOT a "useful proficiency level." In the absence of a
code testing requirement of at least 12 WPM, usage of CW
will certainly decline in the fullness of time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4585. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 04:39:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6DE284.A65D4418@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34096

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>
> If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
> behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
> mechanism?

CW is fun.

> NCI has decided
> to do a trash job on the mode from the start, ...

That's simply a lie, Dick, which can be seen from statements on
the NCI web page. You continue to confuse Morse code testing with
CW, the mode. When are you going to comprehend the situation?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4586. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:15:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4kpvs$u3e$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34097

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F0F3F.3BDD0523@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >>Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
> > >>get through when all other modes fail.
> > >
> > > CW *does* gete through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.
> >
> > No it doesn't, Dick. That statement says CW always gets through.
> > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
>
> IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> stated nor implied!

WRONG! The statement absolutely implies "always".

> If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when
> there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???

Which, to be correct, your stateent should have been phrased...

CW *MAY* get through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.

> > >>Shannon's theorem does matter.
> > >
> > > Not at all to the case that was present, ...
> >
> > Sorry, Dick, theory always matters. Anyone who seeks to dismiss theory
> > is anti-science.
>
> It's clear you don't know what you're talking about here. When
> communications are desperately needed, RESULTS is what matters.

I agree...but the occasions when such results required use of morse
are so very limited, they do not hold sufficient merit to sustain requiring
morse knowledge anymore (IMHO and in the opinion of the FCC).

> > >>Extras should not rest on their laurels.
> > >

> > > Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can now rest on
> > > YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the Extra Lite.
> >
> > Nope, I'm not resting on my laurels, Dick. I am working on a new web page
> > describing my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning technique.
>
> Then you're sending FCC a petition to create new class of ham license so you can
> prepare for another FCC test?

Why would that be needed. I and many other hams pursue additional knowledge all the time. Asking for a new test would limit my pursuits to a specified syllabus of subject matter...all or most of which may hold zero interest to me and many others. Far better to let hams pursue their own path to additional knowledge based on their own interest.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4587. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:22:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4kqej$34m$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34098

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F2149.F1BFDFEA@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > implies always, Dick.
>
> Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the air.
>
> When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be
copied -that
> is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
> intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
> to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
> time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
> "Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.

Dick,
If you don't think your statements above clearly imply "always"
then you need to take some logic classes. If you said "May"
get through...you'd be at least correct regarding your lack
of implication.

> Surely your vast experience as an engineer and a longtime ham has
> included this ordinary but definitive experience.

The point, however, is that when and if "the other modes have dropped
out" it is not at all the case that CW will indeed Get Through", since the
possibility is indeed there that nothing, not even code , may be able
to get through "after the other modes have dropped out..."

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4588. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:31:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ks6ukin1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34153

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020215072116.19482.00000039@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> >if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> >argument in this thread.)
> >
> >Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> >the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000?
>
> I don;t know about the Tech. Too soon to tell about the restructuring.
>
> >If the
> >test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> >popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?
>
> As AC6XG notes, those folks already know it.
>
> More important, there is a large group of hams who know and use Morse
today,
> and will keep doing so regardless of any test. Whether new hams will be
> attracted to
> Morse use on the air is a different question.
>
> >I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
> >interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
> >the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
> >would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
> >become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
> >turn to CW.
>
> Maybe - I know I sure hope so.
>
> However, if the 'phone subbands on HF are widened, there will be less and
less
> room for the Morse folks to operate in accordance with good amateur
practice.
> (Although Morse is legal in the 'phone subbands, the routine use of Morse
in
> those subbands is not got operating practice).
> >
> >In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a

> >testing requirement to "support" it.
>
> Would you say the same thing about the technical parts of the written
test?
>
> >Given the popularity of CW,
> >especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can.
>
> I agree - but only if it is popularized actively.

True....and that's as it should. That is no different for many
other pursuits.

> >After all,
> >SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> >mandatory for license privileges.
> >
> Those activities do not require the acquisition of a new skill.

Archery, driving manual gearbox autos, ice skating, golf,
thousands of first aid squads, thousands of volunteer fire
departments, thousands of Aux police units, etc. etc.
All are "volunteer" activities that require learning skills.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4589. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:35:57 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4kr3tvjs0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34099

Nate Bargmann wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > However, if the 'phone subbands on HF are widened, there will be less
> and less
> > room for the Morse folks to operate in accordance with good amateur
> practice.
> > (Although Morse is legal in the 'phone subbands, the routine use of
> Morse in
> > those subbands is not got operating practice).
>
> At this point no one is proposing any phone expansion that encroaches on
> any portion of the band where Morse Code is routinely used. Exceptions
> are code contests, but even then the activity does not extend to where
> the new phone subband limits are proposed. The new phone extensions may
> be unwise depending on how popular the digital modes become. "Wideband"
> digital modes such as packet radio are giving way to more spectrally
> efficient modes such as PSK31.

I think ANY expansion of the phone bands is a waste of spectrum.
All throughout the Code/No-code debate, we've been hammered with
the argument that "the future is digital." Now it's time to put
up or shut up. If anything, I say the phone bands should be
REDUCED to make more room for a vast expansion of digital modes.

> > Would you say the same thing about the technical parts of the written
> test?
>
> It is arguable that the technical portion of the exams hasn't already
> met the same fate. However, the exams must be geared toward the needs
> of the day. At one time it was critical to understand the proper
> workings of a PI output circuit. While it is still important knowledge
> for the serious home brew artist, it is less important as most hams tend
> to use premanufactured equipment with wideband output circiutry.

Hams still have the authorization to put homebrewed transmitters
on-the-air, therefore the technical basics must still be covered
in the written theory tests. To eliminate that testing would doom
us to using strictly type-accepted transmitting equipment, and
consign us to the CB'er level from that point on.

> > I agree - but only if it is popularized actively.
>
> The General and Extra exams should include a few questions about Morse
> timing and good operating practices after the Morse requirement is

> dropped. I think the popularity of QRP along with home brewing and the
> new activities of backpack and survival radio will encourage a knowledge
> of Morse. Add to that the current popularity contesting enjoys and
> Morse has a bright future on the ham bands for the next decade or more
> even if S25 is struck next year.

Yeah, the next decade, maybe a bit more, but that would still be
covered by the people who learned Morse code under the Pre-Restructuring
ERA licensing requirements. The first thing I'm going to do if and
when S25.5 goes South is to offer a Morse code class to my radio
club. We'll see then just what the future of Morse code really will
be! Right now, I'm not getting any takers, even from people who
only need to pass 5 WPM for a General or Extra ticket!

> >>After all,
> >>SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> >>mandatory for license privileges.

> > Those activities do not require the acquisition of a new skill.
>
> Oh, really? Then why are emergency simulation drills held so
> frequently? Why is traffic handling repeatedly practiced. Please don't
> imply these activities require no new skills. To do so takes away from
> the time and effort hams perform in public service.

A problem with "emergency" communications at a local level is they
tend to exclude all but a very closely intrenched and exclusive
group of "insiders" at the local levels, making it hard for rank-
and-file club members to participate in a meaningful way. Lots of
excuses are given, such as "the local officials want to be dealing
with the same people all the time," but in the end, it usually just
amounts to glory-grabbing, which seems to me to be the major
motivation for a lot of "emergency communicators" anyway. When
hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4590. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:45:56 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34100

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:

> The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to
> end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
> that hams should be forbidden from using CW.

When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means
of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?

> It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
> mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW testing.

It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans. That's why FM is prohibited on most
HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you saying
that both organizations are out of line in doing so?

joshua houk
kd7pos

4591. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:46:11 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <a4krn3ua0@216.155.33.80>
Source record: 34151

W1RFI wrote:

> In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy and
> no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Almost 14 years of being called "lazy" and "no-good" motivated me
to prove that those who were saying it were wrong. And make no
mistake, I wasted all that time that I could have been a ham for
no other reason but that I *was* lazy -- but the fact that I
overcame my laziness disproved anyone who said I was "no good."
Unfortunately, when S25.5 is eliminated, we will no longer be
able to distinction, so those of us who were able to prove
ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
proficiency level on their own initiative.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4592. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:53:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C6DF3E8.7727978A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 34152

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Jason Hsu wrote:
> >
> > Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> > if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> > argument in this thread.)
> >
> > Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> > the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> > test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> > popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?
>
> Because those people know how to use code.

Or use a good computer aided code decode program.
Software and computer hardware are cheap and reliable enough
to be used in any likely scenario that the old CW transmitter and
receiver and code key setup used to be.

4593. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 05:57:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C6DF4C1.AC6E7605@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 34154

>
> If you're referring to me, let me make it clear- I sure won deny that I've said
> that Carl Stevenson and his type are discredited for their attitudes and lack of
> initiative in that they laid around and whimpered for all those years when most of
> us just did what was required to get the license and got on without lives.

^^^^^

People tell me I should get a life as well. (couldn't resist busting chops
over an obvious typo). :-)

4594. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:03:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ksrc$p9b$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34155

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6E82FA.FDD17FAF@worldnet.att.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the
mode tell
> > people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are
because
> > they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated before
becoming
> > hams.
> >
> > I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things
they said
> > here. :-)
>
> If you're referring to me, let me make it clear- I sure won deny that
I've said
> that Carl Stevenson and his type are discredited for their attitudes and
lack of
> initiative in that they laid around and whimpered for all those years when
most of
> us just did what was required to get the license and got on without lives.

Your problem Dick is a lack of logic in your statement.
You are free to make the statement you did above, but I note
the lack of any "in my opinion". The fact remains that if someone
failed to do "what was required to get the license and got on without
lives."
in no way leads to your conclusion that in not doing so, "Carl and his
type are discredited for their attitudes and lack of initiative."
YOU are free to believe whatever you want, but there are millions of
people who are far more motivated than you or I that make
their own judgements as to where, when and how they use their
discretionary time to pursue many things that are non-ham. Is one
of the local volunteer firemen to be castigated as being discredited
and having a lack of initive just because he may voice an interest in being
a ham,
but doesn't do so?

> Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency
in CW
> operations now that no one is required to do it?

Absolutely they will.

> Why in the world would they?

For personal reasons, curiosity, or whatever.

> Sure, a few will find enough reason to,

Exactly...glad you can at least admit it.

> ...just as a few
> always found enough interest in doing so before there was any added
official
> privilege in it. For example when Incentive Licensing came out in 1968
there were
> fewer than 5,000 Extra class licensees.

And the primary reason of those low numbers was because there
was no benefit to getting the Extra. Did those low numbers of Extras
mean that hams were not self educating beyond what was
required to get the General? Are you suggesting all the hams that
stopped at General lacked initive?

> Soon the number began to climb due to the
> incentives involved; learn and pass the tests and as your reward you got
extra
> frequency previliges.

Carrot and stick approach.

> Today no such incentive exists.

When did the FCC drop the exclusive Extra band segments?

> Also the higher speed code
> tests, as they have existed for most of the period of some 18 years since
the
> beginning of VE testing, are considerably easier to pass than when it
required a
> solid minute of five at the FCC office.

So what. Clearly neither you nor anyone else was able to
convince the FCC of any rational, compelling need to retain
the "higher speed" tests. At this point, it is now you that
whines and moans about the status quo because you didn't
prevail with NPRM 98-143.

> This has greatly enhanced the number of higher grade licensees.
> Today all privileges are awarded for what is only the most elementary
level of
> code training,

Ditto my last comments.

> and to become proficient in the mode requires the same commitment
> of time and interest that was found to be far "too much" for so many
necomers.

The same is true for many other things in life that have
no test requirement at all...yet people still pursue them.

> Where does anyone find any indication suggesting a change in that
attitude?

Why does there need to be any attitude change?

> Just because it is no longer demanded as a test requirement, does anyone
really
> believe that now it will be so attractive that newcomers will flock to it?
I think
> that is a daydream.

I agree.
Your problem is that you have an unrealistic expectation or demand
that "newcomers flock to it (code). Why? Your mission Dick,
should you choose to accept it, is to be a recruiter for morse usage.

The burden of sustaining interest and a following for morse is now
far more on the shoulders of morse devotees...and that is going
to become a total responsibility down the road. You can accept that
and be a proactive recruiter or you can turn your back on it
and let others try to do it without you...the choice is yours.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4595. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216011008.16502.00000120@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34156

The important question is: what belongs in QST?

The size of the mag has risen and fallen before, due to costs and things like paper rationing during WW2. Content has always been a controversial thing - some say it's "too technical", others say "too many contests", etc.

But as the official journal of the ARRL, it seems to me that QST simply must contain things like the BOD minutes, financial statement and section news.

Ways to save money:

- Less use of color
- Less "white space"
- Smaller type size for some things
- Less commentary on BoD minutes and contest results. (Note the size of the actual minutes vs. the explanations of them).

73 de Jim, N2EY

ARRL member since 1968
QST since 1923

4596. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020216011626.06196.00000031@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 34157

In article <3c6c8870_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Here, Larry...does this help you out? As it looks right now (my current
>downloaded list of news messages), *I* am the first person to REspond/REply
>to this post...
>
>Feel better?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Gee, Kim -- what about those nasty 'old viruses? Wern't you afraid
of catching one?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4597. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020216011626.06196.00000032@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 34158

In article <a4ja2501896@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> I went to one in England when I was stationed there, took my
>> American YL friend. Some bloke there called her a "wench," and
>> I had to restrain her from decking him! I guess she didn't see the
>> humor in being called a "wench." And seeing as how our language
>> has evolved since the Middle Ages, neither do I.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>It's interesting how you accept the evolution of language, but you won't
>accept evolution of amateur radio away from worthless hazing rituals.

Krell:

If by "worthless hazing ritual" you're referring to SSB and the 10-10
Club, then you're right -- I don't accept it! Morse/CW, OTOH, is a
practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications skill --
and not a "worthless hazing ritual" unless you're a lazy whiner!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4598. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:18:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ktm2vkv1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34159

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F0A8C.4664CB94@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve
proficiency in CW
> > > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world
would they?
> >
> > Because Morse/CW has merits?
>
> And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
> Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
> to do anything but urge newcomers
> to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?

The "hazing ritual" is the TEST. NCI does not oppose you,
nor anyone else, lauding the merits of code to newcomers.

> > Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?
>
> Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
> solved by the latest technology!

So? People are free to propose their own favorite approach
to problems. Today, and more so in the future, morse will
simply be another mode of choice where the choice is driven
what individuals learn about the mode from others. Do you
fear the competition with other mdoes?

> > Because Morse/CW is fun for some people?
>
> Almist invariably those are people who learned Morse code for
> licensing or use at work in the case of oldtimers. Should we expect
> any serious number of newcomers who just can't find time to study
> to learn it just because someone said "Hey, that sounds like fun"
> when so many Cecils and Carls out there relegate it to the status
> a novelty?

I don't know what you should expect...BUT whatever the
numbers of newcomers may be, serious or not, they will
either come or not based on people like yourself providing

the example.

> > Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?
>
> Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
> know the code? Do you REALLY think that CBers like Kim are
> gonna say "Oh, geez I could really get off on learning that Morris
> code and doing it on Qrp!!!" Yeah, verily!

Well...there you go again, cheap personal insults...
to wit, calling Kim a CBer. Never-the-less, why wouldn't
some people decide to try QRP and, because of that, both
do some home contruction AND learn the code?

> > Because hams like you and me promote the mode?
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Dick,
No reply to the challenge presented by Cecil..."because
hams like you and me promote the mode?"

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4599. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:29:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4kumt$3u1$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34160

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F2499.C4E7F86B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve
proficiency in CW
> > > > > operations now that no one is required to do it? Why in the world
would they?
> > > >
> > > > Because Morse/CW has merits?
> > >
> > > And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> > > other than to learn it?
> >
> > If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>
> If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
> behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
> mechanism?

WHY does anyone owe you or anyone else any explanation
as to why they take up code...or anything else?

IF you are asking to better understand the points that can
be made to use as reasons to pitch to newcomers, then
why not conduct your own survey?

> > Sure sounds like you believe that Morse/CW is really unattractive.
>
> I think that NCI and the code bashers in general have done a more
> than adequate job of describing what they think, and for sure they have
made an effort to
> spread their opinon around.

NCI opposes the morse TEST. We do not oppose morse use.

> Sure, a special
> gifted few newcomers will see through all the NCI buffoonery, but most
will do as so many

> have already - swallow it hook, line and sinker. No one "has the time..."
NCI has decided
> to do a trash job on the mode from the start, and insists on "dragging the
ARS into the
> future" and away from the dastardly "hazing ritual", to quote
> The Squig. Such rhetoric doesn't bode well for the viability of CW, as you
well know. And
> you couldn't care less, of course. You'd
> prefer ham radio to be just like CB.

Your gross exaggeration of NCI's position on code
is pathetic. The TEST is what we (NCI) oppose. Get
that straight once and for all. The TEST is the hazing
ritual. In the absence of a test, the personal commitment
of time and effort by any indivdiual to learm code (or anything
else) is their own decision. YOU can influence, recruit,
or ignor newcomers as to gaining new code users and
NCI has no concern as to your efforts. Some may disagree
with your claims, and that is true for any mode.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4600. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:33:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4kui6mja1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34161

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F12FE.89C03C9B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Sure, a few will find enough reason to, just as a few
> > >always found enough interest in doing so before there was any added
official
> > >privilege in it.
> >
> > As a General in 1964, I was given access to all HF spectrum for 13 wpm.
About
> > a year later, I could handily do 25 wpm. There are no additional
privlege in
> > it.
>
> Gee, Ed. I thought you'd know about band segments by license grade.

In 1964 there were NO Extra class band segments.
Ed moved to 25 wpm skill set simply on his personal
efforts...without any incentives for additional
spectrum.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4601. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:42:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4l0i7$f0l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34163

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kngp$9p1$0@216.155.33.80...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I respectfully disagree. CW usage will decline due to the fact that
> > > the vast majority of future hams won't bother to learn it on their own
> > > initiative.
> >
> > I don't agree with that, Larry, but if it is true, it means that
> > the merit of Morse code is not worth the effort to learn it. If
> > Morse code cannot survive on its merit, it doesn't deserve to
> > survive.
>
> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> Cecil. It has to do with the willingness of people who have
> no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
> and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level. 5 WPM
> is NOT a "useful proficiency level." In the absence of a
> code testing requirement of at least 12 WPM, usage of CW
> will certainly decline in the fullness of time.

To what level of usage do you think it will deecline if
there is NO test requirement at all?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4602. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:49:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216014957.02879.00000052@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 34162

In article <3c6dd2e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020215200152.05201.00002068@mb-fa.aol.com...
>>
>> The facts from the FCC in regards to the code testing issue(s) are
>accessible
>> to the US public and anyone who has Internet access capability. As
>to "the
>> code issue being a 'done deal,'" the FCC International Bureau
>Informal Working
>> Group Six (IWG-6) has effectively tabled or DONE NOTHING about S25.5
>insofar
>> as establishing any direct statement one way or another.
>
>Len,
>
>You are mistaken ...

Am I? Let's look at what the PUBLIC can see...

>IWG-6 produced a Draft US Proposal for the revision of S25,
>which included the "suppression" of S25.5. (eliminating Morse
>testing from the ITU Radio Regs) ... I know because I was there
>personally on behalf of NCI and was part of the discussion.

The July and September meeting minutes say you were on the
"phone bridge." Is that video teleconferencing or just audio?

The third revision of the draft on AGENDA item 1.7.1 is indicated
as COMPLETED on 11 July 2001 by Paul Rinaldo (ARRL).
That's the LATEST document on 1.7.1 as given in the separate
IWG-6 listing of all documents.

Anyone in the PUBLIC can look at the US Preliminary Views,
RCS-1363_Rev2, of October 16, 2001 and see NO, repeat NO
mentions of ANY agenda item 1.7, not 1.7.1 the code test item,
not 1.7.2 the call sign revision item, not 1.7.3 the terms and
definitions "legalese" item.

The Preliminary Draft, DA 01-2168, 17 September 2001, mentions
ONLY 1.7.2, 1.7.3 out of the three for 1.7, absolutely NO mention
of 1.7.1.

>While in all honesty, I have to admit that I wish Walt would
>produce the minutes of IWG-6 meetings more promptly,

>I also have to come to his defense to some degree as well,
>as I know he has many other responsibilities and spends
>a good deal of time in Geneva at ITU meetings as well.

I don't accept excuses of "too much workload" there. If there
are too many things to do, then SOMEONE ELSE should be
there. A four-month minutes write-up delay is ridiculous.

>That is not correct ... IWG-6 produced and approved a DRAFT US
>Proposal on Agenda Item 1.7 and that Proposal was approved by
>the WAC (the FCC's WRC Advisory Committee).

Okay, I'll bite, WHERE THE HELL IS IT? All I see is the 3rd draft
proposal IWG-6/049(Rev.3) listed and its not available to the public.

>What you see is not always all you get ... the ARRL was represented
>in IWG-6, but so was NCI ... the mutually-agreed (and approved)
>result was a draft proposal to change S25 to eliminate the Morse
>requirement from the ITU Radio Regs.

What I see is what the PUBLIC sees. The ACTUAL position on
agenda item 1.7.1 is UNKNOWN. It could be either way.

It may be fun as hell to be an "insider" but the PUBLIC doesn't know
from shinola on it. Maybe the position is pro-code, something that
would make the PCTAs deleriously happy. Maybe the position is
no-code-test. That agenda item is NOT a classified document that
would be a danger to national security if released to the public.

>I spoke with the lead person in the FCC's international bureau
>just the other day and was told that it was NTIA that was holding
>up the final release of a formal "agreed by all" (FCC/NTIA/State)
>US Proposal ... but not over the Morse issue, but over some
>apparent confusion or missunderstanding about some other
>aspect of the revision of S25 ... and that it was expected that
>the matter would be resolved shortly.

Look on the List of Documents for IWG-6. According to that, the
NTIA already did their "P.V.s" (Preliminary Views) on 1.7 et al
back on May 23rd, 2001. Hello? Can you deduce over a half
year and a bit more since then?

On the FCC document (mentioned before) on Preliminary Views
(lots of agenda items there done by other IWGs) of October 16,
2001, there are NO item 1.7 mentions. The NTIA has been
involved with OTHER agenda items and OTHER IWGs, so what is
the "excuse" really meaning?

What the hell, I'm just a citizen and a military veteran who votes
regularly and tries to stay aware and informed. Neither I nor a
PCTA can see into the "insiders" world, can we?

Pfui

4603. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 06:58:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34164

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to
> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
>
> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means
> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?

So why do people still learn archery for hunting?
Manual gearbox for driving?

Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true? If so,
feel free to argue against them. Regardless, CW does still have its
niche and, if properly promoted by those that truly like it, there
will always be a niche of CW users/enthusiasts.

> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW testing.
>
> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.

Do you understand that the USA is one of only
a few countries that have such bandplanes?

As to the ARRL...those bandplans are not the law.

> That's why FM is prohibited on most
> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you saying
> that both organizations are out of line in doing so?

There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
the HF band segments. Indeed, the same is true for
commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4604. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 07:39:22 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <K0ob8.4840$BR3.136536@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34165

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
>> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
>> from learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it
>> is) an antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
>> communication?
>
> So why do people still learn archery for hunting?
> Manual gearbox for driving?

Cute, but portraying a mode as inefficient, unreliable, etc. is
discouraging it.

> Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?

Ah yup.

> If so, feel free to argue against them.

Thanks for your blessing, but I already do.

> Regardless, CW does still have its niche and, if properly promoted by
> those that truly like it, there will always be a niche of CW
> users/enthusiasts.

True, but it would be a tremendous help if people who didn't like a mode
testing requirement would not make the mode itself into the arguing point.

>> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
>> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>
> Do you understand that the USA is one of only
> a few countries that have such bandplanes?

Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those countries have
bandplans?

> As to the ARRL...those bandplans are not the law.

You know, I just knew that there was a reason why I used the phrase "ARRL
voluntary bandplans" above...

>> That's why FM is prohibited on most
>> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you
>> saying that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
>
> There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
> the HF band segments. Indeed, the same is true for
> commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
> there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.

If you're arguing against the use of mode-specific bandplans, mandatory or
otherwise, I don't think you'll have much company.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4605. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:19:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216071918.13794.00000275@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34166

>Subject: Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/15/2002 5:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020215061728.18959.00001091@mb-mk.aol.com>

>As to Section news, I believe that publishing that information on the web
>page
>is a much better alternative than publishing it in QST.

As long as you haev a computer at your beck and call, or have no interest
in those topics.

Otherwise, you are screwed.

Remember what I said about the eQSL's and LOTW?...Well, ARRL is already
going that way with these items...

73

Steve, K4YZ

4606. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:36:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6E523D.9B92B749@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34167

Joshua Houk wrote:
> Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?

The same kind of people who own antique cars, ride horses, and walk
for the fun of it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4607. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:43:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6E540B.C018AC04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34168

Larry Roll wrote:
> Unfortunately, when S25.5 is eliminated, we will no longer be
> able to distinction, so those of us who were able to prove
> ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
> do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
> proficiency level on their own initiative.

You are free to feel that you were able to prove yourself.
You are free to have doubts about newcomers. You are free
to be wrong on both counts. You didn't prove anything of
value to the vast majority of people. You simply met the
requirements in order to gain privileges just like people
are doing today and will do in the future.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4608. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:45:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6E5487.C5B6F140@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34169

Larry Roll wrote:
> When
> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.

I suspect that has more to do with your personality than with
your qualifications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4609. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:55:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216075514.18942.00001291@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34170

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> Remember what I said about the eQSL's and LOTW?...Well, ARRL is already
>going that way with these items...

Yup, and they use the telephone instead of shouting from hill to hill. :-)

Rememer, the ARRL Board has not made up its mind about Section News in QST. If you feel a small paragraph of mouse print with several months of lead time is more useful to the membership than a web presentation that can more information, larger print, links, pictures or sound, let your Director know what you feel.

If you feel ARRL should divert some if its resources from <name it> to doing both, let your Director know that, too.

As you can tell by my slant above, I may not say the same things you do to my Director. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4610. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:58:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F9B94.F61CFE74@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34171

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > > implies always, Dick.
> >
> > Nonsense!
>
> Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of
> possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail
> Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and when
> other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical
> premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.
>
> 1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
> 2. CW gets through when other modes fail.
>
> Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion
> given the two above premises.
>
> It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one
> of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true
> so Premise number 2 has to be false.

So let's just repost my response which you so conveniently clipped in its
entirety and let the readers see it all and decide what is real and what is
BS.

> CAM wrote:
> > > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> >
> > IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> > stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> > gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when
> > there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
>
> When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> implies always, Dick.

Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the air.
When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be copied -that

is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
"Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.
Surely your vast experience as an engineer and a longtime ham has
included this ordinary but definitive experience.

4611. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 12:59:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216075929.18942.00001292@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34172

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>But as the official journal of the ARRL, it seems to me that QST simply must
>contain things like the BOD minutes, financial statement and section news.

The financial statement is required by postal law, I believe.

The League already publishes much of its official Board business on the web.
All of those committee reports are not published in QST.

>- Less use of color

How would this impact those who see QST as only a subscription?

>- Smaller type size for some things

I don't think that Board minutes, contest results and Section News could be
made any smaller. :-)

>- Less commentary on BoD minutes and contest results. (Note the size of the
> actual minutes vs. the explanations of them).

I disagree. The commentary explains things that go past the line scores and
formal minutes. I do not read every set of minutes, but I read the articles
about the Board meetings.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4612. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:00:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216080050.18942.00001293@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34173

From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com

> It has to do with the willingness of people who have
>no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
>and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level.

Wanna' bet that the word "effort" does not appear in the FCC regulations for
any radio service?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4613. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:03:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216080308.18942.00001294@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34174

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
>> Cecil.
>
>On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
>After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
>its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
>survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
>pushing up daisies.

Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.

This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe that they should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test folks believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.

That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4614. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:04:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F9CD2.99F7FD8F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34175

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6F2149.F1BFDFEA@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > > implies always, Dick.
> >
> > Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the air.
> >
> > When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> > RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be
> copied -that
> > is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
> > intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
> > to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
> > time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
> > "Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.
>
> Dick,
> If you don't think your statements above clearly imply "always"
> then you need to take some logic classes. If you said "May"
> get through...you'd be at least correct regarding your lack
> of implication.
>

Hey,Slick..... I am fully aware that you have not actually had any
experience with radiotelegraphy on the air, but what I stated is FACT and has
nothing to do with logical order or any of your other
nonsense. It is a simple fact that when conditions deteriorate to the point that
SSB cannot be copied there is a period during which further deterioration of
conditions allow CW to *still* be copied.
That is and has always been the case. You and Stupid may stuff your alleged
logic. It just isn't logical.

4615. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:07:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F9D8E.D088B7E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34176

Larry Roll wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy and
> > no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
>
> Almost 14 years of being called "lazy" and "no-good" motivated me
> to prove that those who were saying it were wrong. And make no
> mistake, I wasted all that time that I could have been a ham for
> no other reason but that I *was* lazy -- but the fact that I
> overcame my laziness disproved anyone who said I was "no good."
> Unfortunately, when S25.5 is eliminated, we will no longer be
> able to distinction, so those of us who were able to prove
> ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
> do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
> proficiency level on their own initiative.

And those NCI-ites, well, we already know about them!

4616. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:08:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216080859.18942.00001295@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34177

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Because Morse/CW has merits?
>
> And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
>other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
>Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
>to do anything but urge newcomers
>to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?

Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test for Morse code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn unless there IS a test?

Carl must love you!

>> Because Morse/CW can solve some communications problems?

>Ah, but you, Kandid Karl et al insist those problems will forever be
>solved by the latest technology!

So, does this mean that you think the usefulness of Morse code cannot even stand up to what Carl and Cecil say?

>> Because Morse/CW is fun for some people?

> Almist invariably those are people who learned Morse code for
>licensing or use at work in the case of oldtimers. Should we expect
>any serious number of newcomers who just can't find time to study
>to learn it just because someone said "Hey, that sounds like fun"

Do you think the above statement makes Morse code sound fun? Telling newcomers that they won't bother to learn it unless there is a test makes it sound onerous, Dick.

>when so many Cecils and Carls out there relegate it to the status
>a novelty?

And what status are you offering in counter?

>> Because Morse/CW is logical to use with QRP kits?

> Don't you think those kits will be built by people who already
>know the code? Do you REALLY think that CBers like Kim are
>gonna say "Oh, geez I could really get off on learning that Morris
>code and doing it on Qrp!!!" Yeah, verily!

Okay, so because a few hams won't be interested in kit building and QRP, you think you should continually put down the mode by telling everyone that you

think it is not worth learning?

>> Because hams like you and me promote the mode?

Somehow it fits that Dick didn't respond to that part of your post...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4617. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:10:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F9E37.9699C54C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34178

Robert Casey wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > Jason Hsu wrote:
> > >
> > > Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> > > if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> > > argument in this thread.)
> > >
> > > Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> > > the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> > > test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> > > popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?
> >
> > Because those people know how to use code.
>
> Or use a good computer aided code decode program.
> Software and computer hardware are cheap and reliable enough
> to be used in any likely scenario that the old CW transmitter and
> receiver and code key setup used to be.

Yep, as long as you have a great signal to noise ratio, current
computer decoding programs work OK. But when things start to
deteriorate, you will find them printing gibberish.

4618. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:10:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216081021.18942.00001296@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34179

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I have never seen anyone in
>NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor that hams should be forbidden from
>using CW.

Carl has come close, saying that CW is an antiquitated mode. He has never said
that he believes CW operation should be forbidden.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4619. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:11:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F9E95.2A51AA98@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34181

Robert Casey wrote:

> >
> > If you're referring to me, let me make it clear- I sure won deny that I've said
> > that Carl Stevenson and his type are discredited for their attitudes and lack of
> > initiative in that they laid around and whimpered for all those years when most of
> > us just did what was required to get the license and got on without lives.
>
> ^^^^^
> People tell me I should get a life as well. (couldn't resist busting chops
> over an obvious typo). :-)

I saw it too- after it had already gone!

4620. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:12:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216081226.18942.00001297@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34182

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.

>If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
>behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
>mechanism?

This could be interesting, so let's have you start, Dick. What things will you say to new hams to encourage them to learn and use the code if there is no testing for Morse proficiency?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4621. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:16:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216081602.18942.00001298@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34183

From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com

>If anything, I say the phone bands should be
>REDUCED to make more room for a vast expansion of digital modes.

Why do you believe that digital should be limited to computer-to-computer operation, or at least believe that the amount of spectrum made available to voice or image digital operation should be reduced? Much digital operation in the rest of radio today is voice.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4622. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:18:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA018.E837BADB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34185

Bill Sohl wrote:

Is one

> of the local volunteer firemen to be castigated as being discredited
> and having a lack of initive just because he may voice an interest in being
> a ham,
> but doesn't do so?
>

I've never seen *anyone* who was seriously interested in
becoming a ham that didn't become a ham. Without sittihg aroung
whine about the test requirements. And I VE'd a LOT of new hams.

> > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve proficiency
> in CW
> > operations now that no one is required to do it?
>
> Absolutely they will.
>

Really??? ON what do you base that profundity?

>
> > Why in the world would they?
>
> For personal reasons, curiosity, or whatever.
>

Yeah, Right! I *said* that a few will, and believe me, a few is what we'll get.
The elite few. In earlier times it have been the
"routine many" (save the whiners). Now it will be the Elite Few.

4623. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:18:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216081833.18942.00001299@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34186

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> How about if you took a part of your design from an app note, or the ARRL
>> Handbook. I do the latter from time to time and my boss has not threatened
>>to fire me.

>Did you lie to your boss and tell him that you designed it all by yourself?

Wouldn't work; he knows what is in the Handbook. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4624. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:22:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216082239.18942.00001300@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34188

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Did fear of getting a low grade motivate you to do anything?

Actually, no; my school career was a rather unfortunate period in my life.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4625. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:24:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA199.7D727B71@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34190

CAM wrote:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
> > Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> > antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>
> The same kind of people who own antique cars, ride horses, and walk
> for the fun of it.

If, after 50 years as a licensed ham, that's the best you can do it
really shows how little you know about ham radio.

4626. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:24:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216082446.18942.00001301@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34180

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>. The criticism was directed at the Carl Stevensons
>who spend their best 25 years moaning and protesting instead of
>getting on with it.

In slapping that brush around to paint Carl, you have said some things that I feel would be very offputting to potential newcomers.

Why don't you settle the matter and send Carl an insultive email once and get it over with, then say things here that will be directed at helping to interest new people in ham radio and Morse code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4627. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:25:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216082552.18942.00001302@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34184

From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com

>so those of us who were able to prove
>ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
>do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
>proficiency level on their own initiative.

Those that feel that way probably have an inner need to have those doubts that
I will probably never understand.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4628. Re: N O C O D E = N O H A M .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:27:23 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020216082723.28389.00000337@mb-cm.news.cs.com>
Source record: 34187

>>> > NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>>> >
>>> > Moan CBers moan.
>>>
>>> Moan...another troll.
>>>
>>> ====================
>>> 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
>>> ||||||||||
>>> ====================
>>> Digital Troll-O-Meter
>>>
>>> Hey what's this?
>>>
>>> http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1332041251
>>>
>>> 73 de Bert
>>> KC2HMN
>>
>>Additional material. ;-)
>>
>>http://www.dxring.net/11beacon.htm

Hi Keith,

Yep, there are some folks that try their darnedest to apply a cold steak to the black eye of CB/11-meters. This includes the effort to put Morse back on 11-meters. Only a funny thing happened when I did, I discovered that Morse had really never left. While certainly not in any numbers that would rival 10-meters, but sufficient enough to impress a skeptic. The first task at hand was to procure (Or build!) some older Part 15 gear. I bought a Signature, Jr. off of ebay and a Concept 2000 for my niece. Bith of these "rigs" put out a whopping 100mW. We managed to cover 15 mi. through some pretty fair QRM with these. I will admit to "bending" the rules a tad by connecting the Sig, Jr. to a 2 el. wire quad. 0:-)

Look on ebay, Keith. You'll find these units, often still new (The Sig, Jr. was.) in the box, at very reasonable cost. I think I paid eleven bucks or so for the Sig, Jr. and twenty for the Concept 2000. And the Concept 2000 came with a base unit and a h/t. (Same innards, different housings.) BTW, I don't believe the 155 mi. rule does not apply to 100mW Part 15 devices, so if I hear you...I'll try to work you.

Here's my next project. It's meant for the HTX-10, but I'm adapting it for a TRC-485. The TRC-485 is basically the same rig in "legal 40" trim.

http://www.qrparci.org/p28.PDF

http://www.qsl.net/n5ib/page2.html

http://www.qsl.net/wb8rcr/cwadapt.html

They're all variatins on the same theme and are NOT internal modifications to the transmitter proper. See you on 27.1250 MHz. Good luck, Keith.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4629. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:27:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216082757.18942.00001303@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34189

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> As a General in 1964, I was given access to all HF spectrum for 13 wpm.
>>About a year later, I could handily do 25 wpm. There are no additional
privlege
>>in it.

> Gee, Ed. I thought you'd know about band segments by license grade.

I don't understand the statement, Dick. What band segments do you think I
didn't have access to as a General? I don't recall any, but if you know of
some obscure rule that I don't remember, I am willing to be corrected.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4630. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:29:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA2CA.74E64811@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34191

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com
>
> > It has to do with the willingness of people who have
> >no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
> >and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level.
>
> Wanna' bet that the word "effort" does not appear in the FCC regulations for
> any radio service?

Of course it doesn't. It sure appeared in high numbers among the
infantile who "just didn't have the time..." though.

4631. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:32:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216083233.18942.00001304@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34192

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>WRONG! The statement absolutely implies "always".

We can put it to the test. If Dick can make a CW contact with Europe on 160 meters at high noon, when all other modes fail, his statement can stand as written.

>CW *MAY* get through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.

More accurate would be:

CW usually gets through when other commonly-used modes can be heard but are unintelligible.

That represents reality pretty nicely.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4632. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:34:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA3EE.D4353BC1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34193

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> >> Cecil.
> > >
> >On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
> >After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
> >its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
> >survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
> >pushing up daisies.
>
> Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.
>
> This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe that they
> should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test folks
> believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.
>

You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre. OF COURSE cw has merits.
We've enumerated them at length. One of them is NOT that it is
learned quickly and without significant investment of time and effort.
(Ah, there's that nasty FCC-absent word again!)
If you think that all those busy folks who "just couldn't find the time
in my busy schedule" will now suddenly get religion and find some
of that time, yer dreamin'.

> That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.

Not without "effort" on the part of those who couldn't care less
about whether or not CW survives.

4633. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:37:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34194

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Because Morse/CW has merits?
> > >
> > > And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> > >other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
> > >Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
> > >to do anything but urge newcomers
> > >to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?
> >
> > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test for Morse
> > code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn unless there IS a
> > test?

No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement

>
> Carl must love you!

He can't help himself.

4634. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:38:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e62ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34198

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kkg1$ha1$0@216.155.33.80...
> > You've proved nothing, either. The subject line was still about
> > "pornstars." Kim accused me of opening the message, then did
> > the exact same thing. It doesn't matter if she recognized my
> > name or not -- she did the same thing she accused me of doing,
> > and probably opened the original message and went to their
> > web site just to see what they had to offer! All I did was give
> > them a quick slam-dunk, and predicted Kim's response almost
> > to the letter. However, I'm sure Kim appreciates your ardent
> > support.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> >Pssst, Larry. You're regaling over nothing if you think you "slam
dunked"
> >anyone.
>
> Kim:
>
> No, I don't think I've "slam dunked" anyone. I don't get my jollies by
> doing that kind of thing; I wouldn't want to intrude on the only fun
> you get in your obviously miserable life!
>

Uh, 'scuse me dear, but you're the one who stated that you slammed dunked
'em, not me.

> >
> >You think the poster of a (probable) broadcasted message to
> >newsgroups is going to then go back and see if there were any responses?
> >Get real. They're looking for page hits.
>
> Yup, and I'm sure you gave 'em at least one!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Nope, if I want to look at porn, I'd probably buy a good magazine or
something. I stay off the sites on the WWW. I've been very fortunate to
keep from getting spam mail all the time and staying off sites like that is
part of what I attribute that to.

Sorry you're so disgruntled <GIGGLE> that the observation was made that you
were the only one in the entire read/post subscribership of the newsgroup

that responded to the original message. I haven't seen your feathers this ruffled in a long time...

Kim W5TIT

4635. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:39:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA539.123CDF04@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34195

Dick Carroll wrote:

>as long as you have a great signal to noise ratio, current

> computer decoding programs work OK. But when things start to
> deteriorate, you will find them printing gibberish.

Which is to say, if you rely on a computer program to do the job
you will be let down when you least expect and most need it to work. In short,
manually operated CW gets through after the other
commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.

4636. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:40:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6326$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34199

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kkv8iba0@216.155.33.80...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > Hmmmm, here I am responding to your original denial, Larry. OK, I'll
renig
> > and say instead: It looks like you were the *first* (and only) RRAPer
to
> > reply to the original post, Larry. If you look at this in the threaded
> > view, all other responses (including this one) are posts to *your* RE
> > message...not posts to the original.
>
> That's right, Kim -- which raises the eternal question: So what?
>
> > You got the award on being the first (and only) RRAPer to reply to the
> > original post. I should have worded it thusly.
>
> I didn't know there was a contest!
>
> > And, I'd bet dollars to donuts that I wasn't the only other person who
> > skipped over the original message. Seems most of us did. At least I
hope
> > most people skip over messages like that. They're so very likely to
>contain viruses.
>
> Which is why I read them on AOL or Netscape, and not on Microsoft
> Outlook or OE, the usual target of the virus-mongers.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well, I am so happy for you that you have found some protection from the
actions of reading such messages. I just as easily exert discretion as to
what type of email/newsgroup messages I open. Men don't seem to have that
kind of self-control, though.

Kim W5TIT

4637. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:42:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA5C2.615D3E79@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34196

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>
> >If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
> >behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
> >mechanism?

Hey, it was Cecil's assertion, with which I *DO NOT* agree. It's
up to him to support it.

4638. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:46:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34001

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6DE059.297AD871@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it
certainly
> > > implies always, Dick.
> >
> > Nonsense!
>
> Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of
> possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail
> Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and when
> other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical
> premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.
>
> 1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
> 2. CW gets through when other modes fail.
>
> Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion
> given the two above premises.
>
> It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one
> of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true
> so Premise number 2 has to be false.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes fail,"
it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone included.
For each and every circumstance in which phone won't work, packet won't
work, 20M won't work, CW won't work, there is a likely circumstance that
will take its place. No mode should be "favored" over another for
reliance--they all have their place.

If predominance of understanding the language is the primary motivation,
then voice should always take the front seat...

Kim W5TIT

4639. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:47:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA6EE.59E3441D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34197

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >. The criticism was directed at the Carl Stevensons
> >who spend their best 25 years moaning and protesting instead of
> >getting on with it.
>
> In slapping that brush around to paint Carl

OOps, you slipped there Ed. I didn't paint Carl, he came with the
pigment intact.

4640. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:53:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA856.64E7D283@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34200

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> As a General in 1964, I was given access to all HF spectrum for 13 wpm.
> >>About a year later, I could handily do 25 wpm. There are no additional
> privlege
> >>in it.
>
> > Gee, Ed. I thought you'd know about band segments by license grade.
>
> I don't understand the statement, Dick. What band segments do you think I
> didn't have access to as a General? I don't recall any, but if you know of
> some obscure rule that I don't remember, I am willing to be corrected.

Must have been your wording. You said "there *are* no added priveleges in it".
If the word had been *was* it would have changed
the meaning. Beginning in 1968 there were added privileges in 20wpm>, if one
took the Extra test.

4641. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 13:57:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FA94A.1D1821E5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34002

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

Golly- the subject line, and callsign, says it all......

4642. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:01:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6827_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34006

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kr3tvjs0@216.155.33.80...
>
> Hams still have the authorization to put homebrewed transmitters
> on-the-air, therefore the technical basics must still be covered
> in the written theory tests. To eliminate that testing would doom
> us to using strictly type-accepted transmitting equipment, and
> consign us to the CB'er level from that point on.
>

So, you are actually saying that you have homebrewed transmitters on the air, Larry? I mean, after all, it seems as though you are pretty darned opposed to type-accepted equipment--in fact, would even equate that with some damned, darned 'ol CBer.

What homebrewed transmitter do ya have? You must share shop space and design tables with Little Dick, I bet!

>
> Yeah, the next decade, maybe a bit more, but that would still be
> covered by the people who learned Morse code under the Pre-Restructuring
> ERA licensing requirements. The first thing I'm going to do if and
> when S25.5 goes South is to offer a Morse code class to my radio
> club. We'll see then just what the future of Morse code really will
> be! Right now, I'm not getting any takers, even from people who
> only need to pass 5 WPM for a General or Extra ticket!
>

Larry, if your personality in any way matches what I've seen of it here on this newsgroup, I'm surprised there's nothing but moans and groans from people when you walk into a room. Who in the world would ever approach taking any "class" from you--if they know anything about you?

>
> A problem with "emergency" communications at a local level is they
> tend to exclude all but a very closely intrenched and exclusive
> group of "insiders" at the local levels, making it hard for rank-
> and-file club members to participate in a meaningful way.
>

Wow, that used to be one of the things I expressed about Dallas RACES on this newsgroup, Larry. And you were one of the most vociferous about my whining about maybe I wasn't wanted. 'Smatta? Dey won't let you join up there, eh?

>
> Lots of
> excuses are given, such as "the local officials want to be dealing
> with the same people all the time," but in the end, it usually just
> amounts to glory-grabbing, which seems to me to be the major
> motivation for a lot of "emergency communicators" anyway.
>

Wow, yep. Sounds just like some of the arguments about RACES down here. You're describing local politics and poor leadership, Larry--NOT the state of emergency communication.

>
> When
> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well, I think they've been trying to drop you a hint. Were a person with your personality to even approach an emergency communication group that I had any leadership in, I'd do my level best to dissuade you from participation--you can be sure of that.

Again, the politics of emergency communication: people leading who can't or have no business doing so; people who are in the "hip pocket" of others; etc., are local and should not be considered to the "state of" emergency communication in ham radio. In fact, while those incestuous little groups are left alone to do there thing...there's often a lot of good work going on elsewhere.

Kim W5TIT

Kim W5TIT

4643. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:05:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PGtb8.5321$BR3.169446@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34003

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA539.123CDF04@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >as long as you have a great signal to noise ratio, current
>
> > computer decoding programs work OK. But when things start to
> > deteriorate, you will find them printing gibberish.
>
> Which is to say, if you rely on a computer program to do the job
> you will be let down when you least expect and most need it to work. In
short,
> manually operated CW gets through after the other
> commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
>

And why this surprises anyone is one of life's minor mysteries. Decoding Morse has several problems including variable-length coding but the biggest one is that No-Signal is one of the states to be decoded. Is it any huge surprise that when Teletype Corp made it work beyond the DC loop it was done with two discreet tones so that no-signal was a distinct condition that could be responded to, or not responded to more precisely.

From Carl's perspective, Morse is ridiculous although the 'legacy mode' schtick tends to remind me of DP jocks trying to avoid some work by consigning all that exists to the netherworld, much to the consternation of their employer who is trying to make a buck on the investment and pay for the brave new world.

And so we have the three-cornered war:

Group A: You gotta quit using or requiring anything that fakes out my compooter.

Group B: I earn my living on a keyboard as a number of us do or did. I need a busman's holiday like Custer needed more Indians. Something fun about wetware.

Group C: I came to yak and work dat dere DX. Why can't I get my ticket from a Post Toasties box and go down below 14.150 and chase ZingaZuluLand?

Makes for an interesting spectator sport but it is not likely anyone will win the war. If A&C successfuly defeat B, the resulting conflict will be legendary.

Dick N&#65533;BK

4644. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:08:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6852_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34004

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216014957.02879.00000052@mb-fk.aol.com...
> In article <3c6dd2e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020215200152.05201.00002068@mb-fa.aol.com...
> >>
> >> The facts from the FCC in regards to the code testing issue(s)
are
> >accessible
> >> to the US public and anyone who has Internet access capability.
As
> >to "the
> >> code issue being a 'done deal,'" the FCC International Bureau
> >Informal Working
> >> Group Six (IWG-6) has effectively tabled or DONE NOTHING about
S25.5
> >insofar
> >> as establishing any direct statement one way or another.
> >
> >Len,
> >
> >You are mistaken ...
>
> Am I? Let's look at what the PUBLIC can see...

Len,

I was not and am not trying to insult you ... merely to
tell you the facts as I know them. To be candid, the
FCC's WRC website does not always contain every
detail, nor is it always completely up to date (there is
an inevitable lag between things happening and their
getting posted ...) This is not to criticize the FCC,
either ... it's just a fact of life.

> >IWG-6 produced a Draft US Proposal for the revision of S25,
> >which included the "suppression" of S25.5. (eliminating Morse
> >testing from the ITU Radio Regs) ... I know because I was there
> >personally on behalf of NCI and was part of the discussion.
>
```

> The July and September meeting minutes say you were on the
> "phone bridge." Is that video teleconferencing or just audio?
>
> The third revision of the draft on AGENDA item 1.7.1 is indicated
> as COMPLETED on 11 July 2001 by Paul Rinaldo (ARRL).
> That's the LATEST document on 1.7.1 as given in the separate
> IWG-6 listing of all documents.

If the minutes say I was "on a phone bridge" that means I was
unable to be there in person and participated via teleconference.
In the case of the September meeting, I was in Portland, OR for
the IEEE 802 conference for the week (a work committment), but
Bruce Perens was physically at that meeting if you'll check the
attendance list which you seem to have. I was there in person
at prior meetings when the major points were argued and
hammered out (if you don't believe me, ask Dave Sumner
or Walt, who I'm sure thought I was a real pain in the ass for
the, as I had some issues with some "IARU party line" language
which they wanted to get into the US position. :-) The rev 3
document was just a "clean copy" for approval, containing only
updates which were agreed at a prior meeting and that version
was circulated electronically to the IWG-6 participants in advance
of the meeting ... I had a copy. The Sept. meeting's action on
the IWG-6 draft proposal to the WAC was simply final review
and approval of the last edits ... which resulted in NCI's withdrawal
of its final objection to the content of the document.

> Anyone in the PUBLIC can look at the US Preliminary Views,
> RCS-1363_Rev2, of October 16, 2001 and see NO, repeat NO
> mentions of ANY agenda item 1.7, not 1.7.1 the code test item,
> not 1.7.2 the call sign revision item, not 1.7.3 the terms and
> definitions "legalese" item.

The RCS preliminary view is something different from the FCC
WAC preliminary view ... different parts of the govt. develop their
own preliminary views, which may differ slightly from each other.
Then those have to be resolved to mutual agreement through
what amounts to a "conference committee." Remember, this
is the govt. ... nothing is as simple as it might be had you or I
designed the process ... but that's the way the process is.

> The Preliminary Draft, DA 01-2168, 17 September 2001, mentions
> ONLY 1.7.2, 1.7.3 out of the three for 1.7, absolutely NO mention
> of 1.7.1.

I know ... I explained below that there were some questions
or confusion about something that had not yet been resolved,
but my understanding is that the matter should be resolved
shortly (perhaps was resolved this past week ....)

> >While in all honesty, I have to admit that I wish Walt would
> >produce the minutes of IWG-6 meetings more promptly,

> >I also have to come to his defense to some degree as well,
> >as I know he has many other responsibilities and spends
> >a good deal of time in Geneva at ITU meetings as well.
>
> I don't accept excuses of "too much workload" there. If there
> are too many things to do, then SOMEONE ELSE should be
> there. A four-month minutes write-up delay is ridiculous.

The ARRL has, as I understand it, 3 people in its Washington
office ... Walt, Paul Rinaldo, and Johnathan Siverling ... with
all of the IWG-s and other WRC preparation, plus things like
the SAVI RFID proposal which threatens interference in the
70 cm band, plus all the other things they need to follow, they
ARE *VERY* busy folks ... I see Walt at several other meetings
which I regularly attend in Washington ... and I believe that Walt
and Paul each spend something on the order of 3-4 MONTHS
per year in Geneva (in the aggregate), attending meetings there.

Yes, as I said, I'd like to see IWG-6 minutes produced more
promptly, but I know from personal experience with my own
work that sometimes other things take priority and some things
have to be put off occasionally. Like me, Walt can only be
in one place at one time, has only so many hours in the day,
and has to prioritize. Should the ARRL increase its staff in
Washington? Perhaps, if they can raise enough $$$ to fund
such an expansion. However, in the meantime, they have to
do the best they can with the resources they have in place.

> >That is not correct ... IWG-6 produced and approved a DRAFT US
> >Proposal on Agenda Item 1.7 and that Proposal was approved by
> >the WAC (the FCC's WRC Advisory Committee).
>
> Okay, I'll bite, WHERE THE HELL IS IT? All I see is the 3rd draft
> proposal IWG-6/049(Rev.3) listed and its not available to the
public.

I'm not sure I'm remembering correctly, but I *think* that a copy
may have been published in "The W5YI Report" ... I would guess
that if there is not a copy on the FCC website as a "WAC" document
that it's either an oversight, or it was decided to wait until the
inter-
governmental issues had been worked out. (speculation on my part)

> >What you see is not always all you get ... the ARRL was represented
> >in IWG-6, but so was NCI ... the mutually-agreed (and approved)
> >result was a draft proposal to change S25 to eliminate the Morse
> >requirement from the ITU Radio Regs.
>
> What I see is what the PUBLIC sees. The ACTUAL position on
> agenda item 1.7.1 is UNKNOWN. It could be either way.
>
> It may be fun as hell to be an "insider" but the PUBLIC doesn't know

> from shinola on it. Maybe the position is pro-code, something that
> would make the PCTAs deleriously happy. Maybe the position is
> no-code-test. That agenda item is NOT a classified document that
> would be a danger to national security if released to the public.

- From what I know, the PCTAs will not be deleriously happy ...
I have no control over what is posted publicly, what is not,
or when it gets posted.

> >I spoke with the lead person in the FCC's international bureau
> >just the other day and was told that it was NTIA that was holding
> >up the final release of a formal "agreed by all" (FCC/NTIA/State)
> >US Proposal ... but not over the Morse issue, but over some
> >apparent confusion or missunderstanding about some other
> >aspect of the revision of S25 ... and that it was expected that
> >the matter would be resolved shortly.
>
> Look on the List of Documents for IWG-6. According to that, the
> NTIA already did their "P.V.s" (Preliminary Views) on 1.7 et al
> back on May 23rd, 2001. Hello? Can you deduce over a half
> year and a bit more since then?
>
> On the FCC document (mentioned before) on Preliminary Views
> (lots of agenda items there done by other IWGs) of October 16,
> 2001, there are NO item 1.7 mentions. The NTIA has been
> involved with OTHER agenda items and OTHER IWGs, so what is
> the "excuse" really meaning?

Nothing more that the delays that are not unusual in large
bureaucracies ...

> What the hell, I'm just a citizen and a military veteran who votes
> regularly and tries to stay aware and informed. Neither I nor a
> PCTA can see into the "insiders" world, can we?

I'm sorry that you're offended in some way at not being as
aware of what happened as those who acually participated
in the process. I guess it's just another case of the wheels
of govt. moving slowly ... but I have no reason to believe that
there is any "funny business" going on, or that the final outcome
will be "pro-code."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG5n6Je+N6+q84HiEQIQ9ACcCEywCbOP9oGIVe7kU3k9Kwq3Pp4An1OJ
vZLX1E0C1rBLOKMgkiCCNCmy
=6I5A
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4645. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:09:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216090957.16502.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34005

In article <a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
>> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>>
>> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
>> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to
>> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
>> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
>> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
>>
>> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means
>> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
>> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
>> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?

BINGO. If it's about the TEST, attack the TEST.
>
>So why do people still learn archery for hunting?

Several reasons:

- it's fun
- it's more of a challenge
- it's quiet
- regulations on bows are different
- in Pennsylvania, at least, there's a special season for bow hunting of deer.
This is, in effect, a "setaside for legacy weapons" because deer hunters
cannot
hunt with a gun during bow season. The hunter who can use both a bow and a
gun has the best chance of getting a deer.
- Archery is also used for target competition (and raising antennas)
- Nobody that I know of is going around saying "archery for hunting has been
superseded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient hunting
weapons". That would be discouraging anyone from learning archery. Who
wants to use an "antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
hunting"?

>Manual gearbox for driving?

- it's fun
- saves fuel

- more control over a vehicle
- ability to drive any car, regardless of trasnsmission, is a desired skill
- some vehicles only have manual transmissions. This is, in effect, a "setaside for legacy transmissions"
- Nobody that I know of is going around saying "manual transmissions have been superseded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient automatic transmissions". That would be discouraging anyone from learning how to shift and use a clutch. Who wants to use an "antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of driving"?

>Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?

Some of them, yes. The context of others is misleading, too. For example, does it meantion anywhere that Morse/CW is the second most popular mode on the amateur HF/MF bands, only slightly behind SSB and way ahead of all allegedly "more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient" modes?

> If so,
>feel free to argue against them.

I have. But one cannot post to NCI's website. You do not want opposing opinion.

The very name "No-Code International" implies anticode, not antitest. Had you folks chosen simply "No Code Test" or "No Code Test Association" (NCTA) it would be unambiguous.

> Regardless, CW does still have its
>niche and, if properly promoted by those that truly like it, there
>will always be a niche of CW users/enthusiasts.

Hopefully. But only IF there is a place for us to go.
>
>> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
>> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW testing.
>>
>> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
>> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.

Not just on HF/MF but on VHF/UHF. Try working high power CW on a repeater input and see what the FCC and ARRL positions are.
>
>Do you understand that the USA is one of only
>a few countries that have such bandplanes?

It would be interesting to see a list of countries with and without bandplans, and
the ham population of each. Most countries with significant amateur populations

DO have bandplans.
>
And the USA has them for very good reasons.

>As to the ARRL...those bandplans are not the law.

True - but violation of them without good reason is viewed by the FCC as poor operating practice.
>
>> That's why FM is prohibited on most
>> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you saying
>> that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
>
>There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
>the HF band segments.

What are those reasons? If they exist, then the same or similar reasons apply to keeping voice modes out of the CW/digital subbands.

>Indeed, the same is true for
>commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
>there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.

Let's see a list, complete with amateur populations.

Once code testing is eliminated, are bandplans the next target?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4646. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:11:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6b1c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34008

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to
> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
>
> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means
> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>

They most certainly are *not* discouraging anyone from learning CW, Joshua.
I'd be disappointed in anyone who translated a desire to see CW ended as a
testing element, into a desire to see all CW go away. That kind of
interpretation is reactionary and nothing more. Who in the world would ever
discourage someone else from learning anything? I don't think we're about
to start relying on wagon trains any more, either, but I'd wholeheartedly
encourage anyone to learn any skill associated with wagon
trains--horseback riding, blacksmithing, cooking, range life, etc.

> >
> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW testing.
>
> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans. That's why FM is prohibited on
most
> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you saying
> that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

The FCC, I'm sure, does not make regulation based on mode preference;
rather, based on most efficient use of spectrum. I'm sure the FCC used some
logic in deciding to set aside a band portion (30M) for the exclusive use of
data technologies so that experimentation could prevail, once again, using
the most effective bandwidth and without interference from other modes that

require greater bandwidth. FM is prohibited on most HF bands due to bandwidth--not because the FCC "doesn't like" FM.

No, the FCC nor the ARRL should have in their domain the decision making power to provide or withold spectrum based on what they think is the best mode.

Kim W5TIT

4647. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:14:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6b1d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34009

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4krn3ua0@216.155.33.80...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > In all of my life, I can't remember a single time that being called lazy
and
> > no-good made me motivated to do anything -- when I was 13 or now.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
>
> Almost 14 years of being called "lazy" and "no-good" motivated me
> to prove that those who were saying it were wrong. And make no
> mistake, I wasted all that time that I could have been a ham for
> no other reason but that I *was* lazy -- but the fact that I
> overcame my laziness disproved anyone who said I was "no good."
> Unfortunately, when S25.5 is eliminated, we will no longer be
> able to distinction, so those of us who were able to prove
> ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
> do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
> proficiency level on their own initiative.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And, I bet you'll leave no room for anyone to think of people like you as
nothing but ritualistic, sadistic, miserable coots...who have nothing
positive to offer anyone or anything.

Yep, you'll be passed by as nothing but insignificant to the newcomers. You
think they are going to waste their time feeling bad about how *you* think
of them? That's a big ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

4648. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:18:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6bf2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34010

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020216011626.06196.00000032@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <a4ja2501896@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> I went to one in England when I was stationed there, took my
> >> American YL friend. Some bloke there called her a "wench," and
> >> I had to restrain her from decking him! I guess she didn't see the
> >> humor in being called a "wench." And seeing as how our language
> >> has evolved since the Middle Ages, neither do I.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >It's interesting how you accept the evolution of language, but you won't
> >accept evolution of amateur radio away from worthless hazing rituals.
>
> Krell:
>
> If by "worthless hazing ritual" you're referring to SSB and the 10-10
> Club, then you're right -- I don't accept it! Morse/CW, OTOH, is a
> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications skill --
> and not a "worthless hazing ritual" unless you're a lazy whiner!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Nope, CW is not a worthless hazing ritual. The "lazy whiner" part is.

Kim W5TIT

4649. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:19:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FAE5F.F25449DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34007

Hey TwIT, I never open your posts any more, but it's early, my coffee hasn't done its thing yet, I clicked on 'next', and damn, there was another of your "thoughtful" statements....

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes fail,"
> it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone included.

ATTENTION W5TITs..... Who was it that *ever* said that CW should be relied upon more than any other mode??? Hmmmm???

Would you like to go back and do some badly needed remedial reading to see what WAS said? I can help, and obviously you need it. It says that "when conditions deteriorate to the point that other modes commonly in use (you know, those that virtually all HF hams have available to them in their radio shacks) will no longer work, it is almost always the case that CW can still be copied - by a ham who has trained himself to do so".
Is there some specific point in that sentence that you would like to have further clarified?

> For each and every circumstance in which phone won't work, packet won't
> work, 20M won't work, CW won't work, there is a likely circumstance that
> will take its place.

????? Let me rub my decoder ring and we'll see if it can get anything out of that sentence.

> No mode should be "favored" over another for
> reliance--they all have their place.
>

Uhhhmm, Duh, I do believe that is obvious, not to say it's also what we've being stating in no uncertain terms for a LONG time, right 'ere on dear ol' rrap, girl.

>
> If predominance of understanding the language is the primary motivation,
> then voice should always take the front seat...
>

Profundity perSohlified! That's Bill Sohl-ified.
And when voice turns to mush because of deteriorating HF band conditions, well, language goes with it. Yep, that's the way it works, Ol' Gal.

>
> Kim W5TIT

4650. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:20:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6c67_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34011

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020216011626.06196.00000031@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3c6c8870_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Here, Larry...does this help you out? As it looks right now (my current
> >downloaded list of news messages), *I* am the first person to
REspond/REply
> >to this post...
> >
> >Feel better?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Gee, Kim -- what about those nasty 'old viruses? Wern't you afraid
> of catching one?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Hell no, I was willing to take the time to deal with a virus if exposed.
Just for you.

Kim W5TIT

4651. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:27:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6e2d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34013

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:K0ob8.4840$BR3.136536@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> > Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?
>
> Ah yup.
>
> > If so, feel free to argue against them.
>
> Thanks for your blessing, but I already do.
>

No, you provide reactionary responses to something you misunderstand. You
think a desire to have CW testing ommited from ARS licensure is a desire to
end all CW use.

> >
> > Regardless, CW does still have its niche and, if properly promoted by
> > those that truly like it, there will always be a niche of CW
> > users/enthusiasts.
>
> True, but it would be a tremendous help if people who didn't like a mode
> testing requirement would not make the mode itself into the arguing point.
>

I think if you really investigated, you'd understand that it is the very
people who like the mode that turn it into an argument "about the mode."

>
> If you're arguing against the use of mode-specific bandplans, mandatory or
> otherwise, I don't think you'll have much company.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

"Much company" isn't the reason someone should enter into a debate about
something one way or the other. I don't Bill Sohl makes his argument due to
a desire for popularity. Is that why you make yours?

Kim W5TIT

4652. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:31:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6d8b_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34012

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has
is to
> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW
nor
> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.

Kim's statement is true ... NCI policy is NOT against Morse usage,
and NCI has REPEATEDLY stated publicly that there is NO intent
or agenda to seek any sort of ban on Morse usage at any point in
the future.

> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
means
> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
> learning CW.

No ... simply making a statement of fact.

Also, please note that both the ARRL and the IARU AC have
adopted resolutions acknowleging that the continuation of
a requirement for Morse testing in the ITU Radio Regulations
is no longer necessary ... the IARU resolution even aludes
to continued Morse requirements not being compatible with
a healthy future for the ARS (paraphrasing, I don't have a
copy of the resolution text on this computer ...)

> Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
> communication?

Someone who thinks its interesting and fun?
>
> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to
any
> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW

testing.
>
> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
FCC-enforced
> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.

The FCC has merely portioned certain segments of some
bands for "narrowband modes" and "wider band modes."
They have SPECIFICALLY declined to "codify" the ARRL
bandplans. In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.

>That's why FM is prohibited on most HF bands.

FM is prohibited on most of the HF bands because those
bands are relatively narrow and FM usage would be an
inefficient use of the spectrum ...

>That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m.

The 30m band is only 50 kHz wide ... it makes sense
in terms of spectrum utilization in such a narrow band,
but it is NOT a statement on the "overall superiority of
Morse."

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG5tIZe+N6+q84HiEQLyWQCcCgmGVT+1leGIjW1dBJKtbR8/8xMAoP3E
IyTMmtF+mL/lrM3ywQFVGj4Y
=7U7n
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4653. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:35:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7007$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34015

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216080308.18942.00001294@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> >> Cecil.
> >
> >On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
> >After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
> >its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
> >survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
> >pushing up daisies.
>
> Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.
>
> This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe that
they
> should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test
folks
> believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.
>
> That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

More importantly, it brings us back full circle to the main argument made way back in the beginning that everyone on the CW testing side just absolutely said was not true. The reason they want CW to remain a testing phase is to keep the riff-raff filter on.

Kim W5TIT

4654. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:38:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e70d8$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34016

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216081021.18942.00001296@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I have never seen anyone in
> >NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor that hams should be forbidden
from
> >using CW.
>
> Carl has come close, saying that CW is an antiquitated mode. He has never
said
> that he believes CW operation should be forbidden.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Well, let me say that I think CW is a pretty darned antiquated mode, myself.
But I in no way would discourage someone from learning CW. More power to
'em if they do.

I can't imagine that Carl Stevenson would sanction someone not learning CW.
If he does, then he's an idiot--plain and simple. But I don't think he
does.

Kim W5TIT

4655. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 14:39:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e6f79_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34014

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216081021.18942.00001296@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I have never seen anyone in
> >NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor that hams should be
forbidden from
> >using CW.
>
> Carl has come close, saying that CW is an antiquitated mode.

- From the standpoint of what's technically feasible (and often
available in other services), I believe that CW is antiquated.

> He has never said
> that he believes CW operation should be forbidden.

In fact, I personally, and NCI as an organization, have repeatedly
stated that we do NOT believe that CW operation should be banned
or restricted.

However, many of those who wish to continue forcing Morse
on everyone by govt. mandated proficiency testing as a condition
of obtaining a license with HF privs seem to "conveniently" ignore
those statements (or even falsely outright claim them to be lies).

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ---
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ---
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG5vDpe+N6+q84HiEQKYAACgwQ5yY2EfrNpsW7/ObS/FpXSZtKgAoIpI
KfuGnyRpClTLGSh+dBy85R2Q
=F9nJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4656. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:00:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e748f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34017

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:a4kr3tvjs0@216.155.33.80...
>
>
> I think ANY expansion of the phone bands is a waste of spectrum.
> All throughout the Code/No-code debate, we've been hammered with
> the argument that "the future is digital." Now it's time to put
> up or shut up. If anything, I say the phone bands should be
> REDUCED to make more room for a vast expansion of digital modes.

I agree in part with Larry (yes, I know it's scary ... :-) I
personally
don't favor an expansion of the phone bands (but I also don't favor
a reduction) ... the growth of digital modes can be accomodated
in a variety of ways ... narrowband modes can operate in the lower
parts of the bands, as they do today ... wider digital modes, such as
digital voice (just one example) could operate in the upper parts of
the bands.

The primary problem, as I see it, is that many people simply
don't understand digital modes and their potential, and harbor
(often excessive, or unjustified) fears that "new digital modes
will screw things up for my favorite mode."

> Hams still have the authorization to put homebrewed transmitters
> on-the-air, therefore the technical basics must still be covered
> in the written theory tests. To eliminate that testing would doom
> us to using strictly type-accepted transmitting equipment, and
> consign us to the CB'er level from that point on.

Again, I agree with Larry ... the technical basics MUST
continue to be a part of the license qualification tests. We
are (at least supposed to be) a service, at least in part,
of tinkerers and experimenters ... to have strict type-
acceptance (and the limitation to commercially-produced
equipment that that would imply) would be disastrous.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG50B5e+N6+q84HiEQKfIACfWgD39toE9tV1QdTwnmwO3KvOx1kAn2qy
C/nM5I+kmZEIN5txooWlciFj

```
=yKXy
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4657. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:02:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7668_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34019

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA3EE.D4353BC1@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre. OF COURSE cw has merits.
> We've enumerated them at length. One of them is NOT that it is
> learned quickly and without significant investment of time and effort.
> (Ah, there's that nasty FCC-absent word again!)
> If you think that all those busy folks who "just couldn't find the time
> in my busy schedule" will now suddenly get religion and find some
> of that time, yer dreamin'.
>

WHAT???!!! Are you actually saying that to inspire someone to do something, one must also do it theirself? In order for me to provide encouragement to learn and appreciate CW, I must use the mode?! My amazement of the mode has done more to convince newcomers to at least give it a try than my not using it, Little Dick. My amazement of APRS has most assuredly gotten more people at least interested in it, if not experimenting with the mode theirself.

>
> > That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.
>
> Not without "effort" on the part of those who couldn't care less
> about whether or not CW survives.
>

What about those who don't care less, but who would never stand in the way of its existence? I don't care one way or the other if CW survives. However, I would never discourage someone from learning something new.

People like you, Little Dick, are prone to be extreme in your approaches; you are extremists. It's either black or white, they're either with you or against you, either love or hate--no in between. You seem to enjoy believing that there are evil, nasty, wicked people out there who LOVE to snarl at CW and anyone who uses it. When, all it really boils down to is that those people whom you think are snarling at CW are really snarling at your insistence upon their characterization.

Here's a scenario for you to think about:

I don't care one way or the other if ham radio survives...how's that? If ham radio goes away, I'd probably get more involved with the Red Cross, REACT, who knows? I may even decide to start tackling this damned black gumbo soil again to get some gardening into it. My motivation for ham radio is pure enjoyment, and an excuse to be on the road during a storm. If you

want me on your side--and to expend some energy to keep ham radio alive--then you'd better change your attitude a little. To me, ham radio seems to provide you nothing but some kind of soap box to stand upon and look down your nose at other people. I'm not the slightest bit interested in providing you that venue.

End of scenario.

Have you, or Larry, or Dave Heil, or anyone like that ever even considered that there are people who think like that scenario? If it is only in this newsgroup that you are brave enough to say and act the way you do--then we are blessed. Because if you are out acting like that on the air, and in clubs, and to the public, then you are the killer of your beloved ham radio. It's just like driving away the one you love because of raging jealousy.

Think about it...if you are acting "out there" like you do in here; you are killing ham radio, Little Dick. As much, if not more, than you say I am. I am at least darned friendly.

Kim W5TIT

4658. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:04:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34018

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.

That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response something
like "So the FCC at some time in the past created band segments by mode
for US hams, obviously for some good reason." Evidently
that went right over your head.

4659. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:06:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34020

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test for
Morse
> > code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn unless there
IS a
> > test?
>
> No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement
>

So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to learn and
use CW?! This is getting really confusing, Little Dick. It sounds more
like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?

Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or the other
for whether someone is going to use it or not.

Kim W5TIT

4660. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:07:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7789$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34021

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA539.123CDF04@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >as long as you have a great signal to noise ratio, current
>
> > computer decoding programs work OK. But when things start to
> > deteriorate, you will find them printing gibberish.
>
> Which is to say, if you rely on a computer program to do the job
> you will be let down when you least expect and most need it to work. In
short,
> manually operated CW gets through after the other
> commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
>

That is just not true.

Kim W5TIT

4661. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:21:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lthlcsq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34022

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F9B94.F61CFE74@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it
certainly
> > > > implies always, Dick.
> > >
> > > Nonsense!
> >
> > Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of
> > possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail
> > Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and
when
> > other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical
> > premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.
> >
> > 1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
> > 2. CW gets through when other modes fail.
> >
> > Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion
> > given the two above premises.
> >
> > It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one
> > of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true
> > so Premise number 2 has to be false.
>
> So let's just repost my response which you so conveniently clipped in its
> entirety and let the readers see it all and decide what is real and what
is
> BS.
> ---------------------------------------
> > CAM wrote:
> > > > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > > > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> > >
> > > IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> > > stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> > > gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when

> > > there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
> >
> > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > implies always, Dick.
>
> Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the air.
> When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be copied

DICK,
That is simply not always true. There are many times when
"the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish,"
and NOTHING, not even CW can then be copied.

> -that
> is, if the operator has bothered to learn it!

That is IF there is ANY signal there at all.

> It'll be weak but intelligible!

It MAY be there, BUT it can also be true that even
the CW signal may be so weak that no one can copy it...
much less even know it is there.

Tell us... if you believe what you say...to wit:
"When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be copied"

... and you believe that is ALWAYS the case...then for how long
after "the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish" do you
expect CW will still "get through"?

> One may have to use his skill as an operator
> to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
> time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
> "Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.

And you seriously believe that will always be the case?

> Surely your vast experience as an engineer and a longtime ham has
> included this ordinary but definitive experience.

Actually, my experiance has shown that there are more than
unique cases when fading is sofast that NOTHING gets through.
Your clinging to Always isn't supported by reality.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4662. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:23:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e79e2_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34023

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F0F3F.3BDD0523@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >>Because of what you have said in your postings, Dick. CW doesn't
> > >>get through when all other modes fail.
> > >
> > > CW *does* gete through when all the other COMMONLY USED modes fail.
> >
> > No it doesn't, Dick. That statement says CW always gets through.
> > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> >
>
> IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> gets through when other modes.....". NO mode gets through when
> there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
>
>
>
> >
> > >>Shannon's theorem does matter.
> > >
> > > Not at all to the case that was present, ...
> >
> > Sorry, Dick, theory always matters. Anyone who seeks to dismiss theory
> > is anti-science.
> >
>
> It's clear you don't know what you're talking about here. When
> communications are desperately needed, RESULTS is what matters.
>
>
>
> > >>Extras should not rest on their laurels.
> > >
> > > Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can now
rest on

> > > YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the Extra
Lite.
> >
> > Nope, I'm not resting on my laurels, Dick. I am working on a new web
page
> > describing my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning technique.
> >
>
> Then you're sending FCC a petition to create new class of ham license so
you can
> prepare for another FCC test?
>
>
> > >>If you would try to be a nicer person, not nearly as many of
> > >>your nits would be picked.
> > >
> > > So I should just allow you and the rest of the anticoders to bulldoze
your way
> > > all over anything I say with impunity. That would make me "nicer".
Right.
> >
> > Dick, the few times I have tried to be nice to you, you have come back
and
> > spit in my face.
>
> You really should show some evidence in support of such a
> statement as that, it sure won't stand on its own. You are an absolute
> master at twisting meanings and altering contexts for the express
> purpose of gouging, for some reason me in particular, and the only
> reason existant is that I support code testing for hams. That's more
> than enough for you.
>
>

4663. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:28:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7b37$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34024

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F0F3F.3BDD0523@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Troll, troll, troll yer boat, you lid. I see that you, too, can
now rest on
> > > YOUR laurels since after 50 years trying you finally got the
Extra Lite.
> >
> > Nope, I'm not resting on my laurels, Dick. I am working on a new
web page
> > describing my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning technique.
>
> Then you're sending FCC a petition to create new class of ham
license so you can
> prepare for another FCC test?

Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
and capabilities.

How pathetic!

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG56pZe+N6+q84HiEQKf7QCcDRwmeo7YqTYldqaMa/wxDbCQ8g4AoJmZ
JczMrZeZprv3oeKnpswHxj5s
=mg40
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4664. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:31:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lu37ain1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34025

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6F9CD2.99F7FD8F@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C6F2149.F1BFDFEA@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it
certainly
> > > > implies always, Dick.
> > >
> > > Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the
air.
> > >
> > > When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> > > RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be
> > copied -that
> > > is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
> > > intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
> > > to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length
of
> > > time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
> > > "Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.
> >
> > Dick,
> > If you don't think your statements above clearly imply "always"
> > then you need to take some logic classes. If you said "May"
> > get through...you'd be at least correct regarding your lack
> > of implication.
> >
>
> Hey,Slick......

Once again...Dick sucombs to his old ways...hence:
Dick's own postings serve more to discredit his credibility
than anything else.

> I am fully aware that you have not actually had any
> experience with radiotelegraphy on the air,

Prey tell us how you are able to know anything I do in the
privacy of my home...or anywhere else for that matter.

> ...but what I stated is FACT and has
> nothing to do with logical order or any of your other
> nonsense. It is a simple fact that when conditions deteriorate to the
point that
> SSB cannot be copied there is a period during which further deterioration
of
> conditions allow CW to *still* be copied.

And what might the shortest duration of that "short period"
be in your opinion/experiance? It can be milleseconds which
offers no opportunity for continued CW ops. I note also
that you have dropped the reference to digital modes
becoming jibberish. Looks like you are trying to open the
window of possible "CW gets through".

> That is and has always been the case.

That MAY be the case...perhaps even on many occasions, BUT
it is not ALWAYS the case.

> You and Stupid may stuff your alleged
> logic. It just isn't logical.

Once again...Dick sucombs to his old ways...hence:
Dick's own postings serve more to discredit his credibility
than anything else.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4665. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:32:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7d72_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34026

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216090957.16502.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> >> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
> >>
> >> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> >> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is
to
> >> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> >> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
> >> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
> >>
> >> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> >> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
means
> >> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
> >> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> >> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>
> BINGO. If it's about the TEST, attack the TEST.
> >

And, in what way should the TEST be attacked, if not to say that:

a) having a test for CW does nothing for proving technical merit

b) having a test for CW at the exclusion of other modes seems to point that
CW is a most important mode

c) testing for CW seems to be used as a way to keep out the "less" desirable

d) any other number of reasons for which one does not support CW testing?

In what way should it be argued, Jim? Everything above, *IS* about the
TEST. It is the reaction to the statement about the TEST and turning it
into a statement about the MODE that is ridiculous.

>
> The very name "No-Code International" implies anticode, not antitest. Had
you
> folks chosen simply "No Code Test" or "No Code Test Association" (NCTA) it

> would be unambiguous.
>

Even from the first time I saw that name, I had no confusion about the implication. I pretty much knew when I saw that name that it meant there was a group out there whose objective was to eliminate CW testing. But then, I'm also not prone to believing there are people who would discourage someone from learning something.

> > Regardless, CW does still have its
> >niche and, if properly promoted by those that truly like it, there
> >will always be a niche of CW users/enthusiasts.
>
> Hopefully. But only IF there is a place for us to go.

As the future becomes the past, I am near certain there will be modes far superior to CW. It seems that we can nearly guarantee ourselves that. The government, as far as I know, has never really been in the business of providing something just because of tradition. While it would be wonderful to think that there would always and forever more be a portion of spectrum for CW, do you think the government should make that a focus in its decisions for bandplans? What if bandwidth becomes so critical that a mode such as CW is at risk, for the preference of modes we haven't even thought of yet that may make even better use of spectrum? Should the government be in the business of preserving a portion for a mode, because of tradition? Unfortunately I don't.

But, I always hope there are places for CW on the spectrum.

> >
> >> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
> >> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
testing.
> >>
> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> >> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>
> Not just on HF/MF but on VHF/UHF. Try working high power CW on a repeater
> input and see what the FCC and ARRL positions are.
>

I still say it is up to the FCC to provide the best use of spectrum, regardless of convenience for ham radio, or traditions. If, for example, some part of 10M was goig to be used for some miraculous medical contraption that would help a person walk, through radio control say, then my radio gets turned off, packed up and I yield to the higher need for spectrum. I would be disappointed in a government that says we can't let the medical people have it because our ham radio operators have it.

That's extreme, because there's lots to play with right now...well, sort of, but you get what I mean.

> >
> >There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
> >the HF band segments.
>
> What are those reasons? If they exist, then the same or similar reasons
apply
> to keeping voice modes out of the CW/digital subbands.
>

I wholeheartedly agree. I agree with allowing room for CW/digital subbands. I'd even go so far as to support absolute law (not just "bandplan"). Bandplan schmandplan--put some meat in to the matter. If we've got the room to play with, the spectrum to divide, etc., then do it.

>
> Once code testing is eliminated, are bandplans the next target?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I can't tell there if that is a policy question to NCI in general, or just a general question. However, my answer would be that there is probably always going to be something going on that changes what we "know today" as ham radio.

Kim W5TIT

4666. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:36:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7e39_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34027

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FAE5F.F25449DE@worldnet.att.net...
> Hey TwIT, I never open your posts any more, but it's early, my coffee
hasn't
> done its thing yet, I clicked on 'next', and damn, there was another of
your
> "thoughtful" statements....
>

Wait, I thought you said I was on your "ignore" list...LOL

You're full of ShIT, Little Dick. You open every post I send. You can't help yourself. In fact, it takes great restraint and thought for you to avoid replying directly to one of my messages.

Ya try, but you've made mistakes.

Kim W5TIT

4667. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:39:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lvavscg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34029

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:K0ob8.4840$BR3.136536@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> >> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> >> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
> >> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
> >> from learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it
> >> is) an antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
> >> communication?
> >
> > So why do people still learn archery for hunting?
> > Manual gearbox for driving?
>
> Cute, but portraying a mode as inefficient, unreliable, etc. is
> discouraging it.

Then counter it as you please.

> > Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?
>
> Ah yup.

You are free to believe whatever you want.

> > If so, feel free to argue against them.
>
> Thanks for your blessing, but I already do.

Then where's your beef? Why should your opinion
be OK but NCI's shouldn't be stated.

> > Regardless, CW does still have its niche and, if properly promoted by
> > those that truly like it, there will always be a niche of CW
> > users/enthusiasts.
>
> True, but it would be a tremendous help if people who didn't like a mode
> testing requirement would not make the mode itself into the arguing point.

We have not done so at all. Nothing in NCI's comments to
the FCC argue for ending USE of the mode by anyone. Indeed,

we clearly state that USE is and should be a personal decision.

> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> >> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
> >
> > Do you understand that the USA is one of only
> > a few countries that have such bandplanes?
>
> Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those countries
have
> bandplans?

Not in light of the fact that the vast majority, including
our Canadian neighbor do not.

> > As to the ARRL...those bandplans are not the law.
>
> You know, I just knew that there was a reason why I used the phrase "ARRL
> voluntary bandplans" above...

Glad you recognize it.

> >> That's why FM is prohibited on most
> >> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you
> >> saying that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
> >
> > There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
> > the HF band segments. Indeed, the same is true for
> > commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
> > there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.
>
> If you're arguing against the use of mode-specific bandplans, mandatory or
> otherwise, I don't think you'll have much company.

Frankly, it's not of any priority in my life.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4668. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:45:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e8079_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34032

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4lthlcsq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6F9B94.F61CFE74@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the
air.
> > When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> > RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be copied
>
> DICK,
> That is simply not always true. There are many times when
> "the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
> RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish,"
> and NOTHING, not even CW can then be copied.
>

Bill: Dick thinks that just because he is sending CW, there is someone out
there copying it. I just realized that... ;)

Kim W5TIT

4669. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:47:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34028

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>
> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response something
> like "So the FCC at some time in the past created band segments by
mode
> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."

Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
be 10 wpm ... at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
the speed to 12.5 wpm ... SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
hams "because the bands were too crowded." (at the time, the
total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)

The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...

Was this decision made "for good reason" ??? Given that
it's been proven that our bands can support FAR more hams
than the small fraction of today's population, then licensed,
the underlying argument of "overcrowding" was invalid, therefore
the decision to increase the code test speed to artificially limit
the population was flawed.

Note that this goes back MANY years and does not reflect
in any way on the current FCC's ability to make rational
public policy decisions.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPG5/CZe+N6+q84HiEQJVEACglsGo9+l+rZSGLRBY8bk/E2bO27kAoN8v
e9rDGSG0d1Px5MXneoMSucDY
=vrQb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4670. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:51:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lvb1scg2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34031

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216090957.16502.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> >> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
> >>
> >> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> >> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is
to
> >> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> >> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
> >> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
> >>
> >> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> >> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
means
> >> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
> >> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> >> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>
> BINGO. If it's about the TEST, attack the TEST.

Agreed. Your point?

> >So why do people still learn archery for hunting?
>
> Several reasons:
>
> - it's fun
> - it's more of a challenge
> - it's quiet
> - regulations on bows are different
> - in Pennsylvania, at least, there's a special season for bow hunting of
deer.
> This is, in effect, a "setaside for legacy weapons" because deer
hunters
> cannot
> hunt with a gun during bow season. The hunter who can use both a bow
and a
> gun has the best chance of getting a deer.
> - Archery is also used for target competition (and raising antennas)

> - Nobody that I know of is going around saying "archery for hunting has
been
> superseded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
hunting
> weapons". That would be discouraging anyone from learning archery. Who
> wants to use an "antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
> hunting"?

Actually many people do argue the merits of their choosen
weoponry. In the end, the choice is personal. If people can't
stand the open disagreement than too bad.

> >Manual gearbox for driving?
>
> - it's fun
> - saves fuel
> - more control over a vehicle
> - ability to drive any car, regardless of trasnsmission, is a desired
skill
> - some vehicles only have manual transmissions. This is, in effect, a
"setaside
> for legacy transmissions"
> - Nobody that I know of is going around saying "manual transmissions have
> been superseded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
> automatic transmissions". That would be discouraging anyone from
learning
> how to shift and use a clutch. Who wants to use an "antiquated,
unreliable,
> slower, inefficient means of driving"?

Actually many people do argue the merits of their choosen
transmission. In the end, the choice is personal. If people can't
stand the open disagreement than too bad.

> >Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?
>
> Some of them, yes. The context of others is misleading, too. For example,
> does it meantion anywhere that Morse/CW is the second most popular mode
> on the amateur HF/MF bands, only slightly behind SSB and way ahead of all
> allegedly "more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient" modes?
>
> > If so,
> >feel free to argue against them.
>
> I have. But one cannot post to NCI's website.

Why does NCI owe you a forum?

>You do not want opposing opinion.

Bull...you are free to start your own web pages, email campaign, snail
mail or whatever. NCI has NEVER stated any opposition to you

or anyone else marketing counter ideas. IF, however, you believe
NCI should provide you with that forum, then that is simply
a totally naive expectation.

> The very name "No-Code International" implies anticode, not antitest. Had
you
> folks chosen simply "No Code Test" or "No Code Test Association" (NCTA) it
> would be unambiguous.

We have actually discussed that veryy point...the bottom line
is that the costs to us as an organization to change the name don't
warrant doing it.

> > Regardless, CW does still have its
> >niche and, if properly promoted by those that truly like it, there
> >will always be a niche of CW users/enthusiasts.
>
> Hopefully. But only IF there is a place for us to go.

Has ANYONE suggested you shouldn't have a place to go.
Currently CW is allowed everywhere in amateur HF bands.

> >> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to any
> >> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
testing.
> >>
> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> >> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>
> Not just on HF/MF but on VHF/UHF. Try working high power CW on a repeater
> input and see what the FCC and ARRL positions are.
> >
> >Do you understand that the USA is one of only
> >a few countries that have such bandplanes?
>
> It would be interesting to see a list of countries with and without
bandplans,
> and
> the ham population of each. Most countries with significant amateur
populations
>
> DO have bandplans.
> >
> And the USA has them for very good reasons.

What makes the US special when others don't need them?

> >As to the ARRL...those bandplans are not the law.
>
> True - but violation of them without good reason is viewed by the FCC as
poor
> operating practice.

Has anyone been so cited?

> >> That's why FM is prohibited on most
> >> HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you saying
> >> that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
> >
> >There is a clear and compelling reason to keep FM out of
> >the HF band segments.
>
> What are those reasons? If they exist, then the same or similar reasons
apply
> to keeping voice modes out of the CW/digital subbands.

Maybe maybe not. FM is far wider in spectrum usage than SSB.
Canada doesn't seem to have a problem.

> >Indeed, the same is true for
> >commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
> >there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.
>
> Let's see a list, complete with amateur populations.

Last I checked, HF radio didn't respect any international
boundaries.

> Once code testing is eliminated, are bandplans the next target?

Not from me. I don't really care one way or the other
about bandplans.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4671. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:51:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e81e0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34035

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Nivb8.5483$BR3.184024@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to
> > learn and use CW?!
>
> They didn't call it "incentive licensing" for naught.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos
>

Yes, they did, Joshua.

Kim W5TIT

4672. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:52:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lvb2scg3@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34030

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6E523D.9B92B749@IEEE.org...
> Joshua Houk wrote:
> > Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> > antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>
> The same kind of people who own antique cars, ride horses, and walk
> for the fun of it.
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil,
They just can't accept the concept of
voluntary.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4673. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:54:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6e8139_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34034

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no
test for Morse
> > code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn unless
there IS a
> > test?
>
> No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement
>
> >
> > Carl must love you!
>
> He can't help himself.
>

"Love" is NOT a word that I would associate with my personal
feelings towards Dick, HOWEVER, I do greatly appreciate
ANYONE who, like Dick, rants and raves so incoherently, making
the PCTA viewpoint look so absolutely ridiculous :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG6Ahpe+N6+q84HiEQLsagCfQrvzbmnp+A5KG5SFnLTPW7SoIhUAniPo
76cp+RtJElQBquWTch2VwkgC
=f0Nv
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4674. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:54:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lvtr$2fh$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34036

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA199.7D727B71@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Joshua Houk wrote:
> > > Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> > > antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
> >
> > The same kind of people who own antique cars, ride horses, and walk
> > for the fun of it.
>
> If, after 50 years as a licensed ham, that's the best you can do it
> really shows how little you know about ham radio.

Once again, Dick's own words or lack of same (lack of any credible
response this time) do more to discredit his comments than
anyone else.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4675. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 15:56:29 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Nivb8.5483$BR3.184024@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34033

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net:

> So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to
> learn and use CW?!

They didn't call it "incentive licensing" for naught.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4676. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:02:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4lvtt$2fh$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34037

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> Because Morse/CW has merits?
> > >
> > > And how is one to learn to appreciate and apply those merits,
> > >other than to learn it? And should we really expect NCI (with a
> > >Carl Stevenson at the helm, and you helping out)
> > >to do anything but urge newcomers
> > >to not waste their time with such a "hazing ritual"?
> >
> > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test for
Morse
> > code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn unless there
IS a
> > test?
>
> No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement

Who expects that? The mission for code devotees will
be to "recruit" newcomers by showing them the benefits
that you claim...or, more marketable, the fundamental
enjoyment which need not be based on anything other
than undefined interests. I don't have a clue why I enjoy
working on antique cars but have ZERO interest in playing golf.
The same can be said for may users/non-users of morse.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4677. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:07:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m124$g0p$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34041

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA018.E837BADB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> Is one
>
> > of the local volunteer firemen to be castigated as being discredited
> > and having a lack of initive just because he may voice an interest in
being
> > a ham,
> > but doesn't do so?
>
> I've never seen *anyone* who was seriously interested in
> becoming a ham that didn't become a ham. Without sittihg aroung
> whine about the test requirements. And I VE'd a LOT of new hams.

Avoiding answering the question.

> > > Do I really believe that many new hams will actually achieve
proficiency
> > > in CW operations now that no one is required to do it?
> >
> > Absolutely they will.
>
> Really??? ON what do you base that profundity?

For the very reason that there are people that take up all
soorts of things on a voluntary basis. The issue, if any,
between my expectation and yours is on just how much
"many" will be.

> > > Why in the world would they?
> >
> > For personal reasons, curiosity, or whatever.
>
> Yeah, Right! I *said* that a few will, and believe me, a few is what
we'll get.
> The elite few. In earlier times it have been the
> "routine many" (save the whiners). Now it will be the Elite Few.

Define what you believe FEW will be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4678. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:11:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m125$g0p$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34039

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216082552.18942.00001302@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com
>
> >so those of us who were able to prove
> >ourselves will always have our doubts about any newcomers who
> >do not "embrace" the Morse code, and learn it to a useful
> >proficiency level on their own initiative.
>
> Those that feel that way probably have an inner need to have those doubts
that
> I will probably never understand.

Yep, reminds me of some people that insist on having
people call them Dr. because they hold a PHD. They
need that public acknowledgement of their past accomplishment
more than the current respect for the work they may or may
not do.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4679. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:12:29 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Nxvb8.5510$BR3.186772@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34038

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20020216090957.16502.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com:

> Once code testing is eliminated, are bandplans the next target?

That's certainly the impression that I'm getting from an NCI director
arguing against bandplans.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4680. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:21:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m126$g0p$3@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34040

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA3EE.D4353BC1@worldnet.att.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> > >> Cecil.
> > >
> > >On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
> > >After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
> > >its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
> > >survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
> > >pushing up daisies.
> >
> > Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.
> >
> > This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe
that they
> > should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test
folks
> > believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.
>
> You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre.

Still the clever user of perjoratives...eh Dick?

> OF COURSE cw has merits.
> We've enumerated them at length.

Why not publish your own recruiting manual then?

> One of them is NOT that it is
> learned quickly and without significant investment of time and effort.
> (Ah, there's that nasty FCC-absent word again!)

So? Your point?

> If you think that all those busy folks who "just couldn't find the time
> in my busy schedule" will now suddenly get religion and find some
> of that time, yer dreamin'.

No dream at all...it is YOUR dream that you want "all" those
busy folks to be mandated to follow a skill development
path just to augment the roles of CW devotees.

> > That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.
>
> Not without "effort" on the part of those who couldn't care less
> about whether or not CW survives.

Your mission, Dick, is for YOU to be a part of those that care
enough about whether CW survives. IMHO, you ain't
cutting the mustard on that objective.

As for those that may have not a care at all about CW surviving,
that is their personal option...always has been, always will be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4681. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:24:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m1e8oes1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34042

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6FA2CA.74E64811@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com
> >
> > > It has to do with the willingness of people who have
> > >no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
> > >and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level.
> >
> > Wanna' bet that the word "effort" does not appear in the FCC regulations
for
> > any radio service?
>
> Of course it doesn't. It sure appeared in high numbers among the
> infantile who "just didn't have the time..." though.

Did the FCC acknowledge the argument that people
"just didn't have the time" in their R&O in response to
NPRM 98-143? Effort alone was neither viewed as
being a plus or minus.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4682. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:37:52 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AVvb8.5563$BR3.191273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34043

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6e6b1c_1@newsa.ev1.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>>
>> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
>> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
>> from learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it
>> is) an antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
>> communication?
>
> They most certainly are *not* discouraging anyone from learning CW,
> Joshua. I'd be disappointed in anyone who translated a desire to see
> CW ended as a testing element, into a desire to see all CW go away.

Look at the statement. It's right there on their first page. The statement
attempts to portray the mode in a negative light - inaccurately, to boot.
How can that not be a discouragement?

Look at K2UNK's response. He's now attacking mode-specific bandplans, and
he's an NCI director. Where does this train lead to?

> Who in the world would ever discourage someone else from learning
> anything?

People with an agenda.

> I don't think we're about to start relying on wagon trains any more,
> either, but I'd wholeheartedly *encourage* anyone to learn any skill
> associated with wagon trains--horseback riding, blacksmithing,
> cooking, range life, etc.

Problem is, CW is much more popular in the ham bands than running wagon
trains is in the world of transportation. Heck, just try to find some
unoccupied bandwidth this weekend. Sorry, it's not an adequate comparasion.

>> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
>> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:

>> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to
>> > any mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
>> > testing.
>>
>> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
>> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans. That's why FM is prohibited

>> on most HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are you
>> saying that both organizations are out of line in doing so?

[snip]

> No, the FCC nor the ARRL should have in their domain the decision
> making power to provide or withold spectrum based on what they think
> is the best mode.

Thank you!

joshua houk
kd7pos

4683. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:39:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m2e1$vl5$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34044

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test
for
> > > Morse code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn
> > > unless there IS a test?
> >
> > No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> > grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement
>
> So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to learn
and
> use CW?! This is getting really confusing, Little Dick. It sounds more
> like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?
>
> Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or
> the other for whether someone is going to use it or not.

Actually Kim, I think that is incorrect. I am sure there
are people that come to like CW simply because they were
forced to learn it to pass the test. That is exactly why Dick
wants to keep tests. If testing ends, there is NO automatic
recruitment to the ranks of CW users simly as a result of
the mandatory skill test. If testing ends, the automatic
recruitment (however small) of some hams to the ranks
of CW users will end and folks like Dick, Larry, et al
will need to become champions/recruiters/marketeers
tof CW use to bring newcomers to the mode...although I
am also certain some people will try it without any
prodding and of those, some will like it, use it and become
long term devotees of CW.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4684. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 16:55:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4m38q$n4j$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34045

```
"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:AVvb8.5563$BR3.191273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6e6b1c_1@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >>
> >> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> >> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
> >> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
> >> from learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it
> >> is) an antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
> >> communication?
> > >
> > > They most certainly are *not* discouraging anyone from learning CW,
> > > Joshua. I'd be disappointed in anyone who translated a desire to see
> > > CW ended as a testing element, into a desire to see all CW go away.
> >
> > Look at the statement. It's right there on their first page. The statement
> > attempts to portray the mode in a negative light - inaccurately, to boot.
> > How can that not be a discouragement?
> >
> > Look at K2UNK's response. He's now attacking mode-specific bandplans, and
> > he's an NCI director. Where does this train lead to?

What does being an NCI director have to do with
non-code related issues?

As to "attacking" bandplans...that's your exaggeration.
I point out a few realities of bandplans (lack of same) in
most countries and you take that as an attack?
If the issue of bandplans comes up at all in the FCC,
odds are you won't see any pro or con comments from
me on the subject. It isn't one of my hot buttons.

> > Who in the world would ever discourage someone else from learning
> > anything?
> >
> > People with an agenda.

Other than ending the code test requirement,
just what do you believe the agenda of NCI is?

> > I don't think we're about to start relying on wagon trains any more,
> > either, but I'd wholeheartedly *encourage* anyone to learn any skill
```

> > associated with wagon trains--horseback riding, blacksmithing,
> > cooking, range life, etc.
>
> Problem is, CW is much more popular in the ham bands than running wagon
> trains is in the world of transportation. Heck, just try to find some
> unoccupied bandwidth this weekend. Sorry, it's not an adequate
comparasion.

So what's the beef?
IF CW is being used as much as
you say, just what else do you want?

> >> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> >> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> >> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to
> >> > any mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
> >> > testing.
> >>
> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both FCC-enforced
> >> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans. That's why FM is prohibited
> >> on most HF bands. That's why you can only use CW and FSK on 30m. Are
you
> >> saying that both organizations are out of line in doing so?
>
> [snip]
>
> > No, the FCC nor the ARRL should have in their domain the decision
> > making power to provide or withold spectrum based on what they think
> > is the best mode.
>
> Thank you!

Sorry, the FCC makes the decision, the ARRL is free to
recommend to the FCC.
The ARRL doesn't get to directly provide or withhold spectrum.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4685. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:01:15 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <vfwb8.5609$BR3.194761@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34046

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in
news:3c6e6d8b_2@news7.fast.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
>> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>>
>> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
>> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has
> is to
>> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
>> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW
> nor
>> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
>
> Kim's statement is true ... NCI policy is NOT against Morse usage,
> and NCI has REPEATEDLY stated publicly that there is NO intent
> or agenda to seek any sort of ban on Morse usage at any point in
> the future.

Well, with an attack on the mode itself on the front page of the NCI
website and now with both a Director and the Executive Director of NCI
attacking FCC subbands (with the ever-convincing argument that "oh, but
there's other countries that don't have regulated subbands!"), it certainly
looks like you're trying to push CW out of the way.

>> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
>> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
>> from learning CW.
>
> No ... simply making a statement of fact.

Well, you would be if it were factual.

> Also, please note that both the ARRL and the IARU AC have
> adopted resolutions acknowleging that the continuation of
> a requirement for Morse testing in the ITU Radio Regulations
> is no longer necessary ... the IARU resolution even aludes
> to continued Morse requirements not being compatible with
> a healthy future for the ARS (paraphrasing, I don't have a
> copy of the resolution text on this computer ...)

The ARRL, if memory serves, decided not to take a position on code testing
and the ITU, which is rather different than taking a position on it. As far

as CW testing and a "healthy future" for the ARS, that's certainly a
discouragement against code testing, not CW itself.

>> Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
>> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
>> communication?
>
> Someone who thinks its interesting and fun?

Sure. "Interesting" and "fun" are not the words that pop up in my mind when
I read that "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been superceded by
more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means of
communication."

>> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to
> any
>> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
> testing.
>>
>> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
> FCC-enforced
>> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>
> The FCC has merely portioned certain segments of some
> bands for "narrowband modes" and "wider band modes."
> They have SPECIFICALLY declined to "codify" the ARRL
> bandplans. In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.

I really find this problem with FCC and ARRL subbands within the
Directorship of the NCI pretty noteworthy as an indication that they don't
plan to stop with morse testing.

> The 30m band is only 50 kHz wide ... it makes sense
> in terms of spectrum utilization in such a narrow band,
> but it is NOT a statement on the "overall superiority of
> Morse."

It is, however, a statement on giving "credence to any mode over another,"
which was the point that I was addressing,

joshua houk
kd7pos

4686. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:16:17 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Btwb8.5641$BR3.197569@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34047

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6e6e2d_2@newsa.ev1.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:K0ob8.4840$BR3.136536@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:
>> >
>> > Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?
>>
>> Ah yup.
>>
>> > If so, feel free to argue against them.
>>
>> Thanks for your blessing, but I already do.
>
> No, you provide reactionary responses to something you misunderstand.
> You think a desire to have CW testing ommited from ARS licensure is a
> desire to end all CW use.

No, I did *not* provide arguments against the NCI statements about CW being
superceded in the previous post.

I don't confuse between people attacking testing and people attacking the
mode, which I thought was fairly evident when I pointed out a specifically
anti-mode statement from NCI. I see obvious merits both for and against
code testing, and I certainly don't desire to end all CW use.

What I do see, however, is a strong anti-mode bias within NCI, and when
they say that there's not, I call them on it.

>> True, but it would be a tremendous help if people who didn't like a
>> mode testing requirement would not make the mode itself into the
>> arguing point.
>>
>
> I think if you really investigated, you'd understand that it is the
> very people who like the mode that turn it into an argument "about the
> mode."

Look again at the front page of the NCI website.

>> If you're arguing against the use of mode-specific bandplans,
>> mandatory or otherwise, I don't think you'll have much company.
>
> "Much company" isn't the reason someone should enter into a debate

> about something one way or the other.

"Much company" most certainly is the reason why there's an FCC requirement to abide by "good amateur practice," why the FCC encourages self-policing, and why amateurs tend to try to do what's best for the ARS.

But, given your callsign, I can see why you might think otherwise.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4687. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:23:54 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <5Fwb8.77076$TI5.3760875@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 34048

Having read this entire thread, I can certainly see why Steve, K4YZ, is interjecting with his call
from time to time. It sounds to me like the club in question has too many grouchy old "buzzard"
ops with too much time on their hands. As I read the reg., it states that the control op must be
present, and the guest can operate the station with pretty much the same guidelines as the control op. But, again, as long as the control op is physically present.

I've run into some of those grouchy old 'buzzards" myself--one of whom took it upon himself to
correct me on-air about the way I signed off the club auto-patch. The way I did it was to pound the patch down, and then announce "This is K4KWH clearing autopatch after 3rd party
traffic with Bill Jones". This way, I didn't have the dial tone going while trying to talk over it. This ancient club member chided me and "instructed" me on the "proper" way to do it. I was
nice about it, and said no more. Then one night, I witnessed an accident where a car was forced off the street by another motorist. I broke into the net in progress and asked for the
patch to report the incident (property damage, but I didn't yet know if anyone was hurt). Per-
mission was immediately granted by the NCS, and I brought up the patch to call the cops to report the incident. The old "buzzard"--same guy who corrected me before--promptly dropped the patch out from under me and began to lecture me and the net that what I had was
not emergency traffic and did not warrant the use of the patch. (How th' hell did HE know what I had just witnessed?) This infuriated me. Heck, by the time we got it straightened out,
the guy that caused the accident was long gone. I sent word to Buzzard that from that moment
on, he was to mind his own beeswax and leave me strictly alone, or I'd kick his butt up around
his shoulders. (Hey, I lost my temper, OK? because he seemed to have this "thing" about me,
and I was tired of his alligator mouth> LOL!) Anyway, things cooled down, he never corrected me again, and I saw him at a hamfest back in the fall, and he was just as nice as he could be to me! I've had this happen before where someone becomes mouthy, bossy, and takes every opportunity to embarrass. With some of them, it takes a little bit of threat to make 'em quit it.

So, after getting a bit off topic here, I would say that if I am operating my station within the law

and somebody reports me for "illegal" operation, they had better be able to back up what they
report. I wouldn't take kindly to having to answer a letter from RH based on some buzzard who interprets the regulations HIS way, and if 'them 'ere young whippersnappers don't do it the
way we did it in 1950, I'll turn 'im in!" LOL!

Jerry
K4KWH

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4fb7a$b4t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:cce22972.0202131353.35992ac6@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:<3c6470ac_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > > "JJ" <qrp5@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > > news:cce22972.0202080430.6e99dfc4@posting.google.com...
> > > > Concerning the transmission of an amateur station by an unlicensed
> > > > person with a properly licensed "control operator" present, we have
> > > > come to some disagreement lately. Some say the "guest" can operate
> > > > the station, making calls and identifying with the callsign of the
> > > > control operator. Others say the guest cannot INITIATE a call, and
> > > > may not IDENTIFY with the callsign of any other person. We have
> > > > looked for this specific situation in Part 97, but weren't able to
> > > > find anything specifically on this. Can anyone point me to the
proper
> > > > clause (if it does indeed exist)? Thanks for your help.
> > > > Respectfully, JJ
> > >
> > > JJ,
> > >
> > > The restrictions against initiating a call or identifying the station
> > > do not appear in Part 97.
> > >
> > > Thus, it would seem that a "guest" operating under the continuous
> > > supervision of a properly licensed control operator can do whatever
> > > the control operator is allowed to do, as long as the control operator
> > > permits it and it is otherwise within the rules.
> > >
> > > Carl - wa6vse
> >
> > Carl, it would seem that most would agree with you. (also TNX to Phil
> > Kane for his input on this question) It has been determined by our
> > club, however, that any unlicesed person initiating a call or ID'ing
> > with another's call sign will be reported to the FCC, regardless if a
> > control operator is present or not. While this seems contrary to the
> > interpretation as understood by most hams who responded, it is a
> > decision we will have to live with locally.
>

> Does your "report any..." cover people operating
> stations other than your club station?" Your club is free to
> set any rules for its own operation as you see fit.
>
> Have you ever actually reported one of your own...and if
> yes, what was the FCC response?
>
> > There have already been
> > confrontations to people who were not aware of our interpretation.
>
> Again, your option regarding your own club station...but that's
> were your interpretation and control ends.
>
> > Personally, I think it is unfortunate that we could not come to a
> > common understanding on this issue because will likely be the cause of
> > much trouble in the future.
>
> How so? Except perhaps on an internal club basis.
>
> > Even our own VE's are divided on this, as
> > well as those VE's administering exams in adjacent counties.
>
> Why would VE's in adjacent counties care about your
> internal club rules?
>
> > I thank you all who responded. Respectfully, JJ
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

4688. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:36:59 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34049

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4lvavscg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net:

> Then where's your beef? Why should your opinion
> be OK but NCI's shouldn't be stated.

The point was, if you check back, that NCI had made statements discouraging
people from using CW. If you're going to say that you don't discourage code
use, then don't make statements discouraging code use.

>> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
>> >> FCC-enforced bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>> >
>> > Do you understand that the USA is one of only
>> > a few countries that have such bandplanes?
>>
>> Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those
>> countries have bandplans?
>
> Not in light of the fact that the vast majority, including
> our Canadian neighbor do not.

Radio Amateurs of Canada Band Plans:

http://www.rac.ca/bandplan.htm

joshua houk
kd7pos

4689. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:39:50 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <GPwb8.5694$BR3.201620@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34050

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6e81e0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:Nivb8.5483$BR3.184024@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>> They didn't call it "incentive licensing" for naught.
>
> Yes, they did, Joshua.

Then why didn't they call it "blooming petunias?"

joshua houk
kd7pos

4690. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 17:55:08 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <02xb8.5726$BR3.204102@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34201

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4m38q$n4j$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:AVvb8.5563$BR3.191273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>> Look at the statement. It's right there on their first page. The
>> statement attempts to portray the mode in a negative light -
>> inaccurately, to boot. How can that not be a discouragement?
>>
>> Look at K2UNK's response. He's now attacking mode-specific bandplans,
>> and he's an NCI director. Where does this train lead to?
>
> What does being an NCI director have to do with
> non-code related issues?

Mode-specific bandplans seem to be code-related, neh?

> As to "attacking" bandplans...that's your exaggeration.
> I point out a few realities of bandplans (lack of same) in
> most countries and you take that as an attack?

Yeah, "attacking" was too strong of a word. Mea culpa.

>> People with an agenda.
>
> Other than ending the code test requirement,
> just what do you believe the agenda of NCI is?

It's obvious what NCI's agenda is - I mean, I can read. :). The people *in*
NCI, well, I think it's clear that a portion of the membership has a
definite bias against the CW mode, not just the test.

>> Problem is, CW is much more popular in the ham bands than running
>> wagon trains is in the world of transportation. Heck, just try to
>> find some unoccupied bandwidth this weekend. Sorry, it's not an
>> adequate comparasion.
>
> So what's the beef?
> IF CW is being used as much as
> you say, just what else do you want?

I'd want people with access to HF bands to be familiar and conversant with
the predominant modes used there. I think the Russian federation's
statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
requirement.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4691. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 18:07:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ea0ad_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34202

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:vfwb8.5609$BR3.194761@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in
> news:3c6e6d8b_2@news7.fast.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> >> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
> >>
> >> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> >> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI
has
> > is to
> >> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license.
I
> >> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW
> > nor
> >> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
> >
> > Kim's statement is true ... NCI policy is NOT against Morse usage,
> > and NCI has REPEATEDLY stated publicly that there is NO intent
> > or agenda to seek any sort of ban on Morse usage at any point in
> > the future.
>
> Well, with an attack on the mode itself on the front page of the NCI

> website

Stating the facts supporting the contention that there is no
longer a justification for Morse proficiency tests in order to get
a license with HF privileges is NOT an attack on the mode
itself ... it is merely an attack on the TESTING requirement.

You neglect to mention the parts of the "NCI Mission Statement"
where we stress the fact that we are NOT against the USE of
Morse ... only the test requirement.

> and now with both a Director and the Executive Director of NCI
> attacking FCC subbands (with the ever-convincing argument that "oh,
but
> there's other countries that don't have regulated subbands!"),
```

The issue of mode-restricted sub-bands was raised by
someone else ... I don't recall who first brought it up. Larry,
a staunch PCTA sort of guy, stated that he was against
phone band expansion ... if you'll check, you'll find that I
agreed with him.

As far as mentioning that other countries don't have the
same sort of sub-band mode restrictions that we have in
the US (and that it doesn't seem to have caused a problem),
goes, that is simply a matter of fact.

I'll be operating next week from another country where there
are no such restrictions ... will I operate SSB in the US
Extra CW sub-band? NO. Could I do so perfectly legally?
Yes, but I have no intention of doing so ...
Neither do "the locals" where I'm going do so ... that's the
point ... there isn't a problem in that regard.

< it certainly
> looks like you're trying to push CW out of the way.

I don't see how you could honestly see that ... CW is
allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands ... the
only mode with such broad allocations under US rules.
NCI has specifically and publicly stated (and I have
personally as well) that there is NO intention of seeking
any sort of ban or restriction on the USE of Morse.

Can you explain how this translates into "trying to push
CW out of the way" ??? Sorry, it "doesn't compute."

[snip]

> > Also, please note that both the ARRL and the IARU AC have
> > adopted resolutions acknowleging that the continuation of
> > a requirement for Morse testing in the ITU Radio Regulations
> > is no longer necessary ... the IARU resolution even aludes
> > to continued Morse requirements not being compatible with
> > a healthy future for the ARS (paraphrasing, I don't have a
> > copy of the resolution text on this computer ...)
>
> The ARRL, if memory serves, decided not to take a position
> on code testing and the ITU, which is rather different than
> taking a position on it.

The ARRL *WROTE* the IWG-6/WAC US Draft Proposal on
Agenda Item 1.7.1 for WRC-03 ... and the contents included
the elimination of the Morse testing requirement of S25.5
from the ITU Radio Regulations. (my comment above
was directed at ITU Radio Regulations requirements ...)

So far, at least, the ARRL has stated that it supports a
continuation of the 5 wpm Morse test for General and Extra
in the US rules ... NCI, of course, has a different postion

on that, but that is a matter which won't be decided until
after WRC-03.

> As far as CW testing and a "healthy future" for the ARS,
> that's certainly a discouragement against code testing,
> not CW itself.

AGREED ... NCI is against code TESTING requirements,
NOT against code USAGE.

> > The FCC has merely portioned certain segments of some
> > bands for "narrowband modes" and "wider band modes."
> > They have SPECIFICALLY declined to "codify" the ARRL
> > bandplans. In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>
> I really find this problem with FCC and ARRL subbands within the
> Directorship of the NCI pretty noteworthy as an indication that they
don't
> plan to stop with morse testing.

Your assertion is TOTALLY false. Again, we have publicly
stated ... from the very beginning until this day ... that there
is NO "hidden agenda" to "eliminate or restrict Morse usage."

All that the above discussion of sub-bands involves is that ...
discussion of the FACTS as they exist, both in the US and
in other regulatory domains. Don't read more into it than
is there ...

> > The 30m band is only 50 kHz wide ... it makes sense
> > in terms of spectrum utilization in such a narrow band,
> > but it is NOT a statement on the "overall superiority of
> > Morse."
>
> It is, however, a statement on giving "credence to any
> mode over another," which was the point that I was
> addressing,

I don't see the facts of the 30m band as "giving credence"
to ANYTHING other than the fact that that particular band
is too narrow to reasonably support wideband modes.
(Note that Morse is NOT the only mode permitted there ...)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG6fPpe+N6+q84HiEQLumgCeK2VBYFTvJblk58jT8/ozodTQFu8AoLVY
H2uvoakfMX7+gk3PkaJb7poW

```
=cKNq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4692. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 18:56:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216135644.11727.00000369@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34203

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> In slapping that brush around to paint Carl

> OOps, you slipped there Ed. I didn't paint Carl, he came with the
>pigment intact.

Do I understand this to mean that you will no longer be insulting Carl on this forum?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4693. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 19:01:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216140124.11727.00000371@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34204

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.

> Hey, it was Cecil's assertion, with which I *DO NOT* agree. It's
>up to him to support it.

If I take those words at their face, you have just said that if Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will not choose to learn it.

New hams are going to learn other things in ham radio that have merits, none of which have FCC testing for priveleges. Why do you feel Morse code's merits are so inferior that no one will learn it?

It is funny, in a sad sort of way. You and Carl agree that Morse code does not have enough merits that hams will want to make much use of it on the bands. The only difference in your positions is that he believes that the lack of merit of Morse code should mean that it should not longer be required via a code test. You believe that Morse code does not have enough merits that people will want to use it so they should be tested for it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4694. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 19:03:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216140335.11727.00000372@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34205

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Which is to say, if you rely on a computer program to do the job
>you will be let down when you least expect and most need it to work. In
>short,
>manually operated CW gets through after the other
>commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.

Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do moonbounce at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that you could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4695. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 19:08:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216140824.11727.00000373@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34206

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Hey TwIT, I never open your posts any more, but it's early, my coffee hasn't
>done its thing yet, I clicked on 'next', and damn, there was another of your
>"thoughtful" statements....

Now, now, Dick; I have been called to task for not calling people who call
other people twits to task.

Carl apologized when he called someone a twit. Are you as noble as he is?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4696. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 19:11:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216141148.11727.00000375@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34207

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Larry Roll wrote:

>> When
>> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
>> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
>> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
>> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.

>I suspect that has more to do with your personality than with
>your qualifications.

The ARRL emergency communications courses have been wildly successful. I don't think they would have if the opening line were, "Dear Knuckle Dragger..."

We all have our own style that really does shape our reality.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4697. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 19:16:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216141614.11727.00000377@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34208

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>wider digital modes, such as
>digital voice (just one example) could operate in the upper parts of
>the bands.

Under the present roles, digital voice is phone, so it belongs in the
phone/image part of the bands.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4698. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 20:01:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6eba94_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34209

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4m126$g0p$3@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C6FA3EE.D4353BC1@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre.
>
> Still the clever user of perjoratives...eh Dick?
>

Bill!! Clever?! Dick?!

Kim W5TIT

4699. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 20:38:36 UTC
From: TraNSforMATionS MaLetoFeMAle <doodadoodadoo@aol.com>
Message-ID: <grzb8.15140$P21.1398572@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34210

I was around when the arrl screwed ham radio in the 60's with
it's so-called "incentive" licencing program...

I was here when they backpeddled in the late 70's because school
clubs were evaporating because of lack of interest...

I was here when they heavy-petitioned the FCC to publish the exam question
pools for the -->SOLE PURPOSE<-- of putting Dick Bash out of business
and NOT because they wanted to make getting a licence any easier...

(Dick Bash crossed the line and took 50% of the arrl publishing business
you see..I can recall one person after an ARRL board meeting repeating
over and over: "..How dare he print those guides without our approval !")

I am still here an watching hamfests dissapear because nobody new is buying
those *obscenely overpriced * recycled plastic & steel Jap radios...

I am still here and THOROUGHLY ENJOYING watching arrl shrivel up
and die on the vine... (having my "I told you so" strawberry shortcake
and coffee - pfhbltttt!)

Bottom line, for the past 35+ Years arrl has taken a typical New England
uppity snobbish country club mentality and attitude about ham radio.
"Were' right and your wrong...."

Guess what sport's fans ----->> S C R E W E M !

Let them and their precious obsolete ham radio go
down the RF toilet. They made it that way, now let
it go to pieces like Enron did.

Your 100% right Clay/N4AOX

I would just add to you comments: "Good riddence to them
and their stupid museum(s) which they dumped thouand
into, the contents of which should have been loaded into
the back of a trash truck and carted to the nearest
Waste Management Inc. landfill..."

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C6C7B3A.F57CE95A@worldnet.att.net...
> As most may have noticed, latter day testimony has shown
> that ENRON's top guys applied the mushroom theory of
> management to their own employees and shareholders. Now,
> according the blurb in QST, the Newington Crowd has decided
> to delete the BOD minutes in fine print from QST to save
> APPROX. 12 PAGES OF QST PER YEAR. The stated reason is that
> falling revenues and increased postage requires cost

> cutting. Is this for real? To cover this change, it states
> minutes will be published on the ARRL web site. Could it be
> that the Newington Crowd has been inspired by the wildly
> successful escapades of the recent world's 7th largest
> company to also adapt the mushroom theory? Lets see, how
> many of the membership have handy internet access or use
> internet access to keep up with the BOD?
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX
>

4700. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:06:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ecaef_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34211

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216135644.11727.00000369@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> In slapping that brush around to paint Carl
>
> > OOps, you slipped there Ed. I didn't paint Carl, he came with the
> >pigment intact.
>
> Do I understand this to mean that you will no longer be insulting
Carl on this
> forum?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Please forgive me ... I *know* I should just let this lie, but I just
can't help taking the opportunity to wish you well ... in answer
to your question to Dick: "You should live so long." (until
Dick stops insulting me ... or anyone else who disagrees with
him, for that matter ...)

Besides, being caucasian, I don't understand why Dick seems
intent on making an issue of "pigment" ... AFAIK, the Morse
issue has nothing to do with color at all.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG7Jtpe+N6+q84HiEQI21gCgwsWvEkhM5i3CyB2k/jttrr+QVo4AoIEF
9blapxg8Jid47ryd+f2pzzeF
=Q+ig
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4701. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:10:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ecc9b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34217

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Btwb8.5641$BR3.197569@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6e6e2d_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:K0ob8.4840$BR3.136536@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:
> >> >
> >> > Do you deny the staements we (NCI) made as being true?
> >>
> >> Ah yup.
> >>
> >> > If so, feel free to argue against them.
> >>
> >> Thanks for your blessing, but I already do.
> >
> > No, you provide reactionary responses to something you misunderstand.
> > You think a desire to have CW testing ommited from ARS licensure is a
> > desire to end all CW use.
>
> No, I did *not* provide arguments against the NCI statements about CW
being
> superceded in the previous post.
>

That's what I think I implied. You provide nothing in the way of argument,
only reactionary response to something you misunderstand.

>
> I don't confuse between people attacking testing and people attacking the
> mode, which I thought was fairly evident when I pointed out a specifically
> anti-mode statement from NCI.
>

You didn't do that either. I have just revisted http://www.nocode.org/ and
see nothing of which you speak. I see that NCI states that it is "a
organization dedicated to the abolition of the Morse code testing
requirement as a prerequisite for any class of Amateur Radio license." I
don't think it could be any more clearly stated than that, Joshua. It is
the *TESTING* requirement that is NCI's focus.

>
> I see obvious merits both for and against

> code testing, and I certainly don't desire to end all CW use.
>
> What I do see, however, is a strong anti-mode bias within NCI, and when
> they say that there's not, I call them on it.
>

Then, you're simply wrong. I don't think I've ever seen anything out of NCI
that should lead a logical thinking person to believe that their agenda is
against all CW--use, learning, expermimenting with, etc.

>
> >> True, but it would be a tremendous help if people who didn't like a
> >> mode testing requirement would not make the mode itself into the
> >> arguing point.
> >>
> >
> > I think if you really investigated, you'd understand that it is the
> > very people who like the mode that turn it into an argument "about the
> > mode."
>
> Look again at the front page of the NCI website.
>

Told you, I just did. I see nothing of the sort which you present in your
argument. Why don't you give a specific cite that you find supports your
stated opinion?

> >>
> >> If you're arguing against the use of mode-specific bandplans,
> >> mandatory or otherwise, I don't think you'll have much company.
> >
> > "Much company" isn't the reason someone should enter into a debate
> > about something one way or the other.
>
> "Much company" most certainly is the reason why there's an FCC requirement
> to abide by "good amateur practice," why the FCC encourages self-policing,
> and why amateurs tend to try to do what's best for the ARS.
>
> But, given your callsign, I can see why you might think otherwise.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos
>

I love it when I'm so right that all that is left is something about a
callsign...

Kim W5TIT

4702. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:12:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ecd02_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34218

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4lvavscg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> > Then where's your beef? Why should your opinion
> > be OK but NCI's shouldn't be stated.
>
> The point was, if you check back, that NCI had made statements
discouraging
> people from using CW. If you're going to say that you don't discourage
code
> use, then don't make statements discouraging code use.
>

Cite the specific statements you are talking about. I think you're, quite
frankly, full of crap.

Kim W5TIT

4703. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:14:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6eccee$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34216

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216141614.11727.00000377@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >wider digital modes, such as
> >digital voice (just one example) could operate in the upper parts
of
> >the bands.
>
> Under the present roles, digital voice is phone, so it belongs in
the
> phone/image part of the bands.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

I thought that's what I proposed? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG7Lspe+N6+q84HiEQK5ugCfU5700MXoUrKPn/NnAjX8IxgkTXMAoNkg
TY1j7ufUkGLQ6egYNLZSftn7
=f3Vf
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4704. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:15:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216161501.07951.00002074@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 34213

In article <20020216090957.16502.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <a4l0i9$f0l$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>>news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>>> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
>>> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
>>>
>>> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
>>> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has is to
>>> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
>>> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW nor
>>> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
>>>
>>> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means
>>> of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone from
>>> learning CW. Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
>>> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of communication?
>
>BINGO. If it's about the TEST, attack the TEST.

Tsk, tsk, so adamant and challenging! One would think N2EY is
"concerned!" :-)

Suggestion: Try and independent website opposing the NCI (several
ISPs offer plenty of webspace free as part of membership).

Non-suggestion: "No SSB International" has already been done.
Another fella named May or July or something like that did one,
too. Not there anymore as I understand.

By all means, BE AGGRESSIVE on the subject and FORBID those
NOT IN amateur radio to EVER discuss anything about GETTING IN;
always bring out the standard boilerplate phrasing, even borrow some
("Try it, you'll like it!"). Convince others that whatever your particular
personal desires are should be "representative" of the entire ARS.

If someone says a generality about something YOU like,
IMMEDIATELY jump in and point out their "obvious shortcomings,"
"they know NOTHING about the ARS," "they are dumbed-down,"
"unworthy of a license for wrong attitude" and similar phrases.
Those seem to be very popular. Obviously those folks ARE

ignorant, stupid, unworthy, etc., etc., etc.

>I have. But one cannot post to NCI's website. You do not want opposing
>opinion.

One could NOT post to "No SSB International." One could not
post to the other website that was very pro code in all respects.
Nobody can post publicly to the ARRL website unless they are a
member. Privately, yes, and expect form-letter replies. :-)

>The very name "No-Code International" implies anticode, not antitest. Had you
>folks chosen simply "No Code Test" or "No Code Test Association" (NCTA) it
>would be unambiguous.

The name American Radio RELAY League is unambiguous and implies
that ordinary folks still use telegrams. :-)

An example of an unambiguous name is Radio Club of America. It was
founded in 1909 on a general interest in radio, not as a poor-man's
Western Union substitute.

>> Regardless, CW does still have its
>>niche and, if properly promoted by those that truly like it, there
>>will always be a niche of CW users/enthusiasts.
>
>Hopefully. But only IF there is a place for us to go.

I hear tell of a group that loves to send code messages over the
Internet to one another. Imagine the high-tech state-of-the-art
of that...using personal computers, modems running 56 K BPS
to send high-speed morse code at 40 WPM with worldwide
access and no propagation problems! :-)

"CW gets through when nothing else will!!!" :-) :-) :-)

<snip>

>>Indeed, the same is true for
>>commercial FM. Other than that, in most countries,
>>there are no or minimal mode specific HF bandplanes.
>
>Let's see a list, complete with amateur populations.

YEAH!!! LET'S SEE THAT LIST!!! [you tellum, Jimmie M]

>Once code testing is eliminated, are bandplans the next target?

Getting worried? Afraid that the State Welfare programs for
Morsemen will be eliminated?

It's been suggested that the sound of "black helicopters" in the
distance is a symptom of tinitus, a common malady of older
folks. It can happen with younger folks, too, especially those
who hear a lot of loud beeping. See your ornithologist for a
checkup regularly, don't flap around imagining a future that will

never fly.

Remember: Time flies like the wind but fruit flies like bananas.

4705. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:15:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216161505.07951.00002075@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 34215

In article <3c6e6852_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020216014957.02879.00000052@mb-fk.aol.com...
>> In article <3c6dd2e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020215200152.05201.00002068@mb-fa.aol.com...
>> >>
>> >> The facts from the FCC in regards to the code testing issue(s)
>are
>> >accessible
>> >> to the US public and anyone who has Internet access capability.
>As
>> >to "the
>> >> code issue being a 'done deal,'" the FCC International Bureau
>> >Informal Working
>> >> Group Six (IWG-6) has effectively tabled or DONE NOTHING about
>S25.5
>> >insofar
>> >> as establishing any direct statement one way or another.
>> >
>> >Len,
>> >
>> >You are mistaken ...
>>
>> Am I? Let's look at what the PUBLIC can see...
>
>Len,
>
>I was not and am not trying to insult you ... merely to
>tell you the facts as I know them. To be candid, the
>FCC's WRC website does not always contain every
>detail, nor is it always completely up to date (there is
>an inevitable lag between things happening and their
>getting posted ...) This is not to criticize the FCC,
>either ... it's just a fact of life.

I'm not offended, just irritated, especially so when I see
standard-boilerplate "political" phrasing. Don't forget that
some of us have been in existance for a while and heard
a LOT of variations on "political" phraseology.

As far as this CITIZEN is concerned, the FCC website is
quite complete, accessible. Like all sites, civil or government,
their search engines cannot read minds or divine thoughts to
it is up to the user to input search criteria...with experience
that becomes easier. I cannot, under any circumstances or
with/without experience access information that is NOT THERE.
Nobody can.

>If the minutes say I was "on a phone bridge" that means I was
>unable to be there in person and participated via teleconference.
>In the case of the September meeting, I was in Portland, OR for
>the IEEE 802 conference for the week (a work committment), but
>Bruce Perens was physically at that meeting if you'll check the
>attendance list which you seem to have. I was there in person
>at prior meetings when the major points were argued and
>hammered out (if you don't believe me, ask Dave Sumner
>or Walt, who I'm sure thought I was a real pain in the ass for
>the, as I had some issues with some "IARU party line" language
>which they wanted to get into the US position. :-) The rev 3
>document was just a "clean copy" for approval, containing only
>updates which were agreed at a prior meeting and that version
>was circulated electronically to the IWG-6 participants in advance
>of the meeting ... I had a copy. The Sept. meeting's action on
>the IWG-6 draft proposal to the WAC was simply final review
>and approval of the last edits ... which resulted in NCI's withdrawal
>of its final objection to the content of the document.

I'm not interested in every attendee's work load or work committment
in regards to governmental public policy and SUPPOSEDLY public
information being available...including that of the ARRL reps. Like
everyone else, I cast as many doubts on "insider views" (where they
know "the real story") as those on the outside who "know all about
inside government" when they've never been there but have a secret
telepathic ability.

IWG-6 seems to have the lightest workload in terms of agenda items
and "issues and concerns" except for the 23-year-old "40 m occupancy"
issue. Please do NOT tell me that agenda items 1.7.2 and 1.7.3 are
of earth-shaking importance and require months of "study"...those
could have been wrapped up in two meetings, done before June 2001.

>The RCS preliminary view is something different from the FCC
>WAC preliminary view ... different parts of the govt. develop their
>own preliminary views, which may differ slightly from each other.
>Then those have to be resolved to mutual agreement through
>what amounts to a "conference committee." Remember, this
>is the govt. ... nothing is as simple as it might be had you or I
>designed the process ... but that's the way the process is.

Those who are PART of "the process" seem to make it grander
and "harder" than it is. Well, if "that is the govt" then pray tell,
how come for why OTHER issues before the FCC, national and
international, get prompt attention in detail, rather excrutiating

detail with footnotes and are AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC?

Let's take an example from the OET's page on spectrum useage
below 28000 KHz. [long-timers will identify there because they've
never ventured much into never-never-land "gigasquirt" space above
30 MHz] That's a big document, a mere week old on release, and
DIRECTLY pertaining to WRC-03 issues on HF-and-below radio
spectrum use...even if it is primarily of domestic concern and
assignments. [read the footnotes and some paragraphs to see the
relationship to ITU-R documents] That's comprehensive and detailed.

On IWG-6 meetings, attendees attended, approved, tabled, as if
EVERYONE WAS ON A PHONE BRIDGE. The ONLY time that
any details are given is when some OUTSIDE statement is cut and
pasted and that is RARE. There has been, supposedly, a 10th
meeting scheduled for 24 January 2002 with the "draft minutes"
supposedly written on 17 January 2002 (?) according to the IWG-6
page and there was NO released minutes text available as of 11
PM Pacific on the 15th of February, 2002.

>> The Preliminary Draft, DA 01-2168, 17 September 2001, mentions
>> ONLY 1.7.2, 1.7.3 out of the three for 1.7, absolutely NO mention
>> of 1.7.1.
>
>I know ... I explained below that there were some questions
>or confusion about something that had not yet been resolved,
>but my understanding is that the matter should be resolved
>shortly (perhaps was resolved this past week ....)

"Shortly" is a non-quantative ambiguous word. WRC is scheduled
for the year 2003. The OTHER IWGs seem to be ready with
something...judging by THEIR minutes, "P.V.s" and whatnot.

>The ARRL has, as I understand it, 3 people in its Washington
>office ... Walt, Paul Rinaldo, and Johnathan Siverling ... with
>all of the IWG-s and other WRC preparation, plus things like
>the SAVI RFID proposal which threatens interference in the
>70 cm band, plus all the other things they need to follow, they
>ARE *VERY* busy folks ... I see Walt at several other meetings
>which I regularly attend in Washington ... and I believe that Walt
>and Paul each spend something on the order of 3-4 MONTHS
>per year in Geneva (in the aggregate), attending meetings there.

Okay, so you are an apologist for the ARRL. No problem. Not
accepted either.

Anyone who is "too busy" to do their "assignments" CANNOT
DO THEM PROPERLY. "My dog ate my homework assignment"
was never an acceptible excuse in school and similar "excuses"
here are on the same order. If the ARRL can't hack it or think the
issue "isn't important" then why in the hell are they there on this
IWG?

Let's face historical fact here. The ARRL has, for years, pushed
morsemanship as the highest (even most noble) attribute of
amateur radio. Denial of that is bullshit, plain, pithy and simple.
Those ARRL "representatives" were raised early on that lore.
Walt Ireland is listed as "scribe" of IWG-6. He is of the ARRL.
IWG-6 scribe minutes seem to have been LATE, way late,
scantily reported. This 3rd Revision of agenda item 1.7.1 is still
not publicly available as were the 2nd and 1st versions. Put them
all together and they spell S-T-O-N-E-W-A-L-L-I-N-G to me.

Stonewalling an issue looks like granite but has a faint odor
of brimstone about it.

>Yes, as I said, I'd like to see IWG-6 minutes produced more
>promptly, but I know from personal experience with my own
>work that sometimes other things take priority and some things
>have to be put off occasionally. Like me, Walt can only be
>in one place at one time, has only so many hours in the day,
>and has to prioritize.

Awwww...shall I punch his TS card? Shall I punch your card?

Do NOT try to patronize anyone. Been there, done that, have
far too many t-shirts.

>Should the ARRL increase its staff in
>Washington? Perhaps, if they can raise enough $$$ to fund
>such an expansion.

...and next you would have us believe that Imlay and company
in DC work everything for the ARRL pro bono?!? Surrrre...tell me
another...

>However, in the meantime, they have to
>do the best they can with the resources they have in place.

Yeah, sure, and one way to "resolve" agenda item 1.7.1 is to
do as little as possible now, wait as long as possible, and then
if S25.5 isn't changed, take all the credit to make themselves
look good to the membership (less than a 1/4 of all licensed
US amateurs)...or if S25.5 IS changed, take all the credit to
make themselves look good to the membership as if they were
"really for the ARS and the future."

Does that phrasing sound familiar? It should...been done a lot.

>> Okay, I'll bite, WHERE THE HELL IS IT? All I see is the 3rd draft
>> proposal IWG-6/049(Rev.3) listed and its not available to the public.
>
>I'm not sure I'm remembering correctly, but I *think* that a copy
>may have been published in "The W5YI Report" ... I would guess
>that if there is not a copy on the FCC website as a "WAC" document
>that it's either an oversight, or it was decided to wait until the
>inter-governmental issues had been worked out. (speculation on my part)

Well, then somebody can come along and quote the document in
here, make themselves Very Important in proving that doubters are
stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, and all those gratuitous pejoratives.
:-)

Strange, but I don't have much trouble getting very detailed documents
on OTHER things in radio regulation from the FCC. Of course, I'm not
an "insider" and not a professional legal beagle so, like the general
public, I am not "qualified" to access the inner working of gubmint.

>- From what I know, the PCTAs will not be deleriously happy ...
>I have no control over what is posted publicly, what is not,
>or when it gets posted.

YOU are NOT being charged with anything, Carl.

Keep up apologizing for some obviously PCTA-siding organizations
and I'm sure the rest of us can think up some "charges." :-)

>Nothing more that the delays that are not unusual in large
>bureaucracies ...

Really?!? Again, I find it "strange" that OTHER radio regulatory
subjects are handled fairly quickly...except for the "important"
Vanity callsign stuff for amateur radio.

I have complete sympathy and understanding of delays resulting
from the 9-11 Attack on America and the Anthrax mail-poisoning.
That disrupted a lot of DC agencies. This issue surrounding agenda
item 1.7.1 and the 23-year-old "40 m issue" has its controversial
roots LONG AGO in radio regulation. There is NO EXCUSE for some
of the delays. Even if one cannot see stonewalling, the brimstone
odor is a dead giveaway.

>I'm sorry that you're offended in some way at not being as
>aware of what happened as those who acually participated
>in the process.

I'm not offended. I've heard a lot of "insider" stories telling about
"what really happened," all of them "true" even when two insider
stories contradicted themselves. THAT is par for the course.

What I don't accept - and what every concerned citizen should not
accept - is tardiness, omissions, and general appearance of doing
things which are "best for us" by special interest groups. From
most of the documents from the FCC done be FCC staff, I do NOT
see much of that, not even when decisions, R&Os, etc. go against
my personal interests. The FCC's reasons are posted for everyone
to see, in detail, including commenters on NPRMs. Those are
publicly available. The goings-on at the inner sanctums of the
Informal Working Groups are largely composed of SIGs yet the
other IWGs seem to have public information on what went on in
those. Maybe its my fault for not being an "insider," ain't it?

>I guess it's just another case of the wheels
>of govt. moving slowly ... but I have no reason to believe that
>there is any "funny business" going on, or that the final outcome
>will be "pro-code."

Neither PCTAs nor NCTAs have any independent public information
on what the US administration is or will be on WRC agenda item
1.7.1...us in the public can only speculate based on public information
on the "40 m issue" from FCC-02-27A1. Speculation on that, and it
is only speculation, is that the FCC and NTIA seem to support the
retention of the amateur 40 m band as it is today, the SW BC folks
move up in the spectrum. Morsemen have a ray of hope for their
declining years...:-)

With all due regards,
a concerned citizen of the USA

4706. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:15:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216161506.07951.00002076@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 34212

In article <20020216080308.18942.00001294@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
>>> Cecil.
>>
>>On the contrary, it has everything to do with the merit of Morse/CW.
>>After Morse testing is dropped, CW will be forced to stand alone on
>>its own merits. You had better hope that CW has enough merits to
>>survive. I believe that CW will still be going strong after I'm
>>pushing up daisies.
>
>Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.
>
>This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe that
>they
>should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test folks
>believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.
>
>That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.

It's the DANCE FLOOR, Ed...

Too many credentialed angels trying to boogie on a pinpoint... :-)

4707. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:15:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216161507.07951.00002077@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 34214

In article <3C6F9CD2.99F7FD8F@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>> news:3C6F2149.F1BFDFEA@worldnet.att.net...
>> >
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
>> > > implies always, Dick.
>> >
>> > Nonsense! What it implies is what happens in real life on HF on the
>air.
>> >
>> > When the voice modes have faded into unintelligible mush, and
>> > RTTY, Packet and PSK31 are printing gibberish, CW can still be
>> copied -that
>> > is, if the operator has bothered to learn it! It'll be weak but
>> > intelligible! One may have to use his skill as an operator
>> > to adjust his receiver to provide adequate copy, but for some length of
>> > time, as the band continues to fade out, CW will indeed
>> > "Get through" after the other modes have dropped out - failed.
>>
>> Dick,
>> If you don't think your statements above clearly imply "always"
>> then you need to take some logic classes. If you said "May"
>> get through...you'd be at least correct regarding your lack
>> of implication.
>
> Hey,Slick..... I am fully aware that you have not actually had any
>experience with radiotelegraphy on the air, but what I stated is FACT and has
>nothing to do with logical order or any of your other
>nonsense. It is a simple fact that when conditions deteriorate to the point
>that
>SSB cannot be copied there is a period during which further deterioration of
>conditions allow CW to *still* be copied.
>That is and has always been the case. You and Stupid may stuff your alleged
>logic. It just isn't logical.

Hmmm. Must be a LOT of that alleged "stupidity" and "lack of experience"
going on in the rest of the radio world, even as far back as 1948 in the
U.S. military (all HF long-haul comms going TTY). Too bad that the rest
of the radio world hasn't kept the superiority of CW...

I just love it when calm, seasoned, civil, technical replies eminate
from a radio expert in Missouri. Wonder when we will see such...?

With all kindest regards,
a veteran

4708. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:17:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ece5f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34220

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4m2e1$vl5$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no test
> for
> > > > Morse code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn
> > > > unless there IS a test?
> > >
> > > No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> > > grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement
> >
> > So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to learn
> and
> > use CW?! This is getting really confusing, Little Dick. It sounds more
> > like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?
> >
> > Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or
> > the other for whether someone is going to use it or not.
>
> Actually Kim, I think that is incorrect. I am sure there
> are people that come to like CW simply because they were
> forced to learn it to pass the test. That is exactly why Dick
> wants to keep tests. If testing ends, there is NO automatic
> recruitment to the ranks of CW users simly as a result of
> the mandatory skill test. If testing ends, the automatic
> recruitment (however small) of some hams to the ranks
> of CW users will end and folks like Dick, Larry, et al
> will need to become champions/recruiters/marketeers
> tof CW use to bring newcomers to the mode...although I
> am also certain some people will try it without any
> prodding and of those, some will like it, use it and become
> long term devotees of CW.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

I'm not so sure, Bill. I don't think it is the test that attracts people to ham radio :) I think it is the ham radio operators. And, if the new hams around here are any indication of people who actually like and use CW, then the mode is quite safe...with or without testing requirements...

However, we shall see, right? :)

Kim W5TIT

4709. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:26:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216162640.15449.00000086@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34219

In article <3C6DBF00.26B84664@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> writes:
>> >When one writes some computer code, one is designing.
>>
>> Only if the code is new and unique.
>
>If one is writing code from scratch, it is new and unique and can be
>copyrighted.

Only if it is sufficiently different from existing code.

More important, it can be copyrighted, which means it's in the same class as a work of fiction rather than engineering innovations, which are patented. One does not "design" a song or novel.

>> > The same applies to hardware.
>>
>> Nope. By that definiton, almost nobody designs computers today, because
>they
>> are almost all classic Von Neumann machines.
>
>You have misunderstood the concept. A new chip is a new design.

By your own definitions, that's not true unless it involves a new technology. Most
new chips are integrations of existing technology - by your definition.
>
>> > So do you think there was anything original in your "design"?
>>
>> Yep. Lots of things. The heterodyne schemes, the RIT method, the dial, and
>> lots more.
>
>Did you patent your inventions?

No reason to. The cost of doing so would be greater than the expected return.
>
>> >Contrast that to my IC-706/HS-1600 tuning system.

Have you patented it?

>> > It is very simple but
>> >I don't know of anybody else who has ever done it that way.
>
>> What does it involve?

>
>Click on my web page. I just got through posting it.
>--
A nice little integration of two pieces of manufactured gear. There is a
commercially
available "tune mode adapter" for the IC-706, btw, but I don't think it's
specifically
for the HS-1600.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

4710. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:32:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ed11b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 34222

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216140124.11727.00000371@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>
> > Hey, it was Cecil's assertion, with which I *DO NOT* agree. It's
> >up to him to support it.
>
> If I take those words at their face, you have just said that if
Morse/CW has
> merits, then new hams will not choose to learn it.

Dick seems to often confuse things ... I think he simply doesn't
have enough confidence in the merits of Morse as a mode to
believe that, absent a government mandate, many people will
bother to learn it (at least not to his satisfaction in terms of how
well they can manually encode/decode it ...)

> New hams are going to learn other things in ham radio that
> have merits, none of which have FCC testing for priveleges.
> Why do you feel Morse code's merits are so inferior that no
> one will learn it?

Good luck in getting an answer ... Cecil has been asking Dick
that for ages and never has gotten a straight answer.

> It is funny, in a sad sort of way. You and Carl agree that Morse
> code does not have enough merits that hams will want to make
> much use of it on the bands.

Actually I *personally* don't feel it has enough merit for ME to
bother with it (though I learned it many years ago when it was
required). As far as others feelings as to whether it's worth
learning or not, that's their business as far as I'm concerned.
While I'm committed to not seeking any ban or restriction on
the use of Morse by those who voluntarily choose to use it,
I frankly don't give a damn if anyone *does* choose to learn
and use it or not. Seriously ... I'm not AGAINST anyone learning
it if they want to and I'm not against anyone using it ... I just
don't give a damn either way ... preserving Morse is not a
"religious issue" to me as it seems to be to Dick and Larry
and some others. The way I see it is, if they want to preserve

it, they'd better promote it ... but as you so aptly point out,
their insults and holier-than-thou attitude towards potential
"converts" is not very good "missionary" practice.

> The only difference in your positions is that he believes that
> the lack of merit of Morse code should mean that it should
> not longer be required via a code test.

It's not even a question for me of "lack of merit" of Morse,
as a mode ... it's more that NO mode has enough merit
to deserve a separate pass/fail barrier to entry test in today's
world when there are so many modes to choose from.

> You believe that Morse code does not have enough merits
> that people will want to use it so they should be tested for it.

That's the difference ... I don't care/mind if people want to
learn/use Morse ... that should be THEIR choice. Dick, on
the other hand wants to force his "religion" on everyone,
whether they like it or not. I say, let him get his converts,
if he can, through good old missionary work, not by
maintaining a "state religion."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPG7Pape+N6+q84HiEQIRhgCgt2aFZ6fhI+3IBoJywDArUYkrPGQAn3/i
7kpWCSs+f8mCcU6w8aPwnvl6
=spog
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4711. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:34:31 UTC
From: k4yn@america.net
Message-ID: <3c6ed000.26229095@news.america.net>
Source record: 34221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 19:32:13 +0000, Walt Davidson
<walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote:

>On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 09:09:11 -0500, Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
>wrote:
>
>>Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...
>>
>> "I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
>> our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
>> Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"
>>
>>
>>You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!
>
>"One small step for a ham ..... one giant leap ...... etc etc"
>
>:-)
>73 de G3NYY
>
>--
>Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Hams have died trying to get to the Spratleys.
Ron

4712. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 21:53:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4mkjo$5j$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34223

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4lvavscg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> > Then where's your beef? Why should your opinion
> > be OK but NCI's shouldn't be stated.
>
> The point was, if you check back, that NCI had made statements
discouraging
> people from using CW. If you're going to say that you don't discourage
code
> use, then don't make statements discouraging code use.
>
> >> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
> >> >> FCC-enforced bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
> >> >
> >> > Do you understand that the USA is one of only
> >> > a few countries that have such bandplanes?
> >>
> >> Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those
> >> countries have bandplans?
> >
> > Not in light of the fact that the vast majority, including
> > our Canadian neighbor do not.
>
> Radio Amateurs of Canada Band Plans:
>
> http://www.rac.ca/bandplan.htm

Hey Josh,
Thems RAC bandplans...the equivalent of ARRL
bandplans...they are not Canadian law.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4713. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:03:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34224

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:02xb8.5726$BR3.204102@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4m38q$n4j$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:AVvb8.5563$BR3.191273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >> Look at the statement. It's right there on their first page. The
> >> statement attempts to portray the mode in a negative light -
> >> inaccurately, to boot. How can that not be a discouragement?
> >>
> >> Look at K2UNK's response. He's now attacking mode-specific bandplans,
> >> and he's an NCI director. Where does this train lead to?
> >
> > What does being an NCI director have to do with
> > non-code related issues?
>
> Mode-specific bandplans seem to be code-related, neh?

Should have said..non-code test related.
My error...corrected staement then:
What does being an NCI director have to do with
non-code test related issues?

> > As to "attacking" bandplans...that's your exaggeration.
> > I point out a few realities of bandplans (lack of same) in
> > most countries and you take that as an attack?
>
> Yeah, "attacking" was too strong of a word. Mea culpa.

Apology accepted.

> >> People with an agenda.
> >
> > Other than ending the code test requirement,
> > just what do you believe the agenda of NCI is?
>
> It's obvious what NCI's agenda is - I mean, I can read. :). The people
in
> NCI, well, I think it's clear that a portion of the membership has a
> definite bias against the CW mode, not just the test.

Having been a director since the inception of NCI, I can
state catagorically that no one in NCI has ever suggested

that CW should be ended as a mode. The fact that
some directors may not like CW as a mode doesn't imply
anti-USE.

> >> Problem is, CW is much more popular in the ham bands than running
> >> wagon trains is in the world of transportation. Heck, just try to
> >> find some unoccupied bandwidth this weekend. Sorry, it's not an
> >> adequate comparasion.
> >
> > So what's the beef?
> > IF CW is being used as much as
> > you say, just what else do you want?
>
> I'd want people with access to HF bands to be familiar and conversant with
> the predominant modes used there.

But that isn't now nor ever been a requirement. Indeed,
once licensed, there is absolutely NO reason that you can
cite to for your "want."

> I think the Russian federation's
> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
> requirement.

How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
in Spanish? Its the same concept.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4714. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:11:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4mlgoora1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34225

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:vfwb8.5609$BR3.194761@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in
> news:3c6e6d8b_2@news7.fast.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ommb8.4735$BR3.126351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> >> news:3c6dd436_2@newsa.ev1.net:
> >>
> >> > The desire for people to learn and appreciate--and apply the
> >> > merits--of CW is not up to NCI. The *only* charter that NCI has
> > is to
> >> > end CW testing for the acquisition of an amateur radio license. I
> >> > have never seen anyone in NCI say that hams should not learn CW
> > nor
> >> > that hams should be forbidden from using CW.
> >
> > Kim's statement is true ... NCI policy is NOT against Morse usage,
> > and NCI has REPEATEDLY stated publicly that there is NO intent
> > or agenda to seek any sort of ban on Morse usage at any point in
> > the future.
>
> Well, with an attack on the mode itself on the front page of the NCI
> website and now with both a Director and the Executive Director of NCI
> attacking FCC subbands (with the ever-convincing argument that "oh, but
> there's other countries that don't have regulated subbands!"), it
certainly
> looks like you're trying to push CW out of the way.

Your entitled to your own opinion...misguided as
it may be. Odd too that CW is allowed everywhere
in ham HF bands...no subband limits at all.

> >> When the NCI says "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
> >> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
> >> means of communication", they most certainly are discouraging anyone
> >> from learning CW.
> >
> > No ... simply making a statement of fact.
>
> Well, you would be if it were factual.

You're free to your own interpretation.

> > Also, please note that both the ARRL and the IARU AC have
> > adopted resolutions acknowleging that the continuation of
> > a requirement for Morse testing in the ITU Radio Regulations
> > is no longer necessary ... the IARU resolution even aludes
> > to continued Morse requirements not being compatible with
> > a healthy future for the ARS (paraphrasing, I don't have a
> > copy of the resolution text on this computer ...)
>
> The ARRL, if memory serves, decided not to take a position on code testing
> and the ITU, which is rather different than taking a position on it.

That's their (ARRL) position which, by default, supports
ending CW testing as a treaty requirement.

> As far
> as CW testing and a "healthy future" for the ARS, that's certainly a
> discouragement against code testing, not CW itself.

Please explain?????

> >> Who wants to use (following NCI's logic, such as it is) an
> >> antiquated, unreliable, slower, inefficient means of
> >> communication?
> >
> > Someone who thinks its interesting and fun?
>
> Sure. "Interesting" and "fun" are not the words that pop up in my mind
when
> I read that "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been superceded by
> more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means of
> communication."

Then don't read it. Start your own CW enthsiasts web site
to laud the use and whatever benefits of morse you like.

> >> > It is not up to the ARRL or the FCC, either, to give credence to
> > any
> >> > mode over another--such as happens with the sanctioning of CW
> > testing.
> >>
> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
> > FCC-enforced
> >> bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
> >
> > The FCC has merely portioned certain segments of some
> > bands for "narrowband modes" and "wider band modes."
> > They have SPECIFICALLY declined to "codify" the ARRL
> > bandplans. In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>
> I really find this problem with FCC and ARRL subbands within the

> Directorship of the NCI pretty noteworthy as an indication that they don't
> plan to stop with morse testing.

Two of us state the actual facts regarding the majority
of adminsitrations around the globe and that troubles you?

> > The 30m band is only 50 kHz wide ... it makes sense
> > in terms of spectrum utilization in such a narrow band,
> > but it is NOT a statement on the "overall superiority of
> > Morse."
>
> It is, however, a statement on giving "credence to any mode over another,"
> which was the point that I was addressing,

But even 30m allows other modes. There are ONLY two
actual exclusive morse subbands...both are VHF.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4715. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:20:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4mm2f$97p$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34226

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c6ece5f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a4m2e1$vl5$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C6FA49C.9DBD203B@worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > > Are you not telling them not to waste their time if there is no
test
> > for
> > > > > Morse code proficiency because it is not useful enough to learn
> > > > > unless there IS a test?
> > > >
> > > > No, I'm saying that you're dreaming if you think they'll suddenly
> > > > grab CW now simply because it is no longer a test requirement
> > >
> > > So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to
learn
> > and
> > > use CW?! This is getting really confusing, Little Dick. It sounds
more
> > > like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?
> > >
> > > Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or
> > > the other for whether someone is going to use it or not.
> >
> > Actually Kim, I think that is incorrect. I am sure there
> > are people that come to like CW simply because they were
> > forced to learn it to pass the test. That is exactly why Dick
> > wants to keep tests. If testing ends, there is NO automatic
> > recruitment to the ranks of CW users simly as a result of
> > the mandatory skill test. If testing ends, the automatic
> > recruitment (however small) of some hams to the ranks
> > of CW users will end and folks like Dick, Larry, et al
> > will need to become champions/recruiters/marketeers
> > tof CW use to bring newcomers to the mode...although I
> > am also certain some people will try it without any
> > prodding and of those, some will like it, use it and become
> > long term devotees of CW.
> >

> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
>
> I'm not so sure, Bill. I don't think it is the test that attracts people
to
> ham radio :)

Agree completely. All I am saying is that there are some
people who, because they had to learn morse, will find they
like it. Would those same people have gravitated to morse
without a test...some may have, others probably not.
THAT is why Larry, Dick and a few others want code
testing. The current scenario means they don't have to do anything
because there's always a few code enthusiasts that pop up via the
mandatory test process.

> I think it is the ham radio operators. And, if the new hams
> around here are any indication of people who actually like and use CW,
then
> the mode is quite safe...with or without testing requirements...

As I've said before, there will be some that try code
just to see how it goes. Maybe not as many as with mandatory
testing, but some to be sure.

> However, we shall see, right? :)

Probably within 18 months or so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4716. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:23:05 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a4mm49$197b$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 34227

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:a4lvavscg1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net:
>>
>> > Then where's your beef? Why should your opinion
>> > be OK but NCI's shouldn't be stated.
>>
>> The point was, if you check back, that NCI had made statements
>discouraging
>> people from using CW. If you're going to say that you don't discourage
>code
>> use, then don't make statements discouraging code use.
>>
>> >> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
>> >> >> FCC-enforced bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>> >> >
>> >> > Do you understand that the USA is one of only
>> >> > a few countries that have such bandplanes?
>> >>
>> >> Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those
>> >> countries have bandplans?
>> >
>> > Not in light of the fact that the vast majority, including
>> > our Canadian neighbor do not.
>>
>> Radio Amateurs of Canada Band Plans:
>>
>> http://www.rac.ca/bandplan.htm
>
>Hey Josh,
>Thems RAC bandplans...the equivalent of ARRL
>bandplans...they are not Canadian law.

That's true. The applicable regulations are in RIC-2, found at

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/SSG/sf01226e.html

Short and sweet is good.

Note, however, that in most countries where the subbands aren't
written into law the effect of the voluntary plans is still pretty
much indistiguishable from the former; some modes get used some places

in the band while other modes get used other places, with relatively few exceptions. That Americans see a big distinction between the two ways of arriving at these divisions is probably why they end up with the FCC micro-managing mode usage and band divisions within the service.

Dennis Ferguson

4717. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:52:07 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <ufnt6u8noueqmkusjlj5a4vam7t45ec12b@4ax.com>
Source record: 34228
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 16 Feb 2002 21:34:31 GMT, k4yn@america.net (RJ) wrote:

>Hams have died trying to get to the Spratleys.

Other vacationers have died jet-ski-ing.
Does that make them national heroes?

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4718. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 22:59:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216175902.03271.00000880@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34229

>Again, I agree with Larry ... the technical basics MUST
>continue to be a part of the license qualification tests.

When did they start testing for this????

4719. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:00:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216180037.03271.00000882@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34230

>That is just not true.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

How do you know, when was your last CW contact?

4720. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:05:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216180537.03271.00000884@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34231

> Indeed,
>we clearly state that USE is and should be a personal decision

And so should the written, there is no reason to test anybody on theory. Most New Hams have no Idea about theory anyway. And the present written is a Joke, it really serves no purpose.

4721. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:35:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216183529.11735.00000376@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34232

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/16/2002 3:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020216161507.07951.00002077@mb-bh.aol.com>

>I just love it when calm, seasoned, civil, technical replies eminate
>from a radio expert in Missouri. Wonder when we will see such...?

And I just love that "calm, reasoned" geographical bigotry that you spew
while lambasting others for it.

As always, you remain the Putz. A two faced lying one, at that.

Thanks for not letting us down.

4722. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:38:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216183808.16502.00000132@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34233

In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...

>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
>> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
>> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
>> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>>
>> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response something
>> like "So the FCC at some time in the past created band segments by
>mode
>> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."
>
>Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
>be 10 wpm ...

Hold it right there. Tell the WHOLE story.

The code test speed for US licenses (except the old Extra) was 10 wpm from
1919 to 1936.

>at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
>the speed to 12.5 wpm ...

That's right - in 1936. TheyALSO asked the FCC to revise the WRITTEN exam
so that it required more radio knowledge in order to pass.

> SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
>hams "because the bands were too crowded."

Incorrect.

The concerns were:

1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
2) many newcomers were getting on the air with insufficient skill AND TECHNICAL
KNOWLEDGE for the conditions of the day
3) the explosive growth (the number of US hams TRIPLED from 1929's ~16,000 in
less than 5 years)
4) high turnover (as many as 40% of hams not renewing, at a time when the
license term
was 3 years
5) increasing numbers of TECHNICAL violations (out of band, harmonics, hum,

chirps, etc.)
wreaking havoc on other services and threatening the reputation of the ARS.
Many of these
violations were the result of inexperienceand a "don't care" attitude.

The solution proposed by the ARRL leadership and accepted by the FCC was a
slight rise in the
code test speed AND new written tests. Funny how the written test changes are
forgotten.

>(at the time, the
>total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
>so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)

Incorrect again. Carl, do you know what the amateur bands were in 1936? Do you
know how
they were used? Do you know what the typical amateur station equipment was like
in those
days? Or how many hours/week a typical amateur was on the air?

The argument was NOT "absurd" once all the FACTS are known.

>The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
>for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...

Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2. Then 5 wpm
was added.
>
>Was this decision made "for good reason" ???

They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are you saying the FCC
made a bad
decision back then?

>Given that
>it's been proven that our bands can support FAR more hams
>than the small fraction of today's population, then licensed,
>the underlying argument of "overcrowding" was invalid, therefore
>the decision to increase the code test speed to artificially limit
>the population was flawed.

Incorrect. It all depends on the methods used and how much a typical ham
operates. These things change over time.

Do some math using realistic-for-1936 and show us what ya got.

>Note that this goes back MANY years and does not reflect
>in any way on the current FCC's ability to make rational
>public policy decisions.

In toehr words, if you agree with them, the decisions are rational, but
if you don't, they are irrational.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4723. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:40:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216184029.13798.00000467@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34234

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Besides, being caucasian, I don't understand why Dick seems
>intent on making an issue of "pigment" ... AFAIK, the Morse
>issue has nothing to do with color at all.

I think his reference to pigment is in response to my "paint everyone with the same brush" post. It is paint pigment, not melanin that he is talking about. It was an extension of my analogy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4724. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:41:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C703236.8465383A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34235

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Which is to say, if you rely on a computer program to do the job
> >you will be let down when you least expect and most need it to work. In
> >short,
> >manually operated CW gets through after the other
> >commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
>
> Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do moonbounce
> at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that you
> could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?

Yeah, I read about that, it's pretty neat. But I see no relationship to
any of the computerized CW copying programs used on HF.

Of course there's Coherent Cw too, Still a different subject.

4725. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:43:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C70329A.1053061B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34236

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Hey TwIT, I never open your posts any more, but it's early, my coffee hasn't
> >done its thing yet, I clicked on 'next', and damn, there was another of your
> >"thoughtful" statements....
>
> Now, now, Dick; I have been called to task for not calling people who call
> other people twits to task.
>
> Carl apologized when he called someone a twit. Are you as noble

Ed, I guess I could have left out the W, as she did.

4726. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:44:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216184420.13798.00000468@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34237

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>I really find this problem with FCC and ARRL subbands within the
>Directorship of the NCI pretty noteworthy as an indication that they don't
>plan to stop with morse testing.

I think that once you get outside of the code-testing arena, there is probably a wide range of opinion on any particular topic to be found on the NCI BOD.

Their statements in the past is that once code testing is eliminated, there will no longer be a need for the organization. To my knowledge, that hasn't changed.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4727. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:47:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216184734.13798.00000470@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34238

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.

Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency authorized under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4728. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:51:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34239

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable on Amateur Radio history and generally comes out on top on any discussion of same.

I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action is to accept defeat gracefully. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4729. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-16 23:57:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216185712.13790.00000546@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34240

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do
>moonbounce
>> at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that
>you
>> could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?

> Yeah, I read about that, it's pretty neat. But I see no relationship to
>any of the computerized CW copying programs used on HF.

Well, as soon as my DSP-10 is built, and a transverter designed (and yes, I will probably cobble it together with some cookbook circuits, just to get Cecil going again), that software WILL be a CW copying program used on HF. :-)

I have done W1-W6 QSOs with about 10 milliwatts. If I can get 40 dB out of the technique, I could do a W1-W6 QSO with 1 microwatt. That would be a hoot. :-) The real challenge will be in dealing with the sometimes wildly varying propagation delay changes and phase shifts. I hope to learn something by trying, succeed or fail.

Now, in fairness to your original contention, the technique requires several hours of transmission and long-term integration, but it is well past the ability of human decoding. I think we have just scratched the surface on this, and extending it past OOK CW to other modulation methods and encoding should get other improvements, too.

The LOWFers are doing some similar work with QRSS CW, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> Of course there's Coherent Cw too, Still a different subject.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4730. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:18:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216191831.10450.00002315@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 34241

In article <02xb8.5726$BR3.204102@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>news:a4m38q$n4j$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:
>
>> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>> news:AVvb8.5563$BR3.191273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>>> People with an agenda.
>>
>> Other than ending the code test requirement,
>> just what do you believe the agenda of NCI is?
>
>It's obvious what NCI's agenda is - I mean, I can read. :). The people *in*
>NCI, well, I think it's clear that a portion of the membership has a
>definite bias against the CW mode, not just the test.

Joshua, I'm NOT a member of NCI nor of the ARRL and my license is commercial, not non-commercial (amateur). *I* am not in favor of OOK CW for either use or testing requirements. NCI rejected me for membership despite actually operating (legally) HF transmitters 49 years ago...and having since operated on more parts of the EM spectrum than are allocated to amateurs, with more different modes than are allocated to US amateurs...plus having BOTH formal training and work experience plus self-study as an electronics engineer (yes, legal title, other readers don't start that silly discussion again) doing radio and electronics design work. However, I am supportive and encourage the viewpoint of the NCI membership and their goals...and I do NOT have anything against OTHERS using OOK CW for personal enjoyment wherever allocated in any radio service.

What I am personally against - and that is shared opinion among thousands worldwide - is that morse code mode skill is NOT a "necessary" or "vital" requirement for any federal administration's regulatory task in determining whether or not an applicant should be licensed in any amateur radio service. In the USA, the FCC has the same viewpoint, has held that same viewpoint for a dozen years by public statements, but is constrained by international agreement (ITU-R S25.5) to require morse code testing for amateur licenses having below-30-MHz privileges.

In the last half century a strong mythos has developed among radio amateurs and the radio amateur press that morse code skill is "vital," "necessary" and other associated adjectival evidence

favoring morse code modes. If anyone wished to analyze this objectively the morsemen can be categorized approximately as belonging to certain groupings:

1. They are able to communicate by simple, on-off keying and at high rates due to an aptitude that is NOT shared among the general population. Those wish to maintain a venue to practice that skill among "their own kind." It makes them exclusive and gives them a feeling of eliteness, of being "better than ordinary." Preservation of "their" special environment is essential to them.

2. They were "impressed" by the general amateur-only environment as teen-agers and by elder radio amateurs who were good at OOK CW. This sort of impressing leaves an emotional bias that is carried on through life, of retention of the status quo when they were young. Such impressing is not overcome by advances in technology or of finding out that the rest of the radio world does not agree with their own personal knowledge or desires. Indeed, some of those are overtly resentful that changes have occurred in the state of the radio technical arts.

3. Some have adopted a STRICT PROTOCOL ETHOS in which every-thing in operating has unbreakable methods, jargon, procedures, even message forms (!) which are "official" as endorsed by the largest membership organization. That is the territorial imperative emotional needs manifesting itself with a high dose of regimentation. To "violate turf" is to encourage hostility, resentment, and cries of "We don't DO that in ham radio!" For them "everybody must have fun their way whether or not anyone else likes it." THEY have proclaimed themselves the "leaders" who "show the proper way." Ex-military are typical there.

4. A minor group is composed of Believers whose life is oriented totally around their avocation. They tend to remain rooted in the past for "keeping the traditions (forever)" and imagining that they are of some vital "service to the nation." The word "service" throughout Part 97 is a regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio being regulated; it is not used in the alternate sense of being of "service to a nation." Some psychologists call that an "emotional anchor" to a stable environmental condition. Some have delusions of fantasy and heroism in an imaginary world, a psychological "shield" from frustrations and danger in reality.

5. One unfortunate minority is the outright self-aggrandizing egotist who would either mold an entire avocational activity around their personal desires or simply proclaim themselves as superior, using their own skills or abilities as the ultimate criterion, lesser beings being (of course) "inferior."

6. An unfortunate majority who have no psychological aberration are simply ignorant of the rest of the radio world, probably because their occupations do not involve the radio arts or details of

communications of any kind. This is largely a fault traceable to the amateur radio publications' scant coverage of that huge area; members are assumed to be "more comfortable" staying solely within the arts and crafts that "have always been" in ham radio. The average non-radio-occupation ham seems to only see the "other radio world" as domestic broadcasting, cell phones, sat comms and CB radio (usually prefixed by pejoratives). The morseman is generally frustrated, angry, or resentful (perhaps all three) that the rest of the radio world has: (A) Never considered morse code as a useful mode in a radio service and never used it; (B) Replaced morse methods with more useful, robust, faster, more reliable data modes. The only holdout in the rest of the world for morsemanship is maritime radio and morse modes are fast disappearing there. The Global Marine Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) relies on the Inmarsat and automatically works with GPSS, operable by any on the bridges for sending both distress and position information immediately.

>>> Problem is, CW is much more popular in the ham bands than running
>>> wagon trains is in the world of transportation. Heck, just try to
>>> find some unoccupied bandwidth this weekend. Sorry, it's not an
>>> adequate comparasion.

The fact that many ALREADY do something and have done so is not necessarily attributable to some mode's "superiority" nor is it a criterion for "proving viability" or efficacy of a mode. Most of the present-day morsemen have been ham radio hobbyists for more than a decade or two and favor that particular mode. Most of them, by their own admission, got into the hobby as teen-agers. As such, they have emotional ties to the mode that aren't correlateable to morse modes being technically "superior" to any other...although the emotions seem to run so high in some that they do amazing rationalization in trying to prove such a "technical superiority."

Government radio regulations that are set or changed today will have their greatest effect on the many that are NOT now in amateur radio. Those already licensed do not have to live in fear that their privileges will be revoked. "Grandfathering" is an established tradition in FCC regulations among all radio services.

One of the conditions of being human is that we are all MORTAL. Everyone. No exceptions. As such everyone can expect to see more and more people coming into existance and older folks leaving this existance. Regulations are made with an eye to the future, not just the past. One of the unfortunate attributes of humans in regards to avocations is that they are quite selfish in desiring conditions to remain static in whatever they enjoy. Quite often such an attitude towards future hobbyists is the pithy "screw you, I've got mine!" or the ever-popular "the way I did it is what you have to do too!" without an adequate explanation of WHY that had to be so.

A federal regulatory agency's license is NOT an academic achievement or even a "skill" award. It is simply a way that the regulatory agency

can use as a tool of regulation. Those who need credentials, certificates, and evidenciary "proof" of their being better than others will dispute this; they usually need many other things, too, such as titles having "authority" to them. They use titles and credentials as a rationalization of their opinions' "greater worth." :-)

Way back in the 1930s (prehistory to some, I was born in 1932), to be a skilled morseman in radio was a positive attribute, a marker of value among communicators. As radio and electronics technology leap-frogged ahead, making it available to the general public, those markers lost their luster and had less and less meaning. By the start of this new millennium the skills of a morseman are simply quaint, ancient, something of a bygone era that is no longer. Radio has CHANGED. Some opinions have not, nor do their holders wish to change.

CHANGE is unstable, it is new, it must be learned, it must be accepted. It is also threatening and may wipe out all those certificates and skills that some held so dear, so precious, so very-very important. It is inevitable. The best way to survive is to plan for it, meet it head-on and accept it, be one with the new.

For all the rest who cannot change, feel free to send me your TS card. I'll get out my new TS punch, turn my collar around, and punch it. :-) Have a nice day.

4731. Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:23:09 UTC
From: Bill <kf6wxj@cwnet.com>
Message-ID: <3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com>
Source record: 34242

Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One is supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill KF6WXJ

4732. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:31:27 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <zRCb8.6179$BR3.255374@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34243

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6ecc9b_1@newsa.ev1.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:Btwb8.5641$BR3.197569@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>> I don't confuse between people attacking testing and people attacking
>> the mode, which I thought was fairly evident when I pointed out a
>> specifically anti-mode statement from NCI.
>>
>
> You didn't do that either. I have just revisted
> http://www.nocode.org/ and see nothing of which you speak.

Go back in the thread and read it again. I reposted it here.

>> What I do see, however, is a strong anti-mode bias within NCI, and
>> when they say that there's not, I call them on it.
>
> Then, you're simply wrong. I don't think I've ever seen anything out
> of NCI that should lead a logical thinking person to believe that
> their agenda is against all CW--use, learning, expermimenting with,
> etc.

You just heard Carl and Bill imply that the US is an odd bird since we have
- gasp! - bandplans. And I saw one at least one NCI member comment against
RM-10352 (a petition for rulemaking for a 160m bandplan), throwing in anti-
code sentiment to boot.

>> "Much company" most certainly is the reason why there's an FCC
>> requirement to abide by "good amateur practice," why the FCC
>> encourages self-policing, and why amateurs tend to try to do what's
>> best for the ARS.
>>
>> But, given your callsign, I can see why you might think otherwise.
>
> I love it when I'm so right that all that is left is something about a
> callsign...

Okey dokey - how about your recent statement that you don't care whether
the ARS lives or dies? Is that doing what's best for the ARS?

joshua houk
kd7pos

4733. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:32:54 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <WSCb8.6182$BR3.255649@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34244

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
news:3c6ecd02_1@newsa.ev1.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>> The point was, if you check back, that NCI had made statements
>> discouraging people from using CW. If you're going to say that you don't
>> discourage code use, then don't make statements discouraging code use.
>
> Cite the specific statements you are talking about. I think you're,
> quite frankly, full of crap.

Again, go back in the thread. Or check the NCI's homepage. Again.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4734. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:37:22 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6XCb8.6188$BR3.255923@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34245

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4mkjo$5j$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:%Mwb8.5686$BR3.201003@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>> >> >> It most certainly is up to both. That's why there's both
>> >> >> FCC-enforced bandplans and ARRL voluntary bandplans.
>> >> >
>> >> > Do you understand that the USA is one of only
>> >> > a few countries that have such bandplanes?
>> >>
>> >> Do you understand that there are practical reasons why those
>> >> countries have bandplans?
>> >
>> > Not in light of the fact that the vast majority, including
>> > our Canadian neighbor do not.
>>
>> Radio Amateurs of Canada Band Plans:
>>
>> http://www.rac.ca/bandplan.htm
>
> Hey Josh,
> Thems RAC bandplans...the equivalent of ARRL
> bandplans...they are not Canadian law.

Hey Bill, in the above exchange, you said that Canada didn't have bandplans
that are the equivalent of ARRL bandplans. And hey, isn't this the second
time that I pointed out to you my use of the word "voluntary?"

joshua houk
kd7pos

4735. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:47:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6EFDAD.88334556@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34247

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > > > implies always, Dick.
> > >
> > > Nonsense!
> >
> > Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of
> > possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail
> > Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and when
> > other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical
> > premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.
> >
> > 1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
> > 2. CW gets through when other modes fail.
> >
> > Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion
> > given the two above premises.
> >
> > It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one
> > of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true
> > so Premise number 2 has to be false.
>
> So let's just repost my response which you so conveniently clipped in its
> entirety and let the readers see it all and decide what is real and what is
> BS.
> ---------------------------------------
> > CAM wrote:
> > > > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > > > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> > >
> > > IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> > > stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> > > gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when
> > > there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
> >
> > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > implies always, Dick.
>
```

> Nonsense!

Reposting what you said just repeats your error, Dick. I proved logically
beyond any shadow of a doubt that your statement is false. If you think
your statement is true, you are more of a dumbshit than any nocode tech.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4736. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:48:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0202161648.75f004cd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:<83oq6u804a65dm6a485spldk1rfbon9cr7@4ax.com>...
> On Fri, 15 Feb 2002 09:09:11 -0500, Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...
> >
> > "I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
> > our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
> > Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"
> >
> >
> >You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!
>
> "One small step for a ham ..... one giant leap ..... etc etc"
>
>
Add two more entries to the list of assholes who hang out in this village.
>
>

>
> :-)
> 73 de G3NYY

4737. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:50:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6EFE3D.F2E48D35@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34249

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Bill: Dick thinks that just because he is sending CW, there is someone out
> there copying it. I just realized that... ;)

Maybe God is copying since Dick thinks CW has supernatural powers to get
through when no other mode will. Reckon we should let the military in
on Dick's secret?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4738. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:53:05 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <R9Db8.6210$BR3.256036@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34248

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:02xb8.5726$BR3.204102@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>> I'd want people with access to HF bands to be familiar and conversant
>> with the predominant modes used there.
>
> But that isn't now nor ever been a requirement.

Surely is. I took a code element and a took a written test that covered
AMTOR, RTTY, SSB, SSTV, etc.

> Indeed, once licensed, there is absolutely NO reason that you can
> cite to for your "want."

Sure, people can lapse or let their knowledge go into disuse (like I'm
seriously thinking of using Baudot code, but I digress), but hey, they
showed that they had the knowledge at one time. What ya gonna do, test
folks again?

>> I think the Russian federation's
>> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a
>> code requirement.
>
> How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
> be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
> in Spanish? Its the same concept.

Not exactly - the same concept is that everyone is conversant on voice
modes (SSB, AM, FM, etc.).

However, I should modify my comment above. While I do certainly believe
that code testing is a good thing, I also do see what folks who don't want
code tests are saying: it's obvious that we need to maintain the health of
the ARS by bringing more people in. The Foundation license in Great Britian
is an interesting way to deal with the problem, and maybe it'd be a good
compromise. There's a few kinks - experimentation not being allowed is
rather silly, for instance - but I think it's worth studying to see where
it goes.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4739. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:54:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6EFF53.3F11BC03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34251

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >WRONG! The statement absolutely implies "always".
>
> We can put it to the test. If Dick can make a CW contact with Europe on 160
> meters at high noon, when all other modes fail, his statement can stand as
> written.

Sounds like a plan. Dick, let us know when you get through to Europe with
CW on 160m at high noon. No other mode gets through to Europe on 160m
at high noon. CW gets through when no other mode will. Seems simple
enough to prove you are right.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4740. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:56:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6EFFB2.F7F45154@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34252

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
> obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
> license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
> that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
> and capabilities.

Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4741. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 00:58:44 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8fDb8.6216$BR3.256903@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34250

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4mlgoora1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net:

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:vfwb8.5609$BR3.194761@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>>
>> As far
>> as CW testing and a "healthy future" for the ARS, that's certainly a
>> discouragement against code testing, not CW itself.
>
> Please explain?????

You know, I have no idea. I thought that I was addressing a point you were
trying to make, but I was confused at the time. No matter...

>> Sure. "Interesting" and "fun" are not the words that pop up in my
>> mind when I read that "Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been
>> superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient
>> means of communication."
>
> Then don't read it. Start your own CW enthsiasts web site
> to laud the use and whatever benefits of morse you like.

The point was simply in response to someone else's point back down yonder.
And why reinvent the wheel? FISTS already exists, and is quite healthy to
boot.

>> It is, however, a statement on giving "credence to any mode over
>> another," which was the point that I was addressing,
>
> But even 30m allows other modes.

Surely does - at the exclusion of others, which was simply the point I was
making.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4742. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:03:12 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <kjDb8.6221$BR3.259136@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34253

"Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
> Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One
is
> supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> KF6WXJ
>
>

No more illegal than Janet and Britney impersonating people with talent.

4743. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:04:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F01B3.83A11C4A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34254

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >If one is writing code from scratch, it is new and unique and can be
> >copyrighted.
>
> Only if it is sufficiently different from existing code.

If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
be new and unique. Every piece of software at Intel is copyrighted.

> >You have misunderstood the concept. A new chip is a new design.
>
> By your own definitions, that's not true unless it involves a new technology.

Nope, most new chips are logically different from the older designs. A
chip *designer* designs the new layout.

> A nice little integration of two pieces of manufactured gear. There is a
> commercially available "tune mode adapter" for the IC-706, btw, but I don't
> think it's specifically for the HS-1600.

I suspect all screwdrivers operate essentially the same way. My design
does what I want it to do. The commercially available designs do not
do what I want done. My tuning process is accomplished without touching
the IC-706. I used it all day today. It works like a champ.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4744. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:09:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F02D2.415CECB1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34255

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In short, manually operated CW gets through after the other
> commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.

Other commonly used modes fade out on 160m to Europe at high noon.
Ed has suggested that you prove your statement with CW on 160m to
Europe at high noon. Let us know when you accomplish that feat.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4745. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:12:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F0362.5EE0BBDF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34256

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do moonbounce
> > at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that you
> > could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?
>
> Yeah, I read about that, it's pretty neat. But I see no relationship to
> any of the computerized CW copying programs used on HF.

Why do you think his program won't work on HF?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4746. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:15:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F0425.BFE5398F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34257

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre. OF COURSE cw has merits.

Does CW have enough merits to survive without forced testing? _____
It's a simple yes/no question.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4747. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:24:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F0641.B1B269CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34258

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If, after 50 years as a licensed ham, that's the best you can do it
> really shows how little you know about ham radio.

I know quite a few years more about ham radio than you do. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4748. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:26:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F06D9.EB537F03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34259

Bill Sohl wrote:
> They just can't accept the concept of voluntary.

They vant everyvun to be forced to volunteer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4749. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:29:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F078E.F1B2BC7B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34260

Joshua Houk wrote:
> I think the Russian federation's
> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
> requirement.

Wow! How times change. People are siding with the Russians.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4750. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:34:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F08B2.FCE9989A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34261

Joshua Houk wrote:
> ... it certainly looks like you're trying to push CW out of the way.

If CW gets through when no other mode will and is allowed on all
amateur frequencies, how can it possibly be pushed out of the way?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4751. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:38:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F098E.E6937E05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34262

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
> >
> > >If that is so there will be an adequate explanation of the mechanism
> > >behind their decision to do so. Would you care to explain that
> > >mechanism?
>
> Hey, it was Cecil's assertion, with which I *DO NOT* agree. It's
> up to him to support it.

I do support CW, Dick. I tell everyone CW is more fun than sex, at
least for the last 15 years.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4752. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 01:45:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6F0B48.603BC62D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34263

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > Gee, Ed. I thought you'd know about band segments by license grade.
>
> I don't understand the statement, Dick. What band segments do you think I
> didn't have access to as a General? I don't recall any, but if you know of
> some obscure rule that I don't remember, I am willing to be corrected.

I had access to all ham frequencies as a Conditional in 1952 - only
ever used the Novice frequencies, though - XTALs, you know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4753. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:09:02 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F10B1.77D21E33@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34264

On 14 Feb 2002 GMT, W1RFI or the other one wrote:

?I think the last time ARRL surveyed its membership on web
access, the number
?was in the upper 70%. Those that want to receive paper
copies of the Board
?minutes only need ask.
?
?I personally think the decision was the correct one.

?73,
?Ed Hare, W1RFI

OHHHHH! I am so confused.

73,
Clay N4AOX

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 15 Feb 2002 23:19:05 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
>
> >To my knowledge, the ARRL doesn't take "standing orders" for Board minutes.
>
> AFAIK they are sent ny mail to all field volunteer/appointees.
> That's how I get mine (I'm a VC, VCE, and former Assistant Director).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4754. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:20:30 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OrEb8.6344$BR3.267434@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34265

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in news:3C6F078E.F1B2BC7B@IEEE.org:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
>> I think the Russian federation's
>> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
>> requirement.
>
> Wow! How times change. People are siding with the Russians.

Hey, "promoting international goodwill" and all that... :)

joshua houk
kd7pos

4755. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:22:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216212224.11635.00000046@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34266

In article <20020216184029.13798.00000467@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>Besides, being caucasian, I don't understand why Dick seems
>>intent on making an issue of "pigment" ... AFAIK, the Morse
>>issue has nothing to do with color at all.
>
>I think his reference to pigment is in response to my "paint everyone with the
>same brush" post. It is paint pigment, not melanin that he is talking about.
>It was an extension of my analogy.

Giving Carl the old brush-off? Tsk, tsk.

I know something about brushes and pigment as a credentialed and work-experienced artist-illustrator. What I see there is an _airbrush_, little micro-sprayer thingy that blows a lot of air with very thinned pigment in a teeny container. [not talking about Carl there]

4756. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:22:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216212224.11635.00000047@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34267

In article <20020216183808.16502.00000132@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Incorrect. It all depends on the methods used and how much a typical ham
>operates. These things change over time.
>
>Do some math using realistic-for-1936 and show us what ya got.

Better yet, tell us from first-hand, personal experience how it was. It would be nice to know seeing as I was only four years old then.

>>Note that this goes back MANY years and does not reflect
>>in any way on the current FCC's ability to make rational
>>public policy decisions.
>
>In toehr words, if you agree with them, the decisions are rational, but
>if you don't, they are irrational.

Hello? That's the criterion N2EY was using for a long while, labeling current statistical interpretations "correct" versus others' interpretations (invariably) as "wrong".

Gotta love it when a "criterion" is "right" when used and "wrong" when another is claimed as doing so.

Er, this year is 2002. 1936 was, um, 63 years ago. Three generations ago, a big world war just igniting (it was in all the papers I remember while beginning to read).

Why don't you go ALL the way back to 1836? Nice time, no radio, no morse telegraph, a tabula rasa to begin the discussion? :-)

4757. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:29:11 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XzEb8.6354$BR3.268862@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34268

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
news:20020216184734.13798.00000470@mb-dd.aol.com:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.
>
> Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
> authorized under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?

Too easy, Ed. :). 5.1675MHz.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4758. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:37:59 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F1779.68EF03B1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34269

Thanks anyway; and, by the way, I hope you get at chance to read the March QST "moved and seconded" and annual meeting highlights section. There, I think you will see that:

1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of the novice bands, thus fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").

2. The Newington Crowd is consolidating further their strangle hold on the ARRL by prohibiting any initiatives or creativity by the field organizations.(p.60, 1st.col.)

3. Not all things are cut and dried in the board meetings, because of the allowance of 11th hour "Director's proposals" on the agenda (see Minute 66). Bodson and Milne proposed moved and seconded to promote "data emissions in the MF/HF bands where phone emissions are authorized"

Boy, we are sure going to be better off not seeing these "near misses" published in QST anymore. We can only hope that data is allowed everywhere in the phone bands soon. ;-).

73,
Clay N4AOX

4759. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 02:58:42 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C6F1C54.99C8F4EB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34270

The only good thing about the BoD vote to suspend printing
the minutes is that the vote was not unanimous. It may have
been close, one or two directors difference maybe. Where
does a member find the director vote report? Maybe this
decision could be reversed.

As to whether the commentary on the meeting or the meeting
minutes are more valuable, pick up a March QST and see for
yourself. The commentary does not show the near miss
proposal of "data in the phone bands".

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>)
>
> Rememer, the ARRL Board has not made up its mind about Section News in QST. If
> you feel a small paragraph of mouse print with several months of lead time is
> more useful to the membership than a web presentation that can more
> information, larger print, links, pictures or sound, let your Director know
> what you feel.
>
> If you feel ARRL should divert some if its resources from <name it> to doing
> both, let your Director know that, too.
>
> As you can tell by my slant above, I may not say the same things you do to my
> Director. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4760. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 03:20:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C706582.7F487889@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34271

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >> If Morse/CW has merits, then new hams will choose to learn it.
>
> > Hey, it was Cecil's assertion, with which I *DO NOT* agree. It's
> >up to him to support it.
>
> If I take those words at their face,

Surely you're not so unconscious as to take Cecil's words -any of them- at face value.

If you believe what he says then Morse/CW has no merits based on the fact that so many of
newer hams "refuse" to learn it to a useful level of skill. As you know, the minimal 5wpm reqiured as the maximum tested speed is not useful speed. For anyone who uses the 5wpm on the air regularly skill quickly improves well beyond the 5wp. I believe it to be accurate based on several factors that few newcomers are spending the time to do it. What other realistic
conclusion can be drawn when so many of the untrained consider it to be a "hazing ritual"?
Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now they will embrace it?
Really? Are you lucid today? Evidently not, if you believe that.

> you have just said that if Morse/CW has
> merits, then new hams will not choose to learn it.
>
> New hams are going to learn other things in ham radio that have merits, none of
> which have FCC testing for priveleges. Why do you feel Morse code's merits are
> so inferior that no one will learn it?
>
> It is funny, in a sad sort of way. You and Carl agree that Morse code does not
> have enough merits that hams will want to make much use of it on the bands.
> The only difference in your positions is that he believes that the lack of
> merit of Morse code should mean that it should not longer be required via a
> code test. You believe that Morse code does not have enough merits that people
> will want to use it so they should be tested for it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4761. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 03:37:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6f27b5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34273

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:zRCb8.6179$BR3.255374@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
> news:3c6ecc9b_1@newsa.ev1.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:Btwb8.5641$BR3.197569@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >> I don't confuse between people attacking testing and people attacking
> >> the mode, which I thought was fairly evident when I pointed out a
> >> specifically anti-mode statement from NCI.
> >>
> >
> > You didn't do that either. I have just revisted
> > http://www.nocode.org/ and see nothing of which you speak.
>
> Go back in the thread and read it again. I reposted it here.
>
> >> What I do see, however, is a strong anti-mode bias within NCI, and
> >> when they say that there's not, I call them on it.
> >
> > Then, you're simply wrong. I don't think I've ever seen anything out
> > of NCI that should lead a logical thinking person to believe that
> > their agenda is against all CW--use, learning, expermimenting with,
> > etc.
>
> You just heard Carl and Bill imply that the US is an odd bird since we
have
> - gasp! - bandplans. And I saw one at least one NCI member comment against
> RM-10352 (a petition for rulemaking for a 160m bandplan), throwing in
anti-
> code sentiment to boot.
>
> >> "Much company" most certainly is the reason why there's an FCC
> >> requirement to abide by "good amateur practice," why the FCC
> >> encourages self-policing, and why amateurs tend to try to do what's
> >> best for the ARS.
> >>
> >> But, given your callsign, I can see why you might think otherwise.
> >
> > I love it when I'm so right that all that is left is something about a
> > callsign...
>
> Okey dokey - how about your recent statement that you don't care whether

> the ARS lives or dies? Is that doing what's best for the ARS?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

Oh good grief, Joshua. That was a scenario, and was clearly presented as such.

Kim W5TIT

4762. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 03:39:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6f27b6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34272

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6EFE3D.F2E48D35@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Bill: Dick thinks that just because he is sending CW, there is someone
out
> > there copying it. I just realized that... ;)
>
> Maybe God is copying since Dick thinks CW has supernatural powers to get
> through when no other mode will. Reckon we should let the military in
> on Dick's secret?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

heh heh heh...maybe his dog, Stains, is listening?

Kim W5TIT

4763. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 03:59:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C706EB1.D65E26B5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34274

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > In short, manually operated CW gets through after the other
> > commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
>
> Other commonly used modes fade out on 160m to Europe at high noon.

Shows what you know. 160 fades long before noon, and when it starts
to fade, CW will fade to the level of unusability AFTER
the other common modes. And you will troll on, and on, and on,
ad naseum.

4764. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:01:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C706F45.DB2EFE49@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34275

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do moonbounce
> > > at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that you
> > > could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?
> >
> > Yeah, I read about that, it's pretty neat. But I see no relationship to
> > any of the computerized CW copying programs used on HF.
>
> Why do you think his program won't work on HF?

Why are YOU a dumbshit? Especially when you bill yourself a genuis.....
It *has never been used*, much less widely used, on HF.

4765. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:09:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216230942.22158.00001008@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34278

In article <20020215180404.10835.00000351@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>> Might depend a lot on whether the old timers who want to promote the mode
>>>tell people about its virtues or tell people how lazy and no good they are
>>>because they waited until the requirements were reduced or eliminated
>>>before becoming hams.
>
>>Sure. You EVER see me write anything like that, Ed?
>
>Not even once. If code testing is removed, you won't have to take anything
>back. :-)

Thanks.
>
>>> I bet some of the old timers will deny vehemently some of the things they
>>>said here. :-)
>
>>Sure. As will those on the other side of the fence.
>
>Amen, though Carl does reluctantly admit that he said some rather nasty
>things
>a few years back. :-)

He has plenty of company.
>
>>How about those who describe other amateurs as "twits", "idiots",
>>"lazy mooch", "luddites", "olde fartz", "assholes", "Tennesee
>>Taliban", "stuck in
>>the past" and a host of other pejoratives? Are they the folks we
>>should look
>>to for leadership into the future?

That's just a mild sample, btw.
>
>While I don't see "stuck in the past" as being in the same league as
>"asshole,"
>there are many on that side of the fence I don't look to for leadership,
>either, even if I agree with some of their points.

Nor I.
>
>I bet if this could be decided by you and Bill Sohl, some sort of agreement
>would be reached if we sat you two in a room together and didn't let you out

>until an agreement was reached.

That would not take long, either.

Worst thing I ever saw Bill write was "safety nazis" in reference to the 55 mph

speed limit. Which has very little to do with amateur radio.

> The coffee would not be decaf. :-)

I don't drink coffee anymore, anyway.

73 es tnx de Jim, N2EY
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>

4766. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:09:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216230944.22158.00001010@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34276

In article <3C6F02D2.415CECB1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Ed has suggested that you prove your statement with CW on 160m to
>Europe at high noon. Let us know when you accomplish that feat.

I'm pretty sure Dick can do that QSO, if he can put up an effective antenna for 160.

After all, you did not say where on earth it would be high noon when the QSO was done.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4767. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:09:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216230944.22158.00001009@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34279

In article <3C6D3532.4030007@networksplus.net>, Nate Bargmann
<n0nb@networksplus.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
> > However, if the 'phone subbands on HF are widened, there will be less
>and less
> > room for the Morse folks to operate in accordance with good amateur
>practice.
> > (Although Morse is legal in the 'phone subbands, the routine use of
>Morse in
> > those subbands is not got operating practice).
>
>At this point no one is proposing any phone expansion that encroaches on
>any portion of the band where Morse Code is routinely used. Exceptions
>are code contests, but even then the activity does not extend to where
>the new phone subband limits are proposed. The new phone extensions may
>be unwise depending on how popular the digital modes become. "Wideband"
>digital modes such as packet radio are giving way to more spectrally
>efficient modes such as PSK31.

The way it works on many HF bands is this:

The CW folks hang out at the bottom of the band, the digital folks above them,
then the non-US 'phones, and finally the US 'phone band begins. That's a
simplified version, but fairly accurate.

If the US 'phone bands are widened, the non-US 'phones will move down to avoid
the US
QRM (US hams are allowed more power than most of the rest of the world, too).
Then the
digital folks move down to avoid the foreign 'phones, and the CW folks get
squeezed even
more.

In any scenario, the narrowband/spectrum efficent folks (digital and CW) get
squeezed
out to allow a few more wide band voice QSOs.

> > Would you say the same thing about the technical parts of the written
>test?
>
>It is arguable that the technical portion of the exams hasn't already
>met the same fate.

That's another way of saying the same thing.

> However, the exams must be geared toward the needs
>of the day. At one time it was critical to understand the proper
>workings of a PI output circuit. While it is still important knowledge
>for the serious home brew artist, it is less important as most hams tend
>to use premanufactured equipment with wideband output circiutry.

It was never critical to understand a pi-network - one could always use a
conventional
link-coupled tank. Most of what is on the written exams today is not critical
unless a
ham wants to use that particular mode or technology.
>
> > I agree - but only if it is popularized actively.
>
>The General and Extra exams should include a few questions about Morse
>timing and good operating practices after the Morse requirement is
>dropped. I think the popularity of QRP along with home brewing and the
>new activities of backpack and survival radio will encourage a knowledge
>of Morse. Add to that the current popularity contesting enjoys and
>Morse has a bright future on the ham bands for the next decade or more
>even if S25 is struck next year.

Maybe. But it is up to Morse enthusiasts to "sell" the mode, just like the
packet
and PSK31 folks have done.

Let me be clear - I still think Morse testing should be required for any
amateur
license. If anything, the arguments I've read against the test have only made
Morse testing appear more necessary, not less.

But it's clear that the FCC and it's counterparts don't think that way. It's
clear to
anyone with an open mind that the chances of S25.5 surviving WRC 2003 are
"slim to none". Even if there is ANY support for it, there probably won't be
anywhere near enough votes to keep it alive. And once S25.5 goes, FCC will
drop the codetest hot potato ASAP.

The thing to focus on it what the license structure should be without S25.5

> >>After all,
> >>SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> >>mandatory for license privileges.

> > Those activities do not require the acquisition of a new skill.

>Oh, really?

Yes, really. Most people know how to talk and listen already.

>Then why are emergency simulation drills held so
>frequently? Why is traffic handling repeatedly practiced. Please don't
>imply these activities require no new skills. To do so takes away from
>the time and effort hams perform in public service.

Let me clarify:

They do not require a new skill be acquired before you can begin participating.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4768. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:09:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020216230945.22158.00001011@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34277

In article <20020216184734.13798.00000470@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.
>
>Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
>authorized
>under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?
>

The special Alaska emergency frequency.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4769. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:48:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grnmc10.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34280

On 16 Feb 2002 23:47:34 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.
>
>Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
>authorized under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?

Section 97.401(d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may
transmit emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.

Sucker punch......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4770. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 04:57:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ndab$3hm$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34281

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216180537.03271.00000884@mb-ch.aol.com...
> > Indeed,
> >we clearly state that USE is and should be a personal decision
>
> And so should the written, there is no reason to test anybody on theory.

If you, WA8ULX, believe that is so, feel free to petition the
FCC for that.

> Most new Hams have no Idea about theory anyway.
> And the present written is a Joke, it really serves no purpose.

If you, WA8ULX, believe that is so, feel free to petition the
FCC to end theory tests.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4771. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 05:09:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4nf2nnov1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34282

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:R9Db8.6210$BR3.256036@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:02xb8.5726$BR3.204102@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >> I'd want people with access to HF bands to be familiar and conversant
> >> with the predominant modes used there.
> >
> > But that isn't now nor ever been a requirement.
>
> Surely is. I took a code element and a took a written test that covered
> AMTOR, RTTY, SSB, SSTV, etc.

Sorry Josh...but of your examples, only the code test
stood on its own as a separate pass/fail. You could
have just as well ignored the AMTOR, RTTY, SSB, SSTV
questions and still passed the test. None of the other
modes (AMTOR....SSB) have their own "must pass" test
element.

> > Indeed, once licensed, there is absolutely NO reason that you can
> > cite to for your "want."
>
> Sure, people can lapse or let their knowledge go into disuse (like I'm
> seriously thinking of using Baudot code, but I digress), but hey, they
> showed that they had the knowledge at one time. What ya gonna do, test
> folks again?

No by my viewpoint.

> >> I think the Russian federation's
> >> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a
> >> code requirement.
> >
> > How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
> > be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
> > in Spanish? Its the same concept.
>
> Not exactly - the same concept is that everyone is conversant on voice
> modes (SSB, AM, FM, etc.).

The bottom line is still a lack of any requirement to
engage in any "universal" mode/language/etc.

> However, I should modify my comment above. While I do certainly believe
> that code testing is a good thing, I also do see what folks who don't want
> code tests are saying: it's obvious that we need to maintain the health of
> the ARS by bringing more people in.

Not all people that oppose code tests do so because they
expect "more people" to become hams. I have always
taken the position that the code tests are simply no
longer justified today...regardless of any prospective
increase in new hams.

> The Foundation license in Great Britian
> is an interesting way to deal with the problem, and maybe it'd be a good
> compromise. There's a few kinks - experimentation not being allowed is
> rather silly, for instance - but I think it's worth studying to see where
> it goes.

Perhaps so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4772. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 05:31:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34283

"Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
> Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One
is
> supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> KF6WXJ

Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
(2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
code?

The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
"on the air".

The answer to #2 is NO since there is absolutely no
requirement for any ham to retain their code ability
once they have passed the code test.

By the way...how have you determined they don't know
code by way of email contacts?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4773. ARNewsline 1279 - Feb 15 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 05:35:23 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217003523.03325.00000933@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34284

Amateur Radio Newsline Report 1279 – February 15, 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1279 with a release date of
Friday, February 15th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Ham radio helps in the face of a California wildfire and an appeals court says that pirate broadcasters cannot be banned from getting FCC licenses. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1279 coming your war right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS AID AT FALLBROOK CA. FIRE

Ham radio was on the scene as a wind-whipped fire raced through the remote north-western portion of Fallbrook California on Sunday February 10th. Sixteen homes were destroyed along with one sheriff's vehicle and two fire trucks. Among the houses that suffered damage was that of Grammy winner Rita Coolidge. An estimate 2600 acres were burned as this report is being prepared. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--
According to Bob Gonsett, W6VR, Amateur radio operators were more than ready when the emergency the emergency hit. And so was their local repeater system:

--
W6VR: “We have two repeater systems that are tied together on Red Mountain that serve Fallbrook and Fallbrook is fortunately a hotbed of Amateur Radio activity. Lots of logistics communications took place in support of Red Cross activities, animal evacuations, people evacuations and it was a very, very busy repeater system which, incidentally, is backed up by emergency power.”

--

Gonsett, who is editor of the CGC Communicator broadcast industry newsletter says that hams were posted at key points in the community. This included the fire department, the sheriffs department, the hospital and the evacuation centers. Some hams provided mobile communications for animal rescue operations. Others, who specialize in evacuation matters and health and welfare traffic worked in conjunction with the American Red Cross to provide support. W6VR says that it was just about a textbook ham radio communications effort for both people and equipment.

--
W6VR: “Their performance was outstanding in every respect. The repeaters worked flawlessly. There was no jamming. The greater community pulled together on this one.”
--

Volunteers came from across the region. Bill and Wayne Dewey, WD6AHW and WD6AHX, served as the Net Control operators. A father and son team, the Dewey’s spent hours directing all radio communications on the Fallbrook Amateur Radio Club's repeaters. Another ham volunteer was Jess Mauk, KD6YEI, of San Diego. He manned a RACES van sent in from San Diego County. In all close to thirty radio amateurs served in the first wave of volunteer communicators. Gonsett says that hams were there because they wanted to help:

--
W6VR: “It was really heartwarming to find such an outpouring of devotion from the ham community in people coming up here and making their presence known and contributing as they could. They were all useful and the community leaders thanked us repeatedly for our roles.”
--

Most communications took place over the Fallbrook Amateur Radio Club’s dual redundancy repeater system This is actually two separate machines designed and built by Chris Durso, AA4CD. One outputs on 146.175 MHz and the other on 445.600 MHz. Both carry the same audio. In time of emergency anyone with a scanner radio in the Fallbrook and Temecula California area can tune to either frequency and hear all of the ham radio communications.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

One last note. According to Gonsett, one of the luckiest hams on Earth has to be Joel Brown, KE6FHS. Brown is the president of the Fallbrook Amateur Radio Club. His home survived the wildfire. Sadly, his immediate neighbor’s' house burned to the ground. (ARNewsline(tm), W6VR)

**

RADIO LAW: COURT THROWS OUR PIRATE RADIO LICENSING BAN

Just because a person one operated a pirate radio station is not enough reason for the FCC to ban him from ever getting a broadcasting permit. So says a Washington D.C. Federal Appeals court. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reports from the nations capitol:

--

The government is not allowed to use your past as a bootleg radio operator to block you from holding a legitimate broadcast license, according to a ruling from a federal appeals court February 8th.

But any victory might be short-lived for onetime pirate operators wanting to turn legit.

The case out of Washington DC involved Greg Ruggiero, a onetime bootleg radio station operator around New York. He challenged an FCC rule that bans those found guilty of pirate broadcasting from ever holding a license, or being formally associated with the recently-created low-power radio station service, an industry that has become known as FM microbroadcasting.

The appeals court agreed with Ruggiero's claim such a ban is unconstitutional as the law is now written. But the court also left open the possibility Congress could write a more narrow law in line with the First and Fifth Amendments. Part of the argument centered on a protest philosophy held by many unauthorized microbroadcasters, who see their bootleg ops as civil disobedience.

The appeals court, siding with the former bootlegger, said there was some evidence Congress, in writing the ban into broadcast law, meant to punish those with a protest message, without really improving future compliance with the law. They called it viewpoint discrimination, and said ... not allowed.

Communications law experts are mixed whether the ruling has implications beyond FM low-power broadcast licensing, including whether FCC can use violations in one service to administer broader punishment.

Traditionally, the FCC has kept open the option of revoking other licenses held by a violator, beyond the service where the violation took place. For example, someone in violation on the ham bands might have his commercial radiotelephone license pulled as well.

In Washington, Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

And what might this decision mean to Amateur Radio? Especially those cases where ham licenses are challenged based on character issues. According to retired ARRL President George Wilson, W4OYI, probably very little. George, who is also an attorney, says that despite the ruling, the FCC still has the authority on a case by case basis to deny a license to a pirate broadcaster. They can also still designate for hearing the license of any station who breaks the law or violates government rules. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW: FOIA BECOMING MORE DIFFICULT

Hams fighting the FCC over enforcement and other issues are finding it a lot more difficult to obtain government records under the Freedom of Information Act. This is because of an administration policy change made a month after the September 11th terrorist attacks. That’s when Attorney General John Ashcroft directed all agency leaders to be more cautious in releasing records.

Over the years, some hams who have been tagged with violations by the FCC have tried to use the federal Freedom of Information Act to try to get a line on their accusers. Most of the time the government refuses unless the person making the request can show good reason for the information to be released.

While not of a national security nature, none the less, bureaus like the FCC will most likely be heading the words of Attorney General John Ashcroft who says that agencies must carefully consider things including the effectiveness of law enforcement before releasing any documents. Ashcroft says that agencies that legitimately turn down requests made under the Freedom of Information Act will have the backing of the Justice Department in doing so. (Published news reports)

**

RAIN PROMO: HOW MANY HAMS ARE THERE IN THE USA?

I'm Greg Sperling, KB9DBC.

Just how many hams are there in the United States?

As you heard last week here on Amateur Radio Newsline, the picture is not a rosy one. You can hear Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, interview with W5YI publisher and VEC Fred Maia this week on the RAIN Report. It is accessible in both Windows Media and RealAudio at www.rainreport.com and for the technologically challenged by telephone at 847-827-7246. (RAIN)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Three Rivers Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Philadelphia Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: LOS ANGELES AREA PAROLED RADIO OPERATOR RE-ASSERTED FOR PROBATION VIOLATION

A Bell California man on parole for jamming police communications is now being held without bail for violating his probation and allegedly making death threats on the 2 meter band. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the details.

--
You may remember that back on November 14, 2001, the FCC set aside an Amateur Service license and the call sign KG6IRO that it had issued to one Jack Gerritson. That grant was made only a few days earlier on November 8th. The Commission took action after it received information that Gerritsen had been arrested in 1999 and convicted in 2000 for interference to the Los Angeles Police Department radio system.

Gerritsen was out on parole after serving one year of a five year prison term on that conviction. On January 29, Los Angeles FCC agents participated in the pre-dawn re-arrest of Gerritsen after authorities received complaints of death threats allegedly made by him on several Amateur frequencies.

As Gerritsen was on parole in the earlier case, a no-bail search and arrest warrant was served. This is because the terms of his probation banned him from possessing any kind of radio transmitting equipment.

But at the time he was taken into custody Gerritsen reportedly had over twenty radios at his premises. Of these the FCC says that eight were capable of operating on frequencies in the Amateur, Marine, Land Mobile and Public Safety bands. The FCC says that Gerritsen even had a Marine radio with batteries connected to it, and a length of antenna line running outside his residence hidden in a closet.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

The FCC says that after they set aside Gerritsen license that he continued operating and causing deliberate interference to numerous Amateur radio repeaters in the Los Angeles area. It acted on these complaints. Now Gerritsen may spend the next four years in jail. (FCC release, other sources)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ORDERS POWER COMPANY TO HELP A HAM

The FCC has told an Alabama power utility that it has to clear up interference it is causing to a local ham radio operator. Amateur Radio Newsline's David Black KB4KCH, has the latest from our South East Bureau in Birmingham:

--

For more than two and a half years, Dan Jeswald, W4NTI, says his ham radio communications have been hampered by a pesky problem: interference. Jeswald moved to Anniston, Alabama, in June, 1999. It wasn't long after that, he says, that he began experiencing interference on numerous high frequency bands. He says 6 meters became unusable because of popping sounds and other interference Jeswald says sometimes rates full scale on his equipment. He says the noise is worst during cold weather and sometimes goes on for days.

Jeswald suspected a faulty transformer or other power company equipment. He says he contacted Alabama Power. Jeswald says the power company responded and began working on the problem. But in midstream before the problems were eliminated, Jeswald says there was a change of people he dealt with at the power company. Jeswald says his efforts to get help with the problem since then
have gone nowhere.

With few options left, Jeswald contacted the ARRL, which put him in touch with the FCC. On January 30th, Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth sent a letter to Alabama Power's Chief Executive Officer. In the letter, Hollingsworth advises the utility about Commission rules governing equipment that generates unintended interference. And he informs the company of its responsibility to fix the problem, or possibly face fines if a violation is found.

A call to the power company seeking comment was not returned. Meanwhile, Dan Jeswald just hopes the airwaves clear up--and soon.

From Birmingham, Alabama, David Black, KB4KCH, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Alabama Power was given thirty days to advise W4NTI as to what steps it was taking to solve the interference. (FCC release)

**

THE CHANGING OF THE GUARD: WAYNE WILLIAMS, K4MOB - S.K.

A radio amateur who dedicated almost a quarter of a century editing a ham radio magazine has crossed over to the other side of the Ethereal Abyss. This with word that Wayne Williams K4MOB, editor of the SouthEastern Repeater Association magazine "The SERA Repeater Journal" has passed away.

According to Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, Williams died at home early Tuesday morning, February 12th of complications from cancer. He was 65 years old.

Pearce says that Williams passion in Amateur Radio was FM and repeaters. He became active in SERA's predecessor, the Carolinas-Virginia Repeater Association, in the early 70's. This, at a time when two meter FM was just beginning to gain in popularity.

In 1977 Williams became the editor for the group's magazine, the Repeater Journal. The Journal was already a respectable size 44 page booklet, with regional advertising from local dealers and hamfests. But over the next 23 years, K4MOB built it into a quarterly magazine featuring full-color covers and both national and regional advertising.

--
Gary Pearce KN4AQ: “Through the Repeater Journal and through the coordination body Wayne helped to provide the infrastructure that we enjoy today on VHF and UHF FM. Repeaters that we can operate with a minimum of interference and maximum of range and quality of enjoyment.”
--

In parallel with his SERA activity, K4MOB also established Williams Radio. He started the business by amassing a huge inventory of crystals. In that pre-synthesizer era, two meter FM radios required a pair of crystals for each frequency used. Other crystal sources made hams wait days or weeks for delivery but Williams Radio was one of the few instant sources of crystals for almost every frequency, and for almost every radio. Later, the business added accessories and several lines of radios. It was a family affair, with Williams wife, brother and sons pitching in at hamfests across the region. K4MOB retired from Williams Radio in 1997.

Wayne Williams, K4MOB, is survived by his wife Gerry KB4SER, and two sons, Wayne Jr. and Chris. A third son, Greg, passed away in 2000. Pierce says that Wayne Williams was a very special man in ham radio. All that knew him say that he will be missed. (KN4AQ)

**

AWARDS: THE VITA WIRELESS SAMARITAN AWARDS

The Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association along with the Cellular Telecommunications industry Association's Wireless Foundation have honored the winners of the 2001 VITA Wireless Samaritan Awards and the 2001 Wireless Industry Achievement Awards. Among the recipients are average citizens from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Texas and South Dakota, who had the presence of mind to turn to their cellular telephones in emergency situations. The VITA Wireless Samaritan Awards are given annually to individuals from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. (CTIA Release)

**

AWARDS: HAMAWARDS.COM

Hamawards.com is a new website that is currently under development. According to Anthony Farmer, KB3HGY, the mission of hamawards.com is to provide centralized on-line information regarding all awards that an Amateur Radio Operator can receive. The site is currently being developed. More information is at www.hamawards.com. (News release)

**

BREAK 2

Here when you need us 52 weeks a year. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO AT THE WINTER OLYMPICS: ANOTHER COMMEMORATIVE STATION

Yet another commemorative station is taking to the airwaves form near the site of the 2002 Winter Olympics. Linda Reeder, N7HVF, reports from Salt Lake City Utah.

--
Linda Reeder, N7HVF: "It will start on Friday February 22nd at 5 PM to the 24th. Our station call will be K7O on 80 through 10 meters. If you want a QSL send an self addressed stamped envelope to Mark Richardson, W7HPW, 11361 South 5825 West Payson Utah 84651-3622"
--

Again the call sign to listen for is K7O and QSL's with a SASE go to Mark Richardson, W7HPW, 11361 South 5825 West Payson Utah 84651-3622 (ARNewsline (tm), N7HVF)

**

CONVENTIONS: HAMVENTION 2002 BANQUET MASTER OF CEREMONIES NAMED
The Master of Ceremonies for the 2002 Dayton Hamvention Banquet will be Carl Nichols, N8WFQ. Nichols is the Chief Meteorologist for WDTN channel 2 News in Dayton. This is a forth return performance for Nichols who served as Hamvention banquet Master of Ceremonies since 1998. (DARA)

**

CONVENTIONS: WIA IN MELBOURNE IN MAY

The 2002 Federal Convention and Annual General Meeting of the Wireless Institute of Australia is now slated for the city of Melbourne on the 17th, 18th and 19th of May. Among the many subjects to be discussed at the meeting will be a possible restructuring of the WIA and the possibility of a Foundation class license similar to that recently introduced in the U-K. (WIA)

**
HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HAMS ASKED TO HELP NANOSAT PROJECT

Ham radio is being asked to provide technical support for an upcoming satellite project. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, says it is a bird called Nanosat:

--

John Heath, G7HIA, the Secretary of the National Space Centre Amateur Radio Society, reports that Bristol University is asking the world-wide amateur radio community to assist with data capture from their forthcoming Nano Satellite Project.

Hand-launched from the Space Shuttle during a space walk, the 6.5-kilogram satellite will send data that can be decoded with software available free from their web site. The software is not yet written because the university wants to give amateurs the chance to have input into how they would like the data stream: 1200 baud AX25 packet, 9K6 packet, Bell 202, or Soundcard etc. More information and an on-line survey form is available on the web at www.handsat.co.uk

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

If you missed that website address you can find it in the print edition of this weeks amateur Radio Newsline report. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - ENGLAND: QUEEN ELIZABETH’S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Thanks to the efforts of the Radio Society of Great Britain, UK Amateur Radio operators will be taking part in a very special celebration. On Wednesday the 6th of February, England’s Queen Elizabeth marked the 50th anniversary of her accession to the royal throne. The Queen's Golden Jubilee will be celebrated next June, and the RSGB has negotiated the use of a special prefix for the celebration. Starting June 1st and continuing through the 30th, UK hams will be permitted use of the 'GQ' prefix to help commemorate the event. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In DX, E20NGF says over the Internet that there is now a new Worked All Thailand Provinces award. There are currently 76 in Thailand and this particular awards requires that you contact and confirm each one. And while E20NGF calls it a great challenge to all award chasers, he also notes that its

not all that difficult to log 20 provinces these days with more than 1000 Thai hams already on H-F. Check the various DX and awards websites for full information. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE NEW ZEALAND AREC AWARD

And finally this week, New Zealand's team of Amateur Radio Emergency Communications volunteers has received an important award. Its a special honor in recognition of their providing support of Search and Rescue efforts down-under. Amateur Radio Newslines Jim Meachen ZL2BHF in Auckland has more:

--

The inaugural presentation of the New Zealand National Search and Rescue Award for the year 2001 was made to AREC at a ceremony held in Wellington earlier this month.

The Award recognizing AREC's outstanding performance and contribution to search and rescue in New Zealand was made by Marion Hobbs MP on behalf of the Government Minister of Transport. In presenting the Awards Marion Hobbs said of AREC:

--
Sound Here
--

Brian Purdie ZL2ADL the National Director of Amateur Radio Emergency Communications accepted the Award on behalf of the AREC team and thanked the New Zealand National Search and Rescue Committee for the award.

--
Sound Here
--

The National Director of New Zealand's Amateur Radio Emergency Communications Brian Purdie ZL2ADL. Further detail of the award ceremony with photographs can be found on the NZART web site at www.nzart.org.nz.

From Auckland New Zealand, I'm Jim Meachen ZL2BHF for Newsline.

--

By the way, ZL2BHF says that he will be a flying in from Kiwi Land to take part in this years Amateur Radio Newsline sponsored live Ham Radio Town Hall meeting. It takes place at the 2002 Dayton Hamvention at 1 p.m. Eastern time on Saturday, May 18th. (ZL2BHF)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio

Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, we want to mention that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm _____ saying 73, and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

4774. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 05:54:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7089AA.83BF80DF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34285

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly
> > > > > implies always, Dick.
> > > >
> > > > Nonsense!
> > >
> > > Let's look at it from a logic standpoint, Dick. There are two sets of
> > > possibilities. 1. When other modes get through 2. When other modes fail
> > > Is there any possibility outside of when other modes get through and when
> > > other modes fail? No, there is not. So the following two logical
> > > premises cover *ALL*, i.e. 100% of the possibilities.
> > >
> > > 1. CW gets through when other modes get through.
> > > 2. CW gets through when other modes fail.
> > >
> > > Therefore, CW *always* gets through. This is the logical conclusion
> > > given the two above premises.
> > >
> > > It's all simple logic, Dick. The conclusion is false so at least one
> > > of the premises must be false. Premise number 1 appears to be true
> > > so Premise number 2 has to be false.
> >
> > So let's just repost my response which you so conveniently clipped in its
> > entirety and let the readers see it all and decide what is real and what is
> > BS.
> > ---------------------------------------
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > That statement says CW always gets through.
> > > > > CW doesn't get through when the band is absolutely dead.
> > > >
> > > > IT SAYS NO SUCH THING!!!!!! **NO** such meaning was either
> > > > stated nor implied! If it was I would have said that "CW ALWAYS
> > > > gets through when other modes.......". NO mode gets through when
> > > > there is NO useful signal path! What the heck is wrong with you???
> > >
> > > When you say, "CW gets through when all other modes fail", it certainly

> > > implies always, Dick.
> >
> > Nonsense!
>
> Reposting what you said just repeats your error, Dick. I proved logically
> beyond any shadow of a doubt that your statement is false

Repeating what you said just repeats your trolling bullshit,Cecil. You proved nothing. But what else have we come to expect from you? Troll, troll, troll your boat.

4775. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 06:00:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C708B1D.E5F95725@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34286

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > And you insist that no one except an engineer is capable of
> > doing any such thing.
>
> That's a lie, Dick, and lies like that are the reason you get
> no respect on this newsgroup

Nope, its truly what your thrust was, entirely what you implied. For

you, that's as good as a direct statement any day.

4776. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 06:25:36 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns91B8E8B1DEB7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 34287

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net:

>
> "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
> news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
>> Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams.
>> One is supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to
>> be an advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal?
>> Bill KF6WXJ
>
> Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
> (2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
> code?
>
> The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
> "on the air".
>
> The answer to #2 is NO since there is absolutely no
> requirement for any ham to retain their code ability
> once they have passed the code test.
>
> By the way...how have you determined they don't know
> code by way of email contacts?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

That is a puzzler
.. -.-. .- - .--. . .- -.. -.-. -.. . -- ..- -.-. ...
.- --.. -- --- . . .. - .... . .--.
N3KIP 20 wpm Extra and 100% phone operator

4777. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 07:44:58 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16d8f1fae7698df0989680@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34288

In article <3c6ea0ad_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> Stating the facts supporting the contention that there is no
> longer a justification for Morse proficiency tests in order to get
> a license with HF privileges is NOT an attack on the mode
> itself ... it is merely an attack on the TESTING requirement.

When such "facts" are wishful thinking, and when such "facts" portray the
mode in a negative light, it is an attack on the mode.

> You neglect to mention the parts of the "NCI Mission Statement"
> where we stress the fact that we are NOT against the USE of
> Morse ... only the test requirement.

And you similarly neglect to mention that there are a number of NCI members
that most certainly are against the use of CW as it currently stands.

> As far as mentioning that other countries don't have the
> same sort of sub-band mode restrictions that we have in
> the US (and that it doesn't seem to have caused a problem),
> goes, that is simply a matter of fact.

[snip]

> Your assertion is TOTALLY false. Again, we have publicly
> stated ... from the very beginning until this day ... that there
> is NO "hidden agenda" to "eliminate or restrict Morse usage."
>
> All that the above discussion of sub-bands involves is that ...
> discussion of the FACTS as they exist, both in the US and
> in other regulatory domains. Don't read more into it than
> is there ...

Then what about this statement?

> The ONLY need for "mandatory bandplans" is to solidify the status
> quo of existing band usage and make it more difficult for folks to
> develop and introduce new modes.

And what on earth does this statement from a comment to the FCC on RM-
9259 by NCI have to do with code testing?

> NCI is concerned that if the FCC declares that the observance of
> band plans parallels "good amateur practice" the ARRL/IARU cartel
> will continue or adopt band plans which will further their narrow
> agenda. We further believe a case will be made that their version
> of amateur radio is the only one that should be authorized. This

> would place the FCC in the untenable position of having to enforce
> a flawed -- and we believe unenforceable -- concept.

If, as you said, NCI is only about getting rid of a testing requirement,
and, as you said, you're only stating facts from I shouldn't read
anything into, then how on earth do you explain this?

Again, the agenda is clear.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4778. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 07:45:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C6F5F8A.316F3DA4@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 34289

>
> Why do you think his program won't work on HF?

Different kinds of noise and interference and things like QSB
you don't get on microwave moonbounce. May require
just some tweaks to a total rewrite, don't know myself...

4779. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 11:05:28 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <sh1v6uor06ppbgbp2g7e85mdpgj4h7atqu@4ax.com>
Source record: 34290
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 16 Feb 2002 16:48:36 -0800, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

>Add two more entries to the list of assholes who hang out in this village.

Are you trying to tell me I am one of the "undeserving"?

;-)
73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4780. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 12:43:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217074347.18951.00001698@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34291

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>When did they start testing for this????

Right after you took the tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4781. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 12:48:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217074823.18951.00001699@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34292

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> If I take those words at their face,
>
> Surely you're not so unconscious as to take Cecil's words -any of them- at
>face
>value.
> * * *
>Really? Are you lucid today?

It was your words I was trying to take at face value, Dick.

If you believe that my doing so makes me not lucid, I will accept that.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4782. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 12:53:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217075305.18951.00001700@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34293

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>The only good thing about the BoD vote to suspend printing
>the minutes is that the vote was not unanimous. It may have
>been close, one or two directors difference maybe. Where
>does a member find the director vote report? Maybe this
>decision could be reversed.

Most often, the Board minutes do not show the voting record. In some cases, one of the Directors call for a roll-call vote, in which case the results appear in the minutes. If you want to know how your Director voted, you will have to ask. He may also share with you his impressions of how close the vote was. He will also gladly hear your views that you feel that the minutes should continue to be printed in QST.

>As to whether the commentary on the meeting or the meeting
>minutes are more valuable, pick up a March QST and see for
>yourself. The commentary does not show the near miss
>proposal of "data in the phone bands".

Data is not allowed in the phone/image bands. Digital voice is not allowed in the CW/data bands. The FCC rules are what prevail here.

However, you are correct; the commentary does not cover every single point in the minutes of the ARRL Board meetings. One has to download the minutes and read through them in all their exciting detail. :-)

Nice, try, though, Clay, but there really is no conspiracy here. Better luck next time!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4783. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 12:55:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217075544.18951.00001701@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34294

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
>> obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
>> license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
>> that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
>> and capabilities.

>Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)

Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
are an accomplisment, don't you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4784. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 12:56:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217075658.18951.00001702@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34295

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>That Americans see a big distinction between the two
>ways of arriving at these divisions is probably why they end up with the
>FCC micro-managing mode usage and band divisions within the service.

From some of the things that the FCC has said, I infer that they really don't
want this job.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4785. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 13:46:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217084625.18921.00001659@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34296

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/16/2002 6:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020216191831.10450.00002315@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Joshua, I'm NOT a member of NCI nor of the ARRL and my license
>is commercial, not non-commercial...

LENNIE...Youa re NOT telling the WHOLE truth again!

Remember! October 12th, last year? You let your unexpirable GROL expire!
You said it, so it HAS to be true!

>NCI rejected
>me for membership despite actually operating (legally) HF
>transmitters 49 years ago..

I may have to re-think NCI membership....they're not as looney as I
thought!

>...and having since operated on more
>parts of the EM spectrum than are allocated to amateurs, with
>more different modes than are allocated to US amateurs..

I seriously doubt this, Your Lyingness.

>...plus
>having BOTH formal training and work experience plus self-study
>as an electronics engineer...(SNIP)

Yeah...14 years of night school for a 3 year degree...real impressive.
Wasn't that one of those correspondence courses Sally Struther use to hawke at
3AM?

> However, I am supportive and encourage the viewpoint
>of the NCI membership and their goals..

> ...and I do NOT have anything
>against OTHERS using OOK CW for personal enjoyment wherever
>allocated in any radio service.

Oooops...lying again. You have repeatedly stated IN THIS FORUM that you
are AGAINST CW usage. How can you say you are not against anyone using it, yet
you are against CW as a mode?

Two faced again. Damn, Anderson, you make this soooooooo easy.

>What I am personally against - and that is shared opinion among
>thousands worldwide.....(SNIP)

Yes, Lennie...we know...we, the 0.0014% of the Amatuer population (that is Amateurs who participate in RAP) who have heard your lies and arrogant bile over and over and over and........

Joshua, beware Leonard H. Anderson. This "person" (I avoid the word "man") has spent an entire second career lying, antagonizing and threatening Amateurs.

>For all the rest who cannot change, feel free to send me your TS
>card. I'll get out my new TS punch, turn my collar around, and
>punch it.

I have a punch for you, Your Putziness...care to collect?

4786. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 14:11:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217091131.19482.00000091@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 34298

In article <grzb8.15140$P21.1398572@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"TraNSforMATionS MaLetoFeMAle" <doodadoodadoo@aol.com> writes:

>I was around when the arrl screwed ham radio in the 60's with
> it's so-called "incentive" licencing program...

It was the FCC's program, not the ARRL's. ARRL went along with it
for two reasons:

- a small majority of the membership favored it
- the FCC made it very clear that they were going to install some form of
incentive licensing program no matter what.

The FCC's proposals were actually far more draconian than what the ARRL
proposed. Example: FCC wanted to demote all Advanceds to General, then
institute a new "Amateur First Class" with 16 wpm code test and new written.

ARRL leadership knew they could either fight the FCC and lose all input to
the process, or work with it and moderate the effects.

>I was here when they backpeddled in the late 70's because school
> clubs were evaporating because of lack of interest...

Ever think that perhaps Vietnam, Woodstock, and the 60-70s youth
culture might have had an effect on amateur radio, which was
considered pretty "square" back then?

>I was here when they heavy-petitioned the FCC to publish the exam
>question pools for the -->SOLE PURPOSE<-- of putting Dick Bash out of
>business and NOT because they wanted to make getting a licence any easier...
>
> (Dick Bash crossed the line and took 50% of the arrl publishing
>business
> you see..I can recall one person after an ARRL board meeting =
>repeating
> over and over: "..How dare he print those guides without our approval =
>!")

In its 1975 restructuring proposal, FCC wanted ALL licenses to be available
via volunteer examiner. FCC offices would also do tests, but the trend was
clear.

The old ARRL License Manual "study guides" were simply the FCC study guides
reprinted with permission. They say so right in the LMs.
>
>I am still here an watching hamfests dissapear because nobody new is >buying
> those *obscenely overpriced * recycled plastic & steel Jap radios...

Sure they are - they just buy them via the Internet and 1-800 numbers.
>
>I am still here and THOROUGHLY ENJOYING watching arrl shrivel up
> and die on the vine... (having my "I told you so" strawberry =
>shortcake
> and coffee - pfhblttt!)

Think about who will look out for amateur radio without the ARRL. Will
any other organization go after Little LEOs, SAVI tags, or RF exposure
limits? How about PRB-1 and CC&Rs? Will other mags publish
Product Reviews that are as in-depth as those in QST? How about
RFI issues?

The enemies of amateur radio would just LOVE to see the ARRL
disappear.
>
>Bottom line, for the past 35+ Years arrl has taken a typical New England
>uppity snobbish country club mentality and attitude about ham radio.
>"Were' right and your wrong...."
>
>Guess what sport's fans ----->> S C R E W E M !
>=20
>Let them and their precious obsolete ham radio go
>down the RF toilet. They made it that way, now let
>it go to pieces like Enron did.

Ah, now it's clear what you want.

N2EY

4787. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 14:11:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217091133.19482.00000092@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 34297

In article <a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> I think the Russian federation's
>> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
>> requirement.
>
>How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
>be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
>in Spanish? Its the same concept.

Question:

Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4788. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:25:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCB58.5663E1D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34300

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Repeating what you said just repeats your trolling bullshit,Cecil. You proved
> nothing. But what else have we come to expect from you? Troll, troll, troll your
> boat.

I can tell you haven't even read the mathematical proof, Dick. Stay ignorant
if you wish, but stop accusing me of trolling when I present a valid mathematical
proof that your statement is false. I am not trolling. I am attempting to get
you to stop embarrassing yourself with your ignorance. My argument is valid
and obeys the rules of logic.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4789. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:26:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCB98.D291DC96@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34301

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
> >> obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
> >> license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
> >> that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
> >> and capabilities.
>
> >Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
>
> Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
> are an accomplisment, don't you?

He says he rested on his laurels from the time he got his Extra license. That
doesn't leave much room for accomplishments.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4790. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:26:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217102620.22644.00000479@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34299

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>NCI rejected me for membership despite actually operating (legally) HF
>transmitters 49 years ago..

On what basis? Do they have a requirement that members be licensed hams?

If it would console you, you can be an ARRL member.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4791. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:28:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCC09.C2805C1C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34302

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > And you insist that no one except an engineer is capable of
> > > doing any such thing.
> >
> > That's a lie, Dick, and lies like that are the reason you get
> > no respect on this newsgroup
>
> Nope, its truly what your thrust was, entirely what you implied. For
> you, that's as good as a direct statement any day.

My exact words were, "Odd are". That means if 51% of circuits are
designed by engineers, I am right and you are wrong. Do you really
want to argue that the majority of electronic circuits are not
designed by engineers?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4792. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:29:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCC40.BE03CA84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34303

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > Bob Larkin recently wrote code for the DSP-10 that allowed it to do moonbounce
> > > > at levels about 30 dB lower than has been done before. Do you think that you
> > > > could copy by ear what the computer pulled out of the noise?
> > >
> > > Yeah, I read about that, it's pretty neat. But I see no relationship to
> > > any of the computerized CW copying programs used on HF.
> >
> > Why do you think his program won't work on HF?
>
> Why are YOU a dumbshit? Especially when you bill yourself a genuis.....
> It *has never been used*, much less widely used, on HF.

I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his program
won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4793. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:31:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCCC5.1730E51A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34304

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > In short, manually operated CW gets through after the other
> > > commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
> > >
> > Other commonly used modes fade out on 160m to Europe at high noon.
>
> Shows what you know. 160 fades long before noon, and when it starts
> to fade, CW will fade to the level of unusability AFTER
> the other common modes. And you will troll on, and on, and on,
> ad naseum.

But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
After CW fades to unusability, the other modes do not get through.
But you say that, "CW gets through when the other modes do not
get through." Your statement is therefore, false.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4794. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:32:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FCCF7.E4495C9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34305

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C6F02D2.415CECB1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Ed has suggested that you prove your statement with CW on 160m to
> >Europe at high noon. Let us know when you accomplish that feat.
>
> I'm pretty sure Dick can do that QSO, if he can put up an effective antenna
> for 160.
>
> After all, you did not say where on earth it would be high noon when the QSO
> was done.

From Dick's QTH, of course.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4795. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:42:40 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4oisj018s5@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34309

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6F0425.BFE5398F@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre. OF COURSE cw has merits.
>
> Does CW have enough merits to survive without forced testing? _____
> It's a simple yes/no question.

Most can't answer it with a simple yes or no.

4796. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:46:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34307

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d8f1fae7698df0989680@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c6ea0ad_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
>
> > Stating the facts supporting the contention that there is no
> > longer a justification for Morse proficiency tests in order to get
> > a license with HF privileges is NOT an attack on the mode
> > itself ... it is merely an attack on the TESTING requirement.
>
> When such "facts" are wishful thinking, and when such "facts" portray the
> mode in a negative light, it is an attack on the mode.
>

That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.

> >
> > You neglect to mention the parts of the "NCI Mission Statement"
> > where we stress the fact that we are NOT against the USE of
> > Morse ... only the test requirement.
>
> And you similarly neglect to mention that there are a number of NCI
members
> that most certainly are against the use of CW as it currently stands.
>

How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of the
ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.

> >
> > As far as mentioning that other countries don't have the
> > same sort of sub-band mode restrictions that we have in
> > the US (and that it doesn't seem to have caused a problem),
> > goes, that is simply a matter of fact.
>
> [snip]
>
> > Your assertion is TOTALLY false. Again, we have publicly
> > stated ... from the very beginning until this day ... that there
> > is NO "hidden agenda" to "eliminate or restrict Morse usage."
> >
> > All that the above discussion of sub-bands involves is that ...
> > discussion of the FACTS as they exist, both in the US and
> > in other regulatory domains. Don't read more into it than
> > is there ...
>

> Then what about this statement?
>
> > The ONLY need for "mandatory bandplans" is to solidify the status
> > quo of existing band usage and make it more difficult for folks to
> > develop and introduce new modes.
>
> And what on earth does this statement from a comment to the FCC on RM-
> 9259 by NCI have to do with code testing?
>
> > NCI is concerned that if the FCC declares that the observance of
> > band plans parallels "good amateur practice" the ARRL/IARU cartel
> > will continue or adopt band plans which will further their narrow
> > agenda. We further believe a case will be made that their version
> > of amateur radio is the only one that should be authorized. This
> > would place the FCC in the untenable position of having to enforce
> > a flawed -- and we believe unenforceable -- concept.
>

Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in the untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty legislation.

>
> If, as you said, NCI is only about getting rid of a testing requirement,
> and, as you said, you're only stating facts from I shouldn't read
> anything into, then how on earth do you explain this?
>
> Again, the agenda is clear.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

No, I think your overreaction is clear.

Kim W5TIT

4797. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:47:07 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <%fQb8.17153$P21.1591031@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34306

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns91B8E8B1DEB7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> >
> > "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
> >> Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams.
> >> One is supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to
> >> be an advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal?
> >> Bill KF6WXJ
> >
> > Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
> > (2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
> > code?
> >
> > The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
> > "on the air".
> >
> > The answer to #2 is NO since there is absolutely no
> > requirement for any ham to retain their code ability
> > once they have passed the code test.
> >
> > By the way...how have you determined they don't know
> > code by way of email contacts?
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> That is a puzzler
> .. -.-. .- - .--. . .- -.. -.-. -.. . -- ..- -.-. ...
> .- --.. -- --- . . .. - .... . .--.
> N3KIP 20 wpm Extra and 100% phone operator
>

Maybe it's the my reader displays the spacing but .. - makes no
sense..here it is

I C A T P E A D CD E M UCO AZ M OE I T H E P

Alex, I'd like to buy a vowel :)

4798. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 15:51:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6fd35a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34308

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6FCCC5.1730E51A@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > In short, manually operated CW gets through after the other
> > > > commonly used modes fade out. Computerized CW does not.
> > >
> > > Other commonly used modes fade out on 160m to Europe at high noon.
> >
> > Shows what you know. 160 fades long before noon, and when it starts
> > to fade, CW will fade to the level of unusability AFTER
> > the other common modes. And you will troll on, and on, and on,
> > ad naseum.
>
> But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> After CW fades to unusability, the other modes do not get through.
> But you say that, "CW gets through when the other modes do not
> get through." Your statement is therefore, false.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Gads, they walk into it every time...

Kim W5TIT

4799. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 16:16:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FD749.1E010B62@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34310

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now they will
> embrace it?

No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
flavor of ice cream on total strangers?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4800. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 16:18:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C6FD7DB.229D3F46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34311

Clay N4AOX wrote:
> 1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of
> the novice bands, thus
> fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda
> supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").

Clay, do you operate CW or digital on the Novice frequencies?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4801. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 16:27:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217112736.23121.00000015@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34313

In article <3c6e6827_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>So, you are actually saying that you have homebrewed transmitters on the
>air, Larry? I mean, after all, it seems as though you are pretty darned
>opposed to type-accepted equipment--in fact, would even equate that with
>some damned, darned 'ol CBer.
>
>What homebrewed transmitter do ya have? You must share shop space and
>design tables with Little Dick, I bet!

Kim:

I have a "Tuna Tin" QRP transmitter for 40-meters, made from the QST
article many years ago. Had it on-the-air many times while operating
as DA1RZ in Germany -- great fun making QRP QSO's with a home-
brewed rig. Gotta dig that thing out again sometime. I've also home-
brewed several non-transmitting projects, like an electronic
attenuator for DF'ing, iambic keyer, a couple of antenna-tuners
(which I sold at a hamfest in Colorado and wish I had back!), not to
mention numerous kit projects ranging from HW-8's to a repeater
control-link receiver. Suffice it to say, I've melted more than my
share of solder.

>> Yeah, the next decade, maybe a bit more, but that would still be
>> covered by the people who learned Morse code under the Pre-Restructuring
>> ERA licensing requirements. The first thing I'm going to do if and
>> when S25.5 goes South is to offer a Morse code class to my radio
>> club. We'll see then just what the future of Morse code really will
>> be! Right now, I'm not getting any takers, even from people who
>> only need to pass 5 WPM for a General or Extra ticket!
>>
>
>Larry, if your personality in any way matches what I've seen of it here on
>this newsgroup, I'm surprised there's nothing but moans and groans from
>people when you walk into a room. Who in the world would ever approach
>taking any "class" from you--if they know anything about you?

My on-air and in-person behavior is nothing like what you see in
this newsgroup. Here, I am subject to the same (false) sense of
security everyone else has, including yourself, while safely hiding
behind my keyboard. Of course, I have been known to publicly
demonstrate my unwillingness to suffer fools gladly, and that has
caused the typical reaction from whining, sniveling no-coders. I've
gained the respect of supporters, and the disdain of detractors,

but I've always had the courage of my convictions and a willingness
to speak the unvarnished truth whenever necessary. I am not on
this planet to win a popularity contest. As to who would take any
kind of class from me, there have been dozens for whom I've been
able to successfully teach the code, if they were willing to learn it --
and many more who gave up without putting in the effort required.
However, I always made it clear at the beginning that their success
or failure was entirely under their own control -- I can't beat the
code into them, and will not even try. All I can do is use time-
honored techniques to teach it, and the rest is up to them.

>> A problem with "emergency" communications at a local level is they
>> tend to exclude all but a very closely entrenched and exclusive
>> group of "insiders" at the local levels, making it hard for rank-
>> and-file club members to participate in a meaningful way.
>>
>
>Wow, that used to be one of the things I expressed about Dallas RACES on
>this newsgroup, Larry. And you were one of the most vociferous about my
>whining about maybe I wasn't wanted. 'Smatta? Dey won't let you join up
>there, eh?

That doesn't matter to me. If they want my services as an emergency
communicator, they can have them, as long as I'm given something
useful to do, and am not having the chair pulled out from under me
by some No-code Tech with a Ham Hero complex. I am not in it for
any kind of recognition; I'm there to serve, and give something back
to the hobby through the use of my skills as a radio operator. I have
nothing to prove, and nothing to lose.

>> Lots of
>> excuses are given, such as "the local officials want to be dealing
>> with the same people all the time," but in the end, it usually just
>> amounts to glory-grabbing, which seems to me to be the major
>> motivation for a lot of "emergency communicators" anyway.

>Wow, yep. Sounds just like some of the arguments about RACES down here.
>You're describing local politics and poor leadership, Larry--NOT the state
>of emergency communication.

I'm describing conditions I've found while attempting to be an
"emergency" communicator in at least three stateside venues.
However, as I said, if they don't want to make use of my skills as
an experienced radio operator, then that's their loss, AFAIC. I don't
define myself as a person, or as a ham, by my ability to grab a
2-meter rig's microphone and talk into it. I can, however, move
large volumes of traffic very efficiently and effectively via digital
modes, a bit less so on CW, and just as well as anyone on voice.
If and when I'm ever in a position to do just that, I'll be able to get
the job done. And I'll probably be too busy at my rig and computer
to get my picture taken for the paper. That's what the guys with
the HT's are for.

>> When
>> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
>> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
>> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
>> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Well, I think they've been trying to drop you a hint. Were a person with
>your personality to even approach an emergency communication group that I
>had any leadership in, I'd do my level best to dissuade you from
>participation--you can be sure of that.

Which makes you the problem, not the solution. You'd be judging
my ability as an effective communicator on your singular, and
incorrect, assessment of my "personality," and not on my ability
to get the job done. Your willingness to discourage me due to my
"personality" only demonstrates that you are in it for personal glory
and group acceptance, not to get the job done.

>Again, the politics of emergency communication: people leading who can't or
>have no business doing so; people who are in the "hip pocket" of others;
>etc., are local and should not be considered to the "state of" emergency
>communication in ham radio. In fact, while those incestuous little groups
>are left alone to do there thing...there's often a lot of good work going on
>elsewhere.

Yes, and it's hams like me, willing to work quietly in the background,
without seeking the spotlight, who are doing that "good work." The
"ham hero" wannabes are the problem, not me. If being a "politician"
is necessary to send and receive message traffic, then I've yet to find
a way to incorporate that skill into the task at hand. If you have, then
God bless you and keep up the good work!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4802. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 16:27:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217112737.23121.00000016@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34312

In article <3c6e7007$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>More importantly, it brings us back full circle to the main argument made
>way back in the beginning that everyone on the CW testing side just
>absolutely said was not true. The reason they want CW to remain a testing
>phase is to keep the riff-raff filter on.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Sez who? I think no part of the license testing regimen has any
possibility of keeping out potentially bad operators. Witness the
fact that most of the NAL's issued in recent years have gone to
20-WPM code-tested Amateur Extra-class licensees. Some of
the sloppiest CW operating I've ever witnessed on-the-air has been
inflicted on my by my fellow Extras. However, I'll still take that
over a life consigned to having the same old pointless QSO day-in
day-out on the local repeater with the rest of the codeless blunders.
Code testing only achieves one purpose -- getting hams involved
in *using* the Morse code. As in anything else, what they do once
they gain their operating privileges is going to vary from individual
to individual. I've never claimed that it was any kind of "lid filter,"
and I don't think anything else is, or could be. Lids are born,
not made.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4803. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:05:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7126CE.213A2B33@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34314

Joshua Houk wrote:

> In article <3c6ea0ad_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> what on earth does this statement from a comment to the FCC on RM-
> 9259 by NCI have to do with code testing?
>
> > NCI is concerned that if the FCC declares that the observance of
> > band plans parallels ï¿½good amateur practiceï¿½ the ARRL/IARU cartel
> > will continue or adopt band plans which will further their narrow
> > agenda. We further believe a case will be made that their version
> > of amateur radio is the only one that should be authorized. This
> > would place the FCC in the untenable position of having to enforce
> > a flawed -- and we believe unenforceable -- concept.
>
> If, as you said, NCI is only about getting rid of a testing requirement,
> and, as you said, you're only stating facts from I shouldn't read
> anything into, then how on earth do you explain this?
>
> Again, the agenda is clear.

Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?

4804. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:11:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34315

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
> >> obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
> >> license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
> >> that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
> >> and capabilities.
>
> >Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
>
> Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
> are an accomplisment, don't you?

Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and something about
their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you and
I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
the rules required to gain the top level of licensing these two
geniuses couldn't cut the mustard. So they keep the troll going in
a lame effort to compensate. We all know where they're coming from.

4805. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:16:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71296D.72E25320@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34316

W1RFI wrote:

> From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
>
> >That Americans see a big distinction between the two
> >ways of arriving at these divisions is probably why they end up with the
> >FCC micro-managing mode usage and band divisions within the service.
>
> From some of the things that the FCC has said, I infer that they really don't
> want this job.

I don't see how traffic control can be seen as micromanaging. Without band segments there would be MANY more on-the-air conflicts that we don't see because of them. That has been true for all the years I've been a ham. Seems those who protest just want to do whatever they want wherever they want. That is the genesis of conflict and problems.

4806. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:25:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C712B7F.DB14094F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34317

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >> Here we go again ... from his absurd question, it is ABUNDANTY
> > >> obvious that Dick equates passing a test for a higher class of
> > >> license as a "graduation certificate" of sorts ... and that, to Dick
> > >> that is the ONLY way to demonstrate one's accomplishments
> > >> and capabilities.
> >
> > >Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
> >
> > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
> > are an accomplisment, don't you?
>
> He says he rested on his laurels from the time he got his Extra license. That
> doesn't leave much room for accomplishments.

Sure leaves you plenty of trolling room tho, doesn't it? The VE
testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the extra exam
and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.

4807. 1967 through 1977 old callbooks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:26:46 UTC
From: Jay Tuttle <tuttlej3@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <qJRb8.73169$fK1.4193567@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 34318

Help! Ineed to find an old call book listing for current FCC exams I am taking. My call sign was WA7HYX.If you can provide this information please email me at tuttlej2@attbi.com

4808. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:27:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C712C09.F2B66D2E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34319

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > And you insist that no one except an engineer is capable of
> > > > doing any such thing.
> > >
> > > That's a lie, Dick, and lies like that are the reason you get
> > > no respect on this newsgroup
> >
> > Nope, its truly what your thrust was, entirely what you implied. For
> > you, that's as good as a direct statement any day.
>
> My exact words were, "Odd are". That means if 51% of circuits are
> designed by engineers, I am right and you are wrong. Do you really
> want to argue that the majority of electronic circuits are not
> designed by engineers?

I'm not arguing anything with you, it just feeds the Troll in you.
I know what I said, and what I meant. I also know your penchant
for twisting meanings and contexts continuously feeds that Troll.
Do you hid out under footbridges and accost kids too?

4809. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:29:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C712C7E.385696EF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34320

CAM wrote:

>
> I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his program
> won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.

I have no opinion on his undescribed work. If you have that's your
affair.

4810. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:34:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C712DCF.9FA91F84@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34321

CAM wrote:

> > Shows what you know. 160 fades long before noon, and when it starts
> > to fade, CW will fade to the level of unusability AFTER
> > the other common modes. And you will troll on, and on, and on,
> > ad naseum.
>
> But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.

Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
through when other modes will not, the statement is true.

>
> After CW fades to unusability, the other modes do not get through.
>

As an engineer (even as an experienced ham)you can be held
responsible for knowing that there
are HF propagation characteristics which dictate that there are are
periods when there is NO propagation for any mode. Thus you can
be expected to accept without excess verbiage needed, that simple fact as
it relates to the instant conversation. Anything is is pure trollery on
your part, as per your usual, and you know it.

> But you say that, "CW gets through when the other modes do not
> get through." Your statement is therefore, false.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4811. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:39:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C712EF6.8D539A75@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34322

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now they will
> > embrace it?
>
> No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
> he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
> flavor of ice cream on total strangers?

Troll, troll, troll. Doncha *ever* get tired of it???

Personal preference has in ice cream or anything else has
nothing to do with it.
It is rather a matter of ham radio operaters learning the basics of
radiocommunications. There IS NO more basic mode than radiotelegraphy

4812. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:40:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4oq2b$7qd$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34323

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217091133.19482.00000092@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> I think the Russian federation's
> >> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
> >> requirement.
> >
> >How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
> >be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
> >in Spanish? Its the same concept.
>
> Question:
>
> Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
> tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
> to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.

Interesting question. I don't recall what my VE handbook
sez about such a request. Regardless, there is NO global
expectation of any one language being used.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4813. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:45:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4oqao$2hs$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34324

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d8f1fae7698df0989680@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c6ea0ad_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
>
> > Stating the facts supporting the contention that there is no
> > longer a justification for Morse proficiency tests in order to get
> > a license with HF privileges is NOT an attack on the mode
> > itself ... it is merely an attack on the TESTING requirement.
>
> When such "facts" are wishful thinking,

The FCC found NO facts supporting the justification
of morse testing...with the sole acknowledged reason
to retain 5 wpm simply being tied to a treaty requirement.

> and when such "facts" portray the
> mode in a negative light, it is an attack on the mode.

We will simply have to disagree on that.

> > You neglect to mention the parts of the "NCI Mission Statement"
> > where we stress the fact that we are NOT against the USE of
> > Morse ... only the test requirement.
>
> And you similarly neglect to mention that there are a number of NCI
members
> that most certainly are against the use of CW as it currently stands.

WHO? Please....name ONE.

> > As far as mentioning that other countries don't have the
> > same sort of sub-band mode restrictions that we have in
> > the US (and that it doesn't seem to have caused a problem),
> > goes, that is simply a matter of fact.
>
> [snip]
>
> > Your assertion is TOTALLY false. Again, we have publicly
> > stated ... from the very beginning until this day ... that there
> > is NO "hidden agenda" to "eliminate or restrict Morse usage."
> >
> > All that the above discussion of sub-bands involves is that ...
> > discussion of the FACTS as they exist, both in the US and
> > in other regulatory domains. Don't read more into it than
> > is there ...
>

> Then what about this statement?
>
> > The ONLY need for "mandatory bandplans" is to solidify the status
> > quo of existing band usage and make it more difficult for folks to
> > develop and introduce new modes.
>
> And what on earth does this statement from a comment to the FCC on RM-
> 9259 by NCI have to do with code testing?
>
> > NCI is concerned that if the FCC declares that the observance of
> > band plans parallels 'good amateur practice' the ARRL/IARU cartel
> > will continue or adopt band plans which will further their narrow
> > agenda. We further believe a case will be made that their version
> > of amateur radio is the only one that should be authorized. This
> > would place the FCC in the untenable position of having to enforce
> > a flawed -- and we believe unenforceable -- concept.
>
> If, as you said, NCI is only about getting rid of a testing requirement,
> and, as you said, you're only stating facts from I shouldn't read
> anything into, then how on earth do you explain this?
>
> Again, the agenda is clear.

Believe whatever you want.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4814. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 17:50:38 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16d98c9f943f52df989681@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34325

In article <3C6FCCC5.1730E51A@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...

> But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> After CW fades to unusability, the other modes do not get through.
> But you say that, "CW gets through when the other modes do not
> get through." Your statement is therefore, false.

You know, when the US Postal Service says that neither rain, sleet, nor
snow will stop them from getting through, they are *so* lying.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4815. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:04:16 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34326

In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.

However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.

> How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of the
> ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.

You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.

> Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in the
> untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
> unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
> legislation.

Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
code testing, he is lying.

What's really not kosher? When NCI does the above then encourages members
to harass someone for making a comment for that same petition. That's
scurrilous, shameful, and very indicative of their mindset.

> No, I think your overreaction is clear.

Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
think that the facts do speak for themselves.

joshua houk
kd7pos

4816. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:08:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4orl6$sp1$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34327

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712EF6.8D539A75@worldnet.att.net...

> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test
> > > that now they will embrace it?
> >
> > No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
> > he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
> > flavor of ice cream on total strangers?
>
> Troll, troll, troll. Doncha *ever* get tired of it???
>
> Personal preference has in ice cream or anything else has
> nothing to do with it.

Let's try some other things...
How does Golf continue to gain new players?
How does the antique car hobby keep attracting new enthusiasts?
How does the local volunteer Red Cross, First Aid Squad,
Vol. Fire Dept., keep getting new members?
...the list goes on and on.

> It is rather a matter of ham radio operaters learning the
> basics of radiocommunications.

So why is it ONLY hams that should be so required?

What about the many radio communications professionals
who have never learned morse?

> There IS NO more basic mode than radiotelegraphy

So what? Knowledge in the mode in NO way inhibits
anyone from becoming a proficient ham. Indeed, IF the
basic aspect of morse was any sort of foundation knowledge,
then engineering schools would have required it for
part of the engineering syllabus. To my knowledge,
NO school EVER had such a requirement. I attended a
two year tech school and we built a 10 watt CW
transmitter when studying transmitter fundaments...but no
knowledge of morse was needed to build it or test it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4817. Re: 100 % free lolitasex !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131037.23121.00000019@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34328

In article <yOqb8.39588$78.1559294156@hestia.telenet-ops.be>, andy@pi.nl writes:

>
>http://clik.to/lolitasex
>
>100 % free lolitasex !

Hi Kim!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4818. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131037.23121.00000018@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34334

In article <3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com>, "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> writes:

>
>Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One is
>supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
>advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
>KF6WXJ

Bill:

No, it's not illegal, it's just ham radio in the Post-Restructuring Era.
All that's required to get an Extra-class license these days is to
answer 70% of the questions correctly on a 10-question multiple-guess
test based on a 5 minute, 5 WPM code transmission, or producing
one minute of solid copy (which is about 25 characters). Once
the test is passed, any code knowledge gained to pass the test would
be quickly lost, if no further use of the code were pursued. Therefore,
it is entirely possible for any ham who has been licensed for a time
to no longer know the code, and most likely with new hams who
were licensed or upgraded to Extra since 4/15/2000.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4819. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131038.23121.00000021@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34331

In article <3c6e6bf2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> If by "worthless hazing ritual" you're referring to SSB and the 10-10
>> Club, then you're right -- I don't accept it! Morse/CW, OTOH, is a
>> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications skill --
>> and not a "worthless hazing ritual" unless you're a lazy whiner!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Nope, CW is not a worthless hazing ritual. The "lazy whiner" part is.

Kim:

Then why do the lazy whiners expend so much time and energy
whining, when the same time and energy could have made Contest-
grade CW operators out of them?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4820. Re: We want to be pornstars

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131038.23121.00000020@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34332

In article <3c6e62ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Nope, if I want to look at porn, I'd probably buy a good magazine or
>something. I stay off the sites on the WWW. I've been very fortunate to
>keep from getting spam mail all the time and staying off sites like that is
>part of what I attribute that to.
>
>Sorry you're so disgruntled <GIGGLE> that the observation was made that you
>were the only one in the entire read/post subscribership of the newsgroup
>that responded to the original message. I haven't seen your feathers this
>ruffled in a long time...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

The only reason I did it was to get YOUR pudgy little fingers dancing
over the keyboard -- and like a puppeteer pulling the strings, you danced
exactly to MY tune! ROTFLMAO!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4821. Re: Valentine s offer : 100 % free sex

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131039.23121.00000022@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34330

In article <3c6e6c67_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Gee, Kim -- what about those nasty 'old viruses? Wern't you afraid
>> of catching one?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Hell no, I was willing to take the time to deal with a virus if exposed.
>Just for you.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Well thank you Kim -- that was very sweet of you! But please don't feel
as though you must expose yourself to viruses on my account.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4822. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131039.23121.00000023@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34338

In article <a4l0i7$f0l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
>> Cecil. It has to do with the willingness of people who have
>> no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
>> and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level. 5 WPM
>> is NOT a "useful proficiency level." In the absence of a
>> code testing requirement of at least 12 WPM, usage of CW
>> will certainly decline in the fullness of time.
>
>To what level of usage do you think it will deecline if
>there is NO test requirement at all?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Well, in a worst-case scenario, the obvious answer is zero -- although
I doubt that we'd see a total abolishment of on-the-air usage of CW in
my expected remaining lifetime. However, I don't think we'll see any
more growth in the numbers of CW operators -- just enough replacements
of dying-off old timers to maintain a stable plateau for a few more years --
then we'll see a decline, probably at a rate a bit shallower than the typical
bell curve. In any event, I doubt that we have half the number of CW
users 20 years from now that we have today. In the absence of a
code testing requirement, the WWII-generation old timer CW users will
be going SK at a rate that we won't ever be able to keep up with simply
by current CW afficianados "selling the mode" as it were.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4823. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131040.23121.00000024@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34329

In article <3C6E540B.C018AC04@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>You simply met the
>requirements in order to gain privileges just like people
>are doing today and will do in the future.

Cecil:

Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've let
the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the future
of the ARS in jeopardy.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4824. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131040.23121.00000025@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34335

In article <3C6E5487.C5B6F140@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll wrote:
>> When
>> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
>> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
>> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
>> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.
>
>I suspect that has more to do with your personality than with
>your qualifications.

Cecil:

Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude. Had it been a problem with my personality, I probably wouldn't have wanted to bother trying to get involved in emergency communications in the first place.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4825. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131041.23121.00000026@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34333

In article <20020216080050.18942.00001293@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Larry Roll k3lt@magpage.com
>
>> It has to do with the willingness of people who have
>>no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
>>and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level.
>
>Wanna' bet that the word "effort" does not appear in the FCC regulations for
>any radio service?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Wanna bet I never said or implied that it did, or should?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4826. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131041.23121.00000027@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34337

In article <20020216080308.18942.00001294@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Larry is apparently trying to convince people that CW has no merits.
>
>This is absolutely bizzarre; some of the "pro CW test" folks believe that
>they
>should tell people that CW has no merit, while some of the no-cw-test folks
>believe they should tell people that CW does have merit.
>
>That really should tell us how twisted this has all become.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

The Morse/CW mode has great merit. It is those hams who think
that elimination of code testing is a good thing for the ARS who are
without merit.

What's this now, Ed -- when you can't come up with something
on your own, you now start parroting Cecil's twisted logic? What's
next -- Kim Walker-like one-liners and ROFLMAO's?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4827. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131042.23121.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34336

In article <20020216081602.18942.00001298@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>If anything, I say the phone bands should be
>>REDUCED to make more room for a vast expansion of digital modes.
>
>Why do you believe that digital should be limited to computer-to-computer
>operation, or at least believe that the amount of spectrum made available to
>voice or image digital operation should be reduced? Much digital operation in
>the rest of radio today is voice.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I never said I have anything against digital voice. I believe in it, and hope the ARS adopts it very soon. There is more than enough phone spectrum available right now -- simply displace analog SSB with digital voice. Leave the non-voice segments alone for digital data and CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4828. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:10:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020217131042.23121.00000029@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34339

In article <20020216082446.18942.00001301@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>. The criticism was directed at the Carl Stevensons
>>who spend their best 25 years moaning and protesting instead of
>>getting on with it.
>
>In slapping that brush around to paint Carl, you have said some things that I
>feel would be very offputting to potential newcomers.

Ed:

Why should the TRUTH be "offputting?" Perhaps there are potential newcomers who are being put off by the existence of dumbed-down, technically uninclined and uninvolved hams, who were also the ones spending years of their lives whining and complaining about something as universally achievable as 5, 13, and 20 WPM code testing! Perhaps the "newcomers" don't want to be associated with such lazy and unmotivated seekers of instant gratification, and would appreciate an ARS where operating privilege was still linked to learning and growth in knowledge and skill. You have no right to criticize Dick for speaking the truth, considering the damage done to the ARS by the dumbing-process presided over by the ARRL.

>Why don't you settle the matter and send Carl an insultive email once and get
>it over with, then say things here that will be directed at helping to
>interest new people in ham radio and Morse code?

I've got a better idea, Ed -- instead of making outrageously inane and offensive suggestions, why don't you try to understand the point of view of those of us who disagree with the notion that we can save Amateur Radio by giving away full operating privileges to any passerby who may have a fleeting interest?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4829. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:16:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4orsj02msc@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34343

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6FCB58.5663E1D@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Repeating what you said just repeats your trolling bullshit,Cecil. You
proved
> > nothing. But what else have we come to expect from you? Troll, troll,
troll your
> > boat.
>
> I can tell you haven't even read the mathematical proof, Dick. Stay
ignorant
> if you wish, but stop accusing me of trolling when I present a valid
mathematical
> proof that your statement is false. I am not trolling. I am attempting to
get
> you to stop embarrassing yourself with your ignorance. My argument is
valid
> and obeys the rules of logic.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dick is typical of what is known in theatre circles as "bad actor
syndrome" - all passion and no thought.

4830. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:17:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4oshp$5oq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34340

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>
> However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
> folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>
> > How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of
the
> > ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.
>
> You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
> policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
> people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
> makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.
>
> > Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in
the
> > untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
> > unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
> > legislation.
>
> Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
> that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
> that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
> comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
> code testing, he is lying.
>
> What's really not kosher? When NCI does the above then encourages members
> to harass someone for making a comment for that same petition. That's
> scurrilous, shameful, and very indicative of their mindset.

Josh,
Your claim is a crock. Please provide whatever evidence you
think you have that "NCI does the above then encourages
members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
making a comment for that same petition."

> > No, I think your overreaction is clear.
>
> Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
> think that the facts do speak for themselves.

I await your reply to my request above.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4831. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:21:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4os6702nd3@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34342

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net...
> > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as
a VE
> > are an accomplisment, don't you?
>
> Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and something
about
> their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
> in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you and
> I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what

If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of the herd,
then I'll take that as a compliment

4832. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:23:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4osat02nlr@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34348

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6FCC40.BE03CA84@IEEE.org...
> > > Why do you think his program won't work on HF?
> > >
> > Why are YOU a dumbshit? Especially when you bill yourself a
genuis.....
> > It *has never been used*, much less widely used, on HF.
> >
> I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his program
> won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dick gets his exercise by flying off the handle.

4833. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:25:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4osmj$2lj$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34341

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217131042.23121.00000029@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <20020216082446.18942.00001301@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >>. The criticism was directed at the Carl Stevensons
> >>who spend their best 25 years moaning and protesting instead of
> >>getting on with it.
> >
> >In slapping that brush around to paint Carl, you have said some things
that I
> >feel would be very offputting to potential newcomers.
>
> Ed:
>
> Why should the TRUTH be "offputting?" Perhaps there are potential
> newcomers who are being put off by the existence of dumbed-down,
> technically uninclined and uninvolved hams, who were also the ones
> spending years of their lives whining and complaining about something
> as universally achievable as 5, 13, and 20 WPM code testing!

Yea, right. I suppose potential new golfers are similarly
"put off" by the existence of non-athletic, inept, duffers who
make no effort to improve their golf game.

> Perhaps the "newcomers" don't want to be associated with such lazy
> and unmotivated seekers of instant gratification, and would
> appreciate an ARS where operating privilege was still linked to learning
> and growth in knowledge and skill.

Larry...please point us all to the rules in Part 97 that
require any ham to "be associated with" any other hams...lazy,
dedicated, smart, dumb, or otherwise.

> You have no right to criticize
> Dick for speaking the truth,

Larry, did you suspend the 1st amendment now?

> considering the damage done to the ARS
> by the dumbing-process presided over by the ARRL.

Where's that "IMHO" and a smiley?

> >Why don't you settle the matter and send Carl an insultive email once and
get

> >it over with, then say things here that will be directed at helping to
> >interest new people in ham radio and Morse code?
>
> I've got a better idea, Ed -- instead of making outrageously inane and
> offensive suggestions,

"offensive"... aren't we a bit sensitive.

> why don't you try to understand the point of
> view of those of us who disagree with the notion that we can save
> Amateur Radio by giving away full operating privileges to any
> passerby who may have a fleeting interest?

Are you now suggesting a no test ham service?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4834. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:26:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4osf802nri@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34346

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712C7E.385696EF@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> > I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his
program
> > won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
>
> I have no opinion on his undescribed work. If you have that's your
> affair.

No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts back
when you mis-read Cecil's question.

4835. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:28:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4osji02o4k@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34347

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712DCF.9FA91F84@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > Shows what you know. 160 fades long before noon, and when it starts
> > > to fade, CW will fade to the level of unusability AFTER
> > > the other common modes. And you will troll on, and on, and on,
> > > ad naseum.
> >
> > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
>
> Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
> through when other modes will not, the statement is true.

I see...now you're putting conditions on your original statement because
Cecil proved you wrong, and you can face up to that fact.

4836. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:30:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4otd4imi1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34344

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217131040.23121.00000025@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3C6E5487.C5B6F140@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Larry Roll wrote:
> >> When
> >> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
> >> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
> >> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
> >> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.
> >>
> >I suspect that has more to do with your personality than with
> >your qualifications.
> Cecil:
>
> Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me
> to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here
> first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude.

Too bad that happens...and I agree with Larry that such
can be the case in many different settings. Newcomers have
to be welcomed and encouraged or else they just won't
come back. I've seen that in every type of voluntary
endeaver I've been involved with...including ham radio,
public service, antique car club, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4837. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:33:52 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4ostk02opv@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34349

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7126CE.213A2B33@worldnet.att.net...

> Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?

The ARRL has been dictating their version of what amateur radio should be
for years, but that's ok because they're the ARRL. Right?

4838. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:34:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4otd5imi2@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34345

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217131039.23121.00000023@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <a4l0i7$f0l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> >> Cecil. It has to do with the willingness of people who have
> >> no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
> >> and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level. 5 WPM
> >> is NOT a "useful proficiency level." In the absence of a
> >> code testing requirement of at least 12 WPM, usage of CW
> >> will certainly decline in the fullness of time.
> >
> >To what level of usage do you think it will deecline if
> >there is NO test requirement at all?
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> Well, in a worst-case scenario, the obvious answer is zero -- although
> I doubt that we'd see a total abolishment of on-the-air usage of CW in
> my expected remaining lifetime. However, I don't think we'll see any
> more growth in the numbers of CW operators -- just enough replacements
> of dying-off old timers to maintain a stable plateau for a few more
years --
> then we'll see a decline, probably at a rate a bit shallower than the
typical
> bell curve. In any event, I doubt that we have half the number of CW
> users 20 years from now that we have today. In the absence of a
> code testing requirement, the WWII-generation old timer CW users will
> be going SK at a rate that we won't ever be able to keep up with simply
> by current CW afficianados "selling the mode" as it were.

I don't agree with you end result...I suspect there will always
be a niche of CW users. I do agree the number (as a percent of
the total of all hams) will go down over time. But, just as
people still bow hunt, musket shot, or drive 40 year old
antique cars, there will be that niche following.

Thanks for answering my question.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4839. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:37:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4ot3g02p30@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34451

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712EF6.8D539A75@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now
they will
> > > embrace it?
> >
> > No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
> > he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
> > flavor of ice cream on total strangers?
>
> Troll, troll, troll. Doncha *ever* get tired of it???

If Cecil is such a troll, then you certainly are falling for it by
continuing to respond to his posts.

4840. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:51:19 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16d99adf9b28f770989683@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34350

In article <a4oshp$5oq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...

> Your claim is a crock. Please provide whatever evidence you
> think you have that "NCI does the above then encourages
> members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
> making a comment for that same petition."

From http://www.nocode.org/articles.html

William A. Tynan, W3XO, Files Scathing "Reply Comments" in RM-9673

Bill Tynan, W3XO, a well-known VHF DXer, former QST columnist, and former President of AMSAT NA, was involved in the filing of and is apparently an ardent supporter of the CSVHFS' Petition for Rulemaking. A number of major organizations have filed comments in opposition to the CSVHFS' Petition, including the ARRL, the Texas VHF FM Society, the 220 Spectrum Management Association of Southern California, and NCI. In his "Reply Comments" W3XO systematically attacks all of these comments in opposition to his desired outcome in the Proceeding, questioning both the motives and the integrity of the organizations in question. He also insinuates that new operators are at the root of the (alleged) "problem" which the Petition "seeks to remedy," stating: "The influx of new operators, most of whom have not been brought up in the tradition of amateur radio and belong to no organization, national or otherwise, can only exacerbate the problem." To view a copy of Mr. Tynan's "Reply Comments" in RM-9673 click in this link. (Adobe .pdf)

> No cheers,

sniff

joshua houk
kd7pos

4841. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 18:59:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c6ffd70_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34452

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C6FD749.1E010B62@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now
they will
> > embrace it?
>
> No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
> he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
> flavor of ice cream on total strangers?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Probably not, (it's in public). But, I bet he makes personal judgements
based on what flavors are chosen... :)

Kim W5TIT

4842. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:14:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217141404.18913.00001867@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34453

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
>have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
>ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?

It is amazing that you think he has dictatorial powers. How did he obtain them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4843. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:16:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217141649.18913.00001868@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34454

Actually, Cecil, I think that he has you on this one. His statement, "CW gets through when other modes do not" does not necessarily imply always. If I say "it happens," that is not the same as "it always happens." If it happens sometimes, it happens.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4844. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:19:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217141950.18913.00001869@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34455

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> While you and
>I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
>the rules required to gain the top level of licensing these two
>geniuses couldn't cut the mustard.

Speak for yourself. The exams I took were nowhere near the hardest ever in ham radio. And I would like to think that the accomplishments I have had after I have my license exceeded the accomplishment of passing the test.

Cecil and Carl have both done just what you and I did -- met the requirements in place at the time they were issued their licenses. Those requirements have been through a lot of changes over the years.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

4845. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:23:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70034F.D431E87B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34456

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Then why do the lazy whiners expend so much time and energy
> whining, when the same time and energy could have made Contest-
> grade CW operators out of them?

A person's life belongs to that person, Larry. Who are you to
question what they choose to do with their time?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4846. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:25:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7003B8.1634BEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34457

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Sure leaves you plenty of trolling room tho, doesn't it? The VE
> testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the extra exam
> and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
> Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.

If you rested on your laurels after obtaining your Extra ticket,
you weren't a good VE.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4847. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:27:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70042D.334F5196@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34458

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > >Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
> >
> > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
> > are an accomplisment, don't you?
>
> Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, ...

How can you possibly accomplish anything while resting on your laurels?
Answer: You can't. You either rested on your laurels or accomplished
something useful. It is impossible to do both.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4848. Re: Yes, Dick, it does matter ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:30:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7004F3.8341EB0B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34459

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'm not arguing anything with you, it just feeds the Troll in you.
> I know what I said, and what I meant.

What you said was a lie. I did NOT say that only engineers
design circuits. I said, "Odds are ...".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4849. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:32:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c70053e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34463

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217112736.23121.00000015@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e6827_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> When
> >> hams show up for some "emergency communications" exercise, only
> >> to find they have nothing to do, then they usually give up on it
> >> and leave it to the insiders. I've seen this happen virtually
> >> everywhere I've been since I've been a ham.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Well, I think they've been trying to drop you a hint. Were a person with
> >your personality to even approach an emergency communication group that I
> >had any leadership in, I'd do my level best to dissuade you from
> >participation--you can be sure of that.
>
> Which makes you the problem, not the solution. You'd be judging
> my ability as an effective communicator on your singular, and
> incorrect, assessment of my "personality," and not on my ability
> to get the job done.
>

Nope. I'd be "judging" your ability to work with others. And, based on
what I see here in this newsgroup, if you are anything like here my
judgement would be that you'd probably disrupt more teammanship than be a
part of or build any.

>
> Your willingness to discourage me due to my
> "personality" only demonstrates that you are in it for personal glory
> and group acceptance, not to get the job done.
>

And, you're wrong again. My willingness to discourage someone who may be
disruptive to the smooth operation and transition duties required in an
event proves that I am willing to make decisions not based on popularity,
but on the ability of the group to work effortlessly and seamlessly toward a
common goal--establishing whatever is required from the EOC.

> >
> >Again, the politics of emergency communication: people leading who can't
or
> >have no business doing so; people who are in the "hip pocket" of others;

> >etc., are local and should not be considered to the "state of" emergency
> >communication in ham radio. In fact, while those incestuous little
groups
> >are left alone to do there thing...there's often a lot of good work going
on
> >elsewhere.
>
> Yes, and it's hams like me, willing to work quietly in the background,
> without seeking the spotlight, who are doing that "good work." The
> "ham hero" wannabes are the problem, not me.
>

Because of what I've seen on this newsgroup, I question your idea of what a "ham hero" is. You've indicated to me that you think I am a "ham hero" or cop wannabe. I couldn't swear to it, but I think even people who don't like me (because I always challenge status quo in emergency communication services) would say I am not "in it" for the glory.

>
> If being a "politician"
> is necessary to send and receive message traffic, then I've yet to find
> a way to incorporate that skill into the task at hand. If you have, then
> God bless you and keep up the good work!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well, suffice it to say that I did like a lot of the commentary you had in the snipped part of this message. The leadership-that-isn't down here have told me many times that it takes politics to be in emergency communication in ham radio. I say balderdash. I've never "bought into" their crap and the only people whose respect I don't have is, well...guess who, them.

The very commentary you had is the "system" of things that exists many times. What I do is ask questions, on the air. Ask why, on the air. Ask why, in meetings. What "damage" they've tried to do because of all that, I simply remind people of the non-answers they always have. Only thing is, because I've asked those questions and because I've been belligerent in trying to get answers (never did), it is the leadership that keeps me from being involved. Their loss.

Do you happen to remember when I was in a hisi-fit over the whole structure of Dallas RACES/ham radio politics quite some time ago? Remember when Johnny Davis/K5JD, posted a message to this newsgroup that anyone who "wanted the truth" could call him collect? Remember the open post I made back to him asking all those questions? Remember there were no answers? It's because I ask, quote "the wrong" questions. That was then and this is now and I think Dallas RACES has actually improved--ever so slightly--but is still very political. Yeah, that irks the crap out of me because it discourages some damned good volunteers from getting involved. But again, their loss, not mine. I don't even live in Dallas County. I work there and hope I'm not in town if and when something happens down there.

Guess what I did hear a while back on a Dallas RACES net? I've always (or used to always) bugged and bugged about simplex communications. After the 9-11 disaster in NYC, I actually heard a Dallas RACES net control station state during training that they were going to have to begin focusing on some simplex operation training!!! I nearly fell outta my chair. It's about the last net I listened to, so don't know whatever became of it...but I hope they did it and continue to do it.

No, Larry, I would never discourage someone who was interested. But, their interest must extend beyond sniping at others for the way they are *especially* as it relates to ham radio operators. I don't care how someone is as a ham radio operator. One can be the most opinionated bugger in the world--yet be the greatest at team work and team building skills. I don't see you being there. Even for me, it takes great effort sometime and when I was younger I never won over my stupid ego-emotions. I'm older now and "don't care" about ego--I have enough of it to last myself.

Interesting that this particular exchange was quite different from our most.

Kim W5TIT

4850. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:36:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4p0va$e8f$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34461

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d99adf9b28f770989683@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a4oshp$5oq$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > Your claim is a crock. Please provide whatever evidence you
> > think you have that "NCI does the above then encourages
> > members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
> > making a comment for that same petition."
>
> From http://www.nocode.org/articles.html
>
> William A. Tynan, W3XO, Files Scathing "Reply Comments" in RM-9673
>
> Bill Tynan, W3XO, a well-known VHF DXer, former QST columnist, and former
> President of AMSAT NA, was involved in the filing of and is apparently an
> ardent supporter of the CSVHFS' Petition for Rulemaking. A number of
> major organizations have filed comments in opposition to the CSVHFS'
> Petition, including the ARRL, the Texas VHF FM Society, the 220 Spectrum
> Management Association of Southern California, and NCI. In his "Reply
> Comments" W3XO systematically attacks all of these comments in opposition
> to his desired outcome in the Proceeding, questioning both the motives
> and the integrity of the organizations in question. He also insinuates
> that new operators are at the root of the (alleged) "problem" which the
> Petition "seeks to remedy," stating: "The influx of new operators, most
> of whom have not been brought up in the tradition of amateur radio and
> belong to no organization, national or otherwise, can only exacerbate the
> problem." To view a copy of Mr. Tynan's "Reply Comments" in RM-9673
> click in this link. (Adobe .pdf)
>
> > No cheers,
>
> *sniff*

The post above offers nothing to substantiate your
claim that: "NCI ...then encourages
members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
making a comment for that same petition."

Where is there any statements that show NCI is encouraging
anyone to do anything regarding the post above?

Still no cheers :-)

Bill K2UNK

4851. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:36:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c700630$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34465

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217112737.23121.00000016@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e7007$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >More importantly, it brings us back full circle to the main argument made
> >way back in the beginning that everyone on the CW testing side just
> >absolutely said was not true. The reason they want CW to remain a
testing
> >phase is to keep the riff-raff filter on.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Sez who? I think no part of the license testing regimen has any
> possibility of keeping out potentially bad operators. Witness the
> fact that most of the NAL's issued in recent years have gone to
> 20-WPM code-tested Amateur Extra-class licensees. Some of
> the sloppiest CW operating I've ever witnessed on-the-air has been
> inflicted on my by my fellow Extras.
>

But, they didn't get the NAL for sloppy CW. . .did they?

>
> However, I'll still take that
> over a life consigned to having the same old pointless QSO day-in
> day-out on the local repeater with the rest of the codeless blunders.
>

Larry, maybe those folks enjoy their conversations. Do you *have* to label
them as blunders just because of the conversations they enjoy?

>
> Code testing only achieves one purpose -- getting hams involved
> in *using* the Morse code.
>

It'd be tough to prove, but I wonder if I'd been more willing to continue to
use CW if I hadn't had to study and learn for a test.

>
> As in anything else, what they do once
> they gain their operating privileges is going to vary from individual
> to individual. I've never claimed that it was any kind of "lid filter,"

> and I don't think anything else is, or could be. Lids are born,
> not made.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I still think lots and lots of people want the test there to use it as a filter. I say that someone who is an "undesirable" ham will go away after time.

Kim W5TIT

4852. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:36:50 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7005FB.ADF3E8CD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34460

It seems to me that this discussion of what CW's niche might be
concentrates almost solely on HF. In my opinion this may be the less
likely usage over time. There are very few things workable on HF CW
that are not also workable on some other mode. I suspect we will
eventually see the rules change so there is little HF spectrum that
excludes phone but I think we will continue to see CW allowed
everywhere. Usage may fade but I think there will be a cadre of devoted
users for many years to come.
On the other hand, CW for weak signal VHF/UHF work seems firmly
entrenched even though most casual users are likely to be on FM. A good
recent example was the extensive F openings on 6M this fall. There was
a lot of CW DXing going on in addition to SSB.
I can think of VHF DX contacts I have made that were not possible on
Phone due to the weakness of signals. I am not set up for EME, is there
any such thing as Phone Moonbounce? (Yes I know there are also more
modern signal processing techniques but they are not mainstream yet.)
John

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020217131039.23121.00000023@mb-ch.aol.com...
> > In article <a4l0i7$f0l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> This has nothing to do with the "merit" of the Morse code,
> > >> Cecil. It has to do with the willingness of people who have
> > >> no direct personal experience in using it to invest the time
> > >> and effort to learn it at a useful proficiency level. 5 WPM
> > >> is NOT a "useful proficiency level." In the absence of a
> > >> code testing requirement of at least 12 WPM, usage of CW
> > >> will certainly decline in the fullness of time.
> > >
> > >To what level of usage do you think it will deecline if
> > >there is NO test requirement at all?
> > >
> > >Cheers,
> > >Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Bill:
> >
> > Well, in a worst-case scenario, the obvious answer is zero -- although
> > I doubt that we'd see a total abolishment of on-the-air usage of CW in
> > my expected remaining lifetime. However, I don't think we'll see any

> > more growth in the numbers of CW operators -- just enough replacements
> > of dying-off old timers to maintain a stable plateau for a few more
> years --
> > then we'll see a decline, probably at a rate a bit shallower than the
> typical
> > bell curve. In any event, I doubt that we have half the number of CW
> > users 20 years from now that we have today. In the absence of a
> > code testing requirement, the WWII-generation old timer CW users will
> > be going SK at a rate that we won't ever be able to keep up with simply
> > by current CW afficianados "selling the mode" as it were.
>
> I don't agree with you end result...I suspect there will always
> be a niche of CW users. I do agree the number (as a percent of
> the total of all hams) will go down over time. But, just as
> people still bow hunt, musket shot, or drive 40 year old
> antique cars, there will be that niche following.
>
> Thanks for answering my question.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

4853. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:37:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4p0uukjd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34462

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a4ostk02opv@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7126CE.213A2B33@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> > have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> > ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
>
> The ARRL has been dictating their version of what amateur radio should be
> for years, but that's ok because they're the ARRL. Right?

And, not for nothing, but on what basis could anyone
claim that NCI is in any position to "dictate" to anyone?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4854. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:38:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7006ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34467

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712EF6.8D539A75@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Should we just assume that because it's no longer on the test that now
they will
> > > embrace it?
> >
> > No, we will assume that if CW has enough merits to be useful to a ham,
> > he/she will learn Morse code. Do you also try to force your favorite
> > flavor of ice cream on total strangers?
>
> Troll, troll, troll. Doncha *ever* get tired of it???
>
> Personal preference has in ice cream or anything else has
> nothing to do with it.
> It is rather a matter of ham radio operaters learning the basics of
> radiocommunications. There IS NO more basic mode than radiotelegraphy
>

Dick Carroll's gotten as boring and monotonous as Len Anderson.

Kim W5TIT

4855. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:39:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7006EF.EDB7429F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34464

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
>
> Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
> through when other modes will not, the statement is true.

Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding. Let
me make it even simpler. Here are two statements which, I presume,
you believe to be true.

1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.

Does there exist any time other than when SSB gets through or
doesn't get through? No, there isn't. Therefore, when SSB
gets through and when SSB doesn't get through is always, i.e.
100% of the time. There doesn't exist a time when SSB gets
through or SSB doesn't get through.

Therefore, CW always gets through, when SSB does and when SSB
doesn't.

Your statement is false, Dick, and is proven false beyond any
shadow of a doubt. I've noticed you haven't produced a QSO
between your QTH and Europe using CW on 160m at high noon.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4856. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:39:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7006e3$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34468

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d98c9f943f52df989681@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3C6FCCC5.1730E51A@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
> > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> > After CW fades to unusability, the other modes do not get through.
> > But you say that, "CW gets through when the other modes do not
> > get through." Your statement is therefore, false.
>
> You know, when the US Postal Service says that neither rain, sleet, nor
> snow will stop them from getting through, they are *so* lying.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos
>

Probably so. Did you have a point?

Kim W5TIT

4857. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:44:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C700801.C4725471@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34466

W1RFI wrote:
> Actually, Cecil, I think that he has you on this one. His statement, "CW gets
> through when other modes do not" does not necessarily imply always.

It indeed does logically imply always. When other modes get through and
when other modes do not get through is logically always. In other words,
there doesn't exist any other time than when other modes get through or
other modes don't get through.

Let T1 be the time when other modes get through. Let T2 be the time when
other modes do not get through. T1+T2 = all the time. There doesn't exist
any time besides T1+T2. Therefore, CW always gets through. That's a false
statement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4858. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:46:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7008A2.87174FAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34469

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Interesting question. I don't recall what my VE handbook
> sez about such a request. Regardless, there is NO global
> expectation of any one language being used.

I give GED exams in Spanish, if requested.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4859. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:48:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7008e3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34471

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>
> However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
> folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>

I don't know why you state the above as though it should bear some kind of
extreme importance. It takes many to make this world go 'round, Joshua.
There are at least just as many knowledgeable folks, backed up with some
serious factual evidence, who believe differently than you.

> >
> > How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of
the
> > ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.
>
> You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
> policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
> people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
> makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.
>

More over-reactionary comments. Nothing more. And, as Bill Sohl often
says, so start your own darned group.

> >
> > Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in
the
> > untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
> > unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
> > legislation.
>
> Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
> that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
> that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
> comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
> code testing, he is lying.
>

I can't help but wonder if NCI made those comments *based on* the CW issue.
And, if Carl is lying--so what? What *if* NCI also takes on other issues?

So what?

>
> What's really not kosher? When NCI does the above then encourages members
> to harass someone for making a comment for that same petition. That's
> scurrilous, shameful, and very indicative of their mindset.
>

I agree. However, I've not been witness to it. I also know that politics
(those which embroil every controversial item in ham radio) is quite nasty.

> >
> > No, I think your overreaction is clear.
>
> Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
> think that the facts do speak for themselves.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos
>

Like I said, *if* Carl is lying that is a personal fault. If Carl is lying
and misrepresenting what NCI is all about, shame on him/them. However,
maybe NCI felt compelled to comment on an issue that parallels their
platform. That, I have no problem with. I might tell you today that I
can't stand something. Then, two years from now I am just lovin' it. You
gonna pick then to call me a liar? Maybe I changed my mind?

By the way, the ARRL has members who detract from policy all the time. I
don't know about NCI, but I'm sure that if there are detractors there is a
platform for them utilize. If not, Joshua, then there is always the exit
door. Simple as that.

Kim W5TIT

4860. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:50:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c700977_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34473

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217131038.23121.00000021@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e6bf2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> If by "worthless hazing ritual" you're referring to SSB and the 10-10
> >> Club, then you're right -- I don't accept it! Morse/CW, OTOH, is a
> >> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications skill --
> >> and not a "worthless hazing ritual" unless you're a lazy whiner!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Nope, CW is not a worthless hazing ritual. The "lazy whiner" part is.
>
> Kim:
>
> Then why do the lazy whiners expend so much time and energy
> whining, when the same time and energy could have made Contest-
> grade CW operators out of them?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry: I've never seen anyone "whining" about CW. I've seen debates on both sides happen, seen people argue and nearly stomp each other over the issue--but I've never seen anyone whine. Unless you call the statement "I don't like CW and don't want to use it" whining.

I don't.

And, maybe they don't *WANT* to be contest-grade CW operators, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

4861. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:52:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7009EA.24340FD7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34470

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?

You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU". It *is* definitely amazing.
Carl, can you leap tall buildings at a single bound?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4862. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:53:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c700a13_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34474

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020217131040.23121.00000024@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3C6E540B.C018AC04@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >You simply met the
> >requirements in order to gain privileges just like people
> >are doing today and will do in the future.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've let
> the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the future
> of the ARS in jeopardy.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If ya wanna know the truth, in my opinion the future of the ARS is *always*
in jeopardy. If it ain't one thing, it's another. And, it doesn't take
more, less, highly qualified, meagerly qualified, or anything else to make
it that way. It takes each passing year, and newer and newer technologies.

Kim W5TIT

4863. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:54:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C700A93.F69B0C2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34472

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Personal preference has in ice cream or anything else has
> nothing to do with it.

Of course it does. Do you deny that it is your personal
preference that all HF hams be forced to learn Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4864. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 19:59:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C700BBD.94FF100E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34475

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C6E540B.C018AC04@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >You simply met the
> >requirements in order to gain privileges just like people
> >are doing today and will do in the future.
>
> Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've let
> the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the future
> of the ARS in jeopardy.

Since the future is unknown, you are at liberty to shout, "The sky will
fall, the sky will fall", to your heart's content. But don't expect
anyone except a few knuckle-draggers to believe you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4865. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 20:01:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C700C08.247F78EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34476

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me
> to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here
> first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude.

Hmmmmm, that attitude sounds exactly like the PCTA folk.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4866. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 22:10:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217171021.16502.00000148@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34477

In article <a4oq2b$7qd$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Question:
>>
>> Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
>> tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
>> to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.
>
>Interesting question. I don't recall what my VE handbook
>sez about such a request. Regardless, there is NO global
>expectation of any one language being used.
>
I'm just talking about the test language. AFAIK, there is no provision
to accomodate non-English speakers, but that may have changed.

If so, a US ham license pretty muchrequires the ability to use English.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4867. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 22:19:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217171915.19008.00001495@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34478

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Why should the TRUTH be "offputting?"

If I had believed for a minute that your version of the "TRVTH" was what Amateur Radio was all about, I would never have become a ham. Fortunately, I met a nice old ham who was willing to lend a helping hand instead of trying to give me a slap in the face.

>You have no right to criticize
>Dick for speaking the truth, considering the damage done to the ARS
>by the dumbing-process presided over by the ARRL.

And by what means did you remove my right to speak as I please, Larry?

>why don't you try to understand the point of
>view of those of us

If, as the following suggests, your point of view is that anyone believes that full operating privileges shoudl be given to any passerby with a fleeing interest, you are right; I will never understand how you could arrive at such a twisted view of your unique version of reality. I know of no one who believes that.

What I understand even less is why you feel the need to be so mean in the expression of your views. If you really believed Amateur Radio had become what you claim it has become, you would leave it. The fact that you stick around suggests to me that you do so just as a good excuse to rail on people.

>who disagree with the notion that we can save
>Amateur Radio by giving away full operating privileges to any
>passerby who may have a fleeting interest?

You are among the few I have seen propose that, Larry. What does that tell us?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4868. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 23:35:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4pert$9fa$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34479

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217171021.16502.00000148@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <a4oq2b$7qd$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Question:
> >>
> >> Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
> >> tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
> >> to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.
> >
> >Interesting question. I don't recall what my VE handbook
> >sez about such a request. Regardless, there is NO global
> >expectation of any one language being used.
> >
> I'm just talking about the test language. AFAIK, there is no provision
> to accomodate non-English speakers, but that may have changed.
>
> If so, a US ham license pretty muchrequires the ability to use English.

But to the original "concept"...the Russians
wanted the code test because (I guess) many
Russians only had code capability. Nothing,
however, mandates anyone speak or know
Russian.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4869. NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-17 23:56:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217185635.03325.00001088@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34480

Isnt this cute:

2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary goal of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an amateur license.

You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad word and we will throw you out.

4870. NCI Funds

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 00:01:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217190155.03325.00001090@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34481

The Executive Director, charged as he is in ARTICLE VI, herein, with maintaining the day to day operations and finances of the organization, shall be empowered to expend funds directly from the NCI treasury for such ongoing and normal expenses as postage, office supplies used for NCI business, web site hosting costs, etc. Any expenditure of this nature in excess of Two Hundred and Fifty US Dollars ($250.00) shall be pre-approved by a majority of the Board of Directors and all expenditures shall be reported monthly to the Board of Directors as a whole, along with copies of bank statements showing such transactions and the ending balance in the NCI treasury account.

I wonder if these funds are being reported to the IRS. Also are they Tax Exempt?

4871. NCIs only7 interested in CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 00:07:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217190743.03325.00001092@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34482

Now isnt this interesting:

In addition, NCI may choose to publicly comment on matters where Morse code policy directly or indirectly influences amateur radio policies. Examples of topics on which NCI may make comment are licensing structures, band plans and spectrum issues, and especially where operating privileges of no-code amateur licensees are affected

Didnt someone say they would not making comments on Band Plans ?

4872. A Small History of Telegraphic Glory and Despair, Part 1

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 00:59:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217195901.18406.00001522@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 34484

In article <20020217091133.19482.00000092@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <a4ml1u$rt1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>> I think the Russian federation's
>>> statement is pretty much in line with what I think about keeping a code
>>> requirement.
>>
>>How come the Russianns don't expect everyone to
>>be conversant in Russian? Latin American countries
>>in Spanish? Its the same concept.
>
>Question:
>
>Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
>tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
>to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.

The above is a classic case of MISDIRECTION in a subject thread,
attempting to steer a thread away from its direction into a pre-
arranged thread of the challenger's own choosing. What is tragic
here is that this "historian expert" on ham radio has previously
"neglected" some full information on the history of communications,
especially that of morse code. What follows is a more complete
communications history, albeit short, but devoid of spin that favors
a historian's favorite mode.

Visual communications "networks" had existed for at least two
centuries prior to the various electrical telegraphy experiments of
the first half of the 1800s. These networks, primarily in France
and Great Britain, required manned "stations" and signalled by
letter-number representative symbols, flags, or torches. While
these were slow and prone to mistakes in transmission, they
were much faster than horse courier modes. An itinerant portrait
painter named Morse received backing from an heir to a railway
equipment family business (Alfred Vail) and developed an
electrical system requiring only a switch or "key" controlling a
battery current flow to a remote electro-magnet-driven ink pen,
later an electro-magnet-driven acoustical "sounder." The original
Morse code was a set of on-off "keyings" in a pattern that
represented a letter, number, word, or some pre-chosen phrases.
The "code" itself was primitive, sufficient to allow "operators" to
note the on-off indications and "receive" them at slow speed,

then transfer them to written paper form. Backer Vail is said to have proposed an alternate code form having two on-times and forming on-off patterns of "dots" and "dashes" to indicate just letters, numerals, or punctuation. This latter form of "code" is slightly faster to use but takes much practice to be proficient at any speed. This primitive system was limited by battery technology, not-yet-developed wire manufacture of that time and had an average range of 20 miles.

The Morse-Vail Telegraphic Relay Apparatus patent of 1840 secured the system commercially in that the "relay" of the patent was essentially an unmanned repeater that could extend a single telegraph circuit to an average of 100 miles without increasing the number of telegraphers beyond one at each terminus. At the time this was an extraordinary technical feat and economically viable as a communications medium. By 1855 many countries had taken up the Morse-Vail telegraph system, built hundreds of miles of circuit pairs, and also developed a number of variations on the original "morse code," always representing one character in their languages by a specific arrythmic on-off pattern.

It should be noted here that "morse code" is not "universal" nor is it necessarily optimum (it has never been quantifiable studied or compared to other methods). What is now called "international morse code" is simply an on-off pattern representation of characters in the English alphabetic-based language. The total of the world's population having alphabet-based languages is a minority; the majority use syllabic or ideographic languages having many more such than the 26 to about 38 letters of the various "western" alphabetic languages. "International morse code" is simply a standardization to one variant of "morse codes" among the several hundred such "morse codes" in the world. The majority of telegraphers had to learn at least part of a second "language" if their primary national language was not in the minority of "western" alphabetic languages.

What is usually lacking in the amateur radio communications histories is that ALL of the "morse codes" indeed ALL of the on-off codings were imperfect and error-prone due to at least two human operators on each circuit. This was made worse when the relatively slow telegraphic throughput (average of about 10 WPM all factors considered) and data security needs (primarily commerce and trading) forced messagers into using "commercial codes." These code books evolved 5-character groups that represented long words, phrases, whole sentences and some quantities. [the "5-letter plus a space" grouping comes from this] Bentley's Commercial Codes ran to over a dozen editions over a quarter century, used less for security reasons (it wasn't) and more for reducing time of messaging.

While a commercial code secured some privacy from telegraphers overtly or inadvertently "eavesdropping" message content, it required an extraordinary proficiency to maintain absolute accuracy. A mistake of one letter or number in a code group could result in a gross error, usually with some economic problems to the messager. None of the "morse codes" have any built-in error detection or correction. The only way to assure accuracy is to "back-send" a message to the originator, have that end check the copy and report of any error. That drops the message throughput rate by at least half, usually a third of the original time if any error did occur. There were several litigations in civil courts of the US during the latter half of the 1800s involving transmission mistakes. As telegrams were used more and more, the communications providers had to find a better method in order to stay in business and out of the courts.

The answer was the teleprinter, a blend of the already-in-use manual typewriter of the 1890s and the telegraph. The tele-printer had been in development since the middle of the 1800s, lagging the manual telegraph due to complexity and state-of-the-machine-arts of the time. The teleprinter offered enormous advantages to communications providers. The primary one was that an exact copy was available at both ends of a circuit; no "translation" was necessary at either end. Speed was an advantage in that early teleprinters met and exceeded the throughput of the best manual telegraphers with less error. An obvious advantage was that it could be operated by "ordinary" clerical help or anyone familiar with the standard keyboards of that time, no specialists required. The punched paper tape (1904 or before, Teletype Corporation) reader and distributor enabled immediate back-sending or re-transmission of the same message if originally on p-tape. Finally, the teleprinter could operate 24/7 between maintenance periods, did not need weekends off or time to sleep or lunch or dinner, never caught a cold or had a headache. It was semi-automatic in that a message could be transmitted and received without any human present at the receiving end.

The communications carriers and governments went for the teleprinter in written communications en masse, hindered only by a few stubborn officials who insisted that everything keep on working in the old, "proven" way. The militaries saw immediate advantages into adapting on-line or off-line encryption to tele-printers. The "stock ticker" (an early model teleprinter) appeared in every stockbroker's office and telegrams began being sent by the "ticker" style of printing on paper tape (then glued on small paper forms).

By the end of the 1800s the skills of the manual telegrapher were becoming unwanted. The "downsizing" of telegraphers began as communications carriers shifted over to the tele-

printers, limited only by new equipment availability and capital equipment budgets. Teleprinters could use the same wire circuits as manual telegraphy. The physical infrastructure was in-place. Laid-off or dismissed telegraphers were angry, bitter that their valued skills were no longer needed. Some became destitute if they did not know another, useful craft. They could no longer brag and demonstrate a specialized skill or feel "important"...they were replaced with a damned machine!

There was an answer just around the corner, proven by several curious genius academics and an entreprenuerial Italian-English lad named Guglielmo Marconi and an experimenting Russian scientist named Aleksandr Popov. The year was 1896. Marconi sent the first radio signals 2 1/2 kilometers near Bologna, Italy, while Popov sent the first message 300 meters in St. Petersburg, Russia (the message was "Heinrich Hertz" the German scientist's name who had observed the first radio wave propagation in his laboratory in Karlsruhe, Germany, in 1887).

RADIO was born only 106 years ago. It was a God-send to the displaced telegrapher.

(continued in part 2)

4873. A Small History of Telegraphic Glory and Despair, Part 2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 00:59:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217195904.18406.00001523@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 34483

(continued from Part 1)

While primitive radio was born in 1896, some growing-up had to be done. Marconi established radio communications between England and France in 1899. It took another two years before the famous 1901 "DX" demonstration between Poldhu, Cornwall, England, across the Atlantic to St. John's, Newfoundland. Marconi had gotten his "S" across the pond.

Two genius Englishmen, Michael Faraday and James Clerk Maxwell had already established the physics and mathematics of electromagnetic wave propagation in the period 1831 to 1864 without using the crude spark gap transmitter Hertz used in Karlsruhe in 1887. Scientist Hertz was a "VHF pioneer" by the descriptions of his experimental transmitting-receiving dipoles. Workable hardware had appeared and it could be demonstrated!

The maritime world was very interested. Where ships had been limited only to visible communications paths (semaphore, light blinkers) the "magic" of radio waves could cut through fog and clouds and bend over the distant horizon to shore stations and other ships. This was truly a mystical mode, old salts and landlubbers alike exclaiming on the "magic" and "romance" of radio. Mariners had little communications with the world before and now they had everything!

A problem was of radio technology. It was PRIMITIVE. Receivers were simply tuned diode detectors. Transmitters used brute-force arc-discharge energy sources ("spark") or specialized high-speed expensive motor-generators ("alternators"). The spark transmitter and "galena crystal" receivers could barely work reliably over the visible horizon. There was only ONE method of carrying any communications over early radio...turning the transmitter on and off in a known pattern. Landline telegraphy used the same mode.

No problem. Out-of-work or about to be out-of-work telegraphers were given short courses in radio operating (longer than seemed necessary since nothing seemed to be standardized yet). They could use their (mostly) unwanted telegraphic skills immediately! The maritime world embraced these "magicians" as God-sends, dubbed them "sparkies" for the audible, sometimes flashing spark transmitters. A "radio room" became standard on ships, a place of mystery and excitement as they pulled messages out of thin air and heard other, unseen ships in distress. Legends were born and tall tales grew in the tradition of the sea. Hero status was awarded the sparkies by the press as they helped save lives in sea

disasters. They could do no wrong. They were quickly made a regular part of a ship's crew for their importance. Legends of expertise were firmly established. Never mind that they used primitive equipment in a primitive manner, they were new and exciting to a majority of humans never having been to sea.

Seemingly forgotten in the glory and heroism of the first two decades of the last century was the everyday communications on land. The invention of the vacuum tube was a quantum leap in electronics technology. True long-distance voice communications could exist on land. The principles of "sideband" were discovered and formulated for landline telephony, the basis for frequency-multiplexing up to four separate voice circuits on a single pair of wires. Up to four tele-printers could now exist on a single voice circuit. Teleprinters became the standard medium for written messaging. Communications carriers did their work 24/7, quietly, without fanfare. The carrier companies pioneered HF communications, adapting their landline carrier equipment to radio for intercontinental communications. The megaton-equivalent explosive growth of electronic-radio technology of the first half of the last century left lay people bewildered...too much for common understanding. As radio grew, a quiet box of hot tubes was foreign, alien, a thing from an unknown universe. A lay person could "under-stand" a buzzing, arcing spark transmitter...it showed evidence of "working" in sensory terms. Lay persons could hear broadcasts and accepted them quickly because the sounds from receiver speakers were familiar. They understood those sounds just as they understood the telephone sounds as familiar or common-language voices. The quiet "black boxes" had no dramatics, devoid of sensory clues except for heat.

By the mid-point of the last century, the legends surrounding morse-manship were firmly established. The mass media entertainment business used the arrythmic morse sounds to emphasize "radio" operation in motion pictures and that newcomer, television. Never mind that such things were used primarily for artistic, nor realistic effect, lay people had associated morse code with radio. Retiring morsemen took their old skills to the hobby of amateur radio and also took their legends and old work ethics with them. The radio world was changing rapidly again in the post-WW2 technology boom even before the semiconductor era beginning about 1960. Retiring morsemen were lagging behind in radio skills as they promoted their old skills and attributes over the mysterious "new" technology in radio. They emphasized morse skill because that was what they could do easily. Not many adapted to new ways.

By the beginning of the semiconductor era the radio world now had television, transcontinental radio relay (hundreds of voice circuits per link) by microwave, the first of the communications satellites, most public safety mobile radios above 30 MHz, private land mobile radios in use by small businesses, private UHF to microwave range fixed radio relay, the first direct-dial-

long-distance telephony beyond domestic boundaries, civil air communications standardized on English worldwide (a result of who won WW2, not that English is the most effective voice language), radiotelephony on cruise ships, voice radio for private boat owners, and a small radio service known as "CB." The teleprinters could run reliably at either 60 WPM or the new 100 WPM rate on landline or radio circuits...and did. Domestic long-distance telephony was commonplace and users could not detect that such circuits were on land or over radio. None of these communications required morse code skills in any way. Radio amateurs were required to know morse code to achieve a license, a permission to transmit on radio.

Twenty years later, by about 1980, intercontinental color television was an established fact, the first of the personal computers had been on the market for a few years, inter-continental direct-dial telephony was an accepted service, so many communications satellites were up and working that equatorial "parking places" had to be worked out. Information Theory had made great strides, now being able to send data at 2400 BPS over voice grade lines. That rate would jump 40-fold in less than a decade. Telephone service from air carriers in flight was begun. The US military began planning the "digital battlefield" of the future with the success of NAVSTAR and such systems as TacFire; their communications had already phased out manual morse methods and frequencies were primarily on VHF and above. The US Army had deployed Troposcatter communications units for radio relay as well as older mulit-channel frequency- and time-multiplexed relay. Citizens Band radio had peaked, now expanding into other countries, sales aided everywhere by low-cost Asian manu-facturing. A new service called "cellular telephony" had begun subscriber trial in urban areas. Amateur radio licenses still required demonstrated morse code proficiency, still touted as a "vital, essential" skill.

By the year 2000 anyone with $1500 could buy a personal computer that had MORE computing speed, MORE mass-storage capability (on tape, disk, CD, or hard disk) on a small desktop than a room-filling IBM 370 mainframe of 1975. Cellular telephony was established with over 40 million subscribers in the USA, cell sites in remote areas, making it possible to direct-dial to any other subscriber in the world. The public Internet was now 8 years old and it was possible to link intercontinentally at a few keystrokes from a residence or office. Modems were now running at 56 KBPS on 3 KHz bandwidth telephone lines. The maritime world had abandoned the old 500 KHz distress-and-safety frequency in favor of GMDSS, ship radio equipment already migrating to voice and data modes earlier. Private boat radios are now on FM over VHF and SSB on HF. Private

Land Mobile Radio Service and private sea and air licensees outnumber total US radio amateur licenses issued. Amateur radio ready-built equipment has precise "VFO-like" frequency control (including "split" frequency capability) as commonplace plus DSP and a number of data modes in ready-to-go peripheral equipment. Digital selection of frequency and function is a common feature of consumer radios, including SW BC portables. The Family Radio Service began in the USA using low-cost ($40/pair in 2002) handheld, palm-sized transceivers with digitized voice; one would save a group of climbers on Mt. Ranier in 2001. The Gulf War is ten years in the past and modern military communications involving voice, data, and imagery has proven itself in a combat zone never once resorting to any morse code modes for any purpose except passive ELINT by MI detachments. Six years earlier FEMA had debuted their transportable sat terminals and used them as "visible bulletin boards" for survivors of the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. The "talking head" portable suitcase-sized journalist's satellite terminal for slow-scan imagery and voice is on the market. Worldwide subscribership for cellular telephony is predicted to number 300 million by 2004. Wireless LANs have proliferated, Ultra-wideband radio makes its debut with FCC beginning studies on how to regulate it, Harris unveils the first Software Defineable Radio for militrary environments. The US military's SINCGARS family begins its 11th operational year as the standard land force small-unit radio, a selectable FHSS type with COMSEC capability. The changeover from analog to digital television broadcasting begins in the USA, promising better video and less TVI from any source (proven in testing). Direct-to-subscriber satellite broadcasting readied, to begin in late 2001 (it does). While an amateur radio license without a code test has existed for ten years, those license classes are restructed to over-30-MHz amateur bands. Amateur licenses having below-30-MHz privileges still require a code test, still touted as a "vital, necessary" skill in radio, to "demonstrate committment and understanding" (only required to old morsemen).

Some old morsemen are forever stuck in a radio time warp of the 1930s while the rest of the radio world has gone far past them, ignoring their old skills that are no longer needed. Even if they were born in the 1950s they demand adherence to standards existing 20 years before they were born.

4874. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:04:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C719741.26E1D6FB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34485

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Repeating what you said just repeats your trolling bullshit,Cecil. You proved
> > nothing. But what else have we come to expect from you? Troll, troll, troll your
> > boat.
>
> I can tell you haven't even read the mathematical proof, Dick.

BS. You can "prove" anything you wish "mathematically" and for
a fact you'll use any trick you can dream up in your endless trolling.
A math instructor once "proved" that by "proving" mathematically
that he was as old as his grandfather.

4875. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:40:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34486

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as
> a VE
> > > are an accomplisment, don't you?
> >
> > Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and something
> about
> > their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
> > in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you and
> > I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
>
> If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of the herd,
> then I'll take that as a compliment

Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest instead of
on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.

4876. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:48:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71A188.143C8DC7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34487

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C712C7E.385696EF@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his
> program
> > > won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
> >
> > I have no opinion on his undescribed work. If you have that's your
> > affair.
>
> No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts back
> when you mis-read Cecil's question.

Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.

4877. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:49:57 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C705DB6.BAC06DFC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34488

Hi Cecil,
I used to work slow codes on the novice bands (mainly
40m)to help the new novices. I have worked several first
time over the air contacts. It was a kick.

I would not think of working "data" (translate: any mode
that interferes with CW that is not phone) on top of new
novices trying to get their feet wet on the air, or for that
matter, any slow code operators looking for a slow code
contact.

Of course, that is soon all gone. :-(Let me know if you
want a sked.

73,
Clay N4AOX

CAM wrote:
>
> Clay N4AOX wrote:
> > 1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of
> > the novice bands, thus
> > fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda
> > supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").
>
> Clay, do you operate CW or digital on the Novice frequencies?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4878. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:53:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C705E81.BE45710A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34489

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Repeating what you said just repeats your trolling bullshit,Cecil. You proved
> > > nothing. But what else have we come to expect from you? Troll, troll, troll your
> > > boat.
> >
> > I can tell you haven't even read the mathematical proof, Dick.
>
> BS. You can "prove" anything you wish "mathematically" and for
> a fact you'll use any trick you can dream up in your endless trolling.
> A math instructor once "proved" that by "proving" mathematically
> that he was as old as his grandfather.

Let me make it so simple that you can understand it, Dick. Is the
following logically true or false?

"Cars are black."

"All" is clearly implied so this is logically a false statement.
To make the statement true requires a qualifier.

"Some cars are black" is a true statement.

Applying our knowledge of logical truth to the CW statement:

CW often gets through when the other popular modes fail
to do so.

This is a logically true statement depending upon your definition
of "often". Your previous statements completely omitted the case
where CW doesn't get through.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4879. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 01:55:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C705F07.AF2DD170@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34490

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What it means is that a bunch
> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest instead of
> on the air enjoying ham radio.

Do they have a right to do so, Dick, or did God put you in charge of
telling them what they can and cannot do with their lives?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4880. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:02:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7060B7.50FB9E93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34491

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts back
> > when you mis-read Cecil's question.
>
> Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.

See, Dick does indeed have an opinion. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4881. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:08:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C706204.B258AF3C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34495

Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> Hi Cecil,
> I used to work slow codes on the novice bands (mainly
> 40m)to help the new novices. I have worked several first
> time over the air contacts. It was a kick.
>
> I would not think of working "data" (translate: any mode
> that interferes with CW that is not phone) on top of new
> novices trying to get their feet wet on the air, or for that
> matter, any slow code operators looking for a slow code
> contact.
>
> Of course, that is soon all gone. :-(Let me know if you
> want a sked.

Just wanted to point out that virtually nobody uses those Novice
frequencies anymore. While tuning around there, I hear a CW signal
maybe every 20 minutes usually calling CQ with no response.

I've got a new IC-756pro and am monitoring 7058 right now. If
someone sends CQ, CQ, de _______ FISTS, is he she looking for
FISTS members or will he/she come back to a non-member?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4882. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:10:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71A68F.2D444E94@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34492

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> > Actually, Cecil, I think that he has you on this one. His statement, "CW gets
> > through when other modes do not" does not necessarily imply always.
>
> It indeed does logically imply always. When other modes get through and
> when other modes do not get through is logically always. In other words,
> there doesn't exist any other time than when other modes get through or
> other modes don't get through.
>
> Let T1 be the time when other modes get through. Let T2 be the time when
> other modes do not get through. T1+T2 = all the time. There doesn't exist
> any time besides T1+T2. Therefore, CW always gets through. That's a false
> statement.

What a crock. Why don't you just set up a math "proof" that
you're as old as your grandfather, like that math teacher?

4883. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:10:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C706299.47C219AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34496

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Actually, Cecil, I think that he has you on this one. His statement, "CW gets
> > > through when other modes do not" does not necessarily imply always.
> >
> > It indeed does logically imply always. When other modes get through and
> > when other modes do not get through is logically always. In other words,
> > there doesn't exist any other time than when other modes get through or
> > other modes don't get through.
> >
> > Let T1 be the time when other modes get through. Let T2 be the time when
> > other modes do not get through. T1+T2 = all the time. There doesn't exist
> > any time besides T1+T2. Therefore, CW always gets through. That's a false
> > statement.
>
> What a crock. Why don't you just set up a math "proof" that
> you're as old as your grandfather, like that math teacher?

I can see that you don't listen to reason.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4884. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:10:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020217211037.07935.00001083@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 34493

In article <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
<jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>says...
>
>> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>
>However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
>folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.

Joshua,

There are none so blind as those who will not see. Sometimes Kim won't
even look ;-)
>
>> How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of the
>> ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.
>
>You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
>policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
>people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
>makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.

Bingo. There is no "loyalty oath" attached to ARRL membership. Indeed,
ARRL members can "steer" the process by electing directors who
support their views - even if those views are currently 100% opposed
to current ARRL policy.
>
>> Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in
>the
>> untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
>> unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
>> legislation.
>
>Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
>that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
>that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
>comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
>code testing, he is lying.

Or maybe just mistaken.

Point is, if an organization says it has one and only one purpose, and then
gets
involved in things that have nothing to do with that purpose, something isn't

quite kosher.
>
>What's really not kosher? When NCI does the above then encourages members
>to harass someone for making a comment for that same petition. That's
>scurrilous, shameful, and very indicative of their mindset.

Which petition are you talking about?
>
>> No, I think your overreaction is clear.
>
>Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
>think that the facts do speak for themselves.

Only to those who can see them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4885. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:11:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7062C6.D9066333@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34497

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> > >
> > > Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
> > > through when other modes will not, the statement is true.
> >
> > Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding.
>
> Given your 50 years as a licensed ham, your ignorance of HF CW
> operations is astounding.

So you think this statement is true? "Cars are black."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4886. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:11:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71A6E9.AA446CD4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34494

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> >
> > Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
> > through when other modes will not, the statement is true.
>
> Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding.

Given your 50 years as a licensed ham, your ignorance of HF CW
operations is astounding.

4887. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:13:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70634C.59B4FE68@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34498

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> Isnt this cute:
>
> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary goal
> of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an amateur
> license.
>
> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad word
> and we will throw you out.

What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4888. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:19:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71A8DC.91EB81EF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34499

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > While you and
> >I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
> >the rules required to gain the top level of licensing these two
> >geniuses couldn't cut the mustard.
>
> Speak for yourself. The exams I took were nowhere near the hardest ever in ham
> radio.

???What prompted that outburst? The exams I took shortly after
the beginning of Incentive Licensing were certainly tough enough
that one could not pass them without knowing a considerable amount
about the subject matter. I did. I didn't mess a question, as
evidenced by the fact the the FCC official grading the answer sheet
did not make a single move to check an incorrect answer.
That didn't help the "Test protesters" who sat it out for another 30
years till the Grate Dumdown.

> And I would like to think that the accomplishments I have had after I
> have my license exceeded the accomplishment of passing the test.
>

Boolah-boolah for you, and the rest of us who can also say that.
Sorry for all the lifelong whyners who can't.

>
> Cecil and Carl have both done just what you and I did -- met the requirements
> in place at the time they were issued their licenses.

Yep- after 30+ years of grousing about them before the Grate Dumdown.

> Those requirements have
> been through a lot of changes over the years.

Indeed they have.

4889. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:21:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71A943.779BD769@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34500

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure leaves you plenty of trolling room tho, doesn't it? The VE
> > testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the extra exam
> > and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
> > Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.
>
> If you rested on your laurels after obtaining your Extra ticket,
> you weren't a good VE.

For every situation, a "plausable" answer. Troll extraordinaire.

4890. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:29:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71AB13.9AF384A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34401

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > > >Give him a break, Carl. That is the only thing he ever accomplished. :-)
> > >
> > > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent as a VE
> > > are an accomplisment, don't you?
> >
> > Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, ...
>
> How can you possibly accomplish anything while resting on your laurels?
> Answer: You can't. You either rested on your laurels or accomplished
> something useful. It is impossible to do both.

So I, knowing that I would never again need to take a ham radio
exam, couldn't rest easy in that knowledge while doing constructive
things within ham radio. We got it.
Of course, you're the fella who
also says that "logically" CW won't get through when other modes
can't.

4891. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 02:38:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71AD43.79126C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34402

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> > have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> > ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
>
> You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
> to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU". It *is* definitely amazing.
> Carl, can you leap tall buildings at a single bound?

Still having reading problems Cecil??? I said HE thinks that.

4892. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:04:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71B339.27847F1E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34403

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > But CW does fade to unusability which proves your statement wrong.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. As long as there is a definite period of time when CW will get
> > > > through when other modes will not, the statement is true.
> > >
> > > Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding.
> >
> > Given your 50 years as a licensed ham, your ignorance of HF CW
> > operations is astounding.
>
> So you think this statement is true? "Cars are black."

I KNOW that you're a crap-loaded troll.

4893. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:13:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4prk4caj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34404

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent
as
> > a VE
> > > > are an accomplisment, don't you?
> > >
> > > Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and something
> > about
> > > their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
> > > in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you and
> > > I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
> >
> > If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of the
herd,
> > then I'll take that as a compliment
>
> Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest
instead of
> on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
> that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.

"a bunch of arrogant characters?"

Just who might some of them be?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4894. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:24:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ptcf$141$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34411

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71A8DC.91EB81EF@worldnet.att.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > While you and
> > >I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
> > >the rules required to gain the top level of licensing these two
> > >geniuses couldn't cut the mustard.
> >
> > Speak for yourself. The exams I took were nowhere near the hardest ever
in ham
> > radio.
>
> ???What prompted that outburst? The exams I took shortly after
> the beginning of Incentive Licensing were certainly tough enough
> that one could not pass them without knowing a considerable amount
> about the subject matter. I did.

The General test I took about 1959 (highest written test needed
for any additional privileges) only took some routine reviewing
and memorization from this, then teenager.

> I didn't mess a question, as
> evidenced by the fact the the FCC official grading the answer sheet
> did not make a single move to check an incorrect answer.

Who cares. You passed the test. I passed the
test. The grade means nothing. Did you get more
privileges than someone that missed the maximum
allowed while still passing?

> That didn't help the "Test protesters" who sat it out for another 30
> years till the Grate Dumdown.

Huh? Last I checked, the ham license states NOTHING
about your test score. The license as issued shows only
that you passed the same as anyone else.

> > And I would like to think that the accomplishments I have had after I
> > have my license exceeded the accomplishment of passing the test.
>
> Boolah-boolah for you, and the rest of us who can also say that.
> Sorry for all the lifelong whyners who can't.

The relationship you suggest makes no sense.

> > Cecil and Carl have both done just what you and I did -- met the
requirements
> > in place at the time they were issued their licenses.
>
> Yep- after 30+ years of grousing about them before the Grate Dumdown.

I guess that really bothers you.

> > Those requirements have
> > been through a lot of changes over the years.
>
> Indeed they have.

Agree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4895. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:28:03 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7x_b8.8395$BR3.453980@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34405

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4prk4$caj$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick
spent
> as
> > > a VE
> > > > > are an accomplisment, don't you?
> > > >
> > > > Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and
something
> > > about
> > > > their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
> > > > in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you
and
> > > > I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
> > >
> > > If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of
the
> herd,
> > > then I'll take that as a compliment
> >
> > Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
> > of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> > to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest
> instead of
> > on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
> > that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.
>
> "a bunch of arrogant characters?"
>
> Just who might some of them be?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
```

I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the facts on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.

4896. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:29:51 UTC
From: cdn <dnorris@k7no.com>
Message-ID: <p5t07u8gjcs13bgidsc9gumdjmc4f3laab@4ax.com>
Source record: 34406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 16 Feb 2002 22:52:07 +0000, Walt Davidson
<walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote:

>On Sat, 16 Feb 2002 21:34:31 GMT, k4yn@america.net (RJ) wrote:
>
>>Hams have died trying to get to the Spratleys.
>
>Other vacationers have died jet-ski-ing.
>Does that make them national heroes?
>
>73 de G3NYY

I don't believe anyone is trying to make them 'national heroes',
however to trivialize their deaths is rather poor taste.

JMNSHO

unkadean

4897. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:29:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4ptcg$141$2@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34412

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71A188.143C8DC7@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C712C7E.385696EF@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his
> > program
> > > > won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
> > >
> > > I have no opinion on his undescribed work. If you have that's your
> > > affair.
> >
> > No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts
back
> > when you mis-read Cecil's question.
>
> Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.

True to form...once again, Dick's own words do more
to discredit himself than anyone else.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4898. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:33:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7075F4.15FED6A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34407

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So I, knowing that I would never again need to take a ham radio
> exam, couldn't rest easy in that knowledge while doing constructive
> things within ham radio. We got it.

If you rested on your laurels, you didn't do anything constructive
for ham radio. If you did something constructive for ham radio,
you didn't (by definition) rest on your laurels. It is impossible
to do both things.

> Of course, you're the fella who
> also says that "logically" CW won't get through when other modes
> can't.

Nope, I say, "Sometimes CW doesn't get through." You say, CW gets
through at all times, both when the other modes are getting through
and also when the other modes are not getting through. So which one
of us is telling the truth? Do you really think, "Cars are black"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4899. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:35:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70768A.3C5BBBDE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34408

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So you think this statement is true? "Cars are black."
>
> I KNOW that you're a crap-loaded troll.

Your CW statement is equivalent to saying, "Cars are black."
I guess when you refuse to answer a question, all you can do
is call others nasty names. Tsk, tsk, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4900. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:36:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7076BA.92153985@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34409

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> > > have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> > > ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
> >
> > You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
> > to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU". It *is* definitely amazing.
> > Carl, can you leap tall buildings at a single bound?
>
> Still having reading problems Cecil??? I said HE thinks that.

Sounds like you agree with him.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4901. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:44:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71BCAA.5854E939@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34410

CAM wrote:

> This is a logically true statement depending upon your definition
> of "often". Your previous statements completely omitted the case
> where CW doesn't get through.

So nothing that is said on rrap can ever be logically correct unless it included all possible cases and covers all situations leaving no room for any part of it to be implied or assumed on the basis that ham radio operators are the readers. And surely engineers should never be assumed to have knowledge of such factors. We see.

I could dig into the archives and scroll out plenty of times when you made such assumptions, but I'm sure that won't be necessary. We all know how it is. And your supporters will be your supporters whatever the situation. Those inclined to support your longterm ingrained trolling will just overlook whatever you do and make every effort to hold me to every dotted i and crossed t, just as you try to co. Sorry I'm so uncooperative, but hey, stuff happens. Even to you.

4902. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 03:56:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4pu4lqqv1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34413

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71AD43.79126C4@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> > > have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> > > ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
> >
> > You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
> > to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU". It *is* definitely amazing.
> > Carl, can you leap tall buildings at a single bound?
>
> Still having reading problems Cecil??? I said HE thinks that.

So now Dick can read people's minds.
Sorry Dick, none of us in NCI have any
such illusions of being able to dictate to
anyone. What we recognized from day one
was that there was a specific process to
be learned, to be followed and we would
do that. We also made our own efforts to
garner support from those that agreed with us.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4903. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 04:07:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C71C22E.7C3539F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34414

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C71AD43.79126C4@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
> > > > have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
> > > > ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
> > >
> > > You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
> > > to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU". It *is* definitely amazing.
> > > Carl, can you leap tall buildings at a single bound?
> >
> > Still having reading problems Cecil??? I said HE thinks that.
>
> So now Dick can read people's minds.

Don't *need* to read NCI minds, we can read their writings.

4904. Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 04:08:25 UTC
From: Birdman67 <Birdman67@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <87%b8.6471$Q9.1865982@twister.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 34415

I am a tech-plus. I might try building a qrp CW rig. I plan on upgrading
to general. Is the FCC planning to have the novice hf privileges removed
from the tech+ hams to make only three lic classes(tech, general, extra)?
Thanks for your help
Dave kb9iig

4905. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 05:11:36 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4q2ai01s5c@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34417

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217185635.03325.00001088@mb-ch.aol.com...
> Isnt this cute:
>
> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary
goal
> of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
amateur
> license.
>
> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad
word
> and we will throw you out.

Source?

4906. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 05:19:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C708ECE.D63D9DF9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 34416

Birdman67 wrote:

> I am a tech-plus. I might try building a qrp CW rig. I plan on upgrading
> to general. Is the FCC planning to have the novice hf privileges removed
> from the tech+ hams to make only three lic classes(tech, general, extra)?

Don't think so. But if you upgrade, you'll have access to
those HF freqs no matter what the FCC does with the tech +
privs. While you're upgrading, try for the extra. Doesn't
cost any extra(!) and maybe you'd get it.

Look here for practice tests:
http://www.qrz.com/ham/index.html
http://www.hamtest.com/
http://www.wvara.org/wvexam/
http://www.aa9pw.com/

4907. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 05:20:29 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4q2q301tbk@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34418

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net...

> Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest
instead of
> on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
> that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.

So someone has to agree with your views in order to be a valuable asset to
ham radio? How nice.

4908. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 05:33:45 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4q3iv01uru@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34419

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71A188.143C8DC7@worldnet.att.net...

> > No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts
back
> > when you mis-read Cecil's question.
>
> Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.

Your posts speak for themselves - all of them.

4909. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 05:40:08 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4q3uv01vfi@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34420

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C700BBD.94FF100E@IEEE.org...
> > Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've let
> > the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the future
> > of the ARS in jeopardy.
>
> Since the future is unknown, you are at liberty to shout, "The sky will
> fall, the sky will fall", to your heart's content. But don't expect
> anyone except a few knuckle-draggers to believe you.

Maybe Larry should go for a guest spot on Art Bell's radio show and do his
Chicken Little routine.

4910. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 08:05:33 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16da455adf3e9d0d989684@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34421

In article <a4p0va$e8f$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...

> The post above offers nothing to substantiate your
> claim that: "NCI ...then encourages
> members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
> making a comment for that same petition."

Certainly does. Why did NCI pick out W3XO? There were certainly dozens of others who commented on RM-9673 without NCI putting out a news bulliten on it. And why is someone making a comment to the FCC in any way newsworthy? There were hundreds of comments about RM-10352 - none of which were singled out on NCI's website. Why this particular person in this particular instance?

> Where is there any statements that show NCI is encouraging
> anyone to do anything regarding the post above?

Did Carl intend for people to read that and just go "eh"? He specifically singled out one person with comments to provoke NCI's membership.

Should we ask W3XO if he was harassed for making his comment to the FCC?

joshua houk
kd7pos

4911. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 10:30:24 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AE6DEAC81577BBCE.782F1D537692D1B2.ED22E980EDAC27AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 34422

On Sun, 17 Feb 2002 15:47:07 GMT, "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>> That is a puzzler
>> .. -.-. .- - .--. . .- -.. -.-. -.. . -- ..- -.-. ...
>> .- --.. -- --- . . .. - .... . .--.
>> N3KIP 20 wpm Extra and 100% phone operator
>>
>
>Maybe it's the my reader displays the spacing but .. - makes no
>sense..here it is
>
>I C A T P E A D CD E M UCO AZ M OE I T H E P

Oh good...I was about to put off taking the code test for another
month after trying to read that.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4912. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 11:11:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218061129.22158.00001048@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34423

In article <3C6D3917.2FF509B2@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>160 meters was what I mainly had in mind.

OK. Acess to 160 was very limited for many years because of the LORAN
system that used those freqs. It was started during WW2 and lasted many years.

In return for the loss of 160 and the top 50 kHz of 20 (used to be 14,000 to
14,400) we got 15 meters (450 kHz).

Of course several years elapsed between when the band was allocated (1947)
and when hams were allowed to use it.

>For US ARS I
>believe there are still restrictions on VHF and UHF
>frequencies use along parts of the Canadian Border for
>security purposes. Of course in the 40's, VHF and UHF were
>not as cherished by the ARS as they are today.

I think those restrictions are much newer than WW2.

Also the wind shear radar limitations on 70 cm and the quiet zone
around the radio astronomy area.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX
>
>
>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C6C7750.70E7F905@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
>> <wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>
>> >Many of your current members are too young to remember that
>> >Part 97 was entirely suspended during WWII, and some of it
>> >was long time coming back.
>>
>> Besides 160 meters, what part was a long time coming back, Clay?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

4913. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:04:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218070416.13815.00000579@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34424

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>It indeed does logically imply always.

Cecil makes mistakes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4914. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:05:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218070535.13815.00000580@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34425

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me
>> to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here
>> first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude.

>Hmmmmm, that attitude sounds exactly like the PCTA folk.

Must be another one of those do as I say, not as I do sort of things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4915. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:07:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218070730.13815.00000581@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34426

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> I've got a better idea, Ed -- instead of making outrageously inane and
>> offensive suggestions,

>"offensive"... aren't we a bit sensitive.

Larry apparently believes that "offense" should come from him, but never be
directed towards him. It must be another one of those double standard things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4916. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:09:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218070944.13815.00000582@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34427

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>> Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
>> have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
>> ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?

>The ARRL has been dictating their version of what amateur radio should be
>for years, but that's ok because they're the ARRL. Right?

The only dictatorship found in Amateur Radio is in the language of the FCC rules. The ARRL does not have the power to dictate to anyone. Nor should it, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4917. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:10:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218071030.22158.00001049@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34428

In article <20020217141649.18913.00001868@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Actually, Cecil, I think that he has you on this one. His statement, "CW
>gets
>through when other modes do not" does not necessarily imply always. If I say
>"it happens," that is not the same as "it always happens." If it happens
>sometimes, it happens.
>
"If it happens, it must be possible."

73 de Jim, N2EY

4918. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:12:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218071219.13815.00000583@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34429

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
>to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU".

I think "dictate" was chosen specifically to strengthen an otherwise weak
argument. It would not have sounded nearly so onerous had he told the truth
and said that Carl
"suggests to the ARRL, FCC, IARU and ITU."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4919. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:15:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218071549.13815.00000584@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34430

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> After all, you did not say where on earth it would be high noon when the
>>QSO was done.

>From Dick's QTH, of course.

Dick could have a CW QSO on 160 meters with a station in Europe when it was
high noon at his QTH.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4920. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:21:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218072106.13815.00000586@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34431

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding. Let
>me make it even simpler. Here are two statements which, I presume,
>you believe to be true.

>1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
>2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.

This is flawed because it presumes that no other combinations can exist.

1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get througn.
3. CW doesn't get through when SSB doesn't get through.
4. CW doesn't get through when SSB gets through.

All are possible under different circumstances and none of them imply "always."

1. Cecil makes mistakes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4921. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:28:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218072859.13815.00000587@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34432

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Clay N4AOX wrote:

>> 1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of
>> the novice bands, thus
>> fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda
>> supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").

>Clay, do you operate CW or digital on the Novice frequencies?

The question was not necessary, Cecil; he told us that he believes that band segment is a dead carcass.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4922. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 12:29:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218072958.13815.00000588@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34433

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>"If it happens, it must be possible."

Yes, but not all things that are possible happen. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4923. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:16:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70FE93.792B31F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34434

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > This is a logically true statement depending upon your definition
> > of "often". Your previous statements completely omitted the case
> > where CW doesn't get through.
>
> So nothing that is said on rrap can ever be logically correct unless
> it included all possible cases and covers all situations leaving no
> room for any part of it to be implied or assumed on the basis that
> ham radio operators are the readers.

There you go again, taking everything to the rail. The addition of
one word to your CW statement makes it true instead of false. Why
on earth would you refuse to add that simple word? You refuse to
discuss the simple statement, "cars are black", which illustrates
exactly what is logically wrong with your CW statement. The fact
that you refuse to add the word, "often", to your statement about
CW is a clue to your supernatural feelings concerning CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4924. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:18:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C70FF35.C3917FD1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34435

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >It indeed does logically imply always.
>
> Cecil makes mistakes.

Now, there's a true statement. Ed, do you think,
"cars are black", is a true statement?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4925. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:23:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C710062.A4C413EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34436

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding. Let
> >me make it even simpler. Here are two statements which, I presume,
> >you believe to be true.
>
> >1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
> >2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.
>
> This is flawed because it presumes that no other combinations can exist.

Exactly, Ed, that is exactly what is wrong with Dick's statement. It
presumes that no other combination can exist. The addition of the
qualifier word, "often" or "sometimes", would indicate that other
conditions can exist. My argument is based on the accepted rules
of mathematical logic.

Do you think, "cars are black", is a true statement? It's not. It
needs a qualifier like, "some", to make it logically true. I can
dig out the rules of logic that apply if you would like.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4926. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:27:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C710126.80E2036B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34437

Bill Sohl wrote:
> So now Dick can read people's minds. Sorry Dick, none of us in NCI have any
> such illusions of being able to dictate to anyone. What we recognized from day one
> was that there was a specific process to be learned, to be followed and we would
> do that. We also made our own efforts to garner support from those that agreed with us.

While you were garnering support, Dick was calling everyone obscene names.
That sure helped his side, didn't it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4927. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:30:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7101E2.4EFEA314@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34438

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> >> 1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of
> >> the novice bands, thus
> >> fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda
> >> supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").
>
> >Clay, do you operate CW or digital on the Novice frequencies?
>
> The question was not necessary, Cecil; he told us that he believes that band
> segment is a dead carcass.

Just trying to figure out whose fault that is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4928. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 13:55:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <AJ7c8.805$eI1.218033@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 34439

> Let's try some other things...
> How does Golf continue to gain new players?
> How does the antique car hobby keep attracting new enthusiasts?
> How does the local volunteer Red Cross, First Aid Squad,
> Vol. Fire Dept., keep getting new members?
> ...the list goes on and on.

Speaking as a Firefighter, the requirements keep going up every year as to the amounts and levels of training necessary. Fortunately most all of the training we recieve is directly related to our jobs. As to why fire departments keep getting new people? Hopefully for the same reason I joined the fire service, to serve my community. Along with the fact that it is one of the most exciting careers out there! :)

Ryan

4929. Re: A Small History of Telegraphic Glory and Despair, Part 2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:01:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218090105.11718.00000646@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34440

>Subject: A Small History of Telegraphic Glory and Despair, Part 2
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/2002 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020217195904.18406.00001523@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Some old morsemen are forever stuck in a radio time warp of
>the 1930s while the rest of the radio world has gone far past
>them, ignoring their old skills that are no longer needed. Even
>if they were born in the 1950s they demand adherence to
>standards existing 20 years before they were born.

But WHEREVER they may be "stuck", if they are, they are licensed and you
are not.

So who's the fool?

4930. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:10:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C710B58.43523DFD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34442

W1RFI wrote:
> 1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
> 2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get througn.
> 3. CW doesn't get through when SSB doesn't get through.
> 4. CW doesn't get through when SSB gets through.
>
> All are possible under different circumstances and none of them imply "always."

Yes, Ed, they all imply, "always", and statements 1 and 4 contradict each other. Statements 2 and 3 contradict each other. In order for any of those statements to be valid, a qualifier, such as "often" or "sometimes" must be used. From logic/probability, one must mind one's p's and q's. If you add the qualifier "sometimes" to all of those statements, they will all be valid.

There are times when CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.

That's a true statement because it implies that there exist times when CW doesn't get through.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4931. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:12:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218091251.02067.00001486@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 34441

In article <a4ostk02opv@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C7126CE.213A2B33@worldnet.att.net...
>
>> Yeah, Josh, it's been clear for a LONG time. Stevenson, NCI Inc et al
>> have decided that their version of ham radio will be dictated to
>> ARRL, FCC, even IARU and ITU! Isn't it amazing?
>
>The ARRL has been dictating their version of what amateur radio should be
>for years, but that's ok because they're the ARRL. Right?
>
Wrong. ARRL's leadership have expressed their views on the subject, nothing
more. That leadership is elected by the members, btw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4932. When Will Leonard H. Anderson Ever Stop Lying?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:18:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218091859.13794.00000658@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34443

Dear Leonard,

Enclosed is a copy of a recent post in which you assert that you were "rejected" for membership in NCI.

I had forgotten this particular item until an interested third party brought it up to me, but Carl had SPECIFICALLY solicited your membership IN THIS FORUM. He's a board member. I assume he has the authority to grant your membership.

Also, I know of other "unlicensed" persons who joined.

You really DO enjoy being made a fool of, don't you?

Keep it up, Anderson. Your date with the maker can't be far off. If I were you, I'd be doubling down on good deeds right now.

Lying in a public forum ain't heping things!

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 2/16/2002 6:18 PM Central Standard Time
Message-id: <20020216191831.10450.00002315@mb-bk.aol.com>

Joshua, I'm NOT a member of NCI nor of the ARRL and my license is commercial, not non-commercial (amateur). *I* am not in favor of OOK CW for either use or testing requirements. NCI rejected me for membership despite actually operating (legally) HF transmitters 49 years ago...and having since operated on more parts of the EM spectrum than are allocated to amateurs, with more different modes than are allocated to US amateurs..

4933. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:36:19 UTC
From: Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
Message-ID: <3C711162.BF609E36@umich.edu>
Source record: 34444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

cdn wrote:
>
> I don't believe anyone is trying to make them 'national heroes',
> however to trivialize their deaths is rather poor taste.

I assure you I am not trivializing their deaths. I am upset whenever
I hear of decent people losing their lives in an undeserving way.

What I *am* trivializing are the comments about how "hams have died
trying to activate X". The original discussion (a tangent from the
eQSL subject) was whether DXpeditioners lose money due to eQSL's; i.e.
whether they deserve monetary compensation for their efforts. I, for
one, typically send $5 to a DXpedition group when I request a QSL.
I appreciate what they do, and want to help out. That a few DXers
have died on an expedition does not make DXpeditions more noble, nor
does it make them more deserving of cash. It's simply an unfortunate
occurence, like an ice fisherman who falls through the ice or a skier
who hits a tree.

Bob, KI8AB

4934. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:43:52 UTC
From: Robert Lyons <boblyons@umich.edu>
Message-ID: <3C711328.D98AA429@umich.edu>
Source record: 34445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> "Robert Lyons" <boblyons@umich.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C6D1687.665A4FA2@umich.edu...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > ... Hams
> > > have DIED trying to give us a New One.
> > >
> > >
> > Lessee - I'm envisioning the moments before the landing sortie ...
> > >
> > "I may die in this attempt, boys, but you know what this means to
> > our friends back home. I may not come back, but I gotta go activate
> > Mellish Reef! For Freedom and DXers everywhere!!"
> > >
> > >
> > You 'spose they really think like that? My, what heros these DXers are!
> > >
> > Bob, KI8AB
>
> Bob meet Leonard H Anderson Len meet Bob. The two of you should be shut
> in a dark room and beat each other. I thought Len topped the cake when he
> trivialized the 911 events, but Bob you take a close 2nd.

My sincere apologies if my posting was taken as insensitive or as trivializing an unfortunate event. Please see my posting of a few minutes ago for what I intended to convey. My apologies to friends of DXpeditioners lost in their pursuit of their avocation.

Bob, KI8AB

4935. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:56:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218095642.18959.00001549@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34446

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary
>> goal of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
>> amateur license.

>> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad
>>word and we will throw you out.

>What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?

What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against Amateur Radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4936. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 14:59:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218095927.18959.00001550@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34447

Dick Carroll wrote:

>> What it means is that a bunch
>> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
>> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest instead
>of
>> on the air enjoying ham radio.

Cecil,

Did you enjoy ham radio before your upgrade?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4937. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 15:00:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218100049.18959.00001551@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34448

From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the facts
>on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally
>prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.

I prefer to be in an area where no one is pissing at all. Sane adults don't
piss into or out of tents.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4938. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 15:02:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218100235.18959.00001552@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34449

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Speak for yourself. The exams I took were nowhere near the hardest ever in
>ham
>> radio.

> ???What prompted that outburst?

Outburst? Man, you ARE losing touch with reality a bit there, Dick.

Let's talk when you are feeling better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4939. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 15:32:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218103249.10857.00000943@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34450

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/18/2002 9:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020218100049.18959.00001551@mb-mk.aol.com>

>
>I prefer to be in an area where no one is pissing at all. Sane adults don't
>piss into or out of tents.

February, 1984...NE Pennsylvania...3AM...in the mountains...

Yep...Inside aiming out is DEFINATELY better!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4940. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 15:45:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218104531.04761.00001708@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 34351

>What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against
>Amateur
>Radio?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Truthfully, ARRL would do nothing, and you would still be a Member

4941. W4AMP Puss Gut Lying Asshole!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 15:56:13 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218105613.12106.00000714@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 34352

dimmy o'brainless is on the sauce once again.....or, did he neer get off of it??

Riley is going to bust your fat ass dimmy..keep it up!

Remember what he did to that lying asshole TR for transmitting information about other amateur operators?

Well, history is getting ready to repeat itself.

Get help holding onto your ass, cause it's too damn big for just you.

Imagine that, dimmy, puss gut lying asshole!

bye bye dimmy.....

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

4942. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:10:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218111058.06756.00000148@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 34353

In article <87%b8.6471$Q9.1865982@twister.kc.rr.com>, "Birdman67"
<Birdman67@wi.rr.com> writes:

>I am a tech-plus. I might try building a qrp CW rig. I plan on upgrading
>to general.

GREAT! Go for it! In fact, try for Extra.

>Is the FCC planning to have the novice hf privileges removed
>from the tech+ hams to make only three lic classes(tech, general, extra)?
>Thanks for your help

Not at the moment. There is no proposal or plan to do so. The basic idea is
"nobody loses any privileges".

Good luck in the exams!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4943. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:10:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218111058.06756.00000149@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 34354

In article <3C70634C.59B4FE68@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>WA8ULX wrote:
>>
>> Isnt this cute:
>>
>> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary
>goal
>> of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
>amateur
>> license.
>>
>> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad
>word
>> and we will throw you out.

That rule makes perfect sense, though.

The organization claims to exist for a single purpose. Suppose a member starts to behave in a way exactly opposite to that single purpose. It is only logical for the organization to "accept the resignation" of the member who does so.

By putting that rule in the by-laws, the organization serves notice up-front as to what they consider acceptable behavior. They avoid a lot of confusion and argument. If ya don't like it, don't join. Simple.
>
>What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?

Nothing. The organization is about promoting and preserving the mode. People can "hate" something yet still be interested in its preservation.

Why would a person who "hates" CW become a member of FISTS, anyway?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4944. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:29:26 UTC
From: paul friedman <pfriedman8426@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <GZ9c8.2326$Or3.403044@typhoon.mn.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 34355

Dave:

The recommendation from the ARRL to the FCC would expand the HF CW privileges for Tech+ and Novice license holders (10m phone would remain unchanged).

Paul AB0SI

"Birdman67" <Birdman67@wi.rr.com> wrote in message news:87%b8.6471$Q9.1865982@twister.kc.rr.com...
> I am a tech-plus. I might try building a qrp CW rig. I plan on upgrading
> to general. Is the FCC planning to have the novice hf privileges removed
> from the tech+ hams to make only three lic classes(tech, general, extra)?
> Thanks for your help
> Dave kb9iig
>
>

4945. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:49:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7274AA.53E1976F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34356

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >You must think Carl Stevenson is Superman to be able to "dictate
> >to the ARRL, FCC, IARU, and ITU".
>
> I think "dictate" was chosen specifically to strengthen an otherwise weak
> argument.

Not for a moment. If Carl's diction doesn't read as dictatorial to
you you need to borrow Cecil's dictionary.

> It would not have sounded nearly so onerous had he told the truth
> and said that Carl
> "suggests to the ARRL, FCC, IARU and ITU."
>

YMMV, of course, but just because it doesn't have its intended
effect does nothing to change its dictatorial intent.

4946. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:55:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727608.72E06902@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34357

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> >> 1. The buzzards are circling to pick at the dead carcass of
> >> the novice bands, thus
> >> fulfilling the final steps of the NCT agenda
> >> supporters.(P.61 "Novice Band Refarming Plan").
>
> >Clay, do you operate CW or digital on the Novice frequencies?
>
> The question was not necessary, Cecil; he told us that he believes that band
> segment is a dead carcass.

Few of Cecil's questions are necessary. Most are not even cogently
applicible.

4947. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 16:56:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727668.9DCA1EC6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34358

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >"If it happens, it must be possible."
>
> Yes, but not all things that are possible happen. :-)

Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
at *some*
times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
use it.

4948. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:01:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727781.E2036798@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34359

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > This is a logically true statement depending upon your definition
> > > of "often". Your previous statements completely omitted the case
> > > where CW doesn't get through.
> >
> > So nothing that is said on rrap can ever be logically correct unless
> > it included all possible cases and covers all situations leaving no
> > room for any part of it to be implied or assumed on the basis that
> > ham radio operators are the readers.
>
> There you go again, taking everything to the rail.

YOU accuse ME of taking everything to the rail???? Can you say
Pot meet Kettle?

> The addition of
> one word to your CW statement makes it true instead of false. Why
> on earth would you refuse to add that simple word? You refuse to
> discuss the simple statement, "cars are black", which illustrates
> exactly what is logically wrong with your CW statement.

Hey, as Ed said, "it happens". Not always, but it happens. Sorry
your trollish nature can't understand that simple fact.

4949. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:03:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7277E5.2615F71E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34360

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >It indeed does logically imply always.
> >
> > Cecil makes mistakes.
>
> Now, there's a true statement. Ed, do you think,
> "cars are black", is a true statement?

Does the statement "it happens" mean "it ALWAYS
happens"?
Every child knows that isn't true. Too bad you
don't.

4950. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:07:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7278E1.94DAFA7A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34361

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >Your ignorance of logic and the English language is astounding. Let
> > >me make it even simpler. Here are two statements which, I presume,
> > >you believe to be true.
> >
> > >1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
> > >2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.
> >
> > This is flawed because it presumes that no other combinations can exist.
>
> Exactly, Ed, that is exactly what is wrong with Dick's statement. It
> presumes that no other combination can exist. The addition of the
> qualifier word, "often" or "sometimes", would indicate that other
> conditions can exist. My argument is based on the accepted rules
> of mathematical logic.
>
> Do you think, "cars are black", is a true statement? It's not. It
> needs a qualifier like, "some", to make it logically true. I can
> dig out the rules of logic that apply if you would like.

Cecil, what you're doing is demonstrating clearly your ability, no
penchant, to be able to "take either side of a debate and win",as you
once said you did in high school.
You leave no doubt that you could support MY side of the
"arguement" just as well if it suited you to do so.

4951. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:07:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218120751.07935.00001088@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 34362

In article <3C6F01B3.83A11C4A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >If one is writing code from scratch, it is new and unique and can be
>> >copyrighted.
>>
>> Only if it is sufficiently different from existing code.
>
>If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
>be new and unique.

By that logic, every ham radio project I've ever built is new and unique.

> Every piece of software at Intel is copyrighted.

But not patented. Almost anyhting can be copyrighted.
>
>> >You have misunderstood the concept. A new chip is a new design.
>>
>> By your own definitions, that's not true unless it involves a new
>technology.
>
>Nope, most new chips are logically different from the older designs. A
>chip *designer* designs the new layout.

In other words, he rearranges standard logic blocks. If that's "design", then
W0EX
is an RF system designer.
>
>> A nice little integration of two pieces of manufactured gear. There is a
>> commercially available "tune mode adapter" for the IC-706, btw, but I don't
>> think it's specifically for the HS-1600.
>
>I suspect all screwdrivers operate essentially the same way.

Therefore it's not unique, or new.

> My design
>does what I want it to do.

Is it a "design" if it's not new or unique?

> The commercially available designs do not
>do what I want done.

That you have not found them does not mean they do not exist.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Amateur Radio Designer/Builder/Tester

Southgate Radio

4952. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:08:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727943.4E971EA3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34363

CAM wrote:

>
> While you were garnering support, Dick was calling everyone obscene names.

Everyone? Hardly, only the obscene.

4953. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:19:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727BB5.C777A66D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34364

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary
> >> goal of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
> >> amateur license.
>
> >> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad
> >>word and we will throw you out.
>
> >What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?
>
> What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against Amateur
> Radio?

Pretty simple in both cases, really. Both organizations would most
likely ignore him and let him rant. After all, they both have the dues
he paid in support of their organizations belying his rants..

4954. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 17:34:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C727F2E.7A4A5DA1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34365

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> > 1. CW gets through when SSB gets through.
> > 2. CW gets through when SSB doesn't get througn.
> > 3. CW doesn't get through when SSB doesn't get through.
> > 4. CW doesn't get through when SSB gets through.
> >
> > All are possible under different circumstances and none of them imply "always."
>
> Yes, Ed, they all imply, "always", and statements 1 and 4 contradict each
> other. Statements 2 and 3 contradict each other. In order for any of those
> statements to be valid, a qualifier, such as "often" or "sometimes" must be
> used. From logic/probability, one must mind one's p's and q's. If you add
> the qualifier "sometimes" to all of those statements, they will all be valid.
>
> There are times when CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.
>
> That's a true statement because it implies that there exist times
> when CW doesn't get through.

And all of that clearly shows the fallacy of attempting to use pure logic in
circumstances where statements depend on the context in
which they are used. The application of pure logic excludes all
previous knowledge which in the case of "CW gets through when other modes cannot" is
a sequentiallty occuring statement, dependant on those prior facts. As in "it
happensBy your application of pure logic,
it happens, all the time, whatever it is! Silly to the max! and not even
logical.
But you already knew that, of course, and your application
of logic was pure Trollism, as per your usual.

4955. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:21:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714620.44C0C49E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34366

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> What it means is that a bunch
> >> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> >> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest instead
> >>of on the air enjoying ham radio.
>
> Cecil, Did you enjoy ham radio before your upgrade?

Sure did. I enjoyed being a Novice before I upgraded to Conditional.
I enjoyed being a Conditional/General before I upgraded to Advanced.
I enjoyed being an Advanced before I upgraded to Extra. Fact is, I
have not used any of my Extra privileges so far and in spite of that
fact, Dick still rags on me for not upgrading sooner. The strange
thing is that I first upgraded long before he did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4956. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:22:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C71465E.5A57B5F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34367

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
> >I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the facts
> >on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally
> >prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.
>
> I prefer to be in an area where no one is pissing at all.

Is that why you retired from this newsgroup for awhile? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4957. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:31:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714898.FB0830AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34368

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
> >be new and unique.
>
> By that logic, every ham radio project I've ever built is new and unique.

Which means you didn't copy someone else's design.

> In other words, he rearranges standard logic blocks. If that's "design", then
> W0EX is an RF system designer.

Rearranging standard logic blocks is logic design, Jim. If I copy a relay
driver circuit that uses a 2N2222 and substitute a 2N3904, I have not done
any design. Dick won't say what he did so I have no way of knowing whether
he designed anything or not. I assume he copied circuits designed by others.
He did not deny doing so or explain what he really did. A man who refuses to
defend himself is usually guilty.

> >I suspect all screwdrivers operate essentially the same way.
>
> Therefore it's not unique, or new.

If you know of another design that automatically puts the IC-706 into tune
mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged, I would like to know about it.
I have never heard of it being done before by one relay and one resistor.

> That you have not found them does not mean they do not exist.

Well, that's true and is the reason that patent lawyers do patent searches.
Do you know of any two-component systems that automatically key the IC-706
into tune mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged? I would really
appreciate knowing about it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4958. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:39:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714A47.8B10DBB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34369

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > >
> > > >It indeed does logically imply always.
> > >
> > > Cecil makes mistakes.
> >
> > Now, there's a true statement. Ed, do you think,
> > "cars are black", is a true statement?
>
> Does the statement "it happens" mean "it ALWAYS
> happens"?

"It happens" is near meaningless unless you define what
"it" is. "CW gets through!" clearly implies always.
If you don't believe it, crack open a logic textbook.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4959. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:41:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714ACA.85107355@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34370

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Yes, but not all things that are possible happen. :-)
>
> Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
> at *some* times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
> use it.

Then I suggest you join FISTS and spread the word which is
part of their charter.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4960. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:42:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714B1D.469A6392@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34371

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil, what you're doing is demonstrating clearly your ability, no
> penchant, to be able to "take either side of a debate and win",as you
> once said you did in high school.
> You leave no doubt that you could support MY side of the
> "arguement" just as well if it suited you to do so.

Nope, I could not do that in good conscience, Dick. "CW gets through!"
implies always. If you don't believe it, crack open a logic textbook.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4961. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:44:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714B98.96D39E56@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34372

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And all of that clearly shows the fallacy of attempting to use pure logic in
> circumstances where statements depend on the context in
> which they are used.

That doesn't excuse you from spreading falsehoods that newcomers might
be duped into believing are true.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4962. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:46:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714BF1.78DAFB38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34373

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?
>
> What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against Amateur
> Radio?

I don't know. Has the ARRL ever kicked out a member?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4963. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 18:47:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C714C32.6EE793FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34374

N2EY wrote:
> Why would a person who "hates" CW become a member of FISTS, anyway?

To see if they would kick him out?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4964. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 19:27:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218142753.11869.00000010@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 34375

In article <20020217102620.22644.00000479@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>NCI rejected me for membership despite actually operating (legally) HF
>>transmitters 49 years ago..
>
>On what basis? Do they have a requirement that members be licensed hams?

I haven't checked...what are their requirements, Ed?

>If it would console you, you can be an ARRL member.

That does no consolation. ARRL "membership" is NON-VOTING if a member has no amateur license. The only reason to be a non-voting member in any organization is ego boost. It gains nothing else, has no assurances that any "director" (that I didn't and could not vote for) will listen to comments/suggestions.

Ed, please avoid trying to pull wool over sheep's eyes. Hans Brakob tried that same ploy a year ago. I am not sheep and you are not a salesman, nor are you good at misdirection of a thread.

I've been a voting member of the ACM courtesy of my IEEE voting membership, got an actual t-shirt free for that (true). Would I get a free t-shirt for joining the ARRL as a NON-VOTING member? I can be a voting member of the Radio Club of America for a small, very small fee. The RCA was begun well before St.Hiram organized the ARRL. The RCA (not, never a part of the former RCA Corporation) is interested in ALL radio, not the subset of radio enjoyed by amateur hobbyists.

For some slight misdirection, allow me to mention another hobbyist organization, the Academy of Model Aeronautics. Founded in 1936, it now has 170 thousand members (about the same as the ARRL), has its own Headquarters staff (like the ARRL), its own Hq building complex (like the ARRL), publishes its own membership magazine (like QST) which must compete for advertising revenue with other model magazines not affiliated with any clubs, has just completed a museum (like the ARRL's). Instead of an antenna farm, it has a much larger flying area adjacent to its midwest headquarters. The AMA is allied with foreign model organizations (but doesn't have web pages on their Internet site like the ARRL does for the IARU). The AMA

maintains a set of competitive contest rules, comprehensive and covering all aspects of model flying and some surface model competition. Like the ARRL the AMA encourages and monitors safety, much more conscious of the impact of model flying on the public (active campaigns, visibility) than the ARRL, gets slightly more media exposure than the ARRL (the recent AMA Convention in Pasadena, CA, got more LA TIMES column inches and NBC-CBS-ABC news video than the Glendale, CA, amateur emergency organization activity. Enthusiast-hobbyist-activists of modeling are active enough, volunteer enough, to be able to secure public recreational locations of rather large size (Sepulveda Dam Recreational Area in the San Fernando Valley here in a relatively dense urban area). There are hobbyist-activists who are into lobbying government(s) in various parts of the nation to secure flying areas. You can find out more by accessing www.modelaircraft.org

What does that have to do with radio? Model flying has evolved in its majority to radio control. Part 95 of Title 47 CFR has a specific section on telecommand or "R/C" with many allocated frequencies solely for telecommand. Model flying includes all phases from free-flight (my first activity, no R/C on free-flight permitted in 1947-1951) to "park flying" (occassional fun flying) to aerobatics (single or multiple aircraft) to U-control combat to high-tech model helicopters (R/C, some able to fly and hover inverted...have to see them to believe them). I was an AMA voting member in post-WW2 times (AMA 19700) and a "professional hobbyist" working part-time at Testor's while in high school (in their model shop) before Testor's got into the plastic model part of the hobby industry. I helped develop the gang-sawing of balsa (a technique stolen by Sig, a competitor in balsa suppies located in Montezuma, IA) at Testor's. I have some experience in the post-WW2 hobby industry.

Modeling is no longer limited by balsa sticks and tissue paper but has embraced all manner of construction materials and techniques. Modelers exist who prize balsa-silkspan structures much as boatanchor hams want radios that glow in the dark. That's a skill-required technique needing much patience and sense of workmanship. It is no less skilled to use fiberglass, plastic sheet covering and foam-plastic-core wing and tail structures. Some radio amateurs refuse to get involved with "modern" semiconductors or any non-vacuum-tube technology.

I'd say that modern aeronautics and real aircraft have advanced since the end of WW2. While aeronautical engineering has concentrated on supersonic flight, it has also advanced general aviation for private fun flying, competitive aerobatics, ultralight, hang-gliding going as far as the first man-powered aircraft ("Gossamer Albatross") to the notable Rutan-Yeager round-the-world flight without landing. Aeronautics has advanced in

several quantum leaps in almost the same period that radio and electronics has advanced (first manned heavier-than-air flight in 1903, Marconi getting his "S" across the pond in 1901).

AMA has about 170 thousand members. ARRL has about 170 thousand members. Both are organized, have permanent Hq, have publications, have activists and volunteers, have foreign organization ties, are subject to government regulations (both FCC and FAA), lobby the government for their "causes," are concerned about public relations (although AMA does more by public evidence), members of both have served in the US military and some dying for their country while in service. Both have museums and welcome visitors at their respective Headquarters and seek to preserve their respective history and lore and whatnot.

The outstanding difference between the two organizations is that the AMA doesn't go into self-patronizing flag-waving of how "good and important they are for the country and national defense-safety" nor do they go off on fantasy island dreaming of preserving old traditions and practices "for advancement of the state of the art" or to make their hobby "a start of life-long learning, service, and dedication" nor do they continually promote their hobby as such a "service" as a craft-guild-union with appropriate class distinctions, titles, labels, credentials so as to make all newcomers feel as lowly on the multi-tiered totem-pole of "excellence" and "worthiness" to their "community." The AMA simply goes into the fun and recreation of their hobby, concentrates on that, works for that, only gets "authoritative" on being the ruling body and arbiter of competitions. That works. The AMA has enjoyed 66 years of existance, wasn't shut down during any war. Model hobbyists can demonstrate their skills and abilities in front of everyone, hobbyists or non-hobbyists alike without needing tall tales, certificates, or wearing any flags except a channel indicator on their R/C antennas.

I am fully qualified (perhaps overly so compared to present company) to design, build, test, and operate a radio in nearly all US radio services; I'm not _authorized_ to transmit on amateur band frequencies that are primary to amateurs.
I am fully qualified though slightly out of practice to design, build, test, and fly a model aircraft under 55 pounds in weight and, like all, subject to local FAA flying rules near airways and airports. I don't need to learn morse code to be evidenciary of a "vital necessity skill" mode for R/C model flying nor even take any federal tests for same...nor do I have to adopt a fraternal order mind-set that embraces gratuitous lodge-hall self-promotion as a lifestyle. Model aircraft flying is just fun, recreational all by itself. No pretenses, no camoflage, everything out in the open.

In all honesty, which membership do you think is the most
attractive to the public?

With all due regards,
a winner in the 1948 Plymouth Internationals, Detroit, MI

4965. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 20:11:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218151115.03457.00000023@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34377

In article <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes fail,"
>it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone included.

So even if Mode X is the most reliable, we should not rely upon Mode X more
than other modes? That's just not logical.

>For each and every circumstance in which phone won't work, packet won't
>work, 20M won't work, CW won't work, there is a likely circumstance that
>will take its place.

Nonsense. You must not understand much about reliability and availability, Kim.

>No mode should be "favored" over another for
>reliance--they all have their place.

Yes, they all have their place. But it is simply illogical to say that a more
reliable mode should not be relied upon more than a less reliable one.

Suppose:

Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.

If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
because it gets me where I want to go.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4966. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 20:11:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218151116.03457.00000024@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34378

In article <3c700630$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020217112737.23121.00000016@mb-ch.aol.com...
>> In article <3c6e7007$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >More importantly, it brings us back full circle to the main argument made
>> >way back in the beginning that everyone on the CW testing side just
>> >absolutely said was not true. The reason they want CW to remain a
>testing
>> >phase is to keep the riff-raff filter on.

If true, is that a bad thing?

>> Kim:
>>
>> Sez who? I think no part of the license testing regimen has any
>> possibility of keeping out potentially bad operators. Witness the
>> fact that most of the NAL's issued in recent years have gone to
>> 20-WPM code-tested Amateur Extra-class licensees. Some of
>> the sloppiest CW operating I've ever witnessed on-the-air has been
>> inflicted on my by my fellow Extras.
>
>But, they didn't get the NAL for sloppy CW. . .did they?

Tells ya something, doesn't it? Hams USING Morse/CW on the air,
regardless of license class, don't seem to get many NALs, now do
they?

>> However, I'll still take that
>> over a life consigned to having the same old pointless QSO day-in
>> day-out on the local repeater with the rest of the codeless blunders.

>Larry, maybe those folks enjoy their conversations. Do you *have* to label
>them as blunders just because of the conversations they enjoy?

I enjoy their conversations, too. As long as they play by the rules, all are
welcome.

>> Code testing only achieves one purpose -- getting hams involved
>> in *using* the Morse code.

>It'd be tough to prove, but I wonder if I'd been more willing to continue to
>use CW if I hadn't had to study and learn for a test.

Would you have ever learned it without the test?

>> As in anything else, what they do once
>> they gain their operating privileges is going to vary from individual
>> to individual. I've never claimed that it was any kind of "lid filter,"
>> and I don't think anything else is, or could be. Lids are born,
>> not made.
>
>I still think lots and lots of people want the test there to use it as a
>filter.

If it works as one, is that a bad thing?

I think what REALLY irks some folks about the code test is its function
as an equalizer for MOST new hams. Except for a very few potential
hams who already know the code, it's a start-from-scratch learning
experience that cannot be done by reading a book now and then.
Age and experience in other radio activities don't help much. The
fabled Ph.D. in EE, the electronics tech, and almost all others are
suddenly given the same task as the pre-teenager who would be a
ham. Just from comments I've read here, that simple fact annoys
some folks no end.

In fact, that's probably what bothers many folks about the code,
test or no test. The grumpy "old-timer's" CV/resume means
nothing in a pileup.

> I say that someone who is an "undesirable" ham will go away after
>time.

All of us will "go away" after enough time. But the fact is that the
"undesirables" have become far more numerous and visible (audible?)
than in the past.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4967. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 20:11:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218151117.03457.00000025@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34376

In article <20020218070416.13815.00000579@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>It indeed does logically imply always.
>
>Cecil makes mistakes.
>
Slam. Dunk. Nuthin' but net.

Check and mate.

Game, set and match to Mr. Hare.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4968. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 21:14:26 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <smq27u8q6vn61bk06v7j5t2i5d6ppl8bl4@4ax.com>
Source record: 34379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 17 Feb 2002 20:29:51 -0700, cdn <dnorris@k7no.com> wrote:

>however to trivialize their deaths is rather poor taste.

I didn't know them, so to be honest they are trivial to me.

To quote KI8AB,
"That a few DXers have died on an expedition does not make DXpeditions
more noble, nor does it make them more deserving of cash. It's simply
an unfortunate occurence, like an ice fisherman who falls through the
ice or a skier who hits a tree."

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

4969. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 21:24:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218162442.22678.00000568@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34380

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
>at *some*
>times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
>use it.

Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4970. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 21:27:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218162710.22678.00000570@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34381

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Not for a moment. If Carl's diction doesn't read as dictatorial to
>you you need to borrow Cecil's dictionary.

How could it be dictatorial when it has absolutely no authority? You ignore
with impunity, something you could not do under a dictatorship.

> YMMV, of course, but just because it doesn't have its intended
>effect does nothing to change its dictatorial intent.

Carl has stated that he does not wish to be the Dictator of Amateur Radio.
Carl, is that still true?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4971. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 21:34:16 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0202181334.2884337b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34382

Your answer to number 1 actually answers what I was trying to say in
number 5 -- "Element credit locked in by a license is good forever."
The catch in number 5 is the 365-day expiration of the April 15, 2000,
et. seq., CSCE for Element 3. One needs the General to lock in the
Element 3 credit in order to take Extra after the 365-day period on
the CSCE.

BUT ... a big thanks for answering my "not sures." Good information.

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0202132123330.5401-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...
> On 12 Feb 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
> >1... for a period of time after April 15, 2000 [known as Black
> >Thursday by some] if you held a pre-Mar 21, 1987, Tech Plus, you could
> >gather the paperwork and have the VE certify that to the FCC,
> >resulting in a General. That license required Element 1 (5wpm) and
> >Element 3 (the current General). I thought that opportunity expired
> >with the 2001 rewrite of Element 3 -- but not sure?
>
> No, it hasn't. Element credit locked in by a license is good forever. For
> January, I think we had one of these to process. In December, my group had 3 -
> but we convinced one to try the Extra test and he passed that also.
>
--------SNIPPED-----
>
> >5... if you passed the 5wpm after Apr 15, 2000, and Element 3 within
> >365 days to earn General, I believe you may test for Extra based on
> >holding General, not on the Element 1 CSCE?
>
> No. One doesn't have to have the general class license in hand. Simply having
> the element credit for element 3 is sufficient to be tested for element 4.

4972. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 22:15:45 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a4rueh$189g$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 34383

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>>As to whether the commentary on the meeting or the meeting
>>minutes are more valuable, pick up a March QST and see for
>>yourself. The commentary does not show the near miss
>>proposal of "data in the phone bands".
>
>Data is not allowed in the phone/image bands. Digital voice is not allowed in
>the CW/data bands. The FCC rules are what prevail here.

I think the failed motion concerned petitioning the FCC to change
those rules. I'm at a loss to imagine the considerations which
led to the motion failing, though I guess one could find this out
by asking.

While on the topic, and I'll probably get in trouble with Phil Kane
again, don't the current FCC rules strike you as, well, weird? If
the bits you are sending in the phone bands are well-compressed voice
its okay, if they're well-compressed text it's not okay, if they're
well-compressed pictures it's okay, unless they're well-compressed
pictures of text in which case maybe it's not okay, if they're the
output of a pseudo-random number generator sent to test the error
characteristics or propagation delay of the link it's probably okay,
unless you've modified the output of the PRNG by exclusive-oring it
with some lower-speed message in which case it is "spread spectrum"
and not okay, even though the bits generated by any of these processes,
if well-done, will be virtually indistinguishable when put on the
communications channel (there's a theorem about this, but I forget
whose).

That the distinctions are drawn by trivial differences in how the
bits were generated, rather than the more fundamental properties of
the communications channel like occupied bandwidth and maybe symbol
rate and modulation characteristics, seems so utterly at odds with the
way digital technology is used in the real world that I'm having trouble
finding any logic in it, especially when the regulations are utterly
silent on digital voice and image coding and hence seem to allow anything.
That is, if you implement your high-compression voice codec by using voice
recognition software (IBM sells some that is good) to generate text
in real time, then compress and send the text, and then use audible
reading software to regenerate voice at the far end from the text then
you've got something legal to run in the phone bands, but if you generate
the same text by just typing real fast then you can only do it if you
change frequencies and fit in tigher bandwidth constraints? It's bizarre.

It is a good thing hardly anyone actually experiments with this stuff since the regulations for anything that isn't either exceedingly slow or a traditional analog mode are irrational.

Dennis Ferguson

4973. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 23:35:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218183506.11731.00000745@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34384

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Pretty simple in both cases, really. Both organizations would most
>likely ignore him and let him rant. After all, they both have the dues
>he paid in support of their organizations belying his rants..

NCI does not have dues.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

4974. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-18 23:38:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218183810.11731.00000750@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34385

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

> Of course, that is soon all gone. :-(Let me know if you
>want a sked.

What is all gone? Slow code? Hams can operate OOK CW at almost any speed they want. If ARRL's plan to refarm the Novice/Tech+ bands goes through, Novices and Tech+s will have spectrum elsewhere in the band.

If my old Novice buddy and I are going to have our 3704 reunion, we better do it soon, though. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4975. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:20:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192050.03287.00001432@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 34386

```
>NCI does not have dues.
>
>73,
>Ed, W1RFI

But they do want you to contribute.
```

4976. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192858.11635.00000114@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34387

In article <3C70634C.59B4FE68@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>What would FISTS do with a member who publicly asserted that he hates CW?

Nancy would meet him after school and beat him up... :-)

4977. Dictatorial Suppression from an SA Wannabe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192858.11635.00000113@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34392

In article <20020218091859.13794.00000658@mb-dd.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Enclosed is a copy of a recent post in which you assert that you were
>"rejected" for membership in NCI.
>
> I had forgotten this particular item until an interested third party
>brought it up to me, but Carl had SPECIFICALLY solicited your membership IN
>THIS FORUM. He's a board member. I assume he has the authority to grant
>your membership.

Ordinarily, I reject Robeson's messages and do not reply to those who have such a deep personal mental aberration that they must confront and attack any posting of another just for the sake of confrontation and attack.

An archive search way back before Robeson joined this chat room, NCI did solicit membership in a general invitation. Carl Stevenson was NOT the executive director at that time. Google will have the dates and times of postings. AT THAT TIME I applied for membership with NCI through their website. The first application went unanswered. A second application was made. That was also unanswered. All of those applications and direct correspondence with NCI are not on any public record or archive.

In a later public posting in this chat room, I mentioned this to Carl Stevenson. He informed me that NCI membership rules "had been changed" and that I was now (at that time) "eligible for member-ship." I answered that posting saying that I had no further desire to apply for any NCI membership but that I supported their position. Those messages are archived and were all public. See also a few messages of at least three years ago between Bill Sohl and myself discussing this matter in public. Those messages are public and archived.

None of that in any way was a negative on either NCI has an organization, its purposes, or the correspondents Anderson, Sohl, and Stevenson. The messaging was about the criteria for membership in NCI. Their original criteria rejected those applicants who did not possess an amateur radio license. That has been changed so that those not licensed in an amateur radio service may have membership.

Some time close to that time period was the ending of the Comment period on NPRM 98-143 (FCC date 15 January 1999). I had submitted a 14-page text Reply to Comments to a Comment

made by Michael Deignan. Due to press of other personal activity I was late but within the deadline, my document indicated as being in the FCC record on 13 January 1999, FCC notation made to indicate paper copies received in the requested quantities along with a 3 1/2" disk containing the test in WordPerfect format.

FCC public record shows that Robeson "replied" to my Reply to Comments on 25 January 1999, filed electronically ten days AFTER the deadline. In that brief one-paragraph "reply," Robeson made NO mention of ANY of the items that I addressed in 14 pages of single-spaced text. Robeson demanded that the FCC discount ALL of my submission because I did not have an amateur radio license. That is all on the public record. At that same time Robeson was making confrontational, accusatory, personal-attack statements in this newsgroup and not achieving his apparently-desired goal of subjugation of any or all who have or had viewpoints other than Robeson's. The timing of that was not coincidental or random, it was a deliberate attack by Robeson to limit my freedom of petitioning to my government as a citizen.

Two other "regulars" in this newsgroup (or chat room, it is difficult to tell sometimes) have since "commented" on my comments, specifically in pages 13, 14 of my text concerning a last item on suggestions for a minimum age. That was opened by Hans Brakob and, while confrontational and accusatory, Brakob never once stated, insinuated, or hinted that I be denied my freedom to petition my government on anything in government. Robeson, in a direct comment had done that very thing directly and has stated in a public message in here that I had "no right" to make any comment to my government based solely on Robeson's personal beliefs (or mental aberrations); that is also public in any newsgroup archive.

As part of my total submission to the FCC on 98-143, I included a cover letter, common practice in business correspondence, stating the contents of the envelope submitted for USPS delivery. In a lengthy and unneccessary series of newsgroup messages, Robeson insisted later that my Reply to Comments was "15 pages" instead of 14 due to the FCC recorder including that cover letter as part of my submitted document. Anyone who had downloaded that particular Reply to Comments could see the page numbers and count for themselves. Robeson insisted on being "right" no matter what the evidence, that I submitted "15 pages" and that I "lied" in the newsgroup. Clearly that indicated Robeson had no wish to discuss anything, just attack, fight, destroy another he did not like. His manner to some others in this newsgroup is consistent with that. No discussion on subjects, just attempts at subjugation through personal attack.

Robeson has continually used the word "lie" and "lying" as a pejorative. This is a curious thing considering that subjects in

threads can be easily supported on facts obtainable from
disinterested sources. However, Robeson uses them rather
clearly in a personal-attack mode against another. Those reasons
might be:
1. He was once caught lying in the past and this has left an
indelible spot on his psyche, correlated with some personal
shame. A method to erase that spot is to make others try to
feel as liars or do as psychologists call "transferrence," to role-
switch so that he is the accuser and the victim of accusation is
no longer him but someone he dislikes, to let them suffer so
that he does not have to endure more painful memories.
2. Beliefs and Truth have been fused in his own perception so that
anything against his personal Belief-set is therefore untrue. This
has been seen in others in this newsgroup. This seems popular
with ex-military types.
3. The control-freak cum bully mind-set. Domination of everything is
their control. They cannot fit into an environment so they seek to
change an environment to something they can handle by any
means possible. Such cannot compromise, cannot accept any
condition but their own. It is a total thing, accept theirs or die.
4. Frustration at failing to achieve certain things in life, anything from
education to occupation to avocation to choice of mate, or to find
out that there is no guarantee in life that they are owed good things
just because they exist. A psychological survival tactic is to
demean those who have achieved things, denigrate accomplishments,
to elevate their own accomplishments far above anyone else's.

> Also, I know of other "unlicensed" persons who joined.

That must have happened after NCI changed their membership criteria
but is not bona fide factual information. Only the NCI can say who is
a member and not a member.

> You really DO enjoy being made a fool of, don't you?

That stand-alone sentence is another in a series of Big Lie technique
statements made by Robeson. The Big Lie technique consists of
constant repetition of statements over a period of time in the hopes
that someone will believe it. It is a covert form of subjugation, knowing
that that the chargee will eventually grow tired of refuting an obvious
pejorative. The charger can then claim "success" when refutations
stop...the charger is vindicated by default.

> Keep it up, Anderson. Your date with the maker can't be far off. If I
>were you, I'd be doubling down on good deeds right now.

This is another perverse attempt at harassment and/or attack. No one
is immortal, everyone will eventually die. It is a condition of being
human. Those who are relatively sane have already come to grips
with reality and must accept it. He is expressing denial that others
have done things before his time, of greater difficulty or greater
accomplishments than his.

Rather than learn from older person's experiences he wishes to subjugate them, to forbid them doing anything in "his" territory. Robeson has previously demanded "learning" such as in microwave theory and techniques, for free. He may think such a thing is a few sentences in length where the condensed version is easily a full year's formal study of 6 hours classroom per day. That may be ignorance on his part but it is always perceived as supremely arrogant in demanding free instruction just because he asked for it!

> Lying in a public forum ain't heping things!

The charges of "lying" have been refuted. Unfortunately, some of a rare gender dislike "long, boring" messages that do not entertain them. :-)

To verify, one need only to do a FULL access to the appropriate subjects at Google archives and/or consult the FCC full public document record on NPRM 98-143. This discussion is closed.

4978. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:28:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192859.11635.00000116@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34389

In article <3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of the
>herd,
>> then I'll take that as a compliment
>
> Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
>of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
>to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest instead
>of on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
>that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.

Everyone has to enjoy amateur radio as Dick enjoys amateur radio...

...whether they like it or not! :-)

4979. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:28:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192859.11635.00000115@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34390

In article <7x_b8.8395$BR3.453980@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the facts
>on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally
>prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.

News Flash:

ITU-R S25.5 has not yet been changed, nor is there any released statement on the FCC's version of the US administration position on agenda item 1.7.1 for WRC-03.

Test element 1 as described in Part 97, Title 47 CFR, still requires a passing of a morse code cognition test for a US amateur radio license class of General or Extra.

There has been NO "elimination" of the code test in US regulations.

McCollum's insinuation of "elimination" must be in regard to his wanting to piss on others. :-)

4980. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:29:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192900.11635.00000117@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34388

In article <a4orsj02msc@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Dick is typical of what is known in theatre circles as "bad actor
>syndrome" - all passion and no thought.

<cue orchestra>

<everybody in chorus>

"There's no business like show business, like no business I know..."

:-)

4981. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:29:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218192901.11635.00000118@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 34391

In article <20020217211037.07935.00001083@mb-mw.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
><jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
>>In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>>says...
>>
>>> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>>
>>However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
>>folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>
>Joshua,
>
>There are none so blind as those who will not see. Sometimes Kim won't
>even look ;-)

Those who say that are generally trying to pull the wool over others' eyes.
N2EY forgets that others are not PCTA sheep.

Wool shrinks when wet. Some PCTA opinions are all wet. Ergo, the
"truth" as the PCTA wishes it to be is no longer truth.

>Bingo. There is no "loyalty oath" attached to ARRL membership. Indeed,
>ARRL members can "steer" the process by electing directors who
>support their views - even if those views are currently 100% opposed
>to current ARRL policy.

Members must, for according to "the Amateur's Code" published in all
ARRL Handbooks since 1978...

"Two
The Amateur is Loyal...He offers his loyalty, encouragement and support
to his fellow radio amateurs, his local club and to the American Radio
Relay League, through which amateur radio is reprsented."

Golly, Gomer, that there shore do look like falling into the ARRL Party
Line in a rather absolute way. No excuses. The ONLY national amateur
radio organization is the ARRL, the only one claimed to represent all
amateur radio.

>>Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
>>think that the facts do speak for themselves.
>
>Only to those who can see them.

It is not unknown to see things that aren't there in all aspects of human endeavor. Astigmatism exists in mental sight just as it does in opthalmy.

It is well known in this newsgroup that some lie by omission, the deliberate omission of certain facts so as to emphasize their points of propaganda.

With all kind regards,
20/20

4982. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:31:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c719cbf$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34393

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217185635.03325.00001088@mb-ch.aol.com...
> Isnt this cute:
>
> 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the primary
goal
> of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
amateur
> license.
>
> You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a bad
word
> and we will throw you out.

You're not going to like this, WA8ULX:

From http://www.arrl.org/aabl.html#bylaws

ARRL BY-LAWS

Members

2. Applications for membership or renewal of membership shall be submitted to the Secretary. In the case of any applicant whose character, reputation or conduct might make him an undesirable member, the Secretary shall refer the application to the Executive Committee for review; in all other cases, the Secretary shall have the authority to grant membership.

Hmmmm, while I don't have a problem with the above, just as I don't have a problem with NCI's #2, above, I wonder if you'd place the same scrutiny on the ARRL--especially since "character, reputation or conduct *MIGHT* (emphasis mine) make him an undesirable member" is pretty darned loosely defined. At least the NCI #2 is clear and leaves little ambiguity.

Kim W5TIT

4983. Re: NCIs only7 interested in CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:33:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c719d64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34394

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217190743.03325.00001092@mb-ch.aol.com...
> Now isnt this interesting:
>
> In addition, NCI may choose to publicly comment on matters where Morse
code
> policy directly or indirectly influences amateur radio policies. Examples
of
> topics on which NCI may make comment are licensing structures, band
plans
> and spectrum issues, and especially where operating privileges of
no-code
> amateur licensees are affected
>
> Didnt someone say they would not making comments on Band Plans ?

I'd expect an organization to comment on *any* aspect that directly affects their charter. You're stretching, Waddles (kinda what your callsign sounds like, if *I* stretch as far as you are here).

Kim W5TIT

4984. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:36:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c719e16_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34395

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C719F9B.1FB44689@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C71284D.F3B05883@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Nonsense. Just off the top of my head, I think the years Dick spent
as
> > a VE
> > > > are an accomplisment, don't you?
> > >
> > > Not to worry, Ed, I know all about my accomplishments, and something
> > about
> > > their lack of accomplishments in ham radio- yes,
> > > in the area of licensing. Which should be the easy part. While you and
> > > I and many,many of thousands of ordinary people just did what
> >
> > If, by that, you mean that we're not sheep that follow the rest of the
herd,
> > then I'll take that as a compliment
>
> Of course you'd be as wrong as usual. What it means is that a bunch
> of arrogant characters who "just don't want to" do what is required
> to get the license, rather would rather spend many years in protest
instead of
> on the air enjoying ham radio. That anyone can believe
> that such a bunch will be valuable assets to ham radio is amazing.
>
>

Who's doing the above, Dick? And, why are you so concerned about them? Or,
are you saying there are ARS licensees who did *not* do what was required to
get the license, but have the license anyway?

Why would "such a bunch" be a valuable asset ham radio--unless you're
speaking of the general public and then, while not directly an asset--we
need all the help we can get, don't we?

Kim W5TIT

4985. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:37:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c719e41$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34396

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71A188.143C8DC7@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C712C7E.385696EF@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I didn't ask if it had been used on HF. I asked why you think his
> > program
> > > > won't work on HF. You didn't answer the question.
> > >
> > > I have no opinion on his undescribed work. If you have that's your
> > > affair.
> >
> > No opinion? You certainly weren't hesitant about showing it a few posts
back
> > when you mis-read Cecil's question.
>
> Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.
>
>

ROFLMAO!!!! Ya got him, it appears, Krell...

Kim W5TIT

4986. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 00:46:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a051_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34397

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020217211037.07935.00001083@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
Houk
> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >says...
> >
> >> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
> >
> >However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
> >folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>
> Joshua,
>
> There are none so blind as those who will not see. Sometimes Kim won't
> even look ;-)
> >

Ya mean where I refuse to see the same things as you do, Jim? You seem to
want to do the painting, you have the palet...go right ahead.

> >>
> >> How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of
the
> >> ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.
> >
> >You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
> >policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
> >people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
> >makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.
>
> Bingo. There is no "loyalty oath" attached to ARRL membership. Indeed,
> ARRL members can "steer" the process by electing directors who
> support their views - even if those views are currently 100% opposed
> to current ARRL policy.
> >

So, you have no problem with the loosely defined statement below:

http://www.arrl.org/aabl.html#bylaws

BY-LAWS

Members

2. Applications for membership or renewal of membership shall be submitted to the Secretary. In the case of any applicant whose character, reputation or conduct might make him an undesirable member, the Secretary shall refer the application to the Executive Committee for review; in all other cases, the Secretary shall have the authority to grant membership.

You know, by the standards noted above, I wonder if my "reputation" makes me a questionable ARRL Member. I wonder if my "conduct" makes me a questionable ARRL member. It's all quite loosely defined, probably deliberately so.

By the way, the caveat of those elected Directors is that there is little accountability at that level.

> >>
> >> Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC in
> >the
> >> untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
> >> unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
> >> legislation.
> >
> >Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
> >that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
> >that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
> >comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
> >code testing, he is lying.
>
> Or maybe just mistaken.
>
> Point is, if an organization says it has one and only one purpose, and then
> gets
> involved in things that have nothing to do with that purpose, something isn't
> quite kosher.
> >

I don't think your interpreatation of this is correct. However, your mileage may vary. I would expect any organization to get involved with any facet that comes under their charter. If bandplans are in some way affected by CW policy decisions, then it would be irresponsible of NCI to ignore the matter.

> >
> >What's really not kosher? When NCI does the above then encourages members
> >to harass someone for making a comment for that same petition. That's
> >scurrilous, shameful, and very indicative of their mindset.
>
> Which petition are you talking about?
> >
> >> No, I think your overreaction is clear.
> >

> >Hey, I'm just as prone to overreaction as the next person, but here I
> >think that the facts do speak for themselves.
>
> Only to those who can see them.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Don't you mean only to those who can't see things *your* way, Jim?

Kim W5TIT

4987. Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:02:52 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <0vhc8.20443$P21.1928719@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34398

Not only is he tedious and monotonous, but extremely long-winded and wrapped up in himself as well.

I did notice that he continually keeps retro'ing back to this splendid military career of his. Based on literally lots of actual veterans I know who experienced war up close and personal, I found them to very quiet about their "careers" regardless of where they served. Those that had to mention their military experiences in every other sentence were so far back from the actual "war" that they the closest they came to front line action was trying to cut the line at the base PX to see war footage on the silver screen. Based on this NG's career veteran, I figure him to be either a cook or a clerk and so far from any front lines that the only action he'd have seen was as they emptied the trash or the latrines.

Keep on calling 'em as you see them. You were right on the nose for this one. High 5's all around.

Ya think he'll take a hint and keep the self serving posts to a minimum...nah...he's on a roll (not Larry Kramden). Only 4 stories of his amazing life, including that thrilling 2 parter. Can he cut and paste or what. And that thrilling analogy about being able to legally use HF..wow how exciting except for the fact that it was not frequencies available to amateur radio operators and since this is an amateur radio NG, just serves as self puffery.

Hope to c u on 10 metres some day. Be interested to actually talk to some NG denizens, the legally licensed ones that is.

4988. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:04:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34399

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16da455adf3e9d0d989684@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a4p0va$e8f$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > The post above offers nothing to substantiate your
> > claim that: "NCI ...then encourages
> > members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
> > making a comment for that same petition."
>
> Certainly does. Why did NCI pick out W3XO? There were certainly dozens of
> others who commented on RM-9673 without NCI putting out a news bulliten
> on it. And why is someone making a comment to the FCC in any way
> newsworthy? There were hundreds of comments about RM-10352 - none of
> which were singled out on NCI's website. Why this particular person in
> this particular instance?
>
> > Where is there any statements that show NCI is encouraging
> > anyone to do anything regarding the post above?
>
> Did Carl intend for people to read that and just go "eh"? He specifically
> singled out one person with comments to provoke NCI's membership.
>
> Should we ask W3XO if he was harassed for making his comment to the FCC?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign against
the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't even
remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.

And, actually, I'm not even sure it was a direct ARRL campaign, but I'd be
willing to bet it was directed from HQ.

It's called politics, Joshua. If it's something you agree with, then it's
OK. When it's something you totally disagree with, then it's a conspiracy.

Kim W5TIT

4989. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:13:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a6bd$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34400

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020218100049.18959.00001551@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the facts
> >on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally
> >prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.
>
> I prefer to be in an area where no one is pissing at all. Sane adults
don't
> piss into or out of tents.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Then the sane ones would be all the women....heh heh heh

Kim W5TIT

4990. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:14:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a6f4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34651

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020218104531.04761.00001708@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against
> >Amateur
> >Radio?
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Truthfully, ARRL would do nothing, and you would still be a Member

And, maybe NCI would do nothing as well. Both have the leeway to do so.

Kim W5TIT

4991. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:18:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a7dc$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34652

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C727943.4E971EA3@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> > While you were garnering support, Dick was calling everyone obscene
names.
>
> Everyone? Hardly, only the obscene.
>

Now, that's totally untrue. I didn't see you call yourself one obscene
name, Dick.

Kim W5TIT

4992. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:26:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71a9cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34653

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020218151115.03457.00000023@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes
fail,"
> >it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone included.
>
> So even if Mode X is the most reliable, we should not rely upon Mode X
more
> than other modes? That's just not logical.
>

I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as people say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is what I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there are more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.

> >For each and every circumstance in which phone won't work, packet won't
> >work, 20M won't work, CW won't work, there is a likely circumstance that
> >will take its place.
>
> Nonsense. You must not understand much about reliability and availability,
Kim.
>
> >No mode should be "favored" over another for
> >reliance--they all have their place.
>
> Yes, they all have their place. But it is simply illogical to say that a
more
> reliable mode should not be relied upon more than a less reliable one.
>
> Suppose:
>
> Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
> Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
> Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
>
> If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
> going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
> should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
> because it gets me where I want to go.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you may be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you where you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so darned reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and a much greater availability of parts. Guess which one I would take on a long trip?

Kim W5TIT

4993. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:29:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71aa65$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34654

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020218151116.03457.00000024@mb-mj.aol.com...
>
> All of us will "go away" after enough time. But the fact is that the
> "undesirables" have become far more numerous and visible (audible?)
> than in the past.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I wouldn't know...I don't focus on them.

Kim W5TIT

4994. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 01:39:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71bfd6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34660

"Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:0vhc8.20443$P21.1928719@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Not only is he tedious and monotonous, but extremely long-winded and
wrapped
> up in himself as well.
>
> I did notice that he continually keeps retro'ing back to this splendid
> military career of his. Based on literally lots of actual veterans I know
> who experienced war up close and personal, I found them to very quiet
about
> their "careers" regardless of where they served. Those that had to
mention
> their military experiences in every other sentence were so far back from
the
> actual "war" that they the closest they came to front line action was
trying
> to cut the line at the base PX to see war footage on the silver screen.
> Based on this NG's career veteran, I figure him to be either a cook or a
> clerk and so far from any front lines that the only action he'd have seen
> was as they emptied the trash or the latrines.
>
> Keep on calling 'em as you see them. You were right on the nose for this
> one. High 5's all around.
>
> Ya think he'll take a hint and keep the self serving posts to a
> minimum...nah...he's on a roll (not Larry Kramden). Only 4 stories of his
> amazing life, including that thrilling 2 parter. Can he cut and paste or
> what. And that thrilling analogy about being able to legally use HF..wow
> how exciting except for the fact that it was not frequencies available to
> amateur radio operators and since this is an amateur radio NG, just serves
> as self puffery.
>
> Hope to c u on 10 metres some day. Be interested to actually talk to some
> NG denizens, the legally licensed ones that is.
>

Hey, kewl...keep a listen up. I don't know where you are (heck, what's your
call), but I have just installed this weekend, my 10M radio, have the Wilson
1000 up on top of the truck, and I even took a listen this afternoon.
Sounded like a lot of great QSOs. Over the weekend I took a listen while
installing and it sounded as though there was a contest...maybe a 10-10
contest. I'm a 10-10 member myself, but it sure would be nice to turn 10M
on during a weekend without a 10-10 hunt going on, sheesh...LOL

Anyway, give me a sked and we can try it. I'd be around between 6:15A-7:15A, then about 4:15P-5:30P on the weekdays. That's when I'm mobile, most of the time. My hubby and I have a Yaesu 890AT sitting right here, and never even turn the thing on. He and I said a long time ago, no TV in the bedroom. We *should* have said no TV in the office/shack...LOL

Kim W5TIT

4995. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 02:01:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218210118.02879.00000126@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 34655

In article <a4rueh$189g$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>It is a good thing hardly anyone actually experiments with this stuff
>since the regulations for anything that isn't either exceedingly slow
>or a traditional analog mode are irrational.

:-)

Dennis, welcome to the club! :-) :-) :-)

Er, I think you "lost" a lot of the PCTA traditionalists with "modern" terms like "exclusive-ORing" (over 40 years old) and PRNG/PRSG acronyms (at least 20 years old) and such like. :-)

REAL ham radio to the PCTA doesn't operate with "bits," only "dits" (plus dashes and spaces). :-)

"Gigahertz for gigasquirts!" - KH2D circa 1997.

"Ein ham, ein volk, ein kode!" - just about every PCTA in here.

"One enhances the state of the radio art by demanding
all to learn morse code and achieving proficiency in morse
at high speeds! That is REAL ham radio!" - PCTA psalm

4996. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 02:12:06 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16db53ac9cf705ad989685@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34656

In article <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign against
> the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't even
> remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.

There is so much difference I'm frankly amazed that anyone would compare
the two.

The W5YI initiative, whatever it was, would have been an FCC *proposal*.

W3XO did not have an FCC proposal on the table, he simply made a public
comment on a proposal in front of the FCC.

Do you seriously expect the ARRL not to comment on a proposed rule for
Part 97??? Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?

joshua houk
kd7pos

4997. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 02:12:33 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lwic8.11211$BR3.607533@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34657

I would assume this would likely be determined by determining if the member
had performed any good deed$. $uch as donation$ to the organization.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c71a6f4_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020218104531.04761.00001708@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > >What would ARRL do with a member who publically made statements against
> > >Amateur
> > >Radio?
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Truthfully, ARRL would do nothing, and you would still be a Member
>
> And, maybe NCI would do nothing as well. Both have the leeway to do so.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

4998. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 02:12:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218211236.22158.00001064@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34658

In article <3C714898.FB0830AD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
>> >be new and unique.
>>
>> By that logic, every ham radio project I've ever built is new and unique.
>
>Which means you didn't copy someone else's design.

That's what I've been saying. Oddly enough, nobody else on this NG seems
to have actually designed an amateur transmitter, receiver or transceiver
recently.

>> In other words, he rearranges standard logic blocks. If that's "design",
>then
>> W0EX is an RF system designer.
>
>Rearranging standard logic blocks is logic design, Jim.

Then rearranging RF blocks is RF design, Cecil.

>If I copy a relay
>driver circuit that uses a 2N2222 and substitute a 2N3904, I have not done
>any design.

Don't get me started on relay circuits and design. I've done a few of those.
;-)

>Dick won't say what he did so I have no way of knowing whether
>he designed anything or not.

He described at least one project that I know of. There are probably lots more.
From his description of his pair of 813s amplifier I would say some fairly
serious RF design took place. Also power supply and control circuit design,
mechanical design and layout, fabrication, and testing.

> I assume he copied circuits designed by others.

Not a good assumption. And there's a lot more to designing a rig than the
circuit.

>He did not deny doing so or explain what he really did.

Yes, he did, in at least one instance cited here..

How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you designed and built, Cecil?

>A man who refuses to defend himself is usually guilty.

To a biased judge, maybe. JC didn't defend himself.
>
>> >I suspect all screwdrivers operate essentially the same way.
>>
>> Therefore it's not unique, or new.
>
>If you know of another design that automatically puts the IC-706 into tune
>mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged, I would like to know about it.
>I have never heard of it being done before by one relay and one resistor.

Just an AND circuit with relay isolation.
>
>> That you have not found them does not mean they do not exist.
>
>Well, that's true and is the reason that patent lawyers do patent searches.

You gonna patent it?

>Do you know of any two-component systems that automatically key the IC-706
>into tune mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged?

Nope. Yours uses at least three components.

You coulda used an optoisolator and eliminated the mechanical relay, too. As much as I like relays, the cheap ones can be trouble.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4999. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 02:44:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C71BBFD.C04655F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34659

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Rearranging standard logic blocks is logic design, Jim.
>
> Then rearranging RF blocks is RF design, Cecil.

Not necessarily. Rearranging standard logic blocks results in a brand new
function. Does rearranging RF blocks result in a brand new function?

> How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you designed and
> built, Cecil?

None. I always copied existing circuits and integrated them. I did, however,
do original designs for controllers for transceivers.

> You coulda used an optoisolator and eliminated the mechanical relay, too. As
> much as I like relays, the cheap ones can be trouble.

I had RFI problems with solid state on 10m. That good old mechanical relay
cannot follow RF.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5000. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:07:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218220712.25535.00000266@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34662

In article <3c6e70d8$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Well, let me say that I think CW is a pretty darned antiquated mode, myself.

Kim:

What do you think of the currency of SSB, FM, and AM? How about
plain 'ole 45-baud RTTY -- the most popular digital mode in amateur radio?

>But I in no way would discourage someone from learning CW. More power to
>'em if they do.

Very generous of you, since nobody (myself included) discourages anyone
from using SSB, even though there isn't much to learn in order to use it.

>I can't imagine that Carl Stevenson would sanction someone not learning CW.
>If he does, then he's an idiot--plain and simple. But I don't think he
>does.

Well, Carl's not an idiot, but I don't think he'd go very far out of his way
to *encourage* anyone to learn CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5001. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:07:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218220713.25535.00000267@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34663

In article <3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to learn and
>use CW?!

Kim:

It certainly did for me -- nothing else was able to accomplish that
goal, including a lot of "selling of the mode" by hams who used and
loved CW at the time.

>This is getting really confusing, Little Dick.

That's MISTER Carroll to you, dear.

>It sounds more
>like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?

How can Dick, or anyone else, "force" CW on anyone? Nobody was
able to "force" it on me -- I learned it because I wanted to be a ham
with HF privileges, and code tests were required.

>Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or the other
>for whether someone is going to use it or not.

Well, it certainly did for me, since I had no intention when initially
licensed to become a CW operator. In fact, I was (at the time) a
most vociferous NCTA kinda guy. If NCI had existed then, I may
have joined. However, learning the code and getting on the air a
few times got me "hooked," and before I even thought I was ready
to take it, I had passed my 20 WPM code test! If code testing had
never been a requirement, I very strongly doubt that I would have
become a CW operator, although I'm not saying it's impossible that
I could have in the absence of the requirement. After all, it was my
umpteenth bad experience with a rabid Ten-Ten number chaser
on 10-meters that put me off of SSB operation back in the early
'90's. Of course, if I hadn't passed at least a 13 WPM code test,
I wouldn't have been on SSB, wouldn't I? Therefore, knowing the
code, and passing the tests, both got me ON the CW bands, and
OFF of the phone bands! Talk about your unintended consequences!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5002. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:07:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218220714.25535.00000268@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34661

In article <20020216184734.13798.00000470@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
>authorized
>under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

5167.5 kHz, SSB only, Alaska emergency use only.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5003. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:11:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71c429_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34664

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16db53ac9cf705ad989685@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign
against
> > the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't even
> > remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.
>
> There is so much difference I'm frankly amazed that anyone would compare
> the two.
>

Quite frankly, not as amazed as I am over the energy you are expending in feeble attempts to discredit an organization. Could it be simply because their mission is something you are so opposed to? Being opposed to their charter is fine, but why is that you find it so easy and correct to attempt to discredit them, rather than either starting your own organization (oh, that would take way too much effort, eh?), or just waiting around for it to flop--if you believe you're in such a majority?

>
> The W5YI initiative, whatever it was, would have been an FCC *proposal*.
>

True. Politics is politics though. I took it that you were just plain opposed to an attempt to campaign (harrass as you called it). So, you're right...the W5YI whatever was, I believe, something to do with a request from the FCC. Like I said, I was just getting my license, and the very first time I turned my brand new handie-talkie on, there was an on-the-air club meeting discussing how bad, bad, bad this person was and it was imperative that each and everyone write the FCC *and* copy him. Like I said, politics is politics.

>
> W3XO did not have an FCC proposal on the table, he simply made a public
> *comment* on a proposal in front of the FCC.
>

Well, I wouldn't know. I simply wonder why it's not OK to campaign. Maybe the behest (if there was such a thing) to send comments to W3XO was to help him/her(?) understand that their opinion was not a popular or favorable one. Not that it would matter to this person--maybe they wouldn't care. But, *if* they were expressing what they thought was a popular opinion, maybe it's a good thing to let them know that, hey, it maybe isn't as popular as

they think. Hey, people feel compelled all the time to make comments to me about what a dumb ham I am, eh?

>
> Do you seriously expect the ARRL not to comment on a proposed rule for
> Part 97???
>

This wasn't necessarily the ARRL doing anything--as I stated. It was, however, an on-the-air mudslinging event, possibly inspired by the desire of the ARRL to undertake a campaign to diminish the possibility of success for W5YI.

However, without truly understanding what it was that was in question, I would be remiss to comment further. Suffice it to say that I see nothing wrong with responding to someone who makes public comment in a public forum. Really. Isn't that one of the "risks" of public forums--even such as this one here? I also think your equating it to harrassment (unless it truly was harrassment--calling someone on the phone at all hours of the day, bothering them at their place of work, disrupting their private life, etc.) is a lot harsh (I started to say a little...but it's a lot).

>
> Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

Publicly? Do I think they're stupid?

Kim W5TIT

5004. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:15:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c71c50e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34666

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020218220712.25535.00000266@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e70d8$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Well, let me say that I think CW is a pretty darned antiquated mode,
myself.
>
> Kim:
>
> What do you think of the currency of SSB, FM, and AM? How about
> plain 'ole 45-baud RTTY -- the most popular digital mode in amateur radio?
>

In order? Heck, what was first :o Yeah, they're all pretty darned
antiquated, too. I should have defined antiquated. Antiquated in terms of
other modes that are more handy, just as favorable to band conditions, etc.

> >
> >But I in no way would discourage someone from learning CW. More power to
> >'em if they do.
>
> Very generous of you, since nobody (myself included) discourages anyone
> from using SSB, even though there isn't much to learn in order to use it.
>

Yeah. That's the beauty of it.

> >
> >I can't imagine that Carl Stevenson would sanction someone not learning
CW.
> >If he does, then he's an idiot--plain and simple. But I don't think he
> >does.
>
> Well, Carl's not an idiot, but I don't think he'd go very far out of his
way
> to *encourage* anyone to learn CW.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I don't think he'd discourage them at all. What I do think he'd discourage
would be feeling superior because of it.

Kim W5TIT

5005. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:22:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73092F.B85AA821@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34665

CAM wrote:

>Dick won't say what he did so I have no way of knowing whether

> he designed anything or not. I assume he copied circuits designed by others.
> He did not deny doing so or explain what he really did. A man who refuses to
> defend himself is usually guilty.

Or dodging the trolls....

5006. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:25:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72f99d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34572

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020218220713.25535.00000267@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c6e7732_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >So, is it that testing creates the enviroment of encouragement to learn
and
> >use CW?!
>
> Kim:
>
> It certainly did for me -- nothing else was able to accomplish that
> goal, including a lot of "selling of the mode" by hams who used and
> loved CW at the time.
>

Welp, too bad you didn't recognize it for it's uniqueness right up front.
Maybe you wouldn't have wasted so many years in defiance of it.

> >
> >This is getting really confusing, Little Dick.
>
> That's MISTER Carroll to you, dear.
>

Nope, sure isn't. Little Dick deserves no, zero, nada, respect from me.

> >
> >It sounds more
> >like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?
>
> How can Dick, or anyone else, "force" CW on anyone? Nobody was
> able to "force" it on me -- I learned it because I wanted to be a ham
> with HF privileges, and code tests were required.
>

Somehow the word "required" doesn't go with "wanted" but whatever.

> >
> >Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or the other
> >for whether someone is going to use it or not.
>
> Well, it certainly did for me, since I had no intention when initially
> licensed to become a CW operator.
>

Yeah, but I think we all realize what a different kind of guy you are,
Larry.

>
> In fact, I was (at the time) a
> most vociferous NCTA kinda guy. If NCI had existed then, I may
> have joined. However, learning the code and getting on the air a
> few times got me "hooked," and before I even thought I was ready
> to take it, I had passed my 20 WPM code test! If code testing had
> never been a requirement, I very strongly doubt that I would have
> become a CW operator,
>

And, that would have, what? Been bad? Who cared whether you became a CW
operator? I learned CW to pass a test. Dropped it right after the test.
So, you were encouraged by learning for a test and I was discouraged by
learning it for a test. With just the two of us, that's 50/50 odds.

>
> although I'm not saying it's impossible that
> I could have in the absence of the requirement.
>

I think CW is "miraculous" enough and fun enough for people who like it,
that those who are inclined to use it in the longrun don't need to be
encouraged by having to learn it for a test. I wasn't tested for APRS or
packet, but I've tried both. Can't stand packet and dig playing with APRS.
I wasn't tested for PSK31, watched my husband doing it one night, shook my
head in bafflement and never will try it.

>
> After all, it was my
> umpteenth bad experience with a rabid Ten-Ten number chaser
> on 10-meters that put me off of SSB operation back in the early
> '90's.
>

You sure are easily discouraged. Imagine me giving up ham radio just
because of your rabidness on this newsgroup, Larry. That'd be ridiculous.
You let others win too easily.

>
> Of course, if I hadn't passed at least a 13 WPM code test,
> I wouldn't have been on SSB, wouldn't I? Therefore, knowing the
> code, and passing the tests, both got me ON the CW bands, and
> OFF of the phone bands! Talk about your unintended consequences!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Your unintended consequence there is that you seem to think that everyone
and anyone else must have the same experience as you. Or, that those who
don't are somehow much lesser a person than you. You can wish forever that
someone would experience your life, Larry, because you think it is so

wonderful. While you are wishing, you may completely miss the beauty of their life. I am so tickled just to get someone on the air and into ham radio that I couldn't care less if they ever even hear of CW.

Kim W5TIT

5007. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:25:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7309CF.B56FFFB7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34667

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > > >
> > > > >It indeed does logically imply always.
> > > >
> > > > Cecil makes mistakes.
> > >
> > > Now, there's a true statement. Ed, do you think,
> > > "cars are black", is a true statement?
> >
> > Does the statement "it happens" mean "it ALWAYS
> > happens"?
>
> "It happens" is near meaningless unless you define what
> "it" is. "CW gets through!" clearly implies always.

Really??? So all the preparatory chat on rrap preceding
that
statement had no bearing on setting up the circumstances
and context under which the statement was made.

Methinks you troll too much. FAR too much.

5008. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:27:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C730A21.EDD6E0E7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34668

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Yes, but not all things that are possible happen. :-)
> >
> > Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
> > at *some* times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
> > use it.
>
> Then I suggest you join FISTS and spread the word which is
> part of their charter.

Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
in Scotland.

5009. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:28:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C730A77.6D3F67B9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34669

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil, what you're doing is demonstrating clearly your ability, no
> > penchant, to be able to "take either side of a debate and win",as you
> > once said you did in high school.
> > You leave no doubt that you could support MY side of the
> > "arguement" just as well if it suited you to do so.
>
> Nope, I could not do that in good conscience, Dick.

You mean to actually insinuate that you EVER did something
in good conscience?

5010. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:32:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C730B51.D5D8FF9B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34670

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > And all of that clearly shows the fallacy of attempting to use pure logic in
> > circumstances where statements depend on the context in
> > which they are used.
>
> That doesn't excuse you from spreading falsehoods that newcomers might
> be duped into believing are true.

That is BS and you know it. If you never spent any time working
weaksignal CW that's not my fault.

5011. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:36:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grr8702.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34671

On 18 Feb 2002 22:15:45 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>While on the topic, and I'll probably get in trouble with Phil Kane
>again, don't the current FCC rules strike you as, well, weird?

Some of them struck me as arcane (read: weird) when I was enforcing
them, but da rulez am da rulez.....

Give it a few more years when more digital-oriented folks get into
the Rules and Standards area on both sides of the fence, and it will
all be different.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5012. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:48:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C730F1A.44C89988@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34672

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
> >at *some*
> >times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
> >use it.
>
> Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use it?

You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
licensees who "just couldn't".

5013. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:53:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C731071.C3FFC23@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34673

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Not for a moment. If Carl's diction doesn't read as dictatorial to
> >you you need to borrow Cecil's dictionary.
>
> How could it be dictatorial when it has absolutely no authority?

Well, he can dream can't he? And try to convince FCC, as in the
last NPRM.

> You ignore
> with impunity, something you could not do under a dictatorship.
>

Gotta be a silver lining there somewhere.

>
> > YMMV, of course, but just because it doesn't have its intended
> >effect does nothing to change its dictatorial intent.
>
> Carl has stated that he does not wish to be the Dictator of Amateur Radio.
> Carl, is that still true?

So one then wonders why he turns around and belies all that with
over conflicting statements.

5014. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:58:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4sikffjj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34675

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C730F1A.44C89988@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
> > >at *some*
> > >times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
> > >use it.
> >
> > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use
it?
>
> You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> licensees who "just couldn't".

Ever the one with such a perfect vocabulary. What
class act.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5015. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 03:59:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7311D0.6084307E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34674

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Pretty simple in both cases, really. Both organizations would most
> >likely ignore him and let him rant. After all, they both have the dues
> >he paid in support of their organizations belying his rants..
>
> NCI does not have dues.

Well I never heard of FISTS nor ARRL precluding anyone from
membeship on philosophical grounds. When they ante up that's
considered prima facie evidence. NCI is a "different" sort of
organization with "different" kind of members anyway.

5016. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:02:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C731282.710D4003@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34676

WA8ULX wrote:

> >NCI does not have dues.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed, W1RFI
>
> But they do want you to contribute.

Ah. "No admission. But the suggested
contribution is ...."

5017. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:05:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4sj1p$78k$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34678

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16da455adf3e9d0d989684@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a4p0va$e8f$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > The post above offers nothing to substantiate your
> > claim that: "NCI ...then encourages
> > members to HARASS (emphasis added) someone for
> > making a comment for that same petition."
>
> Certainly does. Why did NCI pick out W3XO? There were certainly dozens of
> others who commented on RM-9673 without NCI putting out a news bulliten
> on it. And why is someone making a comment to the FCC in any way
> newsworthy? There were hundreds of comments about RM-10352 - none of
> which were singled out on NCI's website. Why this particular person in
> this particular instance?

My daily newspaper often has totally stupid letters to the editor
from people who represent the worst in some positions. Is it the purpose
of the newspaper to cause readers to then harass the writers of
those extreme positions?

> > Where is there any statements that show NCI is encouraging
> > anyone to do anything regarding the post above?
>
> Did Carl intend for people to read that and just go "eh"? He specifically
> singled out one person with comments to provoke NCI's membership.

Bull. That's your own viewpoint and one that doesn't sync up
with common every day reporting as well as newspaper publication of
letters to editors, etc.

> Should we ask W3XO if he was harassed for making his comment to the FCC?

Whatever floats your boat.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5018. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:05:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73133F.DDD00091@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34677

Joshua Houk wrote:

> In article <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign against
> > the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't even
> > remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.
>
> There is so much difference I'm frankly amazed that anyone would compare
> the two.
>
> The W5YI initiative, whatever it was, would have been an FCC *proposal*.
>
> W3XO did not have an FCC proposal on the table, he simply made a public
> *comment* on a proposal in front of the FCC.
>
> Do you seriously expect the ARRL not to comment on a proposed rule for
> Part 97??? Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?

Josh don't take her seriously. She isn't serious, doesn't appear
capable of it.

5019. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:09:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4sj9qaap1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34679

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16db53ac9cf705ad989685@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign
against
> > the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't even
> > remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.
>
> There is so much difference I'm frankly amazed that anyone would compare
> the two.
>
> The W5YI initiative, whatever it was, would have been an FCC *proposal*.
>
> W3XO did not have an FCC proposal on the table, he simply made a public
> *comment* on a proposal in front of the FCC.

As you note...he made a public comment...that's one that can be reported
on by anyone, any news agency, newspaper, and, indeed, NCI.

> Do you seriously expect the ARRL not to comment on a proposed rule for
> Part 97??? Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?

I am certain that comments from others have been reported in the pages
of ARRL on numerous occasions...especially by entities that oppose
ARRL positions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5020. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:25:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7317E0.988A3096@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34680

"Ronnie D." wrote:

>
> Hope to c u on 10 metres some day.

Aw, why come up that far, into all that beeing. Just hang below
two eight, where it's clear...

Boids of a feather.....

5021. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:38:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C731AF6.F05CB74E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34681

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>
> I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as people
> say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is what
> I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there are
> more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.

WHEW!!!!

5022. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:47:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234756.20899.00000066@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34683

In article <%fQb8.17153$P21.1591031@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

>sense..here it is
>
>I C A T P E A D CD E M UCO AZ M OE I T H E P
>
>Alex, I'd like to buy a vowel :)

Wrong show. Alex Terbec hosts "Jeopardy." Pat Sajac is the one who dispenses the vowels, with the assistance of Vanna White, on "Wheel of Fortune."

73 de Larry, K3LT

5023. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:47:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234757.20899.00000067@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34687

In article <3c700977_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Larry: I've never seen anyone "whining" about CW.

Kim:

You may not have "seen" it, but I hear it all the time. Most recently,
at our local radio club meeting last Tuesday, when our Section
Manager made one of his infrequent visits, and during the Q&A
period, some big, fat, stupid looking idiot chimes up with the
inevitable "When are they going get rid of the code?" Needless
to say, after Randy fed us the usually politically-correct ARRL
boilerplate tripe about all the "good people" that came into the
ARS with the No-code Tech etc. etc, I proceeded to explain to
them how the reduction of code testing doesn't seem to have
had the promised effect of creating the "digital paradise" that was
promised so clearly and specifically by ARRL officials ever since
the St. Valentine's Day massacre of the ARS in 1991 -- especially
since all the talk now is about "refarming" the former Novice/Tech
segments to expand voice mode bandwidth.

>I've seen debates on both
>sides happen, seen people argue and nearly stomp each other over the
>issue--but I've never seen anyone whine. Unless you call the statement "I
>don't like CW and don't want to use it" whining.
>
>I don't.

Of course not, since you're one of the whiners.

>And, maybe they don't *WANT* to be contest-grade CW operators, Larry.

You forgot the "So there, nyaa naya!" and the "sticking your tongue out"
emoticon, :-P.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5024. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:47:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234758.20899.00000068@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34684

In article <a4q3uv01vfi@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Since the future is unknown, you are at liberty to shout, "The sky will
>> fall, the sky will fall", to your heart's content. But don't expect
>> anyone except a few knuckle-draggers to believe you.
>
>Maybe Larry should go for a guest spot on Art Bell's radio show and do his
>Chicken Little routine.

Well, if Art ever invited me to "The Kingdon of Nigh" to be a guest on
his show, I'd be quite honored to explain my views on the future of
ham radio, with respect to code testing and other policy issues.
However, even though I live in Delaware, I'm a transplant, not a native --
so I'd probably not be the one to do any kind of a chicken impersonation.
For that, he'd need someone born and raised in Sussex county,
where chickens outnumber people several times over.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5025. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:47:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234758.20899.00000069@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34685

In article <a4osmj$2lj$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> You have no right to criticize
>> Dick for speaking the truth,
>
>Larry, did you suspend the 1st amendment now?
>
>> considering the damage done to the ARS
>> by the dumbing-process presided over by the ARRL.
>
>Where's that "IMHO" and a smiley?

Bill:

OK, OK...I'll give you the IMHO, but I don't do "smileys."

>> >Why don't you settle the matter and send Carl an insultive email once and
>get
>> >it over with, then say things here that will be directed at helping to
>> >interest new people in ham radio and Morse code?
>>
>> I've got a better idea, Ed -- instead of making outrageously inane and
>> offensive suggestions,
>
>"offensive"... aren't we a bit sensitive.

Something I learned from the NCTA, I guess.

>> why don't you try to understand the point of
>> view of those of us who disagree with the notion that we can save
>> Amateur Radio by giving away full operating privileges to any
>> passerby who may have a fleeting interest?
>
>Are you now suggesting a no test ham service?

I don't think I have to. After S25.5 goes away, the (then) former
NCTA's will most likely go into that mode on their own. Then I
guess they'll be "No Written Test Agenda" -- although I'd prefer
a label that fit the acronym NITWITS. And since I don't do
"smileys," I'll throw in a <BSEG>.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5026. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:47:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234759.20899.00000070@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34689

In article <3c700630$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> Sez who? I think no part of the license testing regimen has any
>> possibility of keeping out potentially bad operators. Witness the
>> fact that most of the NAL's issued in recent years have gone to
>> 20-WPM code-tested Amateur Extra-class licensees. Some of
>> the sloppiest CW operating I've ever witnessed on-the-air has been
>> inflicted on my by my fellow Extras.
>>
>
>But, they didn't get the NAL for sloppy CW. . .did they?

Kim:

No, but when their call signs are run-together into indecipherable
gibberish, perhaps they should have been cited for failure to properly
identify their station!

>> However, I'll still take that
>> over a life consigned to having the same old pointless QSO day-in
>> day-out on the local repeater with the rest of the codeless blunders.
>>
>
>Larry, maybe those folks enjoy their conversations. Do you *have* to label
>them as blunders just because of the conversations they enjoy?

Sure, why not? I figure life is too short to waste time being politically
correct, especially with folks like Ed, Cecil, and you to do it for me!

>> Code testing only achieves one purpose -- getting hams involved
>> in *using* the Morse code.

>It'd be tough to prove, but I wonder if I'd been more willing to continue to
>use CW if I hadn't had to study and learn for a test.

I don't, because to a person, everyone I've heard say this has YET
to bother to get involved in learning the code -- even though they only
have to pass 5 WPM to get up to Extra-class HF privileges! They
still figure that a couple more years of whining will make it go away
completely, and they may be right.

>> As in anything else, what they do once
>> they gain their operating privileges is going to vary from individual
>> to individual. I've never claimed that it was any kind of "lid filter,"

>> and I don't think anything else is, or could be. Lids are born,
>> not made.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I still think lots and lots of people want the test there to use it as a
>filter. I say that someone who is an "undesirable" ham will go away after
>time.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Well, as already stated, I don't see ANY part of the testing regimen
to be capable of "filtering" out potentially bad operators. However, to
whatever extent it does, I'm glad that we derive that secondary benefit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5027. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:48:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234800.20899.00000071@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34688

In article <3c700a13_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've let
>> the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the future
>> of the ARS in jeopardy.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>If ya wanna know the truth, in my opinion the future of the ARS is *always*
>in jeopardy. If it ain't one thing, it's another. And, it doesn't take
>more, less, highly qualified, meagerly qualified, or anything else to make
>it that way. It takes each passing year, and newer and newer technologies.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You may have accidentally stumbled on a good point. Commercial
communications technologies have made what even the most advanced
hams can do seem quite "old hat" by comparison to the most
basic cell phone, not to mention broadband wireless voice/data
digital services which are becoming ever more ubiquitous. From a
strictly technological standpoint, about the only thing hams are doing
that stands out would be the more arcane modes like Moonbounce --
but that is hardly a mode which provides viable and reliable
communications capability.

Hams are at the point now where the best we can hope for is to be
accepted as a "backup" communications service, and I believe we have
a proven and vital role to serve in that capacity. However, in order to
be the most capable "backup" operators we an be, we need to
maintain a solid grounding in the very essential basics of radio
communication, including the Morse code. Bringing in a lot more
technically uninvolved button-pushing appliance operators, who
possess no operating skills other than the ability to speak somewhat
clearly into a microphone, is not going to solidify our place in the
public's mind with regard to our REAL backup capability. Yakking
into an HT just doesn't impress anyone anymore, nor should it.
The last time I sat at the operator's position of our radio club's
station at the county EOC, the county's Emergency Operations
Director was more impressed with my ability to copy a W1AW
CW bulletin, than with the PTT skills of the No-code tech sitting
next to me, clutching the mic of the 2-meter rig for dear life.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5028. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:48:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234801.20899.00000072@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34682

In article <3C700C08.247F78EB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me
>> to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here
>> first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude.
>
>Hmmmmm, that attitude sounds exactly like the PCTA folk.

Not hardly, Cecil. It is a common understanding among PCTA's
that anyone with the requisite initiative can learn and become
proficient in the Morse code. The Emergency Communicator
Ham Heroes are not nearly so "inclusive" in their attitude toward
newcomers.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5029. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:48:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020218234801.20899.00000073@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34686

In article <20020218070535.13815.00000580@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>> Actually, I don't think it had anything to do with either. It seems to me
>>> to have had more to do with certain people adopting the "We got here
>>> first, the power, fame, and glory is all ours" attitude.
>
>>Hmmmmm, that attitude sounds exactly like the PCTA folk.
>
>Must be another one of those do as I say, not as I do sort of things.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Nothing like that, Ed -- just personal experience. An experience imposed on me mainly by what were then mainly Technician-class "emergency" communicators. You know, the ones who squeeked thru a 5 WPM code test somehow, then proceeded to view themselves as capable of saving the world on 2-meters FM. And my bad experiences in this area began long before I entered the Code/No-code (testing) debate on Fidonet, and later, on Usenet.

BTW -- another Extra-class ham has just posted a message on the FISTS reflector saying, in effect, "Real radio men know the Morse code." Are you going to go there and set him straight? Or is your politically-correct support of the new, dumbed-down ARS strictly reserved for this newsgroup?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5030. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:53:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020218235353.24789.00000139@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 34691

In article <20020218211236.22158.00001064@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <3C714898.FB0830AD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>> >If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
>>> >be new and unique.

>>If I copy a relay
>>driver circuit that uses a 2N2222 and substitute a 2N3904, I have not done
>>any design.
>
>Don't get me started on relay circuits and design. I've done a few of those.
>;-)

Okay, let's get you started on transistors, then. You've avoided the obvious by not mentioning a 2N2222 or 2N3904. Do you know the difference? How about between a 2N2218 or a 2N3905? Or 2N3906? Or 2N4124 or 2N4125?

What should you add to such a circuit to keep it working and why?

>>Dick won't say what he did so I have no way of knowing whether
>>he designed anything or not.
>
>He described at least one project that I know of. There are probably lots
>more. From his description of his pair of 813s amplifier I would say some
fairly
>serious RF design took place. Also power supply and control circuit design,
>mechanical design and layout, fabrication, and testing.

Claims are not verification, only claims. There have been dozens of 813 finals in amateur literature, many more on the 807-1625 and the 829...and power supplies for all of them. Final amplifiers in HF are not the sum total and ending
of amateur radio design.

"Serious" would imply load-line charting, tests with various impedances (high to accommodate the tube prior to working out the output network). "Serious" implies checking for parasitic oscillations, observation of RF envelopes during keying, checking rise and fall times, and understanding the why and what-happens with all of them.
"Serious" would imply at least some sort of spectrum analysis (even if

only listening-observing with a highly-attenuated receiver).
"Serious" must include checking for spurious and harmonic output to
ascertain that the amplifier follows FCC regulations.
"Serious" would include knowing how to fix/re-design if the performance
did not meet FCC standards.

>> I assume he copied circuits designed by others.
>
>Not a good assumption. And there's a lot more to designing a rig than the
>circuit.

All of us readers are left with a very general CLAIM with not verification
except for your ASSUMPTION, which is specious indeed.

>>He did not deny doing so or explain what he really did.
>
>Yes, he did, in at least one instance cited here..

Please reference or cite that "instance."

>How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you designed
>and built, Cecil?
>
>>A man who refuses to defend himself is usually guilty.
>
>To a biased judge, maybe. JC didn't defend himself.

The reference to "JC" is rather out of place, isn't it? Is electronics design
somehow theological or supernatural?

Are you Judas Escargot? :-)

>>> That you have not found them does not mean they do not exist.
>>
>>Well, that's true and is the reason that patent lawyers do patent searches.
>
>You gonna patent it?

Is the divine JM aware of the approximate full price of a single electronics
patent these days? Unless someone can do their own patent search for
the full disclosure a Search firm must be hired. The total patent applicant's
cost was in the neighborhood of $6000 to $8000 US two years ago
according to a certified patent attorney out here who makes his living in
such law.

>>Do you know of any two-component systems that automatically key the IC-706
>>into tune mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged?
>
>Nope. Yours uses at least three components.
>
>You coulda used an optoisolator and eliminated the mechanical relay, too. As
>much as I like relays, the cheap ones can be trouble.

Does the divine JM consider himself the Design Review Leader now?

If so, he must present his case of negative reviews of another's personal efforts
in clear electronics terms considering all factors of why this particular effort is "unsuitable." Show the work, JM, assumptions are invalid anywhere else.

This non-review by JM is simply a personal negative of no valid electronic signifcance except to attempt putting another down for his expressed personal viewpoints on an unrelated matter. This violates Rules Three and Four in the Amateur's Code.

5031. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 04:54:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C731EB3.839FE943@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34690

Dick Carroll wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > Yes, but not all things that are possible happen. :-)
> > >
> > > Precisely! It will do no good for CW to be able to work
> > > at *some* times when other modes won't if hams aren't prepared to
> > > use it.
> >
> > Then I suggest you join FISTS and spread the word which is
> > part of their charter.
>
> Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
> made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
> in Scotland.

As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here countering

your inane BS?

5032. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 05:08:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7321DD.B37237A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34692

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> > Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
> > Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
> > Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
> >
> > If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
> > going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
> > should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
> > because it gets me where I want to go.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you may
> be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you where
> you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
> with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so darned
> reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
> go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and a
> much greater availability of parts. Guess which one I would take on a long
> trip?

The clearest evidence yet that getting a ham radio license these days is NOT rocket science! Kim the Brain would favor a Yugo over a Mercedes.

5033. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 05:31:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4snpr01q4r@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34693

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C730F1A.44C89988@worldnet.att.net...

> > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use
it?
>
> You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> licensees who "just couldn't".

He didn't say anything about "newcomers." He said "those that we need to
convince to use it," which may include newcomers and oldtimers alike. Learn
how to read before you pound the keyboard.

5034. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 06:11:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219011108.16913.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34694

In article <3c71a051_1@newsa.ev1.net>, Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020217211037.07935.00001083@mb-mw.aol.com...
>> In article <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
>Houk
>> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>
>> >In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>> >says...
>> >
>> >> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>> >
>> >However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
>> >folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>>
>> Joshua,
>>
>> There are none so blind as those who will not see. Sometimes Kim won't
>> even look ;-)
>
>Ya mean where I refuse to see the same things as you do, Jim?

Nope. I mean where you won't even look at information presented to you.

>> >> How many ARRL members are there that agree with every mission/tenant of
>the
>> >> ARRL? Oh, but that's OK, right, because it's the ARRL.
>> >
>> >You betcha. The ARRL has a system where if you disagree with their
>> >policy, you can work to change it. The NCI, on the other hand, purges
>> >people who vary from their doctrine. Which is their right, of course, but
>> >makes NCI a very different creature from the ARRL.
>>
>> Bingo. There is no "loyalty oath" attached to ARRL membership. Indeed,
>> ARRL members can "steer" the process by electing directors who
>> support their views - even if those views are currently 100% opposed
>> to current ARRL policy.

>So, you have no problem with the loosely defined statement below:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/aabl.html#bylaws
>
>BY-LAWS

>
>Members
>
>2. Applications for membership or renewal of membership shall be submitted
>to the Secretary. In the case of any applicant whose character, reputation
>or conduct might make him an undesirable member, the Secretary shall refer
>the application to the Executive Committee for review; in all other cases,
>the Secretary shall have the authority to grant membership.

Nope. Standard boilerplate membership stuff. Without it, an organization has
no mechanism to kick out anyone who pays the dues.
>
>You know, by the standards noted above, I wonder if my "reputation" makes me
>a questionable ARRL Member.

Why?

> I wonder if my "conduct" makes me a
>questionable ARRL member.

Why?

>It's all quite loosely defined, probably deliberately so.

It behooves anyone who wants to join a group to make themselves "desirable"
to that group.
>
>By the way, the caveat of those elected Directors is that there is little
>accountability at that level.
>
I don't understand. Are not the Directors elected by secret ballot of the
members?
Can a Director not be recalled or not reelected?

I've been vpoting in every Director election for my region since 1968. ARRL
sends me the ballot and I fill it out and send it back. I kinda think they
count 'em.
They're independently audited, too.

>> >> Maybe it's the basis at the end you missed: "this would place the FCC
>in
>> >the
>> >> untenable position of having to enforce a flawed -- and we believe
>> >> unenforceable -- concept" Did you miss that part? I also abhor faulty
>> >> legislation.
>> >
>> >Faulty is in the eye of the beholder - but if you think it's faulty,
>> >that's kosher. If Carl thinks it's faulty, ditto. When Carl and NCI say
>> >that NCI's only position is to get rid of code testing and then NCI
>> >comments on a rulemaking petition on something completely removed from
>> >code testing, he is lying.
>>
>> Or maybe just mistaken.

>>
>> Point is, if an organization says it has one and only one purpose, and
>then
>> gets
>> involved in things that have nothing to do with that purpose, something
>isn't
>> quite kosher.
>
>I don't think your interpreatation of this is correct.

What part is not correct? Isn't NCI's sole purpose to end all code testing
for ham licenses? That's what they keep saying.

> However, your
>mileage may vary. I would expect any organization to get involved with any
>facet that comes under their charter.

The CSVHS thing had nothing to do with code testing.

>If bandplans are in some way affected
>by CW policy decisions, then it would be irresponsible of NCI to ignore the
>matter.

Here's the simple facts:

1) There is no code test for access to ALL US amateur privileges above 30 MHz.
2) Except for 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1, which are CW only, and the
data-only segment 218-219, all authorized modes may be used on all
authorized amateur VHF-UHF frequencies.
3) Use of these bands by mode is mostly by voluntary bandplan
4) CSVHS members and others have experienced interference from other hams
operating in violation of the bandplan. Specifically, FM users operating
simplex
on frequencies normally used for weak-signal SSB and CW.
5) The CSVHS petition was to set aside BY LAW 300 kHz of 2 meters and
similar amounts of 6 meters and 70 cm for narrowband modes. Specifically,
modes less than 3 kHZ wide - SSB, PSK31, CW, Pactor, etc. The current CW
only segments would disappear.

Now I ask you - what does any of the above have to do with code testing? How
does it come under NCI's "charter" to oppose the CSVHS proposal?

If made into law, how would the CSVHS proposal have affected license testing in
any way other than to change a question or two in the written test?

You previously said something about "bandplans schmandplans - put some meat
on the thing" or some such. That's EXACTLY what CSVHS tried to do.

Please explain how NCI's "charter" authorizes it to get involved in opposing
something like the CSVHS proposal, which has nothing to do with code testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5035. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 06:42:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020219014232.25535.00000302@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34695

In article <87%b8.6471$Q9.1865982@twister.kc.rr.com>, "Birdman67"
<Birdman67@wi.rr.com> writes:

>I am a tech-plus. I might try building a qrp CW rig. I plan on upgrading
>to general. Is the FCC planning to have the novice hf privileges removed
>from the tech+ hams to make only three lic classes(tech, general, extra)?
>Thanks for your help
> Dave kb9iig

Dave:

What the FCC is looking at is authorizing voice modes on parts of
what are now the Novice/Tech-plus CW/digital allocations. If this
happens, would lose some CW bandwidth, but so would everyone
else. When you upgrade, you still retain the privileges you have as a
Tech plus, until that change takes place, if it does. All current
licensees are "grandfathered" into their existing privilege levels,
nothing is ever lost when upgrading. Since you would not have
to take any more code tests, you may as well just study some
more and go for your Extra. They're giving it away these days.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5036. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 07:26:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C734254.DCB09153@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34696

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C730F1A.44C89988@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use
> it?
> >
> > You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> > I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> > licensees who "just couldn't".
>
> He didn't say anything about "newcomers." He said "those that we need to
> convince to use it," which may include newcomers and oldtimers alike. Learn
> how to read before you pound the keyboard.

I know what he said, and I also know that trying to convince you
of anything is futile. You already know it all.

5037. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 07:29:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C734308.10430D4C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34697

N2EY wrote:

> They're independently audited, too.

Uh, Jim, so was ENRON!

5038. Questions RE offical ham observers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 08:35:39 UTC
From: Birdman67 <Birdman67@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <v7oc8.2431$kq1.474327@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 35446

Let me first say "thank you" to all the volunteer observers who take take their time and effort to keep the ham bands a self policing entity and as good as they are.

Keep up the good work.

Second, I received a notice that I did not ID for 40 min during a QSO. I don't doubt it is true. I was wondering why the observer did not let me know after say 20 or 25 minutes that I needed to ID, Does the word "observer" mean just that he/she observes but does not participate. Why did the ham operator allow a rule that was obviously being broken continue to be broken. I have noticed that I have paid more attention to my IDing practices since I received the notice but, I think I still would be paying just as much attention if I received a note for not IDing after 25 min. I am not angry, however, and have no ill will against the observer.

Third, I would be very happy to get any information on being a observer. I have much time on my hands and would consider "offering" my time and service to help the hobby. I have had my ticket for 9 years and am a tec+.

Do you have to "know some one" or be friends with the "right people".
Do you have to be appointed.
Do you have to be an amateur extra.
Is offering you time and service enughf to be considered.
Do you pay your own postage on notices.
Is there a good web page to go to.
How much paper work is involved ETC....

Finally, Thanks again to all the volunteer observers. You are all doing a GREAT job. I wold be proud to join your ranks.
Dave kb9iig

5039. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:36:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tUpc8.11908$BR3.665166@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34698

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C731282.710D4003@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > >NCI does not have dues.
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed, W1RFI
> >
> > But they do want you to contribute.
>
> Ah. "No admission. But the suggested
> contribution is ...."
>
>

And for a Love Offering of $37.50 we'll send you...

5040. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:46:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219054617.15086.00001588@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34699

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Since you would not have
>to take any more code tests, you may as well just study some
>more and go for your Extra. They're giving it away these days.

Don't listen to Larry. He has some inner need to see the accomplishments of new hams as inferior to his own. He starts with the tests and goes downhill from there.

He is right that you may as well shoot for your Extra, though. The things you will learn to take the exam open up a lifetime of learning.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5041. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:48:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219054818.15086.00001589@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34700

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>You forgot the "So there, nyaa naya!" and the "sticking your tongue out"
>emoticon, :-P.

And clearly you didn't... So much for superiority, eh?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5042. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:49:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219054957.15086.00001590@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34501

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>"offensive"... aren't we a bit sensitive.
>
>Something I learned from the NCTA, I guess.

Keep going. There is still much they can teach you. It is nice to see that you are on the right track, though.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5043. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:51:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219055122.15086.00001591@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34502

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>For that, he'd need someone born and raised in Sussex county,
>where chickens outnumber people several times over.

Ah, ever-superior to everyone, eh, Larry?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5044. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:53:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219055352.15086.00001593@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34503

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> How could it be dictatorial when it has absolutely no authority?

> Well, he can dream can't he? And try to convince FCC, as in the
>last NPRM.

Oh, okay; when you said "dictate" you meant that he filed comments with the FCC
on a rulemaking matter. Kinda' hard to sort it out when you misuse language
like that.

>> Carl has stated that he does not wish to be the Dictator of Amateur Radio.
>> Carl, is that still true?

> So one then wonders why he turns around and belies all that with
>over conflicting statements.

Exactly what is an "over conflicting statement?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5045. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:54:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219055457.15086.00001594@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34504

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here countering
>your inane BS?

Hurting your cause pretty badly...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5046. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 10:57:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219055704.15086.00001595@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34505

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>> > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use
>it?

>> You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
>> I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
>> licensees who "just couldn't".

>He didn't say anything about "newcomers." He said "those that
>we need to convince to use it," which may include newcomers
>and oldtimers alike. Learn how to read before you pound the keyboard.

Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just clarified
that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments with the
FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5047. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 11:01:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219060152.15086.00001596@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34506

From: "JAMES HAMPTON" j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net

>I would assume this would likely be determined by determining if the member
>had performed any good deed$. $uch as donation$ to the organization.

Interesting. Can you provide any examples where someone has been disbarred from membership in either organization who has not contributed and someone whose conduct was similar who was not disbarred because he did make a financial contribution to the organization?

I am just trying to better understand the basis for your assumption.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5048. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 11:07:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219060734.15086.00001597@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34507

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>NCI does not have dues.

>But they do want you to contribute.

I will make a contribution in your honor.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5049. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 11:08:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219060858.15086.00001598@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34508

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> But they do want you to contribute.

> Ah. "No admission. But the suggested
>contribution is ...."

Nice, but not accurate. Contributions to NCI are entirely voluntary. Those
that don't do so are still granted admission.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5050. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 12:24:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219072425.16913.00000080@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34509

In article <20020215073906.13782.00000160@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>Although it hasn't happened as often, I have tried to
>>>point out to some who I believe misunderstood what Dick has said why I
>think
>>>they misunderstood what Dick has said.
>
>>The "as often" part tells the story.
>
>In what way? Kinda hard to misunderstand "go soak your head..."

I "soak my head" whenever possible. The local Y here has at least 7 pools and wonderful scenery.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5051. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 12:24:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219072426.16913.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34510

In article <3c71a9cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020218151115.03457.00000023@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes
>fail,"
>> >it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone included.
>>
>> So even if Mode X is the most reliable, we should not rely upon Mode X
>more
>> than other modes? That's just not logical.
>>
>
>I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as people
>say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is what
>I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there are
>more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.

That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is reliable?

I'm not just talking about CW here, but about how to make choices in general.
If a mode "gets through" more of the time, it makes sense to rely on it more
than a mode that doesn't.

For example, suppose I want to have reliable communications from EPA to SF.
Depending on time of day and sunspot count, the bands between 40 and 15 meters
are the most reliable. But by your logic, those bands should not be relied upon
more
than, say, 6 meters, because there are times when 6 meters will do the job.
Huh??

>> >No mode should be "favored" over another for
>> >reliance--they all have their place.
>>
>> Yes, they all have their place. But it is simply illogical to say that a
>more
>> reliable mode should not be relied upon more than a less reliable one.
>>
>> Suppose:
>>
>> Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time

>> Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
>> Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
>>
>> If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
>> going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
>> should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
>> because it gets me where I want to go.
>>
>Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you may
>be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you where
>you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
>with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so darned
>reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
>go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and a
>much greater availability of parts.

If the car breaks down, it's not getting me where I want to go. By definition.

> Guess which one I would take on a long trip?

You like working on cars, huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5052. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 12:24:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219072427.16913.00000082@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34511

In article <3C71BBFD.C04655F2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Rearranging standard logic blocks is logic design, Jim.
>>
>> Then rearranging RF blocks is RF design, Cecil.
>
>Not necessarily. Rearranging standard logic blocks results in a brand new
>function.

Not necessarily.

> Does rearranging RF blocks result in a brand new function?

If it didn't, there'd be no reason to rearrange them.

>> How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you designed
>and
>> built, Cecil?
>
>None. I always copied existing circuits and integrated them.

How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you integrated
and built, Cecil?

>I did, however,
>do original designs for controllers for transceivers.

Same here.
>
>> You coulda used an optoisolator and eliminated the mechanical relay, too.
>As
>> much as I like relays, the cheap ones can be trouble.
>
>I had RFI problems with solid state on 10m. That good old mechanical relay
>cannot follow RF.
>
What you need to do is filter and bypass the junctions for RF. Also install a
bridge of diodes for the opto because the motor polarity reverses. Then wire
the whole thing with shielded leads and mount on a double layer PC board in
a metal box. Maybe a time delay and sequencing circuit - good job for a PIC,
doncha think?

Component count? Who cares, we're talking cutting edge control circuits here.
We can't be stuck in the past.

After all, relays are OLD technology. Older than vacuum tubes, even. Slow, antiquated, expensive, outmoded, replaced by commercial and military users in all but a few applications. Legacy technology. They go back at least as far as Morse's original telegraph! In an emergency you might be tempted to tear off the
cover and use the relay to send code!

73 de Jim, N2EY

"...that, I say, that's a JOKE, son. I made a funny...." - Foghorn Leghorn

5053. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 12:46:05 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <BC76A1DACCBC21D2.75D3B6ED8AB5CEC4.12E0A4FBD7FAB2EE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 34512

On 18 Feb 2002 22:15:45 GMT, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
wrote:

>While on the topic, and I'll probably get in trouble with Phil Kane
>again, don't the current FCC rules strike you as, well, weird? If
>the bits you are sending in the phone bands are well-compressed voice
>its okay, if they're well-compressed text it's not okay, if they're
>well-compressed pictures it's okay, unless they're well-compressed
>pictures of text in which case maybe it's not okay,

What if they're well-compressed ASCII art?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

5054. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 13:10:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219081034.22716.00000786@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34513

From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net

>>While on the topic, and I'll probably get in trouble with Phil Kane
>>again, don't the current FCC rules strike you as, well, weird? If
>>the bits you are sending in the phone bands are well-compressed voice
>>its okay, if they're well-compressed text it's not okay, if they're
>>well-compressed pictures it's okay, unless they're well-compressed
>>pictures of text in which case maybe it's not okay,

>What if they're well-compressed ASCII art?

Now, if that observation doesn't demonstrate that the present FCC rules are
really not adequate, nothing does.

If any limitation is needed, it should be bandwidth alone, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5055. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 13:51:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219085135.04745.00001850@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 34514

>And for a Love Offering of $37.50 we'll send you...
>

A nice little Paper Certificate, printed on Carls printer, and you will also get a Rare and sought after NCI Number. Dont wait, be the First in your hood to have one.

5056. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 13:54:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219085424.04745.00001851@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 34515

>I will make a contribution in your honor.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Well thank you ED, but Im affaid they would not alloy me as a member. Which really upsets me.

5057. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 14:29:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34516

N2EY wrote:
> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is reliable?

I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and me
than it is for you. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5058. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 14:35:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7262C2.81894EB6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34517

N2EY wrote:
> How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you integrated
> and built, Cecil?

Probably five transmitters and two regen receivers. I never got a superhet
to work right. The mixers didn't mix very well.

> What you need to do is filter and bypass the junctions for RF.

It would be more trouble than it's worth. The power wires to the screwdriver
motor are loaded with RF. One relay is a lot cheaper than all that RF filtering.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5059. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 14:44:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7264D1.772626D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34518

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > "It happens" is near meaningless unless you define what
> > "it" is. "CW gets through!" clearly implies always.
>
> Really??? So all the preparatory chat on rrap preceding
> that statement had no bearing on setting up the circumstances
> and context under which the statement was made.

Readers of r.r.a.p can join the group at any time, Dick. In
order to avoid uttering falsehoods that newcomers might believe,
what is wrong with keeping the statements true by adding one
small four-letter qualifying word like "often"?

CW often gets through when SSB fails to get through.

That's a true statement and doesn't convey supernatural
powers to CW like your other statement does. For instance,
working Houston on 10m CW from my QTH is close to impossible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5060. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 14:54:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C726729.23E527BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34519

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
> made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
> in Scotland.

I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5061. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 14:59:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72684E.F24292A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34520

Dick Carroll wrote:
> As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here countering
> your inane BS?

Do you really think you are promoting CW usage by insulting potential users?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5062. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:01:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7268C8.88E8DCB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34521

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use it?
>
> You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> licensees who "just couldn't".

Instead of encouraging upgraders to use and enjoy CW, you
call them "ASSHOLES". How does that promote CW usage, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5063. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:03:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C726946.C82BD60A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34522

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Cecil, what you're doing is demonstrating clearly your ability, no
> > > penchant, to be able to "take either side of a debate and win",as you
> > > once said you did in high school.
> > > You leave no doubt that you could support MY side of the
> > > "arguement" just as well if it suited you to do so.
> >
> > Nope, I could not do that in good conscience, Dick.
>
> You mean to actually insinuate that you EVER did something
> in good conscience?

I know it's impossible for you to believe, Dick, but someone can
disagree with you in good conscience.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5064. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:06:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C726A0B.EEC029ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34523

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That doesn't excuse you from spreading falsehoods that newcomers might
> > be duped into believing are true.
>
> That is BS and you know it. If you never spent any time working
> weaksignal CW that's not my fault.

Apparently your imagination is good enough that you can work
nosignal CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5065. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:12:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C726B43.A5680711@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34524

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Very generous of you, since nobody (myself included) discourages anyone
> from using SSB, even though there isn't much to learn in order to use it.

To the best of my knowledge, nobody discourages anybody from using any
mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5066. Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:16:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219101625.13810.00000832@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34525

Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/2002 1:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020218142753.11869.00000010@mb-fl.aol.com>

>The only reason to be a non-
>voting member in any organization is ego boost.

An answer I would expect ONLY from you.....

Use of ARRL membership services...

Support of ARRL programs....

QST and QEX subscriptions...

ARRL insurance for radios...

>I am not sheep and
>you are not a salesman, nor are you good at misdirection of
>a thread.

Ed...how could you have made this mistake?...Lennie the Creep is always trying to get your GOAT...not SHEEP.

And Lennie is correct...YOU have no problem allegedly misdirecting threads...He does that ALL himself.

>Would I get a free t-shirt for joining the ARRL as a NON-VOTING
>member?

No free shirt...but they DO have other occassional promotional items. And no license required...

>The RCA (not, never a
>part of the former RCA Corporation) is interested in ALL radio,
>not the subset of radio enjoyed by amateur hobbyists.

Which has WHAT to do with the ARRL? If you want a "one size fit's all" club, go there. That's not what ARRL is about, now, but then you knew that......

>For some slight misdirection, allow me to mention another
>hobbyist organization, the Academy of Model Aeronautics.

Rest of interesting parallels beteween ARRL and AMA snipped due to thier complete irrelevence in Amateur Radio matters. But thanks. I am sure it kept you from drooling in your pablum for a while.

>The outstanding difference between the two organizations is
>that the AMA doesn't go into self-patronizing flag-waving of how "good and
important they are for the country and national defense-safety"....(BIG SNIP)

Could that be because there is NO mandate for them to do so in codified
federal regulations? You are again redirected to the Basis and Purpose of the
Amateur Radio Service, Your Putziness.

Could it be because that those models are STRICTLY for entertainment?

Could it be because those models are useless to anyone more than a mile or
so from the person controlling them?

>I am fully qualified (perhaps overly so compared to present
>company)...

What were the words uttered by one Leonard H. Anderson about
"self-patronizing"...?!?!

>I am fully qualified though slightly out of practice to design,
>build, test, and fly a model aircraft under 55 pounds in
>weight and, like all, subject to local FAA flying rules near
>airways and airports.

Have fun with your models...Not nearly as fun as the Skylane I
fly...Uh...It's a "bit" over 55 pounds and flies a bit faster! Oh yeah...got
the pilot's license for THAT too, Lennie.

>I don't need to learn morse code to be
>evidenciary of a "vital necessity skill" mode for R/C model
>flying nor even take any federal tests for same.

Nor do any of the other 169,999 members of AMA who fly RC, nor any of the
persons licensed by Part 97 who elect to operate RC..Your point was...???

>...nor do I have
>to adopt a fraternal order mind-set that embraces gratuitous
>lodge-hall self-promotion as a lifestyle.

No...you simply lie and decieve...or ATTEMPT to decieve, anyway...you're
not really very good at covering your tracks with YOUR "misdirections", now are
you?

>In all honesty, which membership do you think is the most
>attractive to the public?

Well now...a RATIONAL mind would ask "Guess it depends if I wanted to be a
Ham Radio Operator or just fly model aircraft, now doesn't it, Spunky...?!?!"

>a winner in the 1948 Plymouth Internationals, Detroit, MI

And not a wit's worth of maturity nor civility since.....

AMF

Steve

5067. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:19:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C726D12.8C26269C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34526

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> ... I have just installed this weekend, my 10M radio, have the Wilson
> 1000 up on top of the truck, and I even took a listen this afternoon.
> Sounded like a lot of great QSOs. Over the weekend I took a listen while
> installing and it sounded as though there was a contest...maybe a 10-10
> contest. I'm a 10-10 member myself, but it sure would be nice to turn 10M
> on during a weekend without a 10-10 hunt going on, sheesh...LOL

Hey Kim, SSB doesn't get through from Madisonville to Dallas on 10m but
since CW gets through when SSB doesn't, we can have a 10m CW QSO. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5068. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 15:30:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219103051.13794.00000856@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34527

>Subject: Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/2002 8:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020218210118.02879.00000126@mb-fk.aol.com>

>"Ein ham, ein volk, ein kode!" - just about every PCTA in here.

Usual neo-Nazi analogies, Lennie...?!?!

Can't get away from it. eh?

I bet the little Mrs has to dress up in neo-Nazi leather and whips to get
your attention...Which doesn't surpirse me,a ctually.

5069. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:03:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73BB7E.5BE228F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34528

W1RFI wrote:

> Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just clarified
> that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments with the
> FCC.

IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
his minions, and nitpick code supporters.

5070. Re: Dictatorial Suppression from an SA Wannabe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:16:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219111620.13794.00000861@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34530

>Subject: Dictatorial Suppression from an SA Wannabe
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/2002 6:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020218192858.11635.00000113@mb-cm.aol.com>

Once again, the use of neo-Nazi analogies noted. Unable to suppress the
truth that he has, again, been caught lying causes him great consternation.

By the way..."what" is suppressed? Your bile flows freely despite reams
of bandwidth expended disproving your allegations and insults. And by more
persons than just "me".

>Ordinarily, I reject Robeson's messages and do not reply to those
>who have such a deep personal mental aberration that they must
>confront and attack any posting of another just for the sake of
>confrontation and attack.

"Thug" "Nazi" "Jackboot" "Elitist".....

You started it, Lennie...Do a Gogglesearch on that.

>All of those applications and direct correspondence
>with NCI are not on any public record or archive.

Of course...very convienient.

>In a later public posting in this chat room, I mentioned this to Carl
>Stevenson. He informed me that NCI membership rules "had been
>changed" and that I was now (at that time) "eligible for member-
>ship." I answered that posting saying that I had no further desire
>to apply for any NCI membership but that I supported their position.

I tend to believe that it was due to thier desire to distance themselves
from someone known to be as undesireable and unreliable as you, Lennie.

Can't say I blame them. Your existence is one of mediocrity and failures.
Your retirement one of insignificance and antagonism.

Who'd want you?

>In a
>lengthy and unneccessary series of newsgroup messages, Robeson
>insisted later that my Reply to Comments was "15 pages" instead
>of 14 due to the FCC recorder including that cover letter as part of
>my submitted document.

Lennie..15 pages were catologued by the FCC. You can try to find some
"technicality" to argue, but it's all pretty childish.

>Clearly that indicated Robeson had no wish to
>discuss anything, just attack, fight, destroy another he did not
>like. His manner to some others in this newsgroup is consistent
>with that. No discussion on subjects, just attempts at
>subjugation through personal attack.

"Thug" "Nazi" "Jackboot" "Elitist"

Yep...Your words...Now you were accusing WHO of "subjugation through
personal attacks"...?!?!

>However, Robeson uses them rather
>clearly in a personal-attack mode against another. Those reasons
>might be:

Hmmmm....Lennie must took a "psych" course in his fourteen years of night
school to get that four year degree......

>1. He was once caught lying in the past and this has left an
> indelible spot on his psyche,....(SNIP)

Nope. I have been wrong in this forum, but have not intentionally misled,
which is what a lie is....You know, Lennie...like YOUR stuff.

>2. Beliefs and Truth have been fused in his own perception so that anything
against his personal Belief-set is therefore untrue.

Nope. Untruthful statements made BY YOU and, as you have noted. verifyed
by disinterested parties.

>This has been seen in others in this newsgroup. This seems popular with
ex-military types.

Yep..it does..."Sarge"...ex-Army radio-God of the 1950's .

>3. The control-freak cum bully mind-set. Domination of everything is their
control.

"Thug" "Nazi" "Jackboot" "Elitist"

Yep...You're right...And you have demonstrated it consistently.

>They cannot fit into an environment so they seek to
> change an environment to something they can handle by any
> means possible.

Curious comment coming from a loser who haunts a Ham Radio newsgroup, who
is not himself a licnesee, yet feels compelled to force his "opinions" on all
comers as "the" correct way to be.

>Such cannot compromise, cannot accept any condition but their own.

Evidence "NoCWTest" "Lenover21" "Lenof21" "AveryFine", et all in his
numerous nomme de guerre.

>4. Frustration at failing to achieve certain things in life, anything from
> education to occupation to avocation to choice of mate, or to find

> out that there is no guarantee in life that they are owed good things
> just because they exist.

Hmmmmmm....I am not first cousin to Ross Perot, nor am I Brittaney Spear's personal nurse...so I guess there are some failures there...

Otherwise I'd have to say that, all things considered, I have accomplished more than Lennie could ever hope to do.

The simple fact that more than one human being is still alive and well as a result of MY life's choices is more rewarding than an Amateur Radio license could hope to provide...But since I DO have that TOO, I guess it's a pretty sweet deal!

>A psychological survival tactic is to
> demean those who have achieved things, denigrate accomplishments,
> to elevate their own accomplishments far above anyone else's.

You do a good job all on your own, Lennie.

You just don't get it that YOU are the source of all those things that you consider "denigrat(ing)". You ARE your own worst enemy. You just fail to accept it.

>That stand-alone sentence is another in a series of Big Lie technique
>statements made by Robeson.

I see you didn't answer it. I didn't expect you would. It is not a lie. It is a question based upon YOUR demonstrated misdeeds.

You need not respond. WE (yes, WE) know the answer.

>He is expressing denial that others
>have done things before his time, of greater difficulty or greater
>accomplishments than his.

Part of your own "Big Lie" syndrome, Lennie. I have, as countless others in this forum can attest, have acknowledged your (apparent) knowledge of radio theory and application.

What I ALSO assert is that YOU have NO practical experience in Amateur Radio. Your own posts support that. It is not a lie or untruthful.

>Rather than learn from older person's experiences he wishes to
>subjugate them, to forbid them doing anything in "his" territory.
>Robeson has previously demanded "learning" such as in microwave
>theory and techniques, for free.

Within the past 96 hours, you have posted no less than 20 pages of text on historical matters tha had no relevence to on-going threads.

You have repeatedly (as the above paragraph attests) made reference to your own alleged technical prowess, suggesting that someone might have something to LEARN from you.

I intentionally put myself in the position of "pupil" with you as "teacher".

It was a roll you were not up to. Incapable. Unprepared.

>That may be
>ignorance on his part but it is always perceived as supremely
>arrogant in demanding free instruction just because he asked for it!

I am sure you think so. Pretty embarrasing for you, I imagine...Being asked to actually DO the things you assert you can by the person you least expect it from.

But your "response" was exactly what I anticipated.
"Nothing"..Well...Nothing but excuses, to be exact.

>The charges of "lying" have been refuted.

"Refuted"...?!?! Hardly. An obfuscation, at best, on your part.

>To verify, one need only to do a FULL access to the appropriate
>subjects at Google archives and/or consult the FCC full public
>document record on NPRM 98-143.

And look for the above mentioned screen names of Leonard H. Anderson, used to dilute his bile.

>This discussion is closed.

There's no discussion. There never was. You lie. You berate. You villify and denigrate.

THOSE are facts.

Now run along...Mrs A is getting her neo-Nazi leatehrs out for you....You've been a baaaaaaad boy...

Again.

Steve

5071. !!Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:16:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73BE8B.DF9D208F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34529

CAM wrote:

> CW often gets through when SSB fails to get through.

Gawd, I don't think I can stand it!!!!! We've been waiting a LONG

time for one of you NCTA's to admit to that simple fact. Just look
at the pain and grief you all have put us poor devils on rrap
through,
but Hooray, there it is!

Now to go to work on Carl........

5072. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:18:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73BEEC.2F8CAA4A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34531

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
> > made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
> > in Scotland.
>
> I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
> -

Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
had a number in the 9600's.

5073. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:20:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73BF8B.CD522752@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34532

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here countering
> > your inane BS?
>
> Do you really think you are promoting CW usage by insulting potential users?

Do you really think that Carl Stevenson, Bill Sohl and Krell are
potential users? Some of you NCTA's and Vanilla Ed Hare have
insisted that I insult newcomers. That's a blatent falsehood, which
is commonly known as a lie. If I insult you, consider that you have
certainly earned it.

5074. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:21:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219112128.13794.00000863@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 34533

>Subject: Kim, I agree
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/18/2002 7:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <0vhc8.20443$P21.1928719@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Hope to c u on 10 metres some day.

"Metres"...?!?! methinks we aim the beam northeastward!

>Be interested to actually talk to some
>NG denizens, the legally licensed ones that is.

I dunno...Maybe His Putziness can listen to us on 10M, and we can try to
pull him out of the 11 meter QRM?.....

NAH!!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5075. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:27:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73C109.BBCF3C03@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34534

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use it?
> >
> > You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> > I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> > licensees who "just couldn't".
>
> Instead of encouraging upgraders to use and enjoy CW, you
> call them "ASSHOLES". How does that promote CW usage, Dick?

Go back and retake Reading Comprehension 101. It's the jokers
like you who constantly insist that CW is too old and antiquated
to be useful for anything but a "novelty" and that anyone who
insists otherwise is a dinosaur and Luddite. Meanwhile us PCTAs
are the ones who are actually on the air with the latest digital modes.
What's strange is how they come to their idiotic conclusions while
*we8 insist that CW is one mode among many, but one we need to keep, and the ONLY
one that
requires a ham to actually cause HIMSELF to do what is necessary
to learn how to use it. Their refusal to do that speaks volumes
about their lack of interest in and value to the hobby.
If it was a problem of understanding that can be solved. But in the cases
we see here that clearly is not so.

5076. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 16:31:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C73C1F4.40C46E78@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34535

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That doesn't excuse you from spreading falsehoods that newcomers might
> > > be duped into believing are true.
> >
> > That is BS and you know it. If you never spent any time working
> > weaksignal CW that's not my fault.
>
> Apparently your imagination is good enough that you can work
> nosignal CW.]send us the name of one.

Nope, never said it, never implied it, no one but YOU even suggested it. So we see where you're coming from.

Troll, troll, troll ur boat.

5077. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 17:19:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202190919.287fc628@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34536

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7262C2.81894EB6@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you integrated
> > and built, Cecil?
>
> Probably five transmitters and two regen receivers. I never got a superhet
> to work right. The mixers didn't mix very well.

I gotta wonder when all this was...

> > What you need to do is filter and bypass the junctions for RF.
>
> It would be more trouble than it's worth. The power wires to the screwdriver
> motor are loaded with RF. One relay is a lot cheaper than all that RF filtering.

In other words, old, simple but effective beats new and complex. You also get
that satisfying clunk or click to tell you the thing is working.

Sorry if it wasn't clear that my comments on relays were tongue-in-cheek.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5078. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 17:41:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a4u29d$3oh$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 34537

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216082239.18942.00001300@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Did fear of getting a low grade motivate you to do anything?
>
> Actually, no; my school career was a rather unfortunate period in my life.

So you were actually a pretty good example of what I was talking about - a
kid who doesn't particularly care about what older people have to say.

5079. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 18:29:07 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4u5cf0mve@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34538

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219085135.04745.00001850@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >And for a Love Offering of $37.50 we'll send you...
> >
>
> A nice little Paper Certificate, printed on Carls printer, and you will
also
> get a Rare and sought after NCI Number. Dont wait, be the First in your
hood to
> have one.

I just sent your name in for a lifetime membership, Bruce.

5080. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 18:30:34 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4u5f50n39@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34539

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219085424.04745.00001851@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >I will make a contribution in your honor.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> Well thank you ED, but Im affaid they would not alloy me as a member.
Which
> really upsets me.

What type of alloy? Nickle? Chromium? Titanium?

5081. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 18:37:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4u5rq0nnu@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34540

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C734254.DCB09153@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C730F1A.44C89988@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to
use
> > it?
> > >
> > > You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> > > I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> > > licensees who "just couldn't".
> >
> > He didn't say anything about "newcomers." He said "those that we need to
> > convince to use it," which may include newcomers and oldtimers alike.
Learn
> > how to read before you pound the keyboard.
>
> I know what he said, and I also know that trying to convince you
> of anything is futile. You already know it all.

Obviously you don't know what was said, since I had to re-post it for you.
Everyone can see that.

5082. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 19:38:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202191138.681ee0bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34541

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020219081034.22716.00000786@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>
> >>While on the topic, and I'll probably get in trouble with Phil Kane
> >>again, don't the current FCC rules strike you as, well, weird? If
> >>the bits you are sending in the phone bands are well-compressed voice
> >>its okay, if they're well-compressed text it's not okay, if they're
> >>well-compressed pictures it's okay, unless they're well-compressed
> >>pictures of text in which case maybe it's not okay,
>
> >What if they're well-compressed ASCII art?
>
> Now, if that observation doesn't demonstrate that the present FCC rules are
> really not adequate, nothing does.
>
> If any limitation is needed, it should be bandwidth alone, IMHO.

Better yet:

In each HF/MF ham band have a subband for CW, a subband for "digital"
(data, voice, image, whatever), and a subband for analog voice/image
(SSB, AM, NBFM,
etc.). CW still allowed almost everywhere but discouraged outside the
CW
subband for routine work. Contest rules state "all contacts must be
made inside
the CW subband" or some such. Digital modes typically cluster by
bandwidth -
narrow modes like PSK31 at the bottom end, wide modes like some
digital voice
systems at the top end.

If 40 meters gets straightened out at WRC 2003 the subbands could be
world wide.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5083. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:05:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219150503.12135.00000175@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 34542

In article <3C7311D0.6084307E@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> > Pretty simple in both cases, really. Both organizations would most
>> >likely ignore him and let him rant. After all, they both have the dues
>> >he paid in support of their organizations belying his rants..
>>
>> NCI does not have dues.
>
> Well I never heard of FISTS nor ARRL precluding anyone from
>membeship on philosophical grounds. When they ante up that's
>considered prima facie evidence. NCI is a "different" sort of
>organization with "different" kind of members anyway.

"Different." Do they have to sit in the back of the bus and drink
from different water fountains, too?

5084. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:05:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219150504.12135.00000176@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 34543

In article <3C73BB7E.5BE228F2@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just clarified
>> that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments with
>> the FCC.
>
>IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
>proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
>his minions, and nitpick code supporters.

Carl Stevenson and Bill Sohl went to DC and made their own
ex parte presentation to the FCC on 98-143. That's public
record, can't be "overlooked."

"Code supporters." Are they some sort of athletic clothing
article used in radio-sport "athletics?" "One size fits all" is not
a correct phrase and does not fit.

5085. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:05:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219150504.12135.00000177@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 34544

In article <20020219055352.15086.00001593@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>> How could it be dictatorial when it has absolutely no authority?
>
>> Well, he can dream can't he? And try to convince FCC, as in the
>>last NPRM.
>
>Oh, okay; when you said "dictate" you meant that he filed comments with the
>FCC
>on a rulemaking matter. Kinda' hard to sort it out when you misuse language
>like that.
>
>>> Carl has stated that he does not wish to be the Dictator of Amateur Radio.
>>> Carl, is that still true?
>
>> So one then wonders why he turns around and belies all that with
>>over conflicting statements.
>
>Exactly what is an "over conflicting statement?"

Definition: "Over conflicting statement" is any statement that is not in Carroll's personal interest.

5086. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:05:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219150507.12135.00000178@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 34545

In article <20020219011108.16913.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c71a051_1@newsa.ev1.net>, Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020217211037.07935.00001083@mb-mw.aol.com...
>>> In article <MPG.16d98f975b0af593989682@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
>>> Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <3c6fd216_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>>> >says...
>>> >
>>> >> That is simply your interpretation. Nothing more.
>>> >
>>> >However, it's an interpretation shared by more than a few knowledgeable
>>> >folks, and backed up with some serious factual evidence, no less.
>>>
>>> Joshua,
>>>
>>> There are none so blind as those who will not see. Sometimes Kim won't
>>> even look ;-)
>>
>>Ya mean where I refuse to see the same things as you do, Jim?
>
>Nope. I mean where you won't even look at information presented to you.

"Information presented" is not a universal truism just because it exists.
Many,
many, many people have looked at the PCTA "information presented" and
disagree with it.

Disagreement with PCTA personal views is not against religion, politics, or
anything else. Disagreement is not heresy nor do the PCTA have any "lock"
on "what is good for everyone" yet so many of them insist they do...

>>2. Applications for membership or renewal of membership shall be submitted
>>to the Secretary. In the case of any applicant whose character, reputation
>>or conduct might make him an undesirable member, the Secretary shall refer
>>the application to the Executive Committee for review; in all other cases,
>>the Secretary shall have the authority to grant membership.
>
>Nope. Standard boilerplate membership stuff. Without it, an organization has
>no mechanism to kick out anyone who pays the dues.

So, selective membership and adherence to the Party Line is well and good if explained differently? There is much disagreement among the non-PCTA folk.

NCI does not have dues, does not claim to represent "all" of amateur radio.

>It behooves anyone who wants to join a group to make themselves "desirable"
>to that group.

It "behooves" a group to dictate the Party Line to the faithful in order to maintain
order and control as exercised by a minority leadership in a membership organization that does not represent a majority of licensed amateurs.

That is essential to survival of the group.

>>By the way, the caveat of those elected Directors is that there is little
>>accountability at that level.
>>
>I don't understand. Are not the Directors elected by secret ballot of the
>members? Can a Director not be recalled or not reelected?

This is a standard boilerplate statement by the party faithful. It attempts to wrap the flag of American democratic principles around its own as if voting within the group is "exactly" like that of US governmental elections which are required by law to have election overseers (who may be of an opposite party). The ARRL is a private organization and is NOT bound by any election laws, only those laws which pertain to non-profit groups for tax revenue and real ownership legal purposes.

>I've been vpoting in every Director election for my region since 1968. ARRL
>sends me the ballot and I fill it out and send it back. I kinda think they
>count 'em. They're independently audited, too.

Two words: Arthur Andersen.

There is NO assurance whatsoever that such voting is aboveboard, only the statements by the ARRL that "everything is honest." ALL assurances come from the ARRL. The faithful MUST believe for they have NO other way to check on the veracity, the validity of claims.

There is not General Accounting Office, no Registrar of Voters, no Election Monitoring agency or equivalent name that is present with government elections. The only "overseer" of ARRL election results is a private organization auditor.

>What part is not correct? Isn't NCI's sole purpose to end all code testing
>for ham licenses? That's what they keep saying.

What part of that does N2EY not understand?

>> However, your
>>mileage may vary. I would expect any organization to get involved with any
>>facet that comes under their charter.
>

>The CSVHS thing had nothing to do with code testing.

Many, many, many efforts of the ARRL may be interpreted as "stepping out of their representative role for amateur radio" when it speaks against OTHER radio services. Why is that considered "good and acceptible" yet becomes "bad and inappropriate" when another organization does it?

The ARRL makes a blanket statement of "representing amateur radio." That is clear, repeated, has been repeated for years.

Equally clear is that the membership in the ARRL has remained a MINORITY of all licensed radio amateurs in the USA for years.

Why does this MINORITY insist on ruling or "knowing what is best for the MAJORITY of amateurs who are not members?"

>Here's the simple facts:

NOT "all of the simple facts."

The simplest fact is simply that the ARRL does NOT represent a majority of licensed radio amateurs in the USA yet it claims to know what is "best for ALL."

>Please explain how NCI's "charter" authorizes it to get involved in opposing
>something like the CSVHS proposal, which has nothing to do with code testing.

Explain how the ARRL is "authorized" in ANY representation of US amateur radio, on ANY federal radio regulation matter, especially involving other radio services.

Explain how the ARRL is "authorized" to implicitly rule on the "necessity" of newcomers' knowledge, skills, and ability in radio to GET INTO amateur radio? THE ARRL DOES NOT REPRESENT THE UNLICENSED-IN-AMATEUR-RADIO, never has, yet it claims to "set standards" for entrance.

ALL of the "authorization" of the ARRL is really an egregious group of claims of a MINORITY who have conferred "nobility" on themselves to "rule" over others.

Now show your "authorization" for your own nobility and righteousness.

5087. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:06:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219150656.11713.00003048@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 34546

>I just sent your name in for a lifetime membership, Bruce.
>

Thanks, now when do I get the Toilet paper certificate from NCI, to wipe my A$$
with?

5088. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:12:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219151206.22209.00000656@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 34547

In article <a4u5f50n39@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020219085424.04745.00001851@mb-fo.aol.com...
>> >I will make a contribution in your honor.
>> >
>> >73,
>> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>> >
>>
>> Well thank you ED, but Im affaid they would not alloy me as a member.
>> Which really upsets me.
>
>What type of alloy? Nickle? Chromium? Titanium?

Misch or Pot Metal.

5089. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:13:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B1F2.CFD9BDDF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34548

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7262C2.81894EB6@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you integrated
> > > and built, Cecil?
> >
> > Probably five transmitters and two regen receivers. I never got a superhet
> > to work right. The mixers didn't mix very well.
>
> I gotta wonder when all this was...

1958-1965 right after I learned how radios worked.

> In other words, old, simple but effective beats new and complex. You also get
> that satisfying clunk or click to tell you the thing is working.

Actually, either the relay is silent or I'm deaf. The IC-706 sidetone comes
on when the relay is energized.

> Sorry if it wasn't clear that my comments on relays were tongue-in-cheek.

It was pretty clear and I decided to play along. But please note there is no
mandatory skill testing on the use of relays.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5090. Re: !!Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:15:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B247.5766C985@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34549

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > CW often gets through when SSB fails to get through.
>
> Gawd, I don't think I can stand it!!!!! We've been waiting a LONG
> time for one of you NCTA's to admit to that simple fact.

Huh???? That statement is what you have been railing against for weeks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5091. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:18:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B329.51306CB0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34551

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Do you really think you are promoting CW usage by insulting potential users?
>
> Do you really think that Carl Stevenson, Bill Sohl and Krell are
> potential users? Some of you NCTA's and Vanilla Ed Hare have
> insisted that I insult newcomers. That's a blatent falsehood, which
> is commonly known as a lie. If I insult you, consider that you have
> certainly earned it.

I'm a newcomer to the Extra class, Dick, and you have certainly insulted
me and made me feel unwelcome. Those three guys may need to use CW for
something one of these days. Let's say one of their scheds fail on SSB.
It's logical to switch over to CW on the calling frequency since digital
is illegal on voice bands.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5092. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:18:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219151851.27594.00000145@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 34550

In article <20020219150656.11713.00003048@mb-mq.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>I just sent your name in for a lifetime membership, Bruce.
>
>Thanks, now when do I get the Toilet paper certificate from NCI, to wipe my >A$$ with?

The act of wiping with anything should be a first for Brucie.

Ham radio finally pioneers something for the disadvantaged.

5093. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:20:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B390.C86C6A4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34552

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
> > > made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
> > > in Scotland.
> >
> > I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
> > -
>
> Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> had a number in the 9600's.

They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5094. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:29:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B597.D704CF1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34553

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Instead of encouraging upgraders to use and enjoy CW, you
> > call them "ASSHOLES". How does that promote CW usage, Dick?
>
> It's the jokers
> like you who constantly insist that CW is too old and antiquated
> to be useful for anything but a "novelty" and that anyone who
> insists otherwise is a dinosaur and Luddite.

Dick, Dick, Dick, Isn't everyone entitled to his/her own opinion
about Morse/CW? You call everyone names who doesn't agree with you.
Do you believe yourself to be so omniscient and perfect that the rest
of the world must therefore be wrong?

> Meanwhile us PCTAs
> are the ones who are actually on the air with the latest digital modes.

Oh, really? One of the very latest digital modes is PACTOR II and,
IMO, is superior to any of the other modes. I'm running PACTOR II.
Are you running PACTOR II, Dick? If not, you just uttered a falsehood.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5095. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:31:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B607.D4B41FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34554

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Nope, never said it, never implied it, no one but YOU even suggested it.

Most other modes fail when you can't hear CW. If CW gets through when
other modes fail, then CW gets through when you can't even hear the
CW signal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5096. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:45:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C72B960.273AB528@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34555

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
>
> Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> had a number in the 9600's.

Sorry to break the news to you, Dick, but #3939 is not on the
FISTS membership list.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5097. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 20:50:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C72BA7C.6B3C883D@uci.edu>
Source record: 34556

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The act of wiping with anything should be a first for Brucie.

Once again, Mr. Anderson shares his wealth of knowledge and experience
in his field of expertise.

5098. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 21:32:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219163213.24123.00000326@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 34557

>Ham radio finally pioneers something for the disadvantaged.
>

Not yet Lennie, hang in there, you will get your Welfare CB Ham License before long

5099. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 21:34:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219163417.24123.00000327@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 34558

>"Different." Do they have to sit in the back of the bus and drink
>from different water fountains, too?
>

Only when Carl says its ok

5100. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 21:47:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202191347.151b1159@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34559

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a4pert$9fa$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020217171021.16502.00000148@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <a4oq2b$7qd$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> Question:
> > >>
> > >> Does the FCC require that people taking the US amateur radio
> > >> tests be conversant in English? I've never heard of any procedure
> > >> to allow non-English speakers to get the tests in anotheer language.
> > >
> > >Interesting question. I don't recall what my VE handbook
> > >sez about such a request. Regardless, there is NO global
> > >expectation of any one language being used.
> > >
> > I'm just talking about the test language. AFAIK, there is no provision
> > to accomodate non-English speakers, but that may have changed.
> >
> > If so, a US ham license pretty muchrequires the ability to use English.

Which is a good thing.

> But to the original "concept"...the Russians
> wanted the code test because (I guess) many
> Russians only had code capability. Nothing,
> however, mandates anyone speak or know
> Russian.

I kinda suspect that the Russians require that anybody who wants a Russian
license (except for reciprocals) be able to use Russian, same as the FCC
effectively requires ability to use English.

While Morse helps break down language barriers, and has some "language-like"
characteristics, it's clearly not a "universal language".

Do the Russians really want to keep the code test? I don't know.

Maybe it's just a bargaining chip for them, to get something else
they really want, which might not even have anything to do with
amateur radio.

Maybe they really do want to keep it, for any of a variety of reasons.
Either way, will they have enough votes to make any difference? I
sincerely doubt it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

....where's that Babelfish?....

5101. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 21:59:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4uhnp0jv5@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34560

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7268C8.88E8DCB3@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Then why do you keep cussing out those that we need to convince to use
it?
> >
> > You waking up in a new world each morning??? Show where
> > I ever cussed a newcomer. The ASSHOLES are all long time
> > licensees who "just couldn't".
>
> Instead of encouraging upgraders to use and enjoy CW, you
> call them "ASSHOLES". How does that promote CW usage, Dick?

Dick thinks that you can catch more flies with vinegar.

5102. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 22:15:43 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4uilc0m43@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34561

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C73C109.BBCF3C03@worldnet.att.net...

> Go back and retake Reading Comprehension 101. It's the jokers
> like you who constantly insist that CW is too old and antiquated
> to be useful for anything but a "novelty" and that anyone who
> insists otherwise is a dinosaur and Luddite. Meanwhile us PCTAs
> are the ones who are actually on the air with the latest digital modes.
> What's strange is how they come to their idiotic conclusions while
> *we8 insist that CW is one mode among many, but one we need to keep, and
the ONLY
> one that

...and, as has been pointed out to you before, if it is needed, then it
should be able to stand on its own merits without testing. The people who
want to use it will use it, and those who have no interest in the mode
should not have to be subjected to antiquated hazing rituals of Ye Olde
Fahrtz.

> requires a ham to actually cause HIMSELF to do what is necessary
> to learn how to use it. Their refusal to do that speaks volumes
> about their lack of interest in and value to the hobby.

It would seem that someone lobbying for change shows more interest in the
value of the hobby than someone who would rather walk away and might say,
"Hams still using morse code? To hell with that. I'll find another hobby."

5103. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:04:47 UTC
From: mike@stupidfatkid.com
Message-ID: <67cc2a41.0202191504.799086e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34562

I just have one simple question. I hope somebody can help me out because I'm very confused. I received my Tech (no code) class license Dec, 1993. I upgraded to Tech Plus in May ,1995. If I upgrade to General now, do I have to retake the 5 wpm code test or just take the new element 3 test? The way I understand it, I just have to take the new element 3 test because I passed the code test before April 15, 2000 - but I'm not sure.

Thanks,
Mike

5104. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:11:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <aYAc8.83$Im1.4429@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34563

"Mike" <mike@stupidfatkid.com> wrote in message
news:67cc2a41.0202191504.799086e2@posting.google.com...
> I just have one simple question. I hope somebody can help me out
> because I'm very confused. I received my Tech (no code) class license
> Dec, 1993. I upgraded to Tech Plus in May ,1995. If I upgrade to
> General now, do I have to retake the 5 wpm code test or just take the
> new element 3 test? The way I understand it, I just have to take the
> new element 3 test because I passed the code test before April 15,
> 2000 - but I'm not sure.
>
>
> Thanks,
> Mike

All you need is Element 3. If you do not try 4 on the same fee, you are a
fool.

Come prepared with both the original and photocopy of your ticket.

5105. Testing in Languages other than English (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:47:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219184711.22683.00000908@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34564

I went to the source and ask the ARRL VEC if it was legal for VE teams to translate the pools into languages other than English and give applicants tests in those languages.

Here is Bart Jahnke's explanation:

> FCC allows it, so long as all three VEs are fully fluent in that language,
> and so long as their coordinating VEC agrees to coordinate the examination
> in a language other than English.
>
> ARRL established an ARRL VEC policy some ten plus years ago that we would
> allow only one other language, Spanish, to be administered as ARRL VEC
> exams; and that we would limit those exams to Puerto Rico only, where
> Spanish is an official language. ARRL has not allowed anything other than
> English elsewhere in the world.
>
> Other VECs like W5YI and Greater Los Angeles have been know to coordidate
> Spanish exams. I'm unaware if they impose any geographical limitations, or
> coordinate tests in other languages.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5106. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:50:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219185045.22683.00000910@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34565

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just clarified
>> that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments with
>> the FCC.

>IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
>proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
>his minions, and nitpick code supporters.

Actually, Dick, I drew that conclusion from the discussion I had with you over your use of the term "dictate." When pressed as to how someone without any authority whatsover could be a dictator, you cited his attempts to influence the FCC as the reason for your choice of the word "dictate."

It wasn't Carl's diatribe at all, Dick; you are foist on your own petard on this one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5107. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:54:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219185404.22683.00000911@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34566

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>Would I get a free t-shirt for joining the ARRL as a NON-VOTING
>>member?

> No free shirt...but they DO have other occassional promotional items.
>And
>no license required...

Okay, okay... I give in. Len, if you join ARRL, I will give you a free T shirt.
On me personally.

> And not a wit's worth of maturity nor civility since........

Len was not uncivil in his reply to my post.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5108. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-19 23:57:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219185721.22683.00000912@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34567

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>It would seem that someone lobbying for change shows more interest in the
>value of the hobby than someone who would rather walk away and might say,
>"Hams still using morse code? To hell with that. I'll find another hobby."

I don't think anyone would be offput by knowing that hams still use Morse code.
I think it important that they realize that hams do more than use Morse code
and that the license opens them up to experiment with nearly any mode they
please, at least on some frequencies.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5109. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:00:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219190026.22683.00000913@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34568

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>I will make a contribution in your honor.

>Well thank you ED, but Im affaid they would not alloy me as a member. Which
>really upsets me.

One does not need to be a member to make a contribution to the defense fund, Bruce. I write a check to the fund every month, and I will do the next one in your honor. Not in your name, mind you, 'cuz I want the tax writeoff, but in your honor.

I can think of no reason that you could not be an ARRL member if you wanted to be one, Bruce. I can't say for certain that ARRL has never dismembered someone, but that certainly would be a very rare event.

Tell you what, if your application for membership is denied for any reason other than insufficient funds, I will buy you a lobster.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5110. Re: Testing in Languages other than English (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:07:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grst8a8.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34569

On 19 Feb 2002 23:47:11 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>> ARRL established an ARRL VEC policy some ten plus years ago that we would
>> allow only one other language, Spanish, to be administered as ARRL VEC
>> exams; and that we would limit those exams to Puerto Rico only, where
>> Spanish is an official language. ARRL has not allowed anything other than
>> English elsewhere in the world.

That was the FCC's position on the only non-Rnglish commercial
exam. The Commercial Element One and Two exam for the Marine
Third Class Radiotelephone Operator Permit (minimum required by law
for safety purposes on certain classes of vessels) was given in
Spanish only in Puerto Rico and such licenses carried a restrictive
endorsement making them valid only on Caribbean waters.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5111. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:08:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4v2n0$kq0$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34595

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C73BF8B.CD522752@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here
countering
> > > your inane BS?
> >
> > Do you really think you are promoting CW usage by insulting potential
users?
>
> Do you really think that Carl Stevenson, Bill Sohl and Krell are
> potential users? Some of you NCTA's and Vanilla Ed Hare have
> insisted that I insult newcomers. That's a blatent falsehood, which
> is commonly known as a lie. If I insult you, consider that you have
> certainly earned it.

Interesting. Wonder what exactly I did to have
earned being insulted by Dick?

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5112. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:11:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a4v2n1$kq0$2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34596

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C73BB7E.5BE228F2@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just
clarified
> > that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments
with the
> > FCC.
>
> IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
> proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
> his minions, and nitpick code supporters.

Guess we have to expand Ed's definition to include
commenting anywhere.

No cheers to Dick,
Bill K2UNK

5113. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:45:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219194520.01458.00001162@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34570

>One does not need to be a member to make a contribution to the defense fund,
>Bruce. I write a check to the fund every month, and I will do the next one
>in
>your honor. Not in your name, mind you, 'cuz I want the tax writeoff, but in
>your honor.
>
>I can think of no reason that you could not be an ARRL member if you wanted
>to
>be one, Bruce. I can't say for certain that ARRL has never dismembered
>someone,
>but that certainly would be a very rare event.
>
>Tell you what, if your application for membership is denied for any reason
>other than insufficient funds, I will buy you a lobster.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Great offer Ed, but there is a problem. I have been a Member of ARRL for 20 Years, but if you would like to pay my renewal for QST next year that would be fine with me.

5114. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 00:48:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219194801.01458.00001163@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 34571

>Okay, okay... I give in. Len, if you join ARRL, I will give you a free T
>shirt.
> On me personally.

Ed make sure it is torn and dirty

5115. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:23:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72faa8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34573

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C73133F.DDD00091@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> > In article <3c71a4ab_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> >
> > > I don't think there's any difference when the ARRL chose to campaign
against
> > > the W5YI initiative, back when I was first licensed. Hell, I can't
even
> > > remember now what the issue was--but I do remember the hoopla.
> >
> > There is so much difference I'm frankly amazed that anyone would compare
> > the two.
> >
> > The W5YI initiative, whatever it was, would have been an FCC *proposal*.
> >
> > W3XO did not have an FCC proposal on the table, he simply made a public
> > *comment* on a proposal in front of the FCC.
> >
> > Do you seriously expect the ARRL not to comment on a proposed rule for
> > Part 97??? Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> > noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?
>
> Josh don't take her seriously. She isn't serious, doesn't appear
> capable of it.
>

Dick *ahem* ignores posts from me because I speak so far above his head he
gets a crick in his neck trying to understand...

Kim W5TIT

5116. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:24:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72fae3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34574

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7317E0.988A3096@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> >
> > Hope to c u on 10 metres some day.
>
> Aw, why come up that far, into all that beeing. Just hang below
> two eight, where it's clear...
>
> Boids of a feather.....
>

Hang below two eight...? Gonna have to 'splain that one.

Kim W5TIT

5117. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:25:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72fb29_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34575

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C731AF6.F05CB74E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >
> > I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as
people
> > say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is
what
> > I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there
are
> > more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.
>
> WHEW!!!!
>

heh heh heh, Figgered that would draw you out of the *ahem* ignore mode.

Kim W5TIT

5118. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:29:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72fc15_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34576

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020218234757.20899.00000067@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3c700977_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Larry: I've never seen anyone "whining" about CW.
>
> Kim:
>
> You may not have "seen" it, but I hear it all the time. Most recently,
> at our local radio club meeting last Tuesday, when our Section
> Manager made one of his infrequent visits, and during the Q&A
> period, some big, fat, stupid looking idiot chimes up with the
> inevitable "When are they going get rid of the code?" Needless
> to say, after Randy fed us the usually politically-correct ARRL
> boilerplate tripe about all the "good people" that came into the
> ARS with the No-code Tech etc. etc, I proceeded to explain to
> them how the reduction of code testing doesn't seem to have
> had the promised effect of creating the "digital paradise" that was
> promised so clearly and specifically by ARRL officials ever since
> the St. Valentine's Day massacre of the ARS in 1991 -- especially
> since all the talk now is about "refarming" the former Novice/Tech
> segments to expand voice mode bandwidth.
>

And, I'll bet you gained more respect through your methodology, too, Larry.

> >
> >I've seen debates on both
> >sides happen, seen people argue and nearly stomp each other over the
> >issue--but I've never seen anyone whine. Unless you call the statement
"I
> >don't like CW and don't want to use it" whining.
> >
> >I don't.
>
> Of course not, since you're one of the whiners.
>

Put up or shut up, Larry. You'll never find a shred of evidence to support
your claim of that.

> >
> >And, maybe they don't *WANT* to be contest-grade CW operators, Larry.
>

> You forgot the "So there, nyaa naya!" and the "sticking your tongue out"
> emoticon, :-P.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No "so there" to it, Larry. And, no sticking my tongue out or any of the childish antics you like to play with. Nope, maybe they don't want to be contest-grade CW operators. In what way do you find such a problem with that?

Kim W5TIT

5119. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:36:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72fdaa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34577

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020218234759.20899.00000070@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3c700630$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> Sez who? I think no part of the license testing regimen has any
> >> possibility of keeping out potentially bad operators. Witness the
> >> fact that most of the NAL's issued in recent years have gone to
> >> 20-WPM code-tested Amateur Extra-class licensees. Some of
> >> the sloppiest CW operating I've ever witnessed on-the-air has been
> >> inflicted on my by my fellow Extras.
> >>
> >
> >But, they didn't get the NAL for sloppy CW. . .did they?
>
> Kim:
>
> No, but when their call signs are run-together into indecipherable
> gibberish, perhaps they should have been cited for failure to properly
> identify their station!
>

Well, send it in, then, Larry. Quit your whining and do something about it.
You claim all these other people are whining and the only whining I've ever
seen is coming from you. It also seems to me that a long-time ham worth his
salt would have been through so much experience that reading "sloppy" CW
would come as second nature. After all, seems like any good ham worth his
salt would get on the air with the sloppy fist and give some pointers for
correction. Sorry you don't feel up to the challenge...we know how much
easier it is for you to whine and condemn.

> >>
> >> However, I'll still take that
> >> over a life consigned to having the same old pointless QSO day-in
> >> day-out on the local repeater with the rest of the codeless blunders.
> >>
> >
> >Larry, maybe those folks enjoy their conversations. Do you *have* to
label
> >them as blunders just because of the conversations they enjoy?
>
> Sure, why not? I figure life is too short to waste time being politically
> correct, especially with folks like Ed, Cecil, and you to do it for me!

>

Gads, you have no friends at all, do you.

> >>
> >> Code testing only achieves one purpose -- getting hams involved
> >> in *using* the Morse code.
>
> >It'd be tough to prove, but I wonder if I'd been more willing to continue
to
> >use CW if I hadn't had to study and learn for a test.
>
> I don't, because to a person, everyone I've heard say this has YET
> to bother to get involved in learning the code -- even though they only
> have to pass 5 WPM to get up to Extra-class HF privileges! They
> still figure that a couple more years of whining will make it go away
> completely, and they may be right.
>

You're probably so busy sneering, Larry, that I doubt you've had any time to
notice anything lately.

> >> As in anything else, what they do once
> >> they gain their operating privileges is going to vary from individual
> >> to individual. I've never claimed that it was any kind of "lid
filter,"
> >> and I don't think anything else is, or could be. Lids are born,
> >> not made.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >I still think lots and lots of people want the test there to use it as a
> >filter. I say that someone who is an "undesirable" ham will go away
after
> >time.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Well, as already stated, I don't see ANY part of the testing regimen
> to be capable of "filtering" out potentially bad operators. However, to
> whatever extent it does, I'm glad that we derive that secondary benefit.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Uh huh. The latter part of your last paragraph belies your real thinking,
Larry.

Kim W5TIT

5120. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:41:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c72febf_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34578

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020218234800.20899.00000071@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3c700a13_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Just like people did in the past. The only difference is that we've
let
> >> the lazy whiners have their way, and in doing so, we have put the
future
> >> of the ARS in jeopardy.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >If ya wanna know the truth, in my opinion the future of the ARS is
always
> >in jeopardy. If it ain't one thing, it's another. And, it doesn't take
> >more, less, highly qualified, meagerly qualified, or anything else to
make
> >it that way. It takes each passing year, and newer and newer
technologies.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> You may have accidentally stumbled on a good point.
>

No accident. You're just beginning to realize how smart I am, like I said
before.

>
> Commercial
> communications technologies have made what even the most advanced
> hams can do seem quite "old hat" by comparison to the most
> basic cell phone, not to mention broadband wireless voice/data
> digital services which are becoming ever more ubiquitous. From a
> strictly technological standpoint, about the only thing hams are doing
> that stands out would be the more arcane modes like Moonbounce --
> but that is hardly a mode which provides viable and reliable
> communications capability.
>
> Hams are at the point now where the best we can hope for is to be
> accepted as a "backup" communications service, and I believe we have

> a proven and vital role to serve in that capacity. However, in order to
> be the most capable "backup" operators we an be, we need to
> maintain a solid grounding in the very essential basics of radio
> communication, including the Morse code. Bringing in a lot more
> technically uninvolved button-pushing appliance operators, who
> possess no operating skills other than the ability to speak somewhat
> clearly into a microphone, is not going to solidify our place in the
> public's mind with regard to our REAL backup capability. Yakking
> into an HT just doesn't impress anyone anymore, nor should it.
> The last time I sat at the operator's position of our radio club's
> station at the county EOC, the county's Emergency Operations
> Director was more impressed with my ability to copy a W1AW
> CW bulletin, than with the PTT skills of the No-code tech sitting
> next to me, clutching the mic of the 2-meter rig for dear life.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And I am pretty sure you are wrong. More hams who bring a mix of interests to the hobby of the ARS and begin weaving their experimentation with all of them is what will keep the ARS in some way viable. By the way, those who wish to do nothing but pick up the microphone are probably a vast minority when it compares to the number of people who see the ARS as an exciting laboratory for experimentation with internet/wireless and other endless new technologies.

Kim W5TIT

5121. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:47:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c73003b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34582

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7321DD.B37237A0@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > > Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
> > > Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
> > > Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
> > >
> > > If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
> > > going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
> > > should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
> > > because it gets me where I want to go.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you
may
> > be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you
where
> > you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
> > with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so
darned
> > reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
> > go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and
a
> > much greater availability of parts. Guess which one I would take on a
long
> > trip?
>
> The clearest evidence yet that getting a ham radio license these days is
NOT
> rocket science! Kim the Brain would favor a Yugo over a Mercedes.
>

Hmmm, no, you must have read backwards, Little Dick--and of course that is no surprise. While the very first brand new car I ever bought all by myself was a Yugo (that ran perfectly fine the two years I had it), I would not choose a Yugo...neither then nor today. I don't think they were reliable at all for a good run; nor would the availability of parts or mechanics be all that common (though the Yugo was quite a simple car to work on--they had the Fiat 128 engine in them by the way).

Mercedes? Hell no. I'd not choose them and if you're implying you would your showing some true ignorance in this context. In this context, for the reliability, availability of parts and more frequently found mechanics who would be able to repair, I'd probably pick a Ford or *maybe* a Buick. Ford first, Buick second.

Kim W5TIT

5122. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:52:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219205217.06196.00000849@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34579

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>Okay, okay... I give in. Len, if you join ARRL, I will give you a free T
>>shirt.
>> On me personally.

>Ed make sure it is torn and dirty

Why? If I am going to offer Len a thank you for joining ARRL, that will be a sincere offer. Why would I want to cheapen myself by sending him a torn and dirty t-shirt?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5123. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:53:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219205329.06196.00000851@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34580

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

> Great offer Ed, but there is a problem. I have been a Member of ARRL for 20
> Years, but if you would like to pay my renewal for QST next year that would
> be fine with me.

Naw, but I will send you a T shirt. What is your size?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5124. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:54:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7302a4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34584

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219055457.15086.00001594@mb-mr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here countering
> >your inane BS?
>
> Hurting your cause pretty badly...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Bwaaaahhaaaaahaaaa!!!!

Kim W5TIT

5125. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:57:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219205724.06196.00000854@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34581

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>In each HF/MF ham band have a subband for CW, a subband for "digital"
>(data, voice, image, whatever), and a subband for analog voice/image
>(SSB, AM, NBFM,
>etc.).

I can see reasons to segregate modes like that, but OTOH, having an open allocation of spectrum allows the use of the bands to adjust dynamically. On a CW-test weekend, CW can go as far "up" the band as it needs to to accomodate the nubmer of users; the converse is true on 'phone or digital 'test weekends. For the most part, it seems to work okay in those countries that don't have mode allocations. I rarely hear Canadians or Europeans below 7040 kHz or so, except during major phone contests.

I don't care either way, but I would imagine that the mode that can get through when others fail would be able to get through even better when others are getting through, too. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5126. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 01:58:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219205814.00126.00003263@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 34583

>Naw, but I will send you a T shirt. What is your size?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Make it XLarge in case it shrinks

5127. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219211020.16502.00000190@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34586

In article <3C734308.10430D4C@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> They're independently audited, too.
>
> Uh, Jim, so was ENRON!

So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.

Do you think the ARRL is such a big customer to their auditors that the
auditors might turn a blind eye to something that wasn't quite kosher? I
don't!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5128. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:10:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34585

In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
>reliable?
>
>I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and me
>than it is for you. :-)

Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5129. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:21:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730912_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34587

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219072426.16913.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c71a9cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020218151115.03457.00000023@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes
> >fail,"
> >> >it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone
included.
> >>
> >> So even if Mode X is the most reliable, we should not rely upon Mode X
> >more
> >> than other modes? That's just not logical.
> >>
> >
> >I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as
people
> >say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is
what
> >I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there
are
> >more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.
>
> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
reliable?
>

Yes, it does.

>
> I'm not just talking about CW here, but about how to make choices in
general.
> If a mode "gets through" more of the time, it makes sense to rely on it
more
> than a mode that doesn't.
>

Well, I am taling *only* about CW here.

It makes little sense to rely on a reliable mode just for the sake of its reliability. The fact that you are all missing in your haste to misunderstand what i am saying is this: the reliability of a mode does little if the mode is little understood.

> For example, suppose I want to have reliable communications from EPA to SF.
> Depending on time of day and sunspot count, the bands between 40 and 15 meters
> are the most reliable. But by your logic, those bands should not be relied upon
> more
> than, say, 6 meters, because there are times when 6 meters will do the job.
> Huh??
>

Because my logic says that if I am going to make more contacts, I will make more contacts via other modes that are more commonly understood. It's great that you, a CW operator, have the CW mode to rely on...all the time. Many, many hams do not. Because of the current state of affairs--that of perhaps not that many skilled CW operators any more--I would be least inclined to rely on CW as a mode in disaster communications. Sorry, but that's the way I feel about it. I may very well be wrong in my assessment. But, I don't believe there are as many hams, or people in general, who would hear a CW signal and understand it, as there would be hams who will hear or see almost any other mode and understand it.

> >> >
> >> >No mode should be "favored" over another for
> >> >reliance--they all have their place.
> >>
> >> Yes, they all have their place. But it is simply illogical to say that a
> >more
> >> reliable mode should not be relied upon more than a less reliable one.
> >>

I am more going to go with the sure thing than I am something that *might* work. For every one ham that could hear and understand my CW signal, there are probably 100-150 who could hear and understand my voice signal. In precious seconds, I'd be willing to take the risk that my voice signal may be what saves a life.

> >>
> >> Suppose:
> >>
> >> Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
> >> Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
> >> Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
> >>
> >> If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm

> >> going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
> >> should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
> >> because it gets me where I want to go.
> >>
> >Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you
may
> >be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you
where
> >you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
> >with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so
darned
> >reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
> >go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and
a
> >much greater availability of parts.
>
> If the car breaks down, it's not getting me where I want to go. By
definition.
>

Well, you're right. Especially if it can't get fixed.

> > Guess which one I would take on a long trip?
>
> You like working on cars, huh?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>

Uh, yeah. But, I'd leave it to the mechanics...

Kim W5TIT

5130. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:27:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730989$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34588

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
reliable?
>
> I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and
me
> than it is for you. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

And, for many others, too.... That's exactly right.

Kim W5TIT

5131. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:29:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730a08$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34589

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C726D12.8C26269C@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > ... I have just installed this weekend, my 10M radio, have the Wilson
> > 1000 up on top of the truck, and I even took a listen this afternoon.
> > Sounded like a lot of great QSOs. Over the weekend I took a listen
while
> > installing and it sounded as though there was a contest...maybe a 10-10
> > contest. I'm a 10-10 member myself, but it sure would be nice to turn
10M
> > on during a weekend without a 10-10 hunt going on, sheesh...LOL
>
> Hey Kim, SSB doesn't get through from Madisonville to Dallas on 10m but
> since CW gets through when SSB doesn't, we can have a 10m CW QSO. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

If you can hear my dits, and I can hear yours...then I guess that'd be each
of us having a QSO in our own little way, eh? LOL!!!

Kim W5TIT

5132. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:31:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730a86_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34593

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219112128.13794.00000863@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >Subject: Kim, I agree
> >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> >Date: 2/18/2002 7:02 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <0vhc8.20443$P21.1928719@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> >Hope to c u on 10 metres some day.
>
> "Metres"...?!?! methinks we aim the beam northeastward!
>
> >Be interested to actually talk to some
> >NG denizens, the legally licensed ones that is.
>
> I dunno...Maybe His Putziness can listen to us on 10M, and we can try
to
> pull him out of the 11 meter QRM?.....
>
> NAH!!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

STEVE!!!! Yeah, let's set up a sked...man, that would be cool!

Kim W5TIT

5133. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:33:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730af9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34594

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219150656.11713.00003048@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >I just sent your name in for a lifetime membership, Bruce.
> >
>
> Thanks, now when do I get the Toilet paper certificate from NCI, to wipe
my A$$
> with?

Gads, you sound like a bubba CBer...

Kim W5TIT

5134. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:40:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020219214037.05420.00000049@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34591

In article <20020219054617.15086.00001588@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Since you would not have
>>to take any more code tests, you may as well just study some
>>more and go for your Extra. They're giving it away these days.
>
>Don't listen to Larry. He has some inner need to see the accomplishments of
>new hams as inferior to his own.

Ed:

It's not that I see them that way, they just are!

>He starts with the tests and goes downhill from there.

Not really. The tests have gone downhill quite enough, thank you!

>He is right that you may as well shoot for your Extra, though. The things you
>will learn to take the exam open up a lifetime of learning.

Well, for some people they do...even if all you learn is how to be a
smug, arrogant, politically correct, liberal supporter of a dumbed-down
licensing system.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5135. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:40:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020219214037.05420.00000048@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34592

In article <20020219054818.15086.00001589@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>You forgot the "So there, nyaa naya!" and the "sticking your tongue out"
>>emoticon, :-P.
>
>And clearly you didn't... So much for superiority, eh?

Didja ever notice how politically-correct liberals always seem to whine about other people's alleged claims of superiority, in order to assert their own?

Ed -- we know that you are a totally socially acceptable, politically correct, all-inclusive, touchy-feely, hand holding, guitar strumming, Kumbuya-singing, environmentally pure, Board of Directors Yes man -- the very image of ARRL HQ. You don't need to knock yourself out to impress anyone here. You don't have to worry about putting your personal popularity on the line by expressing original, independent thoughts on any issue relevant to the ARS. You are a completely acceptable "company man." Your job is secure, and you do it well. You can relax. If taking occasional pokes at me helps to further your image, then feel free. I understand.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5136. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:40:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020219214038.05420.00000050@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 34590

In article <20020219055122.15086.00001591@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>For that, he'd need someone born and raised in Sussex county,
>>where chickens outnumber people several times over.
>
>Ah, ever-superior to everyone, eh, Larry?

Ed:

Sussex County, Delaware is one of the largest poultry producing regions in the United States. The fact that the chickens outnumber people by several times just happens to be a fact. Why would it have anything to do with anyone's alleged "superiority?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

5137. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:43:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730d31$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34597

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219205217.06196.00000849@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>
> >>Okay, okay... I give in. Len, if you join ARRL, I will give you a free T
> >>shirt.
> >> On me personally.
>
> >Ed make sure it is torn and dirty
>
> Why? If I am going to offer Len a thank you for joining ARRL, that will be
a
> sincere offer. Why would I want to cheapen myself by sending him a torn
and
> dirty t-shirt?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

WA8ULX hasn't been out of the swamp in a while, Ed. He thinks that is
dressed up.

Kim W5TIT

5138. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:49:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730ea6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34599

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
> >reliable?
> >
> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and
me
> >than it is for you. :-)
>
> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure. Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make. But, let's say there was a choice between a really reliable auto, though garages are few and far between that know it well; and a not-so-reliable auto with garages that know it well are quite common. I'm banking on the likelihood that, knowing my luck, either auto is going to break down. I am going to go with the auto most likely to get repaired.

Kim W5TIT

5139. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:52:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c730f69_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34600

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
> >reliable?
> >
> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and
me
> >than it is for you. :-)
>
> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

OH!!!! Forgot to say, and that's why I also have a CB in my auto. I'm more
likely to get ahold of someone on CB than by CW, 2M, 70cm, or HF any day...
The person may not be the most desirable, but then some hams I know aren't
so desirable either :o

Kim W5TIT

5140. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 02:57:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <egEc8.626$lm1.32061@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34598

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020219214038.05420.00000050@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <20020219055122.15086.00001591@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >>For that, he'd need someone born and raised in Sussex county,
> >>where chickens outnumber people several times over.
> >
> >Ah, ever-superior to everyone, eh, Larry?
>
> Ed:
>
> Sussex County, Delaware is one of the largest poultry producing
> regions in the United States. The fact that the chickens outnumber
> people by several times just happens to be a fact. Why would it
> have anything to do with anyone's alleged "superiority?"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I didn't quite get the connection either, Larry. I lived in a Wisconsin
county that was even a Metropolitan Statistical Area where the Holsteins
outnumbered the humans and live in a state today where things that moo
outnumber the two-legged population several-fold. So what?

Maybe that is why I am so sensitive to bullshit.

Dick N�BK

5141. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:03:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73120A.C48BEE42@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34603

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and me
> >than it is for you. :-)
>
> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?

Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5142. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:05:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C731266.9FA426E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34607

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
> Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.

A good analogy might be that the stick shift vehicle is more reliable but
you don't know how to drive it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5143. Re: Part 97 Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:06:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219220613.06176.00000812@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34602

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>You forgot the "So there, nyaa naya!" and the "sticking your tongue out"
>>>emoticon, :-P.
>>
>>And clearly you didn't... So much for superiority, eh?
>
>Didja ever notice how politically-correct liberals always seem to whine
>about other people's alleged claims of superiority, in order to assert their
>own?
>
>Ed -- we know that you are a totally socially acceptable, politically
>correct, all-inclusive, touchy-feely, hand holding, guitar strumming,
>Kumbuya-singing, environmentally pure, Board of Directors Yes man --
>the very image of ARRL HQ. You don't need to knock yourself out to
>impress anyone here. You don't have to worry about putting your
>personal popularity on the line by expressing original, independent thoughts
>on any issue relevant to the ARS. You are a completely acceptable
>"company man." Your job is secure, and you do it well. You can relax.
>If taking occasional pokes at me helps to further your image, then
>feel free. I understand.

I think you should have the last word there, Larry. I am so astounded at the profoundedness of your words that I just don't know if I could say anything in response that your words didn't already say for me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5144. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:06:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219220624.24181.00000509@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 34601

>Gads, you sound like a bubba CBer...
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>

You got me confussed with your Hubby

5145. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:06:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7312C2.9B4487CF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34608

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> OH!!!! Forgot to say, and that's why I also have a CB in my auto. I'm more
> likely to get ahold of someone on CB than by CW, 2M, 70cm, or HF any day...

That's why I unlocked my IC-706 - in case of emergency I can do AM on
the CB band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5146. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:07:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219220710.06176.00000813@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34604

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Sussex County, Delaware is one of the largest poultry producing
>regions in the United States. The fact that the chickens outnumber
>people by several times just happens to be a fact. Why would it
>have anything to do with anyone's alleged "superiority?"

I stand corrected and apologize.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5147. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:08:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219220824.24181.00000510@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 34605

>Forgot to say, and that's why I also have a CB in my auto.

That doesnt surprise anybody.

5148. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:08:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219220826.06176.00000814@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34606

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Interesting. Wonder what exactly I did to have
>earned being insulted by Dick?

And I? Perhaps I was too "vanilla," whatever that is supposed to mean?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5149. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:10:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219221012.06176.00000815@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 34609

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Do you think the ARRL is such a big customer to their auditors that the
>auditors might turn a blind eye to something that wasn't quite kosher? I
>don't!

If he watched what I had to go through if I lost a $50.00 receipt, or to get approval for a rental car on a business trip, he would probably be a little less paranoid of the big conspiracy. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5150. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 03:14:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020219221407.24181.00000514@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 34610

>WA8ULX hasn't been out of the swamp in a while, Ed. He thinks that is
>dressed up.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

No I think that was probably your Wedding gown

5151. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 04:44:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C746DD3.CC22A120@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34611

CAM wrote:

> I'm a newcomer to the Extra class, Dick, and you have certainly insulted
> me and made me feel unwelcome.

Well, hear hear! One post he's the 50 year expert who has it ALL
under his complete control, and the next he's an offended newcomer!
Ain't it sensational, how he does it? Troll, troll, troll!!!

> Those three guys may need to use CW for
> something one of these days. Let's say one of their scheds fail on SSB.
> It's logical to switch over to CW on the calling frequency since digital
> is illegal on voice bands.

Well pity them all to heck, for they don't stand a chance. It's too
late, game's over.

>
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5152. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 04:47:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C746E92.48E72EC7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34612

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Oh, I joined FISTS about six thousand members ago. In fact, I
> > > > made a couple FISTS CW contacts this evening, one with a station
> > > > in Scotland.
> > >
> > > I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
> > > -
> >
> > Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> > had a number in the 9600's.
>
> They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
> Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?

I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
says #3939.

5153. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 04:48:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a4v9n802s5g@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34616

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C731266.9FA426E8@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> > someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
> > Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> > isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
>
> A good analogy might be that the stick shift vehicle is more reliable but
> you don't know how to drive it.

Exactly! I personally prefer a standard over an automatic transmission,
especially with Pittsburgh's winters. I don't, however, think that someone
should be required to show proficiency in driving a standard shift vehicle
in order to obtain a driver's license.

5154. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 04:54:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C747025.21B5D130@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34613

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
> >
> > Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> > had a number in the 9600's.
>
> Sorry to break the news to you, Dick, but #3939 is not on the
> FISTS membership list.

Sorry to break the news to you, Cecil, but number 3939 IS on
the certificate hanging on my shack wall.

5155. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 04:55:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C747071.80676624@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34614

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > The act of wiping with anything should be a first for Brucie.
>
> Once again, Mr. Anderson shares his wealth of knowledge and experience
> in his field of expertise.

Problem is, he never did get to be very good at it. Butt he keeps
trying!

5156. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 05:03:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C747257.C4C269EB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34615

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just clarified
> >> that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments with
> >> the FCC.
>
> >IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
> >proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
> >his minions, and nitpick code supporters.
>
> Actually, Dick, I drew that conclusion from the discussion I had with you over
> your use of the term "dictate." When pressed as to how someone without any
> authority whatsover could be a dictator, you cited his attempts to influence
> the FCC as the reason for your choice of the word "dictate."

So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
to dictate? I doubt many others who have long read his stuff
would agree.

5157. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 05:07:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C74732F.F3C5A416@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34617

W1RFI wrote:

can't say for certain that ARRL has never dismembered someone,

> but that certainly would be a very rare event.

Gee, I hope so. I have wondered at times what they did with all the
body parts.

5158. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 05:16:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C74753F.397C2420@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34618

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C734308.10430D4C@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> They're independently audited, too.
> >
> > Uh, Jim, so was ENRON!
>
> So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.

Not at all, but it sure does cast doubt on the entire process.

5159. WANTED: Optolinx, CT17, CT-17, CIV, CI-V, ICOM MANUALS IC-R7100, ICR7100, IC7100, R7100, 7100

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 05:41:52 UTC
From: ddmga@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <296ea75a.0202192141.5eba05f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34619
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.marketplace,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

WANTED: Optolinx, CT17, CT-17, CIV, CI-V, ICOM MANUALS IC-R7100, ICR7100, IC7100, R7100, 7100

DDMGA@YAHOO.COM

5160. CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 08:40:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C74A50C.7B54E110@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34620

I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
few weeks ago a columnist
mentioned that California has a new law
that overrules CCR's which
prohibit pets. It specifically states
that a homeowner may have one
pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
pets.

Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
pass while hams get no antennas
with which to conduct emergency
communications for the public good.
Something's wrong with this scene....

5161. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 10:21:39 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220052139.27254.00002382@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34621

>Did he ID every ten minutes?
>--

Only if his call sign was OH EE OH EE OO EE I I I I E E E O O O

5162. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 11:10:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220061040.22724.00000918@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34622

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
>to dictate? I doubt many others who have long read his stuff
>would agree.

You didn't say that he was trying to dictate, Dick; you said that he was dictating to the FCC and the ARRL. I disagreed that someone who has absolutely no authority can be a dictator. You argued for a while, but I can infer from the rewrite of your statement you made above by adding "try" as a qualifier, that you now agree with me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5163. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 11:12:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220061230.22724.00000919@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34623

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I'm a newcomer to the Extra class, Dick, and you have certainly insulted
>> me and made me feel unwelcome.

> Well, hear hear! One post he's the 50 year expert who has it ALL
>under his complete control, and the next he's an offended newcomer!
>Ain't it sensational, how he does it? Troll, troll, troll!!!

Calling him a troll is an insult. You just proved his point for him.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5164. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 11:15:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220061519.22724.00000920@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34624

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
>> Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?

> I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
>says #3939.

Some organizations have permanent memberships (QRP ARCI, NCI), but retain an
active membership for those whose dues are paid up. I have been QRP ARCI member
5860 for a long time, but I let it lapse for so long that they couldn't even
find the records that showed I ever WAS a member. :-) They took me at my word
and reissued the number to me.

Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

5165. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 11:17:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220061741.22724.00000921@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34625

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.

> Not at all, but it sure does cast doubt on the entire process.

You have made mistakes on this forum, Dick. Should that cast doubt on everything said by anybody under any circumstances? Should your mistakes cast doubt on all hams? Should your mistakes cast doubt on everyone here? Should your mistakes cast doubt on everything you say?

I am just trying to understand the standards you use to doubt.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5166. Re: Testing in Languages other than English (was Re: Would Morse Code die wit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 12:15:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220071535.03457.00000087@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34628

In article <20020219184711.22683.00000908@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>I went to the source and ask the ARRL VEC if it was legal for VE teams to
>translate the pools into languages other than English and give applicants
>tests
>in those languages.

Thanks for the info, Ed.

>Here is Bart Jahnke's explanation:
>
>> FCC allows it, so long as all three VEs are fully fluent in that language,
>> and so long as their coordinating VEC agrees to coordinate the examination
>> in a language other than English.

Interesting! The VEs do the translating, too!
>>
>> ARRL established an ARRL VEC policy some ten plus years ago that we would
>> allow only one other language, Spanish, to be administered as ARRL VEC
>> exams; and that we would limit those exams to Puerto Rico only, where
>> Spanish is an official language. ARRL has not allowed anything other than
>> English elsewhere in the world.
>>
>> Other VECs like W5YI and Greater Los Angeles have been know to coordidate
>> Spanish exams. I'm unaware if they impose any geographical limitations, or
>> coordinate tests in other languages.
>
Cool!

Thanks again.

Thinking about it, Canada almost certainly does testing in English and French.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5167. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 12:15:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220071537.03457.00000088@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34626

In article <3c730912_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020219072426.16913.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3c71a9cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020218151115.03457.00000023@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3c6e6470_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
>> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Add to that the fact that even *if* CW "gets through when other modes
>> >fail,"
>> >> >it should never be more relied upon than any other mode, phone
>included.
>> >>
>> >> So even if Mode X is the most reliable, we should not rely upon Mode X
>> >more
>> >> than other modes? That's just not logical.
>> >>
>> >
>> >I can tell you that even though CW is supposed to be as reliable as
>people
>> >say it is, I don't think we should rely on CW that much. Yes, that is
>what
>> >I am saying. Why? Because even though CW may be that reliable, there
>are
>> >more reasons not to rely on it than its reliance.
>>
>> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
>reliable?
>
>Yes, it does.

No, it doesn't.

>> I'm not just talking about CW here, but about how to make choices in
>general.
>> If a mode "gets through" more of the time, it makes sense to rely on it
>more
>> than a mode that doesn't.

>Well, I am taling *only* about CW here.

Ah. That's different.
>
>It makes little sense to rely on a reliable mode just for the sake of its
>reliability.

No, it makes all the sense in the world.

> The fact that you are all missing in your haste to
>misunderstand what i am saying is this: the reliability of a mode does
>little if the mode is little understood.

Then why not say that up-front? I read what is written several times before
replying. I understood what you wrote, which may not be the same as what
you were trying to say.
>
>> For example, suppose I want to have reliable communications from EPA to
>SF.
>> Depending on time of day and sunspot count, the bands between 40 and 15
>meters
>> are the most reliable. But by your logic, those bands should not be relied
>upon
>> more
>> than, say, 6 meters, because there are times when 6 meters will do the
>job.
>> Huh??
>
>Because my logic says that if I am going to make more contacts, I will make
>more contacts via other modes that are more commonly understood.

The above discussion was about band choice, not mode choice.

>It's great
>that you, a CW operator, have the CW mode to rely on...all the time. Many,
>many hams do not. Because of the current state of affairs--that of perhaps
>not that many skilled CW operators any more--I would be least inclined to
>rely on CW as a mode in disaster communications. Sorry, but that's the way
>I feel about it. I may very well be wrong in my assessment. But, I don't
>believe there are as many hams, or people in general, who would hear a CW
>signal and understand it, as there would be hams who will hear or see almost
>any other mode and understand it.

Try listening to the HF bands other than 10 meters when they are open and
see how much CW use there is, compared to other modes. How many hams
do you think could decode a PACTOR 2 signal?
>
>> >> >No mode should be "favored" over another for
>> >> >reliance--they all have their place.

This statement does not single out CW - it says "no mode".
>> >>
>> >> Yes, they all have their place. But it is simply illogical to say that
>a

>> >more
>> >> reliable mode should not be relied upon more than a less reliable one.
>
>I am more going to go with the sure thing than I am something that *might*
>work. For every one ham that could hear and understand my CW signal, there
>are probably 100-150 who could hear and understand my voice signal.

Where do you get such numbers? The reality on HF is more like 1 in 3, not 1 in
100 or 1 in 150.

Or are you saying your CW signal would not be understandable? ;-)

>In
>precious seconds, I'd be willing to take the risk that my voice signal may
>be what saves a life.

All depends on the situation.
>> >>
>> >> Suppose:
>> >>
>> >> Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
>> >> Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
>> >> Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
>> >>
>> >> If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
>> >> going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
>> >> should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
>> >> because it gets me where I want to go.
>> >>
>> >Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you
>may
>> >be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you
>where
>> >you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
>> >with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so
>darned
>> >reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
>> >go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and
>a
>> >much greater availability of parts.
>>
>> If the car breaks down, it's not getting me where I want to go. By
>definition.

>Well, you're right. Especially if it can't get fixed.

That's my entire point. Reliability has many components.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5168. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 12:15:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220071538.03457.00000089@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 34627

In article <3C74A50C.7B54E110@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
>few weeks ago a columnist
>mentioned that California has a new law
>that overrules CCR's which
>prohibit pets. It specifically states
>that a homeowner may have one
>pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
>pets.
>
> Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
>pass while hams get no antennas
>with which to conduct emergency
>communications for the public good.
> Something's wrong with this scene....
>
I think it's good news for hams.

First off, the fact that the new law came to be
means there IS a way to get such a law. We
need to find out how the pet preemption came
to be and use a similar method to get an antenna
preemption.

Second, the new law shows "reasonable
accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
number. For hams that might mean one antenna
of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
up any sort of tower/antenna farm.

Third, your argument about emergency comms
is valid. If preemptions happen for pets, why not
for emergency preparedness?

I'll bet that one factor in the law getting passed
was strong support by pet owners, in the form
of letters to the appropriate legislators.

73 de Jim (not a lawyer), N2EY

5169. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 12:43:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <pRMc8.1345$eI1.370240@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 34629

Sounds like that would be a more interesting topic that what I have been hearing lately. Sounds like the topic list on that show is getting a little light.....

> Maybe Larry should go for a guest spot on Art Bell's radio show and do his
> Chicken Little routine.
>
>
>

5170. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 13:17:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220081728.29971.00000973@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 34630

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Second, the new law shows "reasonable
>accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
>number. For hams that might mean one antenna
>of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
>up any sort of tower/antenna farm.

What ARRL has been asking for is an CC&R pre-emption similar in scope to that given by the FCC to broadcast reception antennas. This would certainly allow verticals, wires in trees, outdoor ground planes, VHF Yagis, etc. It might allow a small HF antenna like a Butternut beam. So far, the FCC has said no.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5171. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 13:29:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220082920.10835.00001186@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 34631

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna tuner to
>use it for the ham bands.

Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5172. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 15:48:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a50gbp02h03@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34635

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220061741.22724.00000921@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.
>
> > Not at all, but it sure does cast doubt on the entire process.
>
> You have made mistakes on this forum, Dick. Should that cast doubt on
> everything said by anybody under any circumstances? Should your mistakes
cast
> doubt on all hams? Should your mistakes cast doubt on everyone here?
Should
> your mistakes cast doubt on everything you say?
>
> I am just trying to understand the standards you use to doubt.

Dick's attitude on this forum is the basis for which many use to cast doubt
on his credibilty. Ditto Larry and Babbling Brucie.

5173. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 15:56:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73C734.4BE8675@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34632

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> > > had a number in the 9600's.
> >
> > They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
> > Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?
>
> I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
> says #3939.

Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
you still think I need my glasses changed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5174. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 15:57:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73C779.A52EF5CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34633

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I don't see W0EX listed in their membership list.
> > >
> > > Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> > > had a number in the 9600's.
> >
> > Sorry to break the news to you, Dick, but #3939 is not on the
> > FISTS membership list.
>
> Sorry to break the news to you, Cecil, but number 3939 IS on
> the certificate hanging on my shack wall.

But it has apparently expired. Did you forget to pay your dues?
Do you think changing my glasses would allow me to see the
expired certificate hanging on your shack wall?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5175. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 15:59:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73C7CA.922112CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34634

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
> to dictate?

You try to dictate things without having any authority. It doesn't
work for you any better than it works for Carl.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5176. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 16:03:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73C8C6.D01B3790@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34636

N2EY wrote:
> I'll bet that one factor in the law getting passed
> was strong support by pet owners, in the form
> of letters to the appropriate legislators.

At first I thought, "Hmmm, get an apartment complex with
all hams." But that wouldn't work, would it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5177. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 16:45:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7516E7.3EFCC378@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34637

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
> >to dictate? I doubt many others who have long read his stuff
> >would agree.
>
> You didn't say that he was trying to dictate, Dick; you said that he was
> dictating to the FCC and the ARRL. I disagreed that someone who has absolutely
> no authority can be a dictator.

You've been hanging out with Cecil too long, you're getting to be the same sort
of wordmeister
Sure he can "dictate"
without authority. If he had authority we'd have to listen. That's
the scary part.

5178. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 16:46:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C751720.73C71003@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34638

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I'm a newcomer to the Extra class, Dick, and you have certainly insulted
> >> me and made me feel unwelcome.
>
> > Well, hear hear! One post he's the 50 year expert who has it ALL
> >under his complete control, and the next he's an offended newcomer!
> >Ain't it sensational, how he does it? Troll, troll, troll!!!
>
> Calling him a troll is an insult. You just proved his point for him.

And you just proved mine.

5179. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 16:51:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75184F.A3D46BC3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34639

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
> >> Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?
>
> > I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
> >says #3939.
>
> Some organizations have permanent memberships (QRP ARCI, NCI), but retain an
> active membership for those whose dues are paid up. I have been QRP ARCI member
> 5860 for a long time, but I let it lapse for so long that they couldn't even
> find the records that showed I ever WAS a member. :-) They took me at my word
> and reissued the number to me.
>
> Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.

Once a FISTS member your membership doesn't expire. If you
want the monthly newsletter you pay an annual membership dues, if not you just
don't get the newsletter, you do keep the membership
and its number. (That's the way it was explained to me). I dropped
the newsletter a couple years ago.

Cecil was probably looking at a list of those who are active
subscibers to the newsletter.

5180. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 16:56:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C751964.BB1315D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34640

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.
>
> > Not at all, but it sure does cast doubt on the entire process.
>
> You have made mistakes on this forum, Dick.

I sure have, and by far the worst one was ever assumsing one could
have a calm, candid, rational conversation with the likes of Cecil
and in fact you yourself. You guys can start your own "organization"
anytime, you are more than ready. Call it NPI, Nit Pickers International. Your
motto can be "We never assume that hams of
long experience will be familiar with anything but they must give
a most complete description of every subject they address, lest
all those wellread newcomers be confused. Don't hold us to our
own standard, though".

5181. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:00:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220120027.18935.00002014@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34641

>Subject: Re: Once More, Into The Fray....
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/19/2002 5:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020219185404.22683.00000911@mb-fx.aol.com>

>
>Len was not uncivil in his reply to my post.

Even "you know who" in 1930's central Europe could be charming and civil on occassion.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5182. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:01:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202200901.55eebf58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34642

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C73120A.C48BEE42@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and me
> > >than it is for you. :-)
> >
> > Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>
> Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)

Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
drive a stick shift.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5183. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:02:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220120224.18935.00002015@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34643

>Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 2/19/2002 8:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c730a86_2@newsa.ev1.net>

>STEVE!!!! Yeah, let's set up a sked...man, that would be cool!

I am off today, 20 Feb. I'll se the HF rig up for 28.525 and let it sit
there...Give a call!

73/88

Steve, K4YZ

5184. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:07:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220120728.18935.00002016@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34644

>Subject: Re: CCR's in California...
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/20/2002 7:29 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020220082920.10835.00001186@mb-cr.aol.com>

>Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know?

Isn't it Tennadyne that has a "six and two meter" yagi that is
specifically designed to LOOK like a TV antenna?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5185. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:10:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C751CBF.3B0A110C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34645

Keith wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> >pass while hams get no antennas
> >with which to conduct emergency
> >communications for the public good.
> > Something's wrong with this scene....
>
> Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna tuner to
> use it for the ham bands. You could get a 50 MHz beam to tune in channel 2-6
> on the TV. The FCC says CCR's can't exclude TV antennas. The problem with
> some hams is that they want a 75 foot tower and the neighbors don't like
> that. I operated for several years in a CCR neighborhood and used thin wire
> dipoles for the bands and never operated between the hours of 6pm and
> 11 pm, I never had a problem. I used to work DX running 25 watts into that
> dipole all over bands and had a blast.

I've never lived in a CCR restricted place but have spent considerable time visiting in them, and have been on the air many times. It's surprising what you can do with a pair of dipoles on 40 and 20 that are hung paralleled on a 6 ft wooden (or in one case concrete block) fence, especially when working CW and digital modes.

5186. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:18:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34646

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
>
> >Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna tuner to
> >use it for the ham bands.
>
> Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)

And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.

Of course N2EY Jim is right, the California Pet Pre-emption law
should help hams get relief of some sort from CCR restrictions. The problem as
always is in the details. One antenna wouldn't be
enough, one would need one for each band in use, particularly
for widely separated frequencies, HF and VHF etc. It would
probably have to be the start of specifying just what could be done,
as opposed to allowing whatever a ham decides he needs. The
potential for problems is large. Some ham will always want something
that a neighbor will consider excessive, etc.
It will certainly be worth working out the details.

5187. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:33:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C752220.5BA806E3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34647

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C74A50C.7B54E110@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> > I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
> >few weeks ago a columnist
> >mentioned that California has a new law
> >that overrules CCR's which
> >prohibit pets. It specifically states
> >that a homeowner may have one
> >pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
> >pets.
> >
> > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> >pass while hams get no antennas
> >with which to conduct emergency
> >communications for the public good.
> > Something's wrong with this scene....
> >
> I think it's good news for hams.
>
> First off, the fact that the new law came to be
> means there IS a way to get such a law. We
> need to find out how the pet preemption came
> to be and use a similar method to get an antenna
> preemption.
>
> Second, the new law shows "reasonable
> accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
> number. For hams that might mean one antenna
> of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
> up any sort of tower/antenna farm.
>
> Third, your argument about emergency comms
> is valid. If preemptions happen for pets, why not
> for emergency preparedness?
>
> I'll bet that one factor in the law getting passed
> was strong support by pet owners, in the form
> of letters to the appropriate legislators.

I'm not sure just when this law was passed, but I wish ARRL
had the information when they asked for reconsideration of FCC's
refusal to prempt CCR's. (assuming they did not). It would seem

to to have been a telling point to be able to point out that at least
one state believes that CCR contracts are not impenetrable for good
reason, and to point out that emergency radio communications
are at least as good reason as a homeowner wanting to keep a pet.

Dick W0EX

5188. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:35:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7522A8.CA75A280@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34648

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Change your glasses and look at #3939. Guy I worked yesterday
> > > > had a number in the 9600's.
> > >
> > > They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
> > > Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?
> > >
> > I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
> > says #3939.
> >
> Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
> you still think I need my glasses changed?

Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire. Dues are only paid to
spport the monthly newsletter, which I dropped a couple years
ago. Actually I think you need a change of attitude more than
a change of glasses.

5189. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 17:37:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C752302.86357833@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34649

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
> > to dictate?
>
> You try to dictate things without having any authority. It doesn't
> work for you any better than it works for Carl.

So because I believe that a code test is appropriate for licensing
ham radio operators, I try to dictate.

You need a brain change.

5190. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:13:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202201013.4f39c5a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34650

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020220081728.29971.00000973@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Second, the new law shows "reasonable
> >accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
> >number. For hams that might mean one antenna
> >of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
> >up any sort of tower/antenna farm.
>
> What ARRL has been asking for is an CC&R pre-emption similar in scope to that
> given by the FCC to broadcast reception antennas. This would certainly allow
> verticals, wires in trees, outdoor ground planes, VHF Yagis, etc. It might
> allow a small HF antenna like a Butternut beam. So far, the FCC has said no.

My understanding is that the FCC wants Congress to tell them to do it, same as
what happened with those "pizza dish" sat antennas. So we need to develop a
way of mustering Congressional support all at once.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5191. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:20:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202201020.79e5dd0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34701

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C72B1F2.CFD9BDDF@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7262C2.81894EB6@IEEE.org>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you integrated
> > > > and built, Cecil?
> > > >
> > > Probably five transmitters and two regen receivers. I never got a superhet
> > > to work right. The mixers didn't mix very well.
> > >
> > I gotta wonder when all this was...
>
> 1958-1965 right after I learned how radios worked.

A few years before I started. Probably used up my weight in solder..

Still building after all these years, though.
>
> > In other words, old, simple but effective beats new and complex.

Just like Morse/CW.

> > You also get
> > that satisfying clunk or click to tell you the thing is working.
>
> Actually, either the relay is silent or I'm deaf. The IC-706 sidetone comes
> on when the relay is energized.

Between the sidetone, the screwdriver motor and typical mobile noise you'd
prolly hafta be right on top of it to hear anything.
>
> > Sorry if it wasn't clear that my comments on relays were tongue-in-cheek.
>
> It was pretty clear and I decided to play along. But please note there is no
> mandatory skill testing on the use of relays.

If there was, we'd have No Relays International busting our chops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5192. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:26:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202201026.110d55f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34702

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020219205724.06196.00000854@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >In each HF/MF ham band have a subband for CW, a subband for "digital"
> >(data, voice, image, whatever), and a subband for analog voice/image
> >(SSB, AM, NBFM,
> >etc.).
>
> I can see reasons to segregate modes like that, but OTOH, having an open
> allocation of spectrum allows the use of the bands to adjust dynamically.

Where have I heard this before?

> On a
> CW-test weekend, CW can go as far "up" the band as it needs to to accomodate
> the nubmer of users; the converse is true on 'phone or digital 'test weekends.

Nice try but the results may be far different.

> For the most part, it seems to work okay in those countries that don't have
> mode allocations.

They also have very small (relatively) amateur populations, too.

> I rarely hear Canadians or Europeans below 7040 kHz or so,
> except during major phone contests.

I hear lots of 'em. They are mostly avoiding US QRM.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5193. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:38:27 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C73ED25.3C1F076F@psu.edu>
Source record: 34703

I have some insight on this, since I just took and passed my Extra
class exam this past weekend.

I'm not smug, or liberal, or arrogant, or even close to politically correct.

The test was just about as hard as I would expect it to be for the
priveleges accorded an extra. It was certainly not simple. A person
could not "memorize the test". You had to know the answer. Note, that
even using the question pool as a study guide, the answers were rearranged.

The test was no harder or easier than tests I've taken in school.

To the original poster: Go for your General, then the Extra. If you
want to take them at the same time, fine. There may be some subtle
advantages to getting them separately though. Just easing into the
levels isn't a bad thing.

And Larry, you ought to give it a little bit of a break! Flip answers
and mostly negative commentary about how Ham radio is being "dumbed
down" can certainly have the effect of steering potential hams away from
the service, if not from general discouragement, then from the
impressions that Hams are just cranky.

- Mike -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <20020219054617.15086.00001588@mb-mr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >>Since you would not have
> >>to take any more code tests, you may as well just study some
> >>more and go for your Extra. They're giving it away these days.
> >
> >Don't listen to Larry. He has some inner need to see the accomplishments of
> >new hams as inferior to his own.
>
> Ed:
>
> It's not that I see them that way, they just are!
>
> >He starts with the tests and goes downhill from there.
>
> Not really. The tests have gone downhill quite enough, thank you!
>

> >He is right that you may as well shoot for your Extra, though. The things you
> >will learn to take the exam open up a lifetime of learning.
>
> Well, for some people they do...even if all you learn is how to be a
> smug, arrogant, politically correct, liberal supporter of a dumbed-down
> licensing system.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

5194. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:41:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C73EDC3.9FAAC012@uci.edu>
Source record: 34711

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3C74A50C.7B54E110@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> > <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >
> > > I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
> > >few weeks ago a columnist
> > >mentioned that California has a new law
> > >that overrules CCR's which
> > >prohibit pets. It specifically states
> > >that a homeowner may have one
> > >pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
> > >pets.
> > >
> > > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> > >pass while hams get no antennas
> > >with which to conduct emergency
> > >communications for the public good.
> > > Something's wrong with this scene....
> > >
> > I think it's good news for hams.
> >
> > First off, the fact that the new law came to be
> > means there IS a way to get such a law. We
> > need to find out how the pet preemption came
> > to be and use a similar method to get an antenna
> > preemption.
> >
> > Second, the new law shows "reasonable
> > accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
> > number. For hams that might mean one antenna
> > of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
> > up any sort of tower/antenna farm.
> >
> > Third, your argument about emergency comms
> > is valid. If preemptions happen for pets, why not
> > for emergency preparedness?
> >
> > I'll bet that one factor in the law getting passed
> > was strong support by pet owners, in the form
> > of letters to the appropriate legislators.
>

> I'm not sure just when this law was passed, but I wish ARRL
> had the information when they asked for reconsideration of FCC's
> refusal to prempt CCR's. (assuming they did not). It would seem
> to to have been a telling point to be able to point out that at
> least
> one state believes that CCR contracts are not impenetrable for
> good
> reason, and to point out that emergency radio communications
> are at least as good reason as a homeowner wanting to keep a pet.
>
> Dick W0EX

It's California Civil Code 1360.5, effective Jan 1, 2001. It
demonstrates a state's authority to prempt CC&R's.

5195. The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:46:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu>
Source record: 34707

I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".

Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.

And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need something substantive here, not just "I know".

- mike -

5196. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:48:15 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C73EF71.668BA1C5@psu.edu>
Source record: 34708

Heh, heh, you bad!!! ;^)

- mike -

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >WA8ULX hasn't been out of the swamp in a while, Ed. He thinks that is
> >dressed up.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> No I think that was probably your Wedding gown

5197. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:48:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7533A8.1021743E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34704

N2EY wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020220081728.29971.00000973@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >Second, the new law shows "reasonable
> > >accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
> > >number. For hams that might mean one antenna
> > >of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
> > >up any sort of tower/antenna farm.
> >
> > What ARRL has been asking for is an CC&R pre-emption similar in scope to that
> > given by the FCC to broadcast reception antennas. This would certainly allow
> > verticals, wires in trees, outdoor ground planes, VHF Yagis, etc. It might
> > allow a small HF antenna like a Butternut beam. So far, the FCC has said no.
>
> My understanding is that the FCC wants Congress to tell them to do it, same as
> what happened with those "pizza dish" sat antennas. So we need to develop a
> way of mustering Congressional support all at once.

The backup communications asset to Homeland Security should
be easy to promote.

5198. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:50:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C73EFE1.963CF3CD@psu.edu>
Source record: 34706

Well, tie a long wire onto them, and say it's a leash. Probably want to keep the power down, or have a steady supply of replacement cats and dogs. 8^)

- Mike -

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
> few weeks ago a columnist
> mentioned that California has a new law
> that overrules CCR's which
> prohibit pets. It specifically states
> that a homeowner may have one
> pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
> pets.
>
> Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> pass while hams get no antennas
> with which to conduct emergency
> communications for the public good.
> Something's wrong with this scene....

5199. Re: Is ARRL going the way of ENRON?? Uh huh. Sure. Whatever.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:50:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C753422.645750C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34705

N2EY wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020219205724.06196.00000854@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >In each HF/MF ham band have a subband for CW, a subband for "digital"
> > >(data, voice, image, whatever), and a subband for analog voice/image
> > >(SSB, AM, NBFM,
> > >etc.).
> >
> > I can see reasons to segregate modes like that, but OTOH, having an open
> > allocation of spectrum allows the use of the bands to adjust dynamically.
>
> Where have I heard this before?
>
> > On a
> > CW-test weekend, CW can go as far "up" the band as it needs to to accomodate
> > the nubmer of users; the converse is true on 'phone or digital 'test weekends.
>
> Nice try but the results may be far different.
>
> > For the most part, it seems to work okay in those countries that don't have
> > mode allocations.
>
> They also have very small (relatively) amateur populations, too.
>
> > I rarely hear Canadians or Europeans below 7040 kHz or so,
> > except during major phone contests.
>
> I hear lots of 'em. They are mostly avoiding US QRM.

I recall US QRM being cited as a major reason for US band segments when I first became a ham in
the 50's.

5200. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:50:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F010.6714CAE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34709

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
>
> Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
> drive a stick shift.

If Kim is not skillful with a stick shift, it might be advisable
to avoid stick shifts. If Kim is not skillful with CW, it might
be advisable to avoid CW for emergency situations. For instance,
her CB radio would probably be a lot more useful out on the
road than HF CW even though HF CW is more reliable.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5201. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:52:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F08B.D3091CAC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34710

```
N2EY wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > In other words, old, simple but effective beats new and complex.
>
> Just like Morse/CW.

Jim, you're talking to yourself. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5202. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:57:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F180.A39BB881@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34712

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.
>
> Once a FISTS member your membership doesn't expire.

They just drop you from the membership lists - I see.

> Cecil was probably looking at a list of those who are active
> subscibers to the newsletter.

I'm looking at the "Member Listings" at:
http://www.asel.demon.co.uk/fists-hq/listings.htm
There's no Dick Carroll or W0EX or #3939. You aren't a member, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5203. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 18:58:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F1C6.D16E7136@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34713

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
> > you still think I need my glasses changed?
>
> Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire.

Memberships don't expire. They just drop you from the membership
lists. I see.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5204. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:00:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F24C.713E680F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34714

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You've been hanging out with Cecil too long, you're getting to be the same sort
> of wordmeister. Sure he can "dictate"
> without authority. If he had authority we'd have to listen. That's
> the scary part.

Dick is obviously using the word "dictate" as in say something to
your secretary so she can take down your dictation. Anytime Carl
says something, he is dictating, apparently even if his secretary
is not present.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5205. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:01:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F26E.716183CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34715

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
> > > to dictate?
> >
> > You try to dictate things without having any authority. It doesn't
> > work for you any better than it works for Carl.
>
> So because I believe that a code test is appropriate for licensing
> ham radio operators, I try to dictate.

Yep, you try and fail.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5206. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:03:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F2F8.E0FB707A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34716

```
Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> I am off today, 20 Feb.

Some people say you are "off" every day, Steve. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5207. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:17:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C73F634.E7DA97C9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34717

mike coslo wrote:
>
> I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> something substantive here, not just "I know".

Mike, they are talking about the lowering of the Morse code requirement to 5wpm.
They believe that a person's IQ goes down when he/she learns Morse code at the
5wpm level. How is that attitude supported? Pure Neurotic Fantasy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5208. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:31:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220143107.05201.00002182@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34721

In article <20020218211236.22158.00001064@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <3C714898.FB0830AD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>> >If it is written from scratch and is not some trivial algorithm, it will
>>> >be new and unique.

>>If I copy a relay
>>driver circuit that uses a 2N2222 and substitute a 2N3904, I have not done
>>any design.
>
>Don't get me started on relay circuits and design. I've done a few of those.
>;-)

Okay, let's get you started on transistors, then. You've avoided the obvious by not mentioning a 2N2222 or 2N3904. Do you know the difference? How about between a 2N2218 or a 2N3905? Or 2N3906? Or 2N4124 or 2N4125?

What should you add to such a circuit to keep it working and why?

>>Dick won't say what he did so I have no way of knowing whether
>>he designed anything or not.
>
>He described at least one project that I know of. There are probably lots
>more. From his description of his pair of 813s amplifier I would say some
fairly
>serious RF design took place. Also power supply and control circuit design,
>mechanical design and layout, fabrication, and testing.

Claims are not verification, only claims. There have been dozens of 813 finals in amateur literature, many more on the 807-1625 and the 829...and power supplies for all of them. Final amplifiers in HF are not the sum total and ending of amateur radio design.

"Serious" would imply load-line charting, tests with various impedances (high to accommodate the tube prior to working out the output network).
"Serious" implies checking for parasitic oscillations, observation of RF envelopes during keying, checking rise and fall times, and understanding the why and what-happens with all of them.
"Serious" would imply at least some sort of spectrum analysis (even if only listening-observing with a highly-attenuated receiver).

"Serious" must include checking for spurious and harmonic output to
ascertain that the amplifier follows FCC regulations.
"Serious" would include knowing how to fix/re-design if the performance
did not meet FCC standards.

>> I assume he copied circuits designed by others.
>
>Not a good assumption. And there's a lot more to designing a rig than the
>circuit.

All of us readers are left with a very general CLAIM with not verification
except for your ASSUMPTION, which is specious indeed.

>>He did not deny doing so or explain what he really did.
>
>Yes, he did, in at least one instance cited here..

Please reference or cite that "instance."

>How many amateur receivers, transmitters or transceivers have you designed
>and built, Cecil?
>
>>A man who refuses to defend himself is usually guilty.
>
>To a biased judge, maybe. JC didn't defend himself.

The reference to "JC" is rather out of place, isn't it? Is electronics design
somehow theological or supernatural?

Are you Judas Escargot? :-)

>>> That you have not found them does not mean they do not exist.
>>
>>Well, that's true and is the reason that patent lawyers do patent searches.
>
>You gonna patent it?

Is the divine JM aware of the approximate full price of a single electronics
patent these days? Unless someone can do their own patent search for
the full disclosure a Search firm must be hired. The total patent applicant's
cost was in the neighborhood of $6000 to $8000 US two years ago
according to a certified patent attorney out here who makes his living in
such law.

>>Do you know of any two-component systems that automatically key the IC-706
>>into tune mode when the screwdriver motor is engaged?
>
>Nope. Yours uses at least three components.
>
>You coulda used an optoisolator and eliminated the mechanical relay, too. As
>much as I like relays, the cheap ones can be trouble.

Does the divine JM consider himself the Design Review Leader now?

If so, he must present his case of negative reviews of another's personal efforts
in clear electronics terms considering all factors of why this particular effort is "unsuitable." Show the work, JM, assumptions are invalid anywhere else.

This non-review by JM is simply a personal negative of no valid electronic signifcance except to attempt putting another down for his expressed personal viewpoints on an unrelated matter. This violates Rules Three and Four in the Amateur's Code.

5209. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:31:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220143108.05201.00002183@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34720

In article <9f4bfe89.0202200901.55eebf58@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3C73120A.C48BEE42@IEEE.org>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> > >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and me
>> > >than it is for you. :-)
>> >
>> > Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>>
>> Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
>
>Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
>drive a stick shift.

No one has said any such thing. All the conclusion leaping has gone on in N2EY's head and never propagated into reality space.

The various states allow a great assortment of motor vehicles on roadways and all cooperate in that, limiting only the drivers who must pass tests for certain qualifications set by each state. States cooperate with each other on allowing other-state motor vehicle operator licensees to operate in their state jurisdictions. "Reliability" has little to do with the type of license but rather the motor vehicle itself. "Reliability" MAY enter into the discussion in inclement weather conditions relating to a specific type of vehicle.

If N2EY has a rare specific type of vehicle and has been authorized to drive it by a particular state, he may feel free to use it within the boundaries of that state's regulations. If he drove the rare vintage three-wheel post-WW2 Messerschmitt motor vehicle and was duly authorized to do so, he may feel "safe" in its reliability but that is not related to safety in bad weather and its potential effect on other motorists, motor vehicles, or pedestrians should he lose control of that or any other vehicle.

Proper control of a motor vehicle does not depend on the style of its transmission or control thereof, but does depend on the motor vehicle speed for road conditions (controlled by throttle, foot or hand operated), steering control (front or rear wheel depending on approved vehicle type), ability to see properly, judge distances to coordinate speed and steering

in differing weather and light conditions, obeying all traffic signals, direction and control signs. The type of motor vehicle transmission control does not enter into the discussion, including those rare cases where a few motor vehicles do not have any transmission (the last steam motor vehicle manufacturing company in the USA was located in eastern Pennsylvania, shut down approximately in the 1970s).

Steering of a motor vehicle does not mean exclusive control by means of a steering wheel. Three-wheel hybrid vehicles modified from motorcycles using a handlebar steering control are allowed in all roadways provided they pass tests to prove their steering capability and control. That proof does not require a specific method of control, only that control ability and safety exists.

On the extremely tenuous analogy attempt of comparing OOK CW radio communications methods to the type of motor vehicle transmission control, there is no sane comparison worthy of further discussion.

The USE of OOK CW radio communications is OPTIONAL by US radio amateurs of ANY CLASS wherever allocated for USE in ANY BAND. USE does NOT depend on whether or not an amateur radio licensee of ANY CLASS has passed a morse code cognition test for that test.

Has N2EY read and understood these conditions as they have been explained to him?

5210. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:31:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220143109.05201.00002184@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34719

In article <3C751964.BB1315D2@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> >> So? One incompetent auditing firm does not mean all audits are useless.
>>
>> > Not at all, but it sure does cast doubt on the entire process.
>>
>> You have made mistakes on this forum, Dick.
>
>I sure have, and by far the worst one was ever assumsing one could
>have a calm, candid, rational conversation with the likes of Cecil
>and in fact you yourself. You guys can start your own "organization"
>anytime, you are more than ready. Call it NPI, Nit Pickers International.

There is NO organization called "Nit Pickers International" except in
the fantasies of individual PCTA minds.

Many have held calm, candid, rational conversations with Cecil Moore
including those who disagree with his viewpoints. That is visible to
anyone with access to this newsgroup, on-line, off-line, or as stored
in archives.

There is NO calm, candid, or rational conversation or discussion with
those who insist that ONLY THEIR viewpoint is "correct," "good," or
"superior."

>Your
>motto can be "We never assume that hams of
>long experience will be familiar with anything but they must give
>a most complete description of every subject they address, lest
>all those wellread newcomers be confused. Don't hold us to our
>own standard, though".

Carroll's viewpoint is simply the old, tired "territorial imperative"
self-ownership-by-tenure closed-mind rationalization. Such has
a great deal of selfishness about it and includes a demand that
all think as he does or be treated to an enormous amount of
pejorative commentary about the person rather than on the subject.

Time NOW is not the 1930s, the 1950s, or the 1970s or any other
time of the PAST. "Hams of long experience" cannot justify their
out-dated standards by anything except their own PERSONAL

PREFERENCES or having met OLD standards set by even-longer-experience radio amateurs who existed at the dawning of amateur radio. ALL radio is only 106 years old. The first radio club organized anywhere in the world began in 1909 in New York City, not some community in New England.

Every other radio service except maritime radio and amateur radio has either never considered OOK CW "morse codes" or have DROPPED its use, finding it neither speedy nor reliable nor advantageous in any aspect. Maritime radio NOW relies on voice and data for regular communications, on automatic Inmarsat relay for distress and safety communications.

That leaves only the little subset of amateur radio where some "hams of long existance" still attempt to hold up their own personal-preference mode of "morse codes" as the "STANDARD" for all newcomers to amateur radio to meet in license testing.

THAT is DICTATORIAL.

5211. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:31:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220143110.05201.00002185@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 34718

In article <3C7516E7.3EFCC378@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> > So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
>> >to dictate? I doubt many others who have long read his stuff
>> >would agree.
>>
>> You didn't say that he was trying to dictate, Dick; you said that he was
>> dictating to the FCC and the ARRL. I disagreed that someone who has
>absolutely
>> no authority can be a dictator.
>
> You've been hanging out with Cecil too long, you're getting to be the same
>sort of wordmeister
> Sure he can "dictate" without authority. If he had authority we'd have to
listen. >That's the scary part.

That is "scary" only to the self-enobled current DICTATORS of
antiquated standards in testing. These current DICTATORS are
fearful of losing their overly-prized credentials, rank, status and
privilege to all those in the majority who do not consider them
as "superior." TS, baby. God never made you as any "standard,"
you made yourselves in your own image.

Have a nice day.

5212. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:33:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_RSc8.14662$BR3.876332@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34722

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...
> I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> something substantive here, not just "I know".
>
> - mike -

Mike, it still would not work simply because the state of the art moves on and so do we. The first time I took Element 3, and I was 12 at the time, one of the cures given for spurious emissions was to neutralize the oscillator which caused me to break out laughing. Exams which would be and are trivial today to the groupies are hardly trivial at the time of first impression. And over the years the question pool changes depending upon among other things the problems the FCC is having at the moment and what their idea of the 'compleat' Amateur has been; this has cycled between 'Prairie Shit, let 'em all come' and the great post-Sputnik emphasis on the pool of skilled ops about the time the military said ZBM-2 and gave up. Some of us took it in the prairie shit days like Ed's famous thin study guide and some did it when people compared the Advanced to the 2nd Phone and some of us managed to do both.

The Second Phone in those days was 150 questions and the Advanced was 50 and still the comparison is made which if nothing else illustrates sampling theory at work, it really doesn't take a whole lot of questions to make the point, especially when I would suspect the grade curve looks like Britney Spears from the top, distinctly bi-modal. Given that one does not select all the questions from variations on one from the pool and spreads them over the major areas and maintains some test security they will do the job.

The trick, of course, is to define just what the job that is supposedly being done really is and what relationship that job has to privleges granted. One suspects that he is in one of those ceremonial things where the outcome is not nearly so important as the ritual itself.

Dick NBK

5213. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 19:39:45 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a50tss022p9@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34723

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220120027.18935.00002014@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Len was not uncivil in his reply to my post.
>
> Even "you know who" in 1930's central Europe could be charming and
civil on
> occassion.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Who? Lord Voldemort?

5214. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 20:08:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C740247.96150D36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34724

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Many have held calm, candid, rational conversations with Cecil Moore
> including those who disagree with his viewpoints. That is visible to
> anyone with access to this newsgroup, on-line, off-line, or as stored
> in archives.

Dick's problem with me is that I treat him the same way he treats me
(and others) and he hates me for it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5215. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 20:25:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C74064C.85DCC235@psu.edu>
Source record: 34725

Richard McCollum wrote:

> Mike, it still would not work simply because the state of the art moves on
> and so do we. The first time I took Element 3, and I was 12 at the time,
> one of the cures given for spurious emissions was to neutralize the
> oscillator which caused me to break out laughing.

Removing the circuit power works better! (grin)

I see your point, Dick. It would still be interesting to see some of
the earlier tests. Even a cursory look-see would answer some of the comparisons.

> granted. One suspects that he is in one of those ceremonial things where
> the outcome is not nearly so important as the ritual itself.

Good point. Good post.

- Mike -

5216. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 20:28:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C740701.3F8F3A9B@psu.edu>
Source record: 34726

I know a few people who aced the CW portion, but had to take the
written part over. I'll have to figure out if they are dumb or smart. 8^)

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> >
> > I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
> >
> > Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> > before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
> >
> > And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> > something substantive here, not just "I know".
>
> Mike, they are talking about the lowering of the Morse code requirement to 5wpm.
> They believe that a person's IQ goes down when he/she learns Morse code at the
> 5wpm level. How is that attitude supported? Pure Neurotic Fantasy.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5217. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 20:41:33 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0202201241.1f23a9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34727

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C710062.A4C413EE@IEEE.org>...
> Exactly, Ed, that is exactly what is wrong with Dick's statement. It
> presumes that no other combination can exist. The addition of the
> qualifier word, "often" or "sometimes", would indicate that other
> conditions can exist. My argument is based on the accepted rules
> of mathematical logic.
>
> Do you think, "cars are black", is a true statement? It's not. It
> needs a qualifier like, "some", to make it logically true. I can
> dig out the rules of logic that apply if you would like.

Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not black" is not true because there are black cars.

"Cars are black" is not the same as "All cars are black" nor the same as "Some cars are black."

IF X="black", "TRUE","FALSE" is a logical test. If any occurrance of X is black, then X="black" -- in that instance.

5218. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 21:21:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C741355.B3D3D193@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34728

Carl Zager wrote:
> Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> black" is not true because there are black cars.

Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
a false statement. "Cars are not black" is also a false statement.
When one makes a logical statement like, "cars are black", *all* is
implied, *by definition*.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5219. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:03:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C742B3B.B6234E80@uci.edu>
Source record: 34734

CAM wrote:
>
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> > ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> > black" is not true because there are black cars.
>
> Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> a false statement.

Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
mention of cars in mine.

5220. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:07:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220180753.18934.00002160@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34729

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
>before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.

I have asked a few FCC and former FCC guys I know. None seem to be able to find any of the old tests, though I know a few more guys now than I did then. Let me try again.

In the meantime, just for a discussion point, here is the text from the 4 pages of Novice material in the ARRL study guide. As I remember, the questions I took on my Novice were mighty similar to these questions. After all, how many ways can you ask how much power a Novice can run? :-)

Please forgive the formatting and OCR errors. And, PLEASE, if you reply to this, cut out the text you are NOT quoting -- this is pretty long and no one wants to download it umpteen times. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

CHAPTER 2

The Novice License

The Novice Class license offers an ideal way to get started in amateur radio -- reduced code speed and a simplified written examination. It grants a portion of amateur privileges on an "apprenticeship" basis for one year. The examination is available only by mail. This chapter explains the license in detail and contains sample questions for the written exam.

In an incentive to encourage a greater number of people to engage in the hobby of amateur radio, the Federal Communications Commission has established a Novice Class of license with greatly reduced requirements and only a few of the privileges available to amateurs. This class of license might well he termed an apprenticeship. It has a term of but one year, compared with the five-yea terms of other amateur licenses, and the objective is to give a newcomer a period of a year of actual on-the-air experience or training in amateur operation so that he may develop his skills toward one of the permanent classes of license more rapidly than he would by textbook study and audio-oscillator code practice.

The Novice Class license examination may now be taken only by mail, under the direct supervision of an amateur holding a General Class license or higher, or a commercial radiotelegraph license. This is true no matter where the applicant lives. Refer to the section "Examination

Procedures " in Chapter 5 for details on the rules governing the routine for making application and obtaining a set of examination papers. Requirements for the Novice license are the passing of a code test in sending and receiving at the rate of 5 words per minute, and a written examination in the most elementary aspects of amateur regulations and theory.

The privileges which are currently available to the Novice licensee are:

3700 3750 kc. - telegraphy
7150-7200 kc. - telegraphy
21,100-21,250 kc. - telegraphy
145-147 MC. --telegraphy or voice

In addition, the transmitter used by a Novice licensee must be crystal-controlled, and may not have an input exceeding 75 watts. Of course, the Novice may operate portable or mobile on any of these frequencies. (SeeChapter 7).

The most important point concerning the Novice license is that it is valid for only one year and may not be renewed. Before the end of his license term the Novice must qualify for one of the other grades of amateur licenses, or go off the air. He may try for a Technician Class or a General Class license (or Conditional Class, if eligible to take the mail examination). Whatever his choice, he must qualify for all requirements of the particular license class inasmuch as the Novice Class license, being obtained by mail, carries no credit toward a higher grade of license even where the examination elements are identical (such as the Technician 5 w.p.m. code test). He may not try for a class higher than those mentioned, of course, since experience as a Novice operator does not qualify for the service requirements for the Extra Class license.

Anyone who is a citizen of the United States may apply for the Novice, license, except a person who holds or ever has held an amateur license of any class. Thus a Novice not only is unable to renew his license at the end of his term, but he may not again apply for Novice privileges. If an applicant for Novice privileges feels that he can pass the standard written examination for amateur licenses but is unable to meet the 13 w.p.m. code requirement, he may simultaneously apply also for the Technician Class of license, taking the 5 w.p.m. code test, the elementary Novice written exam, and the standard written exam.

A Novice may operate any FCC-licensed amateur radio station, but only to the extent of the privileges available to the Novice and similarly available to the licensee of the station being operated. For example, when a Novice visits a station licensed to a General Class amateur, he may operate in only the Novice bands, using crystal control and with 75 watts input power or less. He uses his host's call sign exactly as issued, however. When a Novice operates a Technician's station, he may use only the 145-147 Mc band, since that is the only band common to both Novices and Technicians.

As stated, the written examination for the Novice license is quite simple. It consists of about 20 questions dealing with basic amateur regulations, and certain points of theory and technique. The questions are of the "multiple-choice" type, as explained in Chapter 1. There are no diagrams required. Following is a set of questions similar to those which are asked in the examination. If you are thoroughly able to answer each of these sample questions, you will have no difficulty in passing the written exam. However, in any event we recommend additional study of at least the technical material in How to Become a Radio Amateur and preferably of the introductory chapters of The Radio Amateur's Handbook ($3.50), both available postpaid from the ARRL, West Hartford 7, Conn.

The receiving code test for the Novice Class license consists of 25 five-letter words, mostly common ones. No punctuation marks or numerals are included. To pass, the applicant must copy at least 25 consecutive letters accurately. In the sending test, numerals and simple punctuation marks may be included.

QUESTIONS:

1. What is the maximum input power permitted to the final stage of the transmitter in a station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license or operated by such an operator?

The maximum input power permitted a Novice is 75 watts.

2. What is the maximum penalty for a violation of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission?

A fine of up to $500 for each day during which the offense occurs, suspension of operator license, and revocation of station license.

3. On what frequency bands may the holder of a Novice Class license operate an amateur radio station?

3700-3750 kc.
7150-7200 kc.
21,100-21,250 kc.
145-147 MC.

4. On what frequency bands may the holder of a Novice Class license operate an amateur radiotelephone station?

5. What is the log of an amateur station, and what information is required to be entered therein? How long must it be preserved ?

The log of an amateur station is the written record of transmissions. The log must show:
1) the date and time of transmission
2) the signature of each licensed operator operating the equipment and the name of any person not holding a license who speaks over a radiotelephone transmitter directly or by recording, or operates a teleprinter keyboard
3) call of the station called
4) the input power to the transmitter

5) the frequency band used
6) the type of emission used
7) the location of the station at the time of transmission
8) the message traffic handled

Information such as the input power, frequency band, type of emission, location of station, need be entered only once provided the conditions are not changed. Similarly, one entry of the date need not be repeated for other transmissions made on that date. If the station is mobile, the approximate geographic location can be indicated in the log.

The log of an amateur station must be preserved for at least one year following the last date of entry. Similarly, any message traffic handled must be kept on file for at least one year.

6. What is the term of an amateur Novice Class license? Under what conditions may this license be renewed?

The term of an amateur Novice Class license is one year. It may not be renewed under any conditions.

7. What are the rules and regulations regarding the transmission of improper language, false signals, or malicious interference?

The transmission of obscene, indecent or profane language, or of false or deceptive signals or call letters, or of malicious interference is expressly prohibited and there are heavy penalties for violation.

8. What are the rules and regulations regarding purity and stability of emissions?

Below 144 megacycles, spurious radiations must be reduced in accordance with good engineering practice, and must not cause interference to near-by receivers of good engineering design not tuned to the transmitter. Voice modulation of a transmitter must not cause spurious emissions; the maximum modulation percentage is 100%. Simultaneous frequency modulation and amplitude modulation is not permitted. The frequency of the signal transmitted must be as constant as the state of the art permits.

9. What method of frequency control is required to be used in the transmitter of a station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license?

The frequency must be crystal-controlled.

10. What are the rules and regulations regarding the measurement of the frequencies of the emissions of an amateur radio station?

Regular measurement of the frequency of the transmitter is required. This measurement must be by means independent of the means used to control the transmitting frequency and must be of sufficient accuracy to ensure operation within the frequency band used.

11. Who may be permitted to operate the transmitter of an amateur radio station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license?

Any amateur radio operator (though a Technician may operate a Novice's station only in the band 145-147 Mc., since that is the only band the two classes have in common).

12. Under what circumstances may an amateur radio station be used by a person who does not hold a valid license?

A person not properly licensed may not operate an amateur station. However, he may speak over the microphone of an amateur radiotelephone station or use the keyboard of an amateur radio-teleprinter, provided a duly licensed operator is present to control the emissions.

13. What is the maximum permissible percentage of modulation of an amateur radiotelephone station?

One hundred per cent.

14. At what intervals must an amateur station be identified by the transmission of its call sign? May any transmission be made without identification of the station?

An amateur station must identify its call sign at the beginning and end of each transmission and at least every ten minutes if a single transmission lasts longer than ten minutes. No transmission by itself may be made without identification of the station, except that during a sequence of transmissions each less than three minutes long, the call sign needs to be given only once each ten minutes as well as at the beginning and end of the work.

15. Under what conditions is notice of portable or mobile operation required to be given, and to whom in each case?

Notice of intended portable operation, or mobile operation, must be given the FCC Engineer-in-Charge of the inspection district in which such portable or mobile operation is contemplated only when the operation is or is expected to be for a period longer than 48 hours.

16. What are the recognized abbreviations for: kilocycles, megacycles, Eastern Standard Time, Greenwich Mean Time, continuous wave, frequency modulation, amplitude modulation?

kilocycles - kc.
megacycles - MC.
Eastern Standard Time - EST
Greenwich Mean Time - GMT
continuous wave - C.W.
frequency modulation - f.m.
amplitude modulation - a.m.

17. What is the relationship between a fundamental frequency and its second harmonic; its third harmonic, etc.?

The second harmonic is twice the frequency of the fundamental, the third harmonic is three times the fundamental frequency, and so on. A harmonic is always related to its fundamental frequency by an integral multiplier; i.e., 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, etc.

18. What is the relationship between a cycle, a kilocycle, and a megacycle?

1 kilocycle = 1000 cycles
1 megacycle = 1000 kilocycles = l,000,000 cycles

19. What instrument is used to measure: electrical potential; electrical current; electrical power; electrical energy?

Electrical potential is measured by a voltmeter.
Electrical current is measured by an ammeter, milliammeter, or microammeter.
Electrical power is measured by a wattmeter.
Electrical energy is measured by a watt-hour meter.

20. What is the purpose of: a modulator; an amplifier; a rectifier; a filter?

A modulator is used to vary the amplitude, frequency or phase of the output of a transmitter for the purpose of transmitting information. An amplifier is used to increase the amplitude, or power level, of a signal. A rectifier is used to change alternating current into pulsating direct, current. The purpose of a filter is to attenuate undesired frequencies while simultaneously passing, without appreciable attenuation, a desired band of frequencies and/or direct current. Examples: The power-supply "smoothing filter," which eliminates the alternating-current ripple from the output of a rectifier but permits direct current to flow with little or no attenuation; the "low-pass" filter, which attenuates all frequencies (such as harmonics of a transmitter) above a given frequency but passes all lower frequencies.

21. What is meant by: amplification; modulation; detection; attenuation?

Amplification is the process of increasing the amplitude, or power level, of a signal. Modulation is the process of varying the amplitude, frequency or phase of the radio-frequency output of a transmitter. Modulation is normally employed for the purpose of transmitting information. However, it may also occur inadvertently, as in the case of "hum" modulation of a signal resulting from ripple in the output of an insufficiently-filtered d.c. power supply. Detection or demodulation is the process of extracting the information contained in the modulation on a radio-frequency signal. Attenuation is a reduction in amplitude.

22. What is the purpose of: a radio-frequency choke; an audio-frequency choke; a filter choke?

The purpose of a radio-frequency choke is to oppose the flow of radio-frequency current while permitting direct current and audio frequencies to flow without appreciable opposition. The purpose of an audio-

frequency choke is to oppose the flow of audio-frequency currents while permitting direct current to flow. The purpose of a filter choke is to aid in smoothing the direct-current output of a rectifier.

23. How is the actual power input to the tube or tubes supplying energy to the antenna of an amateur transmitter determined?

The input power is determined by measuring the direct-current plate voltage and the d.c. plate current to the tube or tubes in the final stage in the transmitter. The power input is equal to the plate voltage multiplied by the plate current in amperes. Example: Two tubes in the final stage of the transmitter take 50 milliamperes each, at a plate voltage of 500 volts. The total plate current is 2 X 50 = 100 milliamperes, or 0.1 ampere. The power input is therefore 500 X 0.1 = 50 watts.

24. Why are a rectifier and filter required in the plate power supply system of an amateur transmitter when operated from alternating current?

The amateur regulations require that an adequately-filtered plate supply be used on transmitters operating below 144 Mc. The rectifier is used to convert the alternating current into direct current. However, its d.c. output is pulsating, not constant, and the filter must be used to smooth out the pulsations so that the output is essentially "pure" -- that is free from pulsations or "ripple."

25. What is a frequency multiplier?

A frequency multiplier is a device that delivers output at an integral multiple (i.e., 2, 3, 4 times, etc.) of the applied frequency. The output of a frequency multiplier is consequently on a frequency that is a harmonic of the fundamental (applied) frequency.

26. What are the undesirable effects of overmodulation in radiotelephony?

Overmodulation results in the generation of spurious sidebands - that is, frequencies lying outside the band of frequencies or "channel" actually required for transmitting the information contained in the modulation. Those spurious frequencies, called "splatter," will interfere with communication on near-by channels and may even lie outside an amateur band. At close range they may also cause interference with broadcast reception.

27. What is meant by a "parasitic" oscillation?

A parasitic oscillation is one not essential to the operation of the equipment and usually occurring on a frequency considerably removed from the operating frequency.

28. What is the purpose of a "key-click filter" and when should it be used?

The purpose of a key-click filter is to reduce spurious radiation generally when keying a radiotelegraph transmitter. It should be used whenever required for suppressing such spurious radiations.

29. What is Ohm's Law?

Ohm's Law expresses the relationship between potential, current and resistance in any circuit.

It is stated as I = E / R where I = current in amperes, E = potential in volts and R = resistance in ohms. By simple algebra it is also E = I * R and R = E / I.

30. What precautions should be taken to avoid the danger of shock from high-voltage electrical circuits?

Such circuits in transmitters and receivers should not be exposed where the operator can inadvertently come in contact with them when the power is turned on. All work on equipment involving the possibility of contact with such circuits should be done only after the power has been turned off. All power-supply capacitors should have bleeder resistors connected across them, to discharge the capacitors after the power has been turned off.

31. What is the relationship between the frequency and the wavelength of a radio wave if its velocity in space is 300,000,000 meters per second?

The frequency in cycles multiplied by the wavelength in meters is 300,000,000. Therefore, the wavelength is inversely proportional to the frequency; in other words, the longer the wavelength, the lower the frequency. The formula for calculating frequency (f) in cycles when the wavelength in meters is known is f = 3,000,000 / wavelength ; similarly, wavelength = 3,000,000 / f. Example: The wavelength of a signal whose frequency is 3700 kilocycles is 300,000,000 / 3,700,000 or 81.08 meters.

32. What symbol is used in the amateur rules to designate amplitude-modulated telegraphy without the use of modulating audio frequencies (on-off keying)?

Al. (The "A" indicates amplitude modulation, and the numeral "1" is used to indicate telegraphy by on-off keying).

33. What is the ruling regarding eligibility for reexamination?

An applicant who fails an operator examination may not take another examination for the same or higher privileges within 30 days (except that this does not apply to an examination for a General Class license following a mail examination for a Conditional, Novice or Technician Class license).

34. What factors are commonly responsible for harmonic radiation and what practical means can be used to detect and correct such condition?

The principal factors responsible for harmonic radiation are (1) improper operating conditions in the final amplifier, such as excessive

grid bias and excessive drive, causing the tube or tubes to develop unnecessarily large harmonic output: (2) poor selectivity interstage tank circuits, resulting in excessive harmonic content in the excitation voltage applied to the final stage (3) inadequate selectivity in the final tank circuit because of too-low operating Q; and (4) insufficient selectivity in the coupling circuit between the final-amplifier tank circuit and the antenna, or omission of such a coupling circuit.

These defects can be corrected by (1) reducing grid bias and drive to the minimum necessary for reasonably efficient operation of the final tube or tubes; (2) using higher-Q interstage circuits, usually by increasing the ratio of capacitance to inductance or by decreasing the coupling to lighten the loading on the circuit; (3) adjusting the final tank inductance so that the tuning capacitor will be set for higher capacitance at the operating frequency: and (4) installing a tuned antenna-coupling or matching circuit between the transmitter and the transmission line or antenna.

The presence of harmonics in the output of a transmitter can be detected by the use of an absorption wavemeter, having a sensitive indicator, coupled to the final tank circuit or to the antenna coupling circuit, and successively tuned through the harmonics of the operating frequency. Alternatively, tests can be conducted with a nearby amateur station, with the cooperating amateur listening on the various harmonic frequencies while the transmitter is in operation. The receiving station should not be so close that the fundamental-frequency signal strength will be such as to overload the receiver and thus cause spurious harmonic responses in the receiver itself.

5221. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:10:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220181013.18934.00002161@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34730

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

> And Larry, you ought to give it a little bit of a break! Flip answers
>and mostly negative commentary about how Ham radio is being "dumbed
>down" can certainly have the effect of steering potential hams away from
>the service, if not from general discouragement, then from the
>impressions that Hams are just cranky.

He knows this, but if he can steer enough hams away, he will then have proved himself right about how the sky is falling on Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5222. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:12:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220181226.18934.00002163@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34731

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Your
>motto can be "We never assume that hams of
>long experience will be familiar with anything but they must give
>a most complete description of every subject they address, lest
>all those wellread newcomers be confused. Don't hold us to our
>own standard, though".

Actually, Dick, I would settle for being able to take your words at face value, instead of having to get into long arguements only to find out that you meant something different than you actually said.

If you don't want to talk with me, Carl has not dictated that you must.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5223. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:13:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51adp0l6@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34740

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C741355.B3D3D193@IEEE.org...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> > ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> > black" is not true because there are black cars.
>
> Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> a false statement. "Cars are not black" is also a false statement.
> When one makes a logical statement like, "cars are black", *all* is
> implied, *by definition*.

Of course, Dick's idea of logic is watching Spock on Star Trek.

5224. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:14:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220181423.18934.00002166@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34732

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.
>
> Once a FISTS member your membership doesn't expire. If you
>want the monthly newsletter you pay an annual membership dues, if not you
>just
>don't get the newsletter, you do keep the membership
>and its number. (That's the way it was explained to me). I dropped
>the newsletter a couple years ago.
>
>Cecil was probably looking at a list of those who are active
>subscibers to the newsletter.

QRP ARCI operates the same way, and once you are a member, you are a member for life. It sounds like FISTS is the same.

For that matter, NCI also signs people up for life. NCI and FISTS have something in common after all!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5225. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:17:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220181751.18934.00002167@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34733

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> Even "you know who" in 1930's central Europe could be charming and civil
>on occassion.

Under the rules of engagement, you have just lost the debate. Sorry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5226. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:20:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220182027.18934.00002168@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34735

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > Well, hear hear! One post he's the 50 year expert who has it ALL
>> >under his complete control, and the next he's an offended newcomer!
>> >Ain't it sensational, how he does it? Troll, troll, troll!!!

>> Calling him a troll is an insult. You just proved his point for him.

> And you just proved mine.

Which point did I prove, Dick? That Cecil is a 50-year ham who has it all under control, that he is an offended newcomer, that he is sensational or that he is a troll?

In what way does my saying that by insulting him you have proved Cecil's point that all you do is insult prospective CW ops prove any of the above?

Help me out, here, Dick; I am trying to take your words at face value.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5227. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:24:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220182415.18934.00002169@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34736

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You try to dictate things without having any authority. It doesn't
>work for you any better than it works for Carl.

And neither are successful, so neither is dictating.

Trying to dictate and dictating are not the same.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5228. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:25:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220182528.18934.00002170@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34737

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>So because I believe that a code test is appropriate for licensing
>ham radio operators, I try to dictate.

And Carl believes that a code test is not appropriate for licensing ham radio operators. You both made comments to the FCC. Why is he dictating, and you not?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5229. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:27:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220182751.18934.00002172@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34738

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick is obviously using the word "dictate" as in say something to
>your secretary so she can take down your dictation. Anytime Carl
>says something, he is dictating, apparently even if his secretary
>is not present.

I don't think so, Cecil. I don't think that Dick believes that the ARRL and the FCC used shorthand to take down his words.

I just can't see a dictionary definition of dictate that fits what he said in context. Can you?

Does "wordmeister" mean that we believe that words mean what words mean?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5230. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:29:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220182926.18934.00002173@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34739

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
>you still think I need my glasses changed?

He may have chosen to not pay his dues. In some organizations, one is still a member.

He probably does realize that you need your glasses changed. Carl apologized to Bert for calling him a twit; perhaps Dick will be as noble with you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5231. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-20 23:58:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C743818.1E4FA3E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34741

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> > > ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> > > black" is not true because there are black cars.
> >
> > Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> > a false statement.
>
> Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
> mention of cars in mine.

"Logic, an Introduction", by Ruby and "Introduction to Logic", by Copi.
I cannot quote the symbolic logic equations because of the ASCII limitation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5232. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:06:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7439F0.9FB4CC9F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34743

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> > > ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> > > black" is not true because there are black cars.
> >
> > Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> > a false statement.
>
> Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
> mention of cars in mine.

Here's an example, however:
"Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5233. Re: Tech Plus to General Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:06:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210006440.18146-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34742

On 19 Feb 2002, Mike wrote:
>I just have one simple question. I hope somebody can help me out
>because I'm very confused. I received my Tech (no code) class license
>Dec, 1993. I upgraded to Tech Plus in May ,1995. If I upgrade to
>General now, do I have to retake the 5 wpm code test or just take the
>new element 3 test? The way I understand it, I just have to take the
>new element 3 test because I passed the code test before April 15,
>2000 - but I'm not sure.

Only element 3.

5234. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:10:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210009270.18146-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34744

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
> I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
>few weeks ago a columnist
>mentioned that California has a new law
>that overrules CCR's which
>prohibit pets. It specifically states
>that a homeowner may have one
>pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
>pets.
>
> Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
>pass while hams get no antennas
>with which to conduct emergency
>communications for the public good.
> Something's wrong with this scene....

You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.

5235. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:24:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C743E4D.490B0132@uci.edu>
Source record: 34745

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:

> > > Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> > > a false statement.
> >
> > Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
> > mention of cars in mine.
>
> Here's an example, however:
> "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.

So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?

5236. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:26:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C743EA5.34DE83A6@uci.edu>
Source record: 34746

"D. Stussy" wrote:
> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way
> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.

PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.

5237. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:51:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220195120.18975.00002125@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34747

>Subject: Re: Once More, Into The Fray....
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/20/2002 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020220181751.18934.00002167@mb-mf.aol.com>

>
>Under the rules of engagement, you have just lost the debate. Sorry.

There's no debate here, Ed. I checked the Webser's and nothing that
transpires here meets the criteria.

Sorry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5238. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:53:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220195337.18975.00002129@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 34748

>Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 2/20/2002 1:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C73F2F8.E0FB707A@IEEE.org>

>Some people say you are "off" every day, Steve

I'd agree, but ya got some of that pot/kettle/black thing going on, Amigo!

73

Steve, K4YZ

BTW...heard lotsa KL7 and Left Coast, but no one from the heartland. Maybe some other time.

73

Steve

5239. Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 00:58:17 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <JCXc8.3877$ZC3.339728@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34749

From the ARRL Web-zine...

Boston Marathon Amateur Radio preparations under way: Amateurs in Massachusetts are making preparations to support the 106th running of the Boston Athletic Association's Boston Marathon on Patriot's Day, April 15, 2002. Amateur Radio plays a vital part in supporting runners before, during, and after the 26-mile marathon. "This year we have a combined organization handling all phases of radio support; start area, length of the course, and finish line," said Paul Topolski, W1SEX. Positions are available starting early in the day at the starting point in Hopkinton, as well as at aid and water stations along the route and later in the day at finish-line operations in Boston. Volunteers may chose an activity to be involved with or work multiple locations, Topolski said. Along the 26-mile route, hams will assist the Red Cross at aid stations with supply requirements and ambulance dispatch. Hams also will be aboard runner pick-up buses traveling the route. At the finish line, hams work with the medical teams and shadow Marathon officials. Participants will need a 2-meter or dual-band H-T, extended antenna, and extra batteries. Training will be available before the event. An on-line sign-up form and more details are available on the Crocker Public Service Group Web site. A BAA volunteer form is available at the Boston Athletic Association Web site. For more information, contact Steve Schwarm, W3EVE, w3eve@arrl.net; 508-384-7697 (after 8 AM or before 9 PM).--Paul Topolski, WISE

Of course, it's not official till it's in a main stream west coast news medium AND just to show there is something for everyone...note the callsign!!!!

5240. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:05:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7449a8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34750

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4v2n0$kq0$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C73BF8B.CD522752@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > As for "spreading the word", what do you think I'm doing here
> countering
> > > > your inane BS?
> > >
> > > Do you really think you are promoting CW usage by insulting potential
> users?
> >
> > Do you really think that Carl Stevenson, Bill Sohl and Krell are
> > potential users? Some of you NCTA's and Vanilla Ed Hare have
> > insisted that I insult newcomers. That's a blatent falsehood, which
> > is commonly known as a lie. If I insult you, consider that you have
> > certainly earned it.
>
> Interesting. Wonder what exactly I did to have
> earned being insulted by Dick?
>
> No cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Bill: With people who think like Little Dick, one need not worry about what prompted their attempt to insult you. It's because they're too ignorant to understand what the meaning of diversity is.

Kim W5TIT

5241. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:06:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7449f8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34751

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C73120A.C48BEE42@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her
and me
> > >than it is for you. :-)
> >
> > Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>
> Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Ah, but I can... :)

Kim W5TIT

5242. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:10:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34752

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C731266.9FA426E8@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> > someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
> > Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> > isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
>
> A good analogy might be that the stick shift vehicle is more reliable but
> you don't know how to drive it.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It would be a good analogy if I didn't know how to drive one. I do (my Saturn and this truck are the only two automatics I have had since driving--started in a SAAB, then Yugo, , then Subaru GLF, then VW Golf, now these two recent vehicles). An appropriate analogy, though, for the stickshift would be that I can drive it, but why would I want to beat myself up with one? (I had to get out of stickshifts because of my back). That is to auto driving as CW is to radio: why would I want to beat myself and others up with using CW when I can do lots of other things that may work just as well?

Kim W5TIT

5243. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:11:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744b16$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34753

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219220624.24181.00000509@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >Gads, you sound like a bubba CBer...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> You got me confussed with your Hubby

Nope, I checked.

Kim W5TIT

5244. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:12:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744b55_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34754

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219220824.24181.00000510@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >Forgot to say, and that's why I also have a CB in my auto.
>
> That doesnt surprise anybody.

Well, it shouldn't. Y'all should realize how smart I am by now...

Kim W5TIT

5245. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:13:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744b8c$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34755

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219220826.06176.00000814@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Interesting. Wonder what exactly I did to have
> >earned being insulted by Dick?
>
> And I? Perhaps I was too "vanilla," whatever that is supposed to mean?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

It is said that the scent of vanilla arouses a man. Maybe you turn Dick on
too much :o

Kim W5TIT

5246. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:16:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744c66_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34761

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C74A50C.7B54E110@worldnet.att.net...
> I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
> few weeks ago a columnist
> mentioned that California has a new law
> that overrules CCR's which
> prohibit pets. It specifically states
> that a homeowner may have one
> pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
> pets.
>
> Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> pass while hams get no antennas
> with which to conduct emergency
> communications for the public good.
> Something's wrong with this scene....
>

You sure you aren't using emergency communication as just an excuse? Not a good one...the FCC is right on that; you can communicate mobile or from the EOC. Add to that it seems that your abhorrent fear of people who like 2M and are marginal with CW and you wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in emergency communication. Are you?

Kim W5TIT

5247. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:18:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744cbe_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34762

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220061519.22724.00000920@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> They have two lists, Dick. One by call and the other by number.
> >> Did you find your call in the listed-by-call list?
>
> > I'll leave the 'looking' to you. I have the certificate on my wall that
> >says #3939.
>
> Some organizations have permanent memberships (QRP ARCI, NCI), but retain
an
> active membership for those whose dues are paid up. I have been QRP ARCI
member
> 5860 for a long time, but I let it lapse for so long that they couldn't
even
> find the records that showed I ever WAS a member. :-) They took me at my
word
> and reissued the number to me.
>
> Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >

One outta two ain't bad...he certainly is lapsed...

Kim W5TIT

5248. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:23:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744df5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34764

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220120224.18935.00002015@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/19/2002 8:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c730a86_2@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >STEVE!!!! Yeah, let's set up a sked...man, that would be cool!
>
> I am off today, 20 Feb. I'll se the HF rig up for 28.525 and let it
sit
> there...Give a call!
>
> 73/88
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Outside my privilege...gotta be between 28.3 and 28.5!

73/88 to you, Kim W5TIT

5249. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:25:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744e84_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34765

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C751CBF.3B0A110C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Keith wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> > >pass while hams get no antennas
> > >with which to conduct emergency
> > >communications for the public good.
> > > Something's wrong with this scene....
> >
> > Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
tuner to
> > use it for the ham bands. You could get a 50 MHz beam to tune in channel
2-6
> > on the TV. The FCC says CCR's can't exclude TV antennas. The problem
with
> > some hams is that they want a 75 foot tower and the neighbors don't like
> > that. I operated for several years in a CCR neighborhood and used thin
wire
> > dipoles for the bands and never operated between the hours of 6pm and
> > 11 pm, I never had a problem. I used to work DX running 25 watts into
that
> > dipole all over bands and had a blast.
>
> I've never lived in a CCR restricted place but have spent considerable
time
> visiting in them, and have been on the air many
> times. It's surprising what you can do with a pair of dipoles on 40
> and 20 that are hung paralleled on a 6 ft wooden (or in one case
> concrete block) fence, especially when working CW and digital
> modes.
>

Good point. I think the ARRL is spinning its wheels with the issue, but
they can have the fun. I think the FCC is right on this one and you do
point out that workarounds can be made in restricted operating
conditions--exactly the FCC's point when they state that there is mobile,
club, EOC, and other ways in which to operate.

Kim W5TIT

5250. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:26:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220202635.16913.00000120@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34758

In article <3C73F010.6714CAE9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> > Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
>>
>> Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
>> drive a stick shift.
>
>If Kim is not skillful with a stick shift, it might be advisable
>to avoid stick shifts.

OK. Do Yugos have automatic transmissions?

>If Kim is not skillful with CW, it might
>be advisable to avoid CW for emergency situations.

Ah, I understand. So I should get a Yugo with an automatic transmission.

> For instance,
>her CB radio would probably be a lot more useful out on the
>road than HF CW even though HF CW is more reliable.

I didn't know Yugo made cb sets.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:26:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220202635.16913.00000119@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34759

In article <3c730ea6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
>> >reliable?
>> >
>> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her and
>me
>> >than it is for you. :-)
>>
>> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
>someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.

Ah, I see. A car that is reliably unreliable is better because you can rely
on its being fixable.

>Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
>isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.

So we need to find a car that is both rare and unreliable.

>But, let's say
>there was a choice between a really reliable auto, though garages are few
>and far between that know it well; and a not-so-reliable auto with garages
>that know it well are quite common.

With automatic transmissions only, too.

>I'm banking on the likelihood that,
>knowing my luck, either auto is going to break down. I am going to go with
>the auto most likely to get repaired.

So your recommendation is to rely on unreliable things because they may
be counted upon to be fixed reliably. But don't rely on reliable things because
their reliability works against them being reliable.

Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good condition.
So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5252. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:26:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220202636.16913.00000121@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34757

In article <3C73F08B.D3091CAC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > > In other words, old, simple but effective beats new and complex.
>>
>> Just like Morse/CW.
>
>Jim, you're talking to yourself. :-)

No, we're not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5253. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:26:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220202637.16913.00000122@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34760

In article <3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
>before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
>something substantive here, not just "I know".
>
Mike,

Congrats on the upgrade! Enjoy the new privs!

Before the restructuring of April 2000, there were 3 code and 5 written test elements. Today there is only one code test and 3 written elements. The pre-restructuring tests totalled 190 questions in 5 tests while the new writtens
involve 120 questions in 3 tests.

--

Here's what the written tests were like back when I took them: (Novice - 1967, Tech - 1968, Advanced - 1968, Extra 1970). I don't know if these would be considered "the tests Real Hams took" or not.

I didn't think the written tests were that hard back then. They were easy enough
for me to get the Advanced at age 14 and the Extra at age 16, and those ages weren't unusual back then.

A few years ago an 8 year old in the third grade got the Extra. This was before restructuring, so this ham did 20 wpm code and all five written tests.

The Novice was a very basic 20 question multiple choice exam, mostly on the regs witha little theory thrown in. But its privileges were extremely limited, and
once the license expired in two years you were off the hambands until you upgraded.

The Tech and General both used the same exam back then. About 50 questions, about 1/3 regs and 2/3 theory. Schematic and block diagram recognition, some calculations, Ohm's Law for DC, etc.

The Advanced was 50 or so questions, mostly theory. Lots of phase angles and such.

The Extra was about 50 questions, again mostly theory. Less calculation, though.

Exact comparisons are not possible because the old tests are not available, to my knowledge. One can gauge the difficulty and subject matter of the tests from the
"study guides" put out by the FCC and reprinted in the ARRL License Manuals and other publications. These guides were in the form of essay questions, even though the tests were all multiple choice.

The old tests covered fewer subjects, but covered them in more depth.

The real difference between now and the past is the test methods and requirements.

Today, the exact questions and answers are public knowledge and available to all for study. Back then, the exact questions and answers were kept secret. This meant that a prospective ham did not know exactly what to expect. For example, today a prospective ham knows exactly what all of the Ohm's Law questions look like, but back then, we only knew that there would be Ohm's Law questions on the test, so we tended to learn Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and sideways, to be ready for everything.

Today, one can retest at any time - just pay another fee. Back then, there was a minimum 30 day wait before retesting. You also had to pass ALL of the elements for a particular license at the same session - no CSCEs. They gave the code first, and only if you passed it did you get to try the written. If you failed
the written, you went home for at least 30 days and then had to do both code and
written again.

Today, VE sessions are given on weekends and at night. Back then, unless you lived way out in the boonies or were disabled, anyone wanting a General or higher had to go to an FCC office for a daytime weekday test session. For many hams that meant a 3 hour drive each way, and the test began at 8 AM.

Back then you needed 2 years experience as a General or higher before they'd even let you try the Extra.

So you see that "back in the day", we had lots of "incentive" to be really really
REALLY ready for the tests, because it was a lot of aggravation to get to the test session and even more to retest.

The code tests were different, too, but that's another story.

Which do you think is easier: a test where you have the exact Q&A available, or one where you have sample essays on the material the test covers?

How does having to pass 5 written tests totalling 190 questions compare to having to pass 3 written tests totalling 120 questions - for the same license, and the same question pools?

--

If you want a detailed history of how the US licensing system for hams has evolved from the end of WW2 to the 2000 restructuring, I'll repost it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5254. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:26:41 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ddebfb4cd1e3e989686@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34756

In article <3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net>, dickc58@worldnet.att.net says...

> And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
> not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.

Well, if you make sure that you use SSTV once in a while, that covers the bases, neh? :)

joshua houk
kd7pos

5255. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:30:13 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ddecd41196d18d989687@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34763

In article <3C743EA5.34DE83A6@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...

> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only
> > if they provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't
> > accomodate in any way are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's
> > ruling.
>
> PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.

Yup. N4QX has an excellent article about PRB-1 in the light of recent court actions in this month's QST. Mentions CC&R's, too. Well worth the read.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5256. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:31:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c744fcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34766

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C73F010.6714CAE9@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
> >
> > Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
> > drive a stick shift.
>
> If Kim is not skillful with a stick shift, it might be advisable
> to avoid stick shifts. If Kim is not skillful with CW, it might
> be advisable to avoid CW for emergency situations. For instance,
> her CB radio would probably be a lot more useful out on the
> road than HF CW even though HF CW is more reliable.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yep. Plus, with CB radio *and* ham radio, I have a greater chance of reaching someone. Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency. If I thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also have FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities. But, the line must be drawn somewhere. 2M, 70cm, and CB are better than nothing. And, all do me better than CW capability. I suspect there are many who feel the same way.

Kim W5TIT

5257. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:35:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7450d7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34767

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C741355.B3D3D193@IEEE.org...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> > ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> > black" is not true because there are black cars.
>
> Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> a false statement. "Cars are not black" is also a false statement.
> When one makes a logical statement like, "cars are black", *all* is
> implied, *by definition*.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It might be easier for them to relate if you used the statement "people are
black." heh heh I think they can probably see that "all" a lot easier
now...

Kim W5TIT

5258. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:39:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c745198_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34769

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220202635.16913.00000119@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c730ea6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
> >> >reliable?
> >> >
> >> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her
and
> >me
> >> >than it is for you. :-)
> >>
> >> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> >someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
>
> Ah, I see. A car that is reliably unreliable is better because you can
rely
> on its being fixable.
>
> >Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> >isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
>
> So we need to find a car that is both rare and unreliable.
>
> >But, let's say
> >there was a choice between a really reliable auto, though garages are few
> >and far between that know it well; and a not-so-reliable auto with
garages
> >that know it well are quite common.
>
> With automatic transmissions only, too.
>

> >I'm banking on the likelihood that,
> >knowing my luck, either auto is going to break down. I am going to go
with
> >the auto most likely to get repaired.
>
> So your recommendation is to rely on unreliable things because they may
> be counted upon to be fixed reliably. But don't rely on reliable things
because
> their reliability works against them being reliable.
>
> Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> condition.
> So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Don't know about that...but maybe people think right off the top it's too
expensive...

Kim W5TIT

5259. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:43:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c74529e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34770

Maybe you men are just having a hard time with this. Let's say I can get a European made sound system/stereo that is absolutely reliable. The components last and last, the sound is beautiful, the workmanship is top notch. BUT, if it ever breaks I have to ship it back over to Europe and pay shipping both ways, as well as the inconvenience of the time it would take.

Then, let's say I can get a lot less reliable sound system/stereo that has a service and repair shop in nearly every major city, and some small towns.

I'm getting the less reliable sound system, unless I'm just in a really crazy mood and take that chance that the super reliable system really *is* *always* that reliable. I am not a risk taker, never have been.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220202635.16913.00000119@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c730ea6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
> >> >reliable?
> >> >
> >> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her
and
> >me
> >> >than it is for you. :-)
> >>
> >> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> >someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
>
> Ah, I see. A car that is reliably unreliable is better because you can
rely
> on its being fixable.

>
> >Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> >isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
>
> So we need to find a car that is both rare and unreliable.
>
> >But, let's say
> >there was a choice between a really reliable auto, though garages are few
> >and far between that know it well; and a not-so-reliable auto with
garages
> >that know it well are quite common.
>
> With automatic transmissions only, too.
>
> >I'm banking on the likelihood that,
> >knowing my luck, either auto is going to break down. I am going to go
with
> >the auto most likely to get repaired.
>
> So your recommendation is to rely on unreliable things because they may
> be counted upon to be fixed reliably. But don't rely on reliable things
because
> their reliability works against them being reliable.
>
> Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> condition.
> So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5260. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 01:46:26 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ddf0a4f99e1959989688@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34768

http://www.eham.net/exams/ has exams for the question pools before the 2000 restructuring, including the older Advanced and Extra pools. I'm in the same boat as you having just passed Extra the week before last, so I'm interested in seeing how I'd stack up. Cross yer fingers!

joshua houk
kd7pos

5261. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 02:36:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75A157.442128CF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34771

Carl Zager wrote:

> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C710062.A4C413EE@IEEE.org>...
> > Exactly, Ed, that is exactly what is wrong with Dick's statement. It
> > presumes that no other combination can exist. The addition of the
> > qualifier word, "often" or "sometimes", would indicate that other
> > conditions can exist. My argument is based on the accepted rules
> > of mathematical logic.
> >
> > Do you think, "cars are black", is a true statement? It's not. It
> > needs a qualifier like, "some", to make it logically true. I can
> > dig out the rules of logic that apply if you would like.
>
> Why is it necessary to add a qualifier to make a statement true? Cars
> ARE black. Not ALL cars are black, but cars are black. "Cars are not
> black" is not true because there are black cars.
>
> "Cars are black" is not the same as "All cars are black" nor the same
> as "Some cars are black."
>
> IF X="black", "TRUE","FALSE" is a logical test. If any occurrance of X
> is black, then X="black" -- in that instance.

Don't try to confuse Cecil with facts, he has chosen his "side" and
he intends to do whatever it takes to "win", facts be damned.
To him its just another high school debate to snow job everyone
else with.

Troll! Troll! Troll!

5262. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 02:44:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75A32E.58A926B1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34772

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >You try to dictate things without having any authority. It doesn't
> >work for you any better than it works for Carl.
>
> And neither are successful, so neither is dictating.
>
> Trying to dictate and dictating are not the same.

So you're saying that a dictator whose dictations aren't completely
successful isn't a dictator, just an attempted dictator.

I see you HAVE proved my point, you're becoming a Cecilian
troll yourself.

5263. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 02:46:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75A3A0.504F2160@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34773

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
> >you still think I need my glasses changed?
>
> He may have chosen to not pay his dues. In some organizations, one is still a
> member.
>
> He probably does realize that you need your glasses changed. Carl apologized to
> Bert for calling him a twit; perhaps Dick will be as noble with you.

I'll just go ahead and call him a dumshit. Explanations are useless
to him.

5264. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 02:50:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75A4B4.6A038165@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34774

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
> >few weeks ago a columnist
> >mentioned that California has a new law
> >that overrules CCR's which
> >prohibit pets. It specifically states
> >that a homeowner may have one
> >pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
> >pets.
> >
> > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
> >pass while hams get no antennas
> >with which to conduct emergency
> >communications for the public good.
> > Something's wrong with this scene....
>
> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way
> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.

You need to read this...

http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/woverbeck/antregs.htm

5265. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 02:55:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75A5BB.2E7BA559@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34775

Jim Kelley wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
>
> > > > Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
> > > > a false statement.
> > >
> > > Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
> > > mention of cars in mine.
> >
> > Here's an example, however:
> > "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> > Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> > statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> > One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.
>
> So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?

M R ducks.

M R not ducks!

O S A R 2 ducks! C M wangs?

L I B! M *R* ducks!

5266. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:10:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c746709_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34776

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75A157.442128CF@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Don't try to confuse Cecil with facts, he has chosen his "side" and
> he intends to do whatever it takes to "win", facts be damned.
> To him its just another high school debate to snow job everyone
> else with.
>
> Troll! Troll! Troll!
>

And Dick is feeling unusually snowjobbed these days...

Kim W5TIT

5267. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:20:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c746973_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34778

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75A4B4.6A038165@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> You need to read this...
>
> http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/woverbeck/antregs.htm
>

From the above reference submitted by you, Little Dick:

"Given the deed restrictions and municipal ordinances that we now face in urban areas, the easiest way to have a big signal these days may be to head for the boondocks. There are all sorts of places where land is still cheap and nobody seems to care if you put up a tower or two--or three or four! Those places just aren't in the cities where most of us live."

Now, where've we heard *that* before? Head for the hills. No, wait. I'm in the boondocks and we don't need no steenking city slickers... :^)

Kim W5TI and a T

5268. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:24:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220222423.16884.00001055@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34777

>Subject: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 02/20/02 13:46 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu>

>I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".

Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash, Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide folks.

I think it absolutely ludicrous that we have a radio service that is supposed to promote some sort of self education on radio communication practice and theory, but we lay the answers out for all to see.

Where's the learning in that?

As a VE, I don't believe the tests themselves are "dumbed down". The questions are, as much as the lag time from concept to publication allows, pertinent.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5269. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:38:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020220223852.16884.00001062@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 34779

>Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 02/20/02 20:23 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c744df5_1@newsa.ev1.net

>Outside my privilege...gotta be between 28.3 and 28.5

Whoooops!......

Well...darn the luck anyway...Perhaps this weekend, but we have a rather popular regional hamfest in Dalton, GA Saturday.

Pick a frequency, Kim, and I'll set up to monitor there.

I can be QRV after 0030Z Sunday (6:30P CDT) Any other RRAPer's join in....Lennie, I will watch for you on IM...Assuming you don't have another family emergency to lie about.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5270. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:44:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75B15C.38A44003@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34780

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Apparently, it has expired. Did you forget to pay your dues? Do
> > > you still think I need my glasses changed?
> >
> > Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire.
>
> Memberships don't expire. They just drop you from the membership
> lists. I see.

You see what you want to see. The UK membership is separate from the
US membership. If they drop members from the membership
list it is a drastic change in policy that has not been announced.
I seriously doubt it, and in any case I still have my certificate with
number 3939 that was issued for life. End story and termination
of your current troll.

5271. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:50:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51qtccfo1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34781

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75184F.A3D46BC3@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Some organizations have permanent memberships (QRP ARCI, NCI), but
retain an
> > active membership for those whose dues are paid up. I have been QRP ARCI
member
> > 5860 for a long time, but I let it lapse for so long that they couldn't
even
> > find the records that showed I ever WAS a member. :-) They took me at
my word
> > and reissued the number to me.
> >
> > Perhaps Dick is a lapsed FISTS member.
>
> Once a FISTS member your membership doesn't expire. If you
> want the monthly newsletter you pay an annual membership dues, if not you
just
> don't get the newsletter, you do keep the membership
> and its number. (That's the way it was explained to me). I dropped
> the newsletter a couple years ago.

Well jeepers, permanent membership batman...
And to think of all the lambasting NCI got for doing exactly
the same thing. Go figure?

Cheers and LMAO,
Bill K2UNK

5272. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 03:55:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51r60$s50$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34782

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C747257.C4C269EB@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> Words have special meaning that only Dick can understand. We just
clarified
> > >> that he believes the definition of dictator is one who files comments
with
> > >> the FCC.
> >
> > >IF that's all you see in Carl Stevenson's diatribes you have just
> > >proved that what I have said is true. You really do overlook him and
> > >his minions, and nitpick code supporters.
> >
> > Actually, Dick, I drew that conclusion from the discussion I had with
you over
> > your use of the term "dictate." When pressed as to how someone without
any
> > authority whatsover could be a dictator, you cited his attempts to
influence
> > the FCC as the reason for your choice of the word "dictate."
>
> So you think that because Carl has no authority that he wouldn't try
> to dictate? I doubt many others who have long read his stuff
> would agree.

The only people that might think that way would be totally
berift of logic and common sense. It takes more than just
words on paper/screen to dictate to anyone.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5273. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:00:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020220230024.23640.00000368@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 34786

In article <3c72f99d_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> It certainly did for me -- nothing else was able to accomplish that
>> goal, including a lot of "selling of the mode" by hams who used and
>> loved CW at the time.
>>
>
>Welp, too bad you didn't recognize it for it's uniqueness right up front.
>Maybe you wouldn't have wasted so many years in defiance of it.

Kim:

Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire only
after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
proficiency.

>> >This is getting really confusing, Little Dick.
>>
>> That's MISTER Carroll to you, dear.
>>
>
>Nope, sure isn't. Little Dick deserves no, zero, nada, respect from me.

At the risk of speaking for Dick, I'm fairly certain the feeling is mutual.

>> >It sounds more
>> >like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?

I can't force anything on anyone, Kim. However, this "force" thing,
as empty an argument as it is, is one of the mainstays of the NCTA
debating syllabus. It's a meaningless, empty, illogical argument used
by people who cannot justify their position.

>> How can Dick, or anyone else, "force" CW on anyone? Nobody was
>> able to "force" it on me -- I learned it because I wanted to be a ham
>> with HF privileges, and code tests were required.

>Somehow the word "required" doesn't go with "wanted" but whatever.

What kind of an argument is "but whatever?" OIC, a Kim Walker kind of
argument. Never mind.

>> >Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or the other
>> >for whether someone is going to use it or not.

>>
>> Well, it certainly did for me, since I had no intention when initially
>> licensed to become a CW operator.
>>
>
>Yeah, but I think we all realize what a different kind of guy you are,
>Larry.

We're all different, Kim -- except for NCTA's, who are all strangely alike.

>> In fact, I was (at the time) a
>> most vociferous NCTA kinda guy. If NCI had existed then, I may
>> have joined. However, learning the code and getting on the air a
>> few times got me "hooked," and before I even thought I was ready
>> to take it, I had passed my 20 WPM code test! If code testing had
>> never been a requirement, I very strongly doubt that I would have
>> become a CW operator,
>>
>
>And, that would have, what? Been bad? Who cared whether you became a CW
>operator? I learned CW to pass a test. Dropped it right after the test.

I'm sure you did. That took less effort than giving it a fair try on-the-air,
to see if you'd actually enjoy using it. The pity is, you don't know what
you're missing -- and are too stupid to make the attempt to find out.

>So, you were encouraged by learning for a test and I was discouraged by
>learning it for a test. With just the two of us, that's 50/50 odds.

And the difference between us is that I beat those odds by approaching
CW with a mature, open-minded attitude. You've made up your mind
about it without even giving it a fair chance. Typical NCTA laziness.
However, you've got the whining and excuse-making down pat.

>> although I'm not saying it's impossible that
>> I could have in the absence of the requirement.
>>
>
>I think CW is "miraculous" enough and fun enough for people who like it,
>that those who are inclined to use it in the longrun don't need to be
>encouraged by having to learn it for a test.

If you think this is true, PROVE it.

>I wasn't tested for APRS or
>packet, but I've tried both. Can't stand packet and dig playing with APRS.
>I wasn't tested for PSK31, watched my husband doing it one night, shook my
>head in bafflement and never will try it.

What's so baffling about PSK-31? It's got to be one of the dead-easiest
modes to operate, and it's a lot of fun. It's one of the few digital modes
I've tried that really CAN give CW a run for it's money -- though I've still
made CW contacts long after PSK-31 died out on me.

>> After all, it was my
>> umpteenth bad experience with a rabid Ten-Ten number chaser
>> on 10-meters that put me off of SSB operation back in the early
>> '90's.

>You sure are easily discouraged. Imagine me giving up ham radio just
>because of your rabidness on this newsgroup, Larry. That'd be ridiculous.
>You let others win too easily.

My disenfranchisement with SSB was building up long before that
particular incident on 10-meters, which was just the straw that broke
the camel's back, as it were.

>> Of course, if I hadn't passed at least a 13 WPM code test,
>> I wouldn't have been on SSB, wouldn't I? Therefore, knowing the
>> code, and passing the tests, both got me ON the CW bands, and
>> OFF of the phone bands! Talk about your unintended consequences!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Your unintended consequence there is that you seem to think that everyone
>and anyone else must have the same experience as you.

I get that a lot, but I've never said it. All I've ever done is relate my own
personal experiences using CW, from the point-of-view of a person who
may never have done so in the absence of the testing requirement. In
expecting you to understand this, perhaps I'm expecting too much, given
the low intellectual level you consistently seem to demonstrate in this NG.

>Or, that those who
>don't are somehow much lesser a person than you.

More whining. Yawn!

>You can wish forever that
>someone would experience your life, Larry, because you think it is so
>wonderful.

My life is my life, Kim -- nobody can experience it other than myself. All
I'm doing is offering others the benefit of my own experiences. A lot of
people have listened, taken heed, and tried to do things they wouldn't
have tried before -- and succeeded where they never expected to. I guess
that's the one thing I've learned the hard way -- to stretch myself beyond
my own self-imposed limits, and learn that I'm not really limited at all!

>While you are wishing, you may completely miss the beauty of
>their life. I am so tickled just to get someone on the air and into ham
>radio that I couldn't care less if they ever even hear of CW.

Merely getting "on the air" doesn't make a person a ham. It can do so,
but it isn't likely that they will really be fulfilled as a ham unless they
also embrace the growth of the technical and operational learning
experience. Just yakking into a microphone isn't even 1 percent of

that. And someone who admits to "shaking [her] head in bafflement"
at a mode like PSK-31, and vowing never to try it, isn't qualified to judge
me as a ham!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5274. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:00:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020220230025.23640.00000369@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 34783

In article <3c72fdaa_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Well, as already stated, I don't see ANY part of the testing regimen
>> to be capable of "filtering" out potentially bad operators. However, to
>> whatever extent it does, I'm glad that we derive that secondary benefit.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Uh huh. The latter part of your last paragraph belies your real thinking,
>Larry.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Don't look now, Kim, but that's what it was intended to do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5275. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:00:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020220230026.23640.00000370@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 34784

In article <3c72febf_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> You may have accidentally stumbled on a good point.
>>
>
>No accident. You're just beginning to realize how smart I am, like I said
>before.

Kim:

No, not likely. By that, I mean you're not as smart as you think you
are.

>> Hams are at the point now where the best we can hope for is to be
>> accepted as a "backup" communications service, and I believe we have
>> a proven and vital role to serve in that capacity. However, in order to
>> be the most capable "backup" operators we an be, we need to
>> maintain a solid grounding in the very essential basics of radio
>> communication, including the Morse code. Bringing in a lot more
>> technically uninvolved button-pushing appliance operators, who
>> possess no operating skills other than the ability to speak somewhat
>> clearly into a microphone, is not going to solidify our place in the
>> public's mind with regard to our REAL backup capability. Yakking
>> into an HT just doesn't impress anyone anymore, nor should it.
>> The last time I sat at the operator's position of our radio club's
>> station at the county EOC, the county's Emergency Operations
>> Director was more impressed with my ability to copy a W1AW
>> CW bulletin, than with the PTT skills of the No-code tech sitting
>> next to me, clutching the mic of the 2-meter rig for dear life.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>And I am pretty sure you are wrong.

And I'm absolutely positive you are wrong.

>More hams who bring a mix of interests
>to the hobby of the ARS and begin weaving their experimentation with all of
>them is what will keep the ARS in some way viable.

"Their experimentation." Right. What have YOU experimented with lately, Kim -- besides newer and better ways to make a fool of yourself on rrap? What new modes have you developed? Heck, what new modes have you just *tried?* Ever used *any* mode other than FM/SSB voice? Why are you still just a Tech? Why don't you have your Extra, with full HF privileges? You don't have to take any more code tests, so what's standing in your way?

>By the way, those who
>wish to do nothing but pick up the microphone are probably a vast minority
>when it compares to the number of people who see the ARS as an exciting
>laboratory for experimentation with internet/wireless and other endless new
>technologies.

You know, Kim, with a bunch of tired old bromides like that, you could easily run for ARRL Section Manager! However, they do nothing to support your claim of how smart you are!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5276. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:01:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gruxl2b.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34785

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 04:57:09 -0800, Keith wrote:

> Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
>tuner to use it for the ham bands. You could get a 50 MHz beam to tune
>in channel 2-6 on the TV. The FCC says CCR's can't exclude TV
>antennas.

The FCC (and the law) has made it clear that if the "TV antenna" is
used for any purpose other than broadcast reception they will not
back you up on preemption.

You give bad advice.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

5277. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:01:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gruxydc.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34787

On 20 Feb 2002 13:29:20 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>>Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna tuner to
>>use it for the ham bands.
>
>Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)

If the Association or the Complainer is mean enough and has deep
enouch pockets, they can very well hire an engineering firm (such
as the one that I consult for) to sit and DF the signal. For us
retired spooks, it's like shooting fish in a barrel.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5278. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:01:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gruyr1d.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34788

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 17:33:44 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> I'm not sure just when this law was passed,

California courts have had a long history of overruling CC&R
proscriptions on things like window shade colors, pets and pickup
trucks, but not one case on ham antennas has been successful - and
it wasn't because we haven't been tryimg for years.

>to to have been a telling point to be able to point out that at
>least one state believes that CCR contracts are not impenetrable for
>good reason,

California had preemption for TV and satellite antennas several
years before the Feds got around to it.

The FCC's claim - rightly - is that CC&Rs are state creatures and
the state can overrule them with inmpunity, but the agency
can't/won't do it on its own without specific direction ("get us
off the hook" from The Congress.

The League General Counsel and I and several other ham lawyers have
kicked this around for many years (we worked on a big California
vase in the 1990s) and we knew what the FCC was going to say long
before the League approached them. What we succeeded in was getting
the FCC to say out loud that they needed The Congress to order them
to do it.

On to our Congressreps....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5279. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:06:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51s5tbsj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34789

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220081728.29971.00000973@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Second, the new law shows "reasonable
> >accomodation". One pet, not an unlimited
> >number. For hams that might mean one antenna
> >of reasonable size, not an unlimited right to put
> >up any sort of tower/antenna farm.
>
> What ARRL has been asking for is an CC&R pre-emption similar in scope to
that
> given by the FCC to broadcast reception antennas. This would certainly
allow
> verticals, wires in trees, outdoor ground planes, VHF Yagis, etc. It might
> allow a small HF antenna like a Butternut beam. So far, the FCC has said
no.

The ideal is FCC (i.e. federal) preemption...BUT, like the Calif
pet exception, it could also be fought on a state-by-state basis.
Lots more work, but maybe it could lead to federal preemption
once a handful of states did it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5280. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:11:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51s4ivic1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34790

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
> >
> > >Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
tuner to
> > >use it for the ham bands.
> >
> > Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)
>
> And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
> not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.

Most won't bother. You may get an extremist, but the worst
that'd happen is you have to remove the antenna. Not a very
big deal in the catagory of problems.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5281. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:16:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51tjrdad1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34800

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C743EA5.34DE83A6@uci.edu...
>
>
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if
they
> > provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in
any way
> > are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>
> PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.

To be more accurate...PRB-1 addresses ALL governmentally
imposed restrictions/zoning. That can be state, county, city or local.

Jim is 100% correct on the CC&Rs not being addressed at all by
PRB-1 and that is because CC&Rs are NOT governmentally
imposed rules/regs, but rather they are part of the contract of
sale for the property...even if you didn't know they existed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5282. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:19:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C74753B.93642DAF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34791

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire.
> >
> > Memberships don't expire. They just drop you from the membership
> > lists. I see.
>
> You see what you want to see. The UK membership is separate from the
> US membership.

Hmmmmmmm, these don't look like UK calls. Your W0EX just isn't there.

W0DAM Dick 6623
W0DYD Gary 8446
W0FCL David 6754
W0FF Jim 5020

Still think I need to get my glasses changed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5283. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:20:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51se701bj2@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34797

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220195120.18975.00002125@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Once More, Into The Fray....
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/20/2002 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020220181751.18934.00002167@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
> >
> >Under the rules of engagement, you have just lost the debate. Sorry.
>
> There's no debate here, Ed. I checked the Webser's and nothing that
> transpires here meets the criteria.

Not Webster, but Godwin.

5284. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:21:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7475B2.AB39508C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34792

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?

If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5285. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:22:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C747621.D3405322@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34793

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > "Cars are black" is not the same as "All cars are black" ...

According to the accepted rules of logic, they are the same.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5286. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:24:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C747682.3EF40C4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34794

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
> The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
> amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
> not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire only
> after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
> proficiency.

But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5287. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:27:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51sq401c5f@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34851

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220182528.18934.00002170@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >So because I believe that a code test is appropriate for licensing
> >ham radio operators, I try to dictate.
>
> And Carl believes that a code test is not appropriate for licensing ham
radio
> operators. You both made comments to the FCC. Why is he dictating, and you
not?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

To paraphrase Chevy Chase in Caddyshack, "Me dictating, no! You do!"

5288. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:31:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51tjsdad2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34799

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gruxydc.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On 20 Feb 2002 13:29:20 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
>
> >>Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna tuner
to
> >>use it for the ham bands.
> >
> >Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)
>
> If the Association or the Complainer is mean enough and has deep
> enouch pockets, they can very well hire an engineering firm (such
> as the one that I consult for) to sit and DF the signal. For us
> retired spooks, it's like shooting fish in a barrel.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

So Phil, if your firm was asked to ferret out a local ham in
a CC&R community, would you take the case for the $$$
or turn it down because of your being a ham and your being opposed
to CC&R restrictions against ham antennas?

Just curious.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5289. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:32:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51t3201ciq@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34852

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75A32E.58A926B1@worldnet.att.net...

> I see you HAVE proved my point, you're becoming a Cecilian
> troll yourself.

You toss the word "troll" around while making similar posts yourself. I don't think you know what the word means, else you wouldn't even bother responding to such posts you consider "trolls."

Mr. Pot, meet Mr. Kettle.

5290. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:33:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C747884.2700DE96@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34795

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the
> Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash,
> Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide
> folks.

The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different form
than the tests. Quoting from the 1957 ARRL License Manual: "If our answers
sometimes seem to the initiated to be naive or incomplete, rest assured that
they are sufficient for the purpose." That means everything needed to pass
the exam was in the License Manual. And it was. I couldn't afford anything
except an ARRL License Manual at the time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5291. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:36:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a51tjtdad3@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34798

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gruxl2b.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 04:57:09 -0800, Keith wrote:
>
> > Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
> >tuner to use it for the ham bands. You could get a 50 MHz beam to tune
> >in channel 2-6 on the TV. The FCC says CCR's can't exclude TV
> >antennas.
>
> The FCC (and the law) has made it clear that if the "TV antenna" is
> used for any purpose other than broadcast reception they will not
> back you up on preemption.
>
> You give bad advice.

I don't think the advice was offered as a legal way around
the CC&Rs, but rather it was offered in an attempt
to portray the deception as probably being immune from discovery
But, if it was discovered, it would be subject to removal. The advice
offers
just another "stealth" method to generally avoid detection. Such
"stealth" antennas have been advertised/sold for years.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5292. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:37:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gruzxfe.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34796

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 00:10:46 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only
>if they provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't
>accomodate in any way are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's
>ruling.

Wrong there, my friend. We tried that approach in the _Hotz v Rich_ case and the First District (California) Court of Appeal shot us down. The PRB-1 Order specifically states in a footnote that it does not apply to private agreements such as CC&Rs, and the appellate court judge's clerk must have read the fine print where the trial court judge's clery must have overlooked it.

In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have turned a deaf ear to us hams.

That's why the League started the ball rolling to get the FCC to "amend" PRB-1 to drop that exclusion.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

5293. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:40:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51tjb01ded@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34854

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7439F0.9FB4CC9F@IEEE.org...
> Here's an example, however:
> "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.

Only when all relevant facts about a given statement are known can it be
determined to be true or false. Truth is subjective. A statement in one
context and/or circumstances may be true, while in another
context/circumstnaces, the same statement might be false.

5294. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 04:43:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a51tnl01dlg@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34855

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75A5BB.2E7BA559@worldnet.att.net...
> > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
>
> M R ducks.
>
> M R not ducks!
>
> O S A R 2 ducks! C M wangs?
>
> L I B! M *R* ducks!

Most of us learned that in the third grade, which only goes to show the
level of your wit.

5295. Re: Once More, Into The Fray....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:00:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020221000007.23640.00000371@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 34853

In article <20020220181751.18934.00002167@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> Even "you know who" in 1930's central Europe could be charming and civil
>>on occassion.
>
>Under the rules of engagement, you have just lost the debate. Sorry.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I'm sure that in Central Europe of the 1930's, there were lots of people who were charming and civil. To whom did you think Steve was referring?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5296. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:16:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv1xzh.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34856

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 23:11:26 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
>> not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.
>
>Most won't bother. You may get an extremist, but the worst
>that'd happen is you have to remove the antenna. Not a very
>big deal in the catagory of problems.

Until the Association bills you for their costs and attorney fees as
they can do by the standard terms of CC&Rs and Association by-laws
in California.

Remember, folks, this is Califor-na-yay law.....where the loser
pays.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5297. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:16:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv1zbi.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34857

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 01:26:41 GMT, Joshua Houk wrote:

>In article <3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net>, dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>says...
>
>> And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
>> not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.
>
>Well, if you make sure that you use SSTV once in a while, that covers the
>bases, neh? :)

No.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5298. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:37:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv35uk.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34858

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 23:31:20 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> If the Association or the Complainer is mean enough and has deep
>> enouch pockets, they can very well hire an engineering firm (such
>> as the one that I consult for) to sit and DF the signal. For us
>> retired spooks, it's like shooting fish in a barrel.
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>So Phil, if your firm was asked to ferret out a local ham in
>a CC&R community, would you take the case for the $$$
>or turn it down because of your being a ham and your being opposed
>to CC&R restrictions against ham antennas?

I and the owner would turn it down because it would require us to
do something that we didn't believe in (support anti-ham CC&Rs) but
I can name several competitors' firms who would take it, not that
their work would be as precise, respected, and bullet-proof as ours
is, you know.... <ggg>

But I would be a bad lawyer if I didn't point out the risks to
the person wanting to know if their action was supportable.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5299. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:40:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210539220.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34859

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
>> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way
>> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>
>PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.

You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction between the
two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.

5300. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:40:07 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16de275f89a888c0989689@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34860

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.grv1zbi.pminews@news.earthlink.net>,
Phil.Kane@no.spam says...
> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 01:26:41 GMT, Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> >Well, if you make sure that you use SSTV once in a while, that covers the
> >bases, neh? :)
>
> No.

I'm not saying that my post qualified as witty or anything... but please
take my post as the (lame attempt at a) joke that is was. No more. No
less.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5301. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 05:56:29 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210545360.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34861

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > I noticed in the Fresno, CA newspaper a
>> >few weeks ago a columnist
>> >mentioned that California has a new law
>> >that overrules CCR's which
>> >prohibit pets. It specifically states
>> >that a homeowner may have one
>> >pet regardless of CCR's which prohibit
>> >pets.
>> >
>> > Isn't that neat? Fido and Kitty get a
>> >pass while hams get no antennas
>> >with which to conduct emergency
>> >communications for the public good.
>> > Something's wrong with this scene....
>>
>> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
>> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way
>> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>
>You need to read this...
>
>http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/woverbeck/antregs.htm

So, you point me to a text where some guy LOST. Furthermore, the 9th Circuit is known for its bad rulings. You don't hear about the cases where the amateur wins, now do you? Why? Because often, it's not news.

My neighborhood has CC&R's too, and my 12 antennas have been up for almost a full 10 years now. A couple of my neighbors asked, I pointed them to PRB-1 (before some of these "adverse rulings"), and even the neighbor who was an attorney BACKED DOWN. Now, part of my situation may also be that I got the CC&R's on my property cancelled by executing the "escape clause" that was in it for inherited property, which some newer tracts don't have in their CC&R's.

My property isn't the only one with antennas now either.

I'm not interested in those losers who aren't skilled enough to make a proper argument in defending their interpretation of PRB-1. It CAN be used to quash CC&R's if done properly.

5302. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:12:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75D3DE.BD7F45C2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34862

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
> > >
> > > >Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
> tuner to
> > > >use it for the ham bands.
> > >
> > > Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)
> >
> > And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
> > not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.
>
> Most won't bother.

Right, most people won't notice. The one who does is your worry, and your
nemisis.

5303. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:30:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv5d4n.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34863

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 05:40:01 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>>PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
>
>You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
>between the two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.

Ah, the old "state action" argument. The Court of Appeal didn't buy
that one either when we raised it. And this was in a case where the
city government and the homeowners' association were co-terminous.
The city was forced to grant the building permit for Jimmy's 75 foot
tower because of PRB-1 but the individuals as homeowners sued under
the CC&Rs and won.

Unless there is a specific state law that outlaws specific things in
CC&Rs, they are as different from ordinances as chalk is from cheese.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5304. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:30:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv5kvo.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34864

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 05:40:07 GMT, Joshua Houk wrote:

>> >Well, if you make sure that you use SSTV once in a while, that covers the
>> >bases, neh? :)
>>
>> No.
>
>I'm not saying that my post qualified as witty or anything... but please
>take my post as the (lame attempt at a) joke that is was. No more. No
>less.

Pardon me too, Joshua, but realize that I do these cases in real
life as a communications attorney and I've heard all these attempts
at subterfuge and they ceased being funny long ago.

Peace, brother.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5305. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:48:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75DC4D.4DABD3FB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34865

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire.
> > >
> > > Memberships don't expire. They just drop you from the membership
> > > lists. I see.
> >
> > You see what you want to see. The UK membership is separate from the
> > US membership.
>
> Hmmmmmmm, these don't look like UK calls. Your W0EX just isn't there.
>
> W0DAM Dick 6623
> W0DYD Gary 8446
> W0FCL David 6754
> W0FF Jim 5020
>

Looks like he imported all the US calls into his UK database. To get them
on this side of the pond you need to check fists.org webpage. I did, and it
says the list is ACTIVE members only. Maybe they have changed the rules, if
so no one put out the word.
I notice that N2EY is missing, also. I'm pretty sure that Jim joined
after I did, so looks like he is in the same status.
I paid dues and got the newsletter for a couple years after I
signed on, but dropped it then. Wasn't much in it other than new
members stuff, and I already had subscriptions to more ham radio
publications than I could justify. So, looks like I may be considered
an inactive member. Still have certificate #3939 on the wall, though
Sorry. Troll rejected.

>
> Still think I need to get my glasses changed?

Dunno, but I still think you need a brain tuneup.

5306. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:49:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75DCAA.B74206CA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34866

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
>
> If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.

That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
assumed based on experience.

>>Troll rejected<<

5307. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:50:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75DCF2.1FA95AF0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34867

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > "Cars are black" is not the same as "All cars are black" ...
>
> According to the accepted rules of logic, they are the same.

So most of the world is illogical. The English language sure is

>>Troll rejected<<

5308. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:52:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75DD66.80F833A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34868

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
> > The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
> > amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
> > not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire only
> > after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
> > proficiency.
>
> But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.

Obviously you are. If it isn't easy you pass. You said so.

5309. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 06:58:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C75DEBE.D8B83A3C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34869

CAM wrote:

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the
> > Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash,
> > Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide
> > folks.
>
> The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different form
> than the tests.

More trolling bullshit. You of all people, hold me and anyone
else you choose to the very letter of perfection, then have the brass
balls to make such a claim. The ARRL license manual was a
STUDY GUIDE in which entire pages were used in DISCUSSION
of the theory and background on much of the subject matter.
You're a worthless old lying idiot.

5310. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 07:09:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grv7j5p.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34870

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 05:56:29 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>My neighborhood has CC&R's too, and my 12 antennas have been up for
>almost a full 10 years now. A couple of my neighbors asked, I pointed
>them to PRB-1 (before some of these "adverse rulings"), and even the
>neighbor who was an attorney BACKED DOWN.

All you proved is that you could bluff your neighbors, and that the attorney in question was a poor attorney for not researching the proffered authority for him/herself. The exclusion of CC&Rs has always been there in black and white.

So you were successful in not having your neighbors bring suit under the CC&Rs. Congratulations. Maybe they didn't care. But beware the Neighborhood Nazi who does, and wants to make a case out of it. That's when we lawyers get into the picture.

Your tactic, albeit successful, doesn't set a precedent or change the law one bit, and I for one am very uncomfortable defending any situation unless it is "bullet-proof" with both the facts AND the law on my side.

>Now, part of my situation may also be that I got the CC&R's on my
>property cancelled by executing the "escape clause" that was in it for
>inherited property, which some newer tracts don't have in their
>CC&R's.

Yeah, that gem went away a while ago.

>My property isn't the only one with antennas now either.

>I'm not interested in those losers who aren't skilled enough to make
>a proper argument in defending their interpretation of PRB-1. It CAN
>be used to quash CC&R's if done properly.

Yeah, and I can ride downtown on the bus without paying the fare if it's done properly, too.

YMMV.

The Fourth District Court of Appeal (Los Angeles) bought the "state action" approach to court enforcement of restrictive covenants. When we tried the same argument relying on that holding in our case in the First District (San Francisco) the justices there wouldn't buy it, claiming that what they did in the Fourth District was not binding on the First District (which it wasn't). _Hotz v Rich_ would have been a slam-dunk had they bought it, obviating a retrial with a different burden of proof which was a disaster in spite of over $100,000 worth

of pro-bono engineering testimony and the pro-bono services of four high-powered lawyers including the litigation specialist for a major California corporation and several communications lawyers..

That was my only significant loss in several decades of comm law.

Sometimes you win, sometimes you don't.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5311. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 07:56:14 UTC
From: Birdman67 <Birdman67@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <yK1d8.6045$kq1.2778310@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 35351

Many tests for professions (one example is funeral director in WI, I THINK
nursing also does(I may be wrong on that one))also publish the question
pools to their exams for all to see.
Dave kb9iig
"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220222423.16884.00001055@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >Subject: The tests that Real Hams took
> >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 02/20/02 13:46 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu>
>
> >I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to
the
> Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick
Bash,
> Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study
guide
> folks.
>
> I think it absolutely ludicrous that we have a radio service that is
> supposed to promote some sort of self education on radio communication
practice
> and theory, but we lay the answers out for all to see.
>
> Where's the learning in that?
>
> As a VE, I don't believe the tests themselves are "dumbed down". The
> questions are, as much as the lag time from concept to publication allows,
> pertinent.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

5312. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 09:05:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221040541.22644.00001207@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 34871

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.

> Obviously you are. If it isn't easy you pass. You said so.

So you think that Amateur Radio should not include people who find the tests easy to pass. I see.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5313. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 12:57:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <096d8.1636$el1.439593@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 34873

I have asked the same question here and other groups before. No one wants to seem to provide any. I am sure that the tests back in the day when you had to go to a F.C.C. office are unobtainable, but there has got to be some VE teams that have kept that kind of stuff. Not that hams aren't anal retentive now. I know one ham who does the equivalent of a site survey just to figure out where to place the microphone from his rig.....

If ya find any of these tests, or the question pools from years prior to the pools being public knowledge, let me know. I really want to see how many changes in the questions there were to make them "easier." I understand from other hams in my area, that most of the question changes are to improperly worded, or erroneous, or outdated questions.

Speaking of real tests..... If the morse code test is sooo important, there should be 100% copy and nothing less. Then the term REAL HAM would have some relevance as it is flung around so often.

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...
> I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> something substantive here, not just "I know".
>
> - mike -

5314. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 12:57:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <196d8.1637$el1.439551@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 34872

I have suggested in certain circles, that maybe as a "happy medium" is to release the Questions only, not the four multiple guesses.... A person would still need to do the research, but would get an idea of what they are going to be tested on.

I obtained the question pools and made my own flashcards after many reads of the instruction manuals. I wrote the actual test pool question on one side, and the correct answer according to the book or other research on the other side. Some of the questions were really easy to complete the answer without research, and other questions I had to do more research. When I was not in an area where keeping a book was conducive, I kept a stack of the cards with me and kept on pounding the information into my head. When I reached a point where I knew around 90 percent of the cards, I went an took the tests. Perfect score on the tech, missed two on the general, and missed the extra by one.

Overall, I believe the suggestion in the first paragraph may be one of many possible solutions.

> could not "memorize the test". You had to know the answer. Note, that
> even using the question pool as a study guide, the answers were rearranged.

5315. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:00:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202210600.1c050bf8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34874

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020220180753.18934.00002160@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> > Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> >before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> I have asked a few FCC and former FCC guys I know. None seem to be able to find
> any of the old tests, though I know a few more guys now than I did then. Let
> me try again.
>
> In the meantime, just for a discussion point, here is the text from the 4 pages
> of Novice material in the ARRL study guide. As I remember, the questions I
> took on my Novice were mighty similar to these questions. After all, how many
> ways can you ask how much power a Novice can run? :-)

And for passing the Novice you got a license that was good for one or
two years
(it changed in 1967) 75 watts of xtal control on tiny slices of 3 HF
bands, plus
145-147 MHz in the days before repeaters. No 10 meters, 'phone was AM
only and
no 'phone at all after the term was extended to 2 years.

And the old Novice of which Ed speaks was a one-shot deal - you could
not renew
it or get another one by retesting. It was upgrade or off the air.

What Ed doesn't say is what the other "study guides" entailed. Also
not
mentioned is the fact that the non-Novice tests included rules
questions
not in the study guides. The LMs had all the amateur regs in them,
too.

--
Here's a compilation of what the study guides involved, and how they
evolved over time.

1951:
Novice: 28 questions, no diagrams - 2-1/2 pages
General/Conditional/Technician: 69 questions, 8 diagrams - 7-1/2 pages
Advanced: 52 questions, 11 diagrams - 5 pages
Total for a General: 97 questions, 8 diagrams, 10 pages
Total for an Advanced: 149 questions, 19 diagrams, 15 pages

1953:
Novice: 30 questions, no diagrams - 2-1/2 pages
General/Conditional/Technician: 70 questions, 8 diagrams - 7-1/2 pages
Extra: 279 questions, 30 diagrams - 25 pages
Total for a General: 100 questions, 8 diagrams, 10 pages
Total for an Extra: 379 questions, 38 diagrams, 35 pages

1962:
Novice: 34 questions, no diagrams - 3-1/2 pages
General/Conditional/Technician: 108 questions, 52 diagrams - 14 pages
Extra: 239 questions, 23 diagrams - 21 pages
Total for a General: 142 questions, 52 diagrams, 17-1/2 pages
Total for an Extra: 381 questions, 75 diagrams, 38-1/2 pages

1968:
Novice: 50 questions - 6 pages
General/Conditional/Technician: 86 questions - 12 pages
Advanced: 51 questions - 10 pages
Extra: 80 questions - 15 pages
Total for a General: 136 questions, 18 pages
Total for an Advanced: 187 questions, 28 pages
Total for an Extra: 267 questions, 43 pages

1971: Novice: 50 questions, no diagrams - 5 pages
General/Conditional/Technician: 61 questions, 33 diagrams - 11 pages
Advanced: 70 questions, 7 diagrams - 12 pages
Extra: 90 questions, 4 diagrams - 16 pages
Total for a General: 111 questions, 33 diagrams, 16 pages
Total for an Advanced: 181 questions, 40 diagrams, 28 pages
Total for an Extra: 271 questions, 44 diagrams, 44 pages

Note the greatly increased amount of material for a Novice or General
in the '60s compared to the early '50s.

Here are some typical questions and answers from the "study guides" of
the 1968 manual:

GENERAL:

Q: What is the impedance of series-tuned and parallel-tuned circuits
at resonance?

A: In a series circuit the impedance is equal to the vector sum of the
resistance, inductive reactance, and capacitive reactance. At
resonance,the inductive and capacitive reactances are equal and
oposite and thus cancel, leaving only the resistance as the effective
impedance. In most tuned radio-frequency circuits, the resistance is
quite low -- of the order of a few ohms or a few tens of ohms. In a
parallel resonant circuit the impedance as viewed from the circuit
terminals is approximately equal to the square of the reactance of
ether the capacitance or inductance (the reactances have the same
numerical value) divided by the internal series resistance. This is
equivalent to saying that the parallel impedance at resonance is equal
to XQ, where Q is the effective Q of the circuit, including loading

effects, and X is the reactance. The parallel impedance is resistive and is usually on the order
of some thousands of ohms.

ADVANCED:

Q: What function does a variable-mu tube perform in an r.f. amplifier stage of a
receiver?

A: A variable-mu or remote-cutoff tube is one designed in such a way that the
amplification factor decreases with increasing negative grid bias. This enables the tube to handle either large and small signals with minimum distortion and
cross-modulation (by proper choice of grid bias). Varying the grid bias offers a convenient means of varying the gain of the stage without introducing undesirable distortion effects. The gain may be varied either by manual or automatic adjustment of the grid bias. In automatic gain control the bias voltage is obtained from rectification of the signal and is applied (usually) to two or more r.f. or i.f. stages so that gain can be varied over a wide range. Sufficient control obtained in this way makes the audio output substantially constant over a wide range of signal levels.

EXTRA:

Q: How is the output circuit of a transmitter adjusted to increase its coupling to the antenna system?

A: The adjustment procedure to use depends on the form of the final amplifier tank circuit. If the circuit is a pi network the coupling to the antenna or load circuit will be increased by decreasing the capacitance of the network's output capacitor. Increasing the output capacitance will decrease the coupling to the load. In either case, the network must be maintained in resonance at the operating frequency by readjustment of the pi network input capacitor, to compensate for the detuning caused by changes in the output capacitance. Coupling also may be varied by adjustment of the pi-network inductance in combination with the output capacitance, but for mechanical reasons adjustment of the inductance in the necessary small steps is seldom provided for in transmitter circuit design. If the transmitter has an output circuit consisting of a parallel-resonant circuit inductively coupled to an output coil or link, coupling to the load may be varied by varying the mutual inductance between the tank coil and link coil. The mutual inductance can be varied by changing the spacing between the two coils or by varying the inductance of one or both of the coils. Coupling increases as the mutual inductance is made larger, and vice versa. Retuning the tank capacitor to maintain resonance will be necessary each time the coupling is varied.

--

Note how much content is stuffed into a single study question. How
many
multiple choice questions do you think could be derived from just
one of the above study questions?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5316. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:24:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34875

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
> >
> > If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> > If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.
>
> That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> assumed based on experience.

While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5317. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:25:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C750342.E94C8413@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34876

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7439F0.9FB4CC9F@IEEE.org...
> > Here's an example, however:
> > "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> > Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> > statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> > One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.
>
> Only when all relevant facts about a given statement are known can it be
> determined to be true or false. Truth is subjective. A statement in one
> context and/or circumstances may be true, while in another
> context/circumstnaces, the same statement might be false.

Not in formal logic. That's why formal logic has rules.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5318. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:26:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C750378.CFB2F72D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34877

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > > "Cars are black" is not the same as "All cars are black" ...
> > >
> > > According to the accepted rules of logic, they are the same.
> >
> > So most of the world is illogical. The English language sure is

Especially when you get ahold of it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5319. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:45:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7507EE.F53C7944@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34878

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > > Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the
> > > Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash,
> > > Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide
> > > folks.
> >
> > The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different form
> > than the tests.
>
> More trolling bullshit. You of all people, hold me and anyone
> else you choose to the very letter of perfection, then have the brass
> balls to make such a claim. The ARRL license manual was a
> STUDY GUIDE in which entire pages were used in DISCUSSION
> of the theory and background on much of the subject matter.
> You're a worthless old lying idiot.

I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.
Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?

It contained everything needed to pass the exam. Here's the first Q&A
from the General Class section. The answer is the *exact* answer to
one of the questions on the exam.

Q: Name the basic unit of electrical resistance.
A: The basic unit of electrical resistance is the ohm.

That's even easier than multiple choice because there are no incorrect
answers. There were 96 questions on 10 pages.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5320. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 14:58:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C750B30.62F4D4BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34879

KC8PMX wrote:
> If ya find any of these tests, or the question pools from years prior to the
> pools being public knowledge, let me know.

You can sometimes find an old License Manual at a Hamfest. They were
in statement form but contained everything needed to pass the exam.
I memorized my way to a Conditional class license. The content was
contemporary for the times and close to the same level of difficulty
as today's exams. The ARRL License Manual covered essentially the
same material as the Bash books. The rumor was that the FCC only
had two exams and that's why they disliked Bash so much. The FCC
could have turned the Bash books into just another License Manual
by having multiple exams covering everything in the ARRL License
Manual.

Some hams with feelings of inferiority have tried to appear superior
by claiming that the old exams were extremely difficult compared to
today's exams. I've been a licensed ham for 50 years, took exams in
the 50's, 70's, and 90's, and that old wives' tale is just not true.
It's the old fart's syndrome: "I had to crawl uphill both ways in the
snow to take my exam and you young folk have it too easy."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5321. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 15:10:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221101041.21470.00000001@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 34881

In article <3c744fcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3C73F010.6714CAE9@IEEE.org...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> > > Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
>> >
>> > Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
>> > drive a stick shift.
>>
>> If Kim is not skillful with a stick shift, it might be advisable
>> to avoid stick shifts. If Kim is not skillful with CW, it might
>> be advisable to avoid CW for emergency situations. For instance,
>> her CB radio would probably be a lot more useful out on the
>> road than HF CW even though HF CW is more reliable.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Yep.

Nope.

> Plus, with CB radio *and* ham radio, I have a greater chance of
>reaching someone.

In case one radio breaks, you have the others.

>Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency.

Including CW/Morse?

> If I
>thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also have
>FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities.

They are getting popular. An injured mountain hiker was rescued last year
because his FRS HT was heard 80 miles away by a couple of kids. Love
that tropo ducting.

> But, the line must be drawn somewhere.

Why?

> 2M, 70cm, and CB are better than nothing.

No cell phone?

> And, all do me better than CW
>capability.

Ah, I understand. You need all those radios because the car breaks down so much.

Mobile has its limitations, but home is another story. Ask the folks who dealt with the ice storms in 1997.

>I suspect there are many who feel the same way.

Kim, have you ever actually had a QSO on CW/Morse? Ever originated, received or relayed a formal message by CW/Morse? Just curious.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5322. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 15:10:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221101042.21470.00000002@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 34880

In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3C731266.9FA426E8@IEEE.org...
>> Kim wrote:
>> > I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
>> > someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
>> > Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
>> > isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
>>
>> A good analogy might be that the stick shift vehicle is more reliable but
>> you don't know how to drive it.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>It would be a good analogy if I didn't know how to drive one.

Ah - so since you know how to drive one, I can operate CW and
buy reliable appliances. Whew!

> I do (my
>Saturn and this truck are the only two automatics I have had since
>driving--started in a SAAB, then Yugo, , then Subaru GLF, then VW Golf, now
>these two recent vehicles).

What truck?

>An appropriate analogy, though, for the
>stickshift would be that I can drive it, but why would I want to beat myself
>up with one?

Shifting one of those cars is "beating yourself up"?

>(I had to get out of stickshifts because of my back).

Then you can't drive one, so now I'm not supposed to operate CW.

> That is
>to auto driving as CW is to radio: why would I want to beat myself and
>others up with using CW when I can do lots of other things that may work
>just as well?

"Beat yourself up"? Good heavens.

Besides, other things don't work "just as well". That's the point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5323. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 15:10:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221101043.21470.00000003@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 34882

In article <3c74529e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Maybe you men are just having a hard time with this.

Who is "you men"? Heck, how do you even know I'm a man? Ever hear
of actor James King?

Of course if I made some sort of comment in that vein I'd be "sexist".

I have found that some people take care of things and others tend to abuse
them. Vehicles demonstrate this to an extreme degree - some people make
sure all preventive maintenance is done, and drive carefully, while others
ignore maintenance and abuse the vehicle, then wonder why it breaks
down.

>Let's say I can get a
>European made sound system/stereo that is absolutely reliable.

I don't know of any European sound systems. Almost all of the
consumer-grade stuff I see is made in Pacific rim countries.

If a thing is "absolutely reliable", then it never breaks down. So
repairs aren't an issue.

> The
>components last and last, the sound is beautiful, the workmanship is top
>notch.

I want one of those. My Dynaco stereo components are getting up there
in years, and I've already had to fix one of them.

>BUT, if it ever breaks I have to ship it back over to Europe and pay
>shipping both ways, as well as the inconvenience of the time it would take.

You said it was "absolutely reliable". That means it never breaks.

>Then, let's say I can get a lot less reliable sound system/stereo that has a
>service and repair shop in nearly every major city, and some small towns.

Have you ever tried to get consumer electronics fixed? Most of the time they
tell you to just buy a new one. Repair of those things is often impractical
unless it's something minor.
>
>I'm getting the less reliable sound system, unless I'm just in a really
>crazy mood and take that chance that the super reliable system really *is*
>*always* that reliable.

You said it was absolutely reliable, which means it never breaks.

So what this comes down to is that people should not use CW, drive a reliable vehicle or buy reliable consumer electronics because you might have to ship them back to Europe. Maybe the idea is to keep me so busy fixing things that I won't have time to get on the air or post to rrap.

> I am not a risk taker, never have been.

So the safe path is to buy the unreliable thing and the risky path is to buy the reliable thing. OK.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5324. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 15:18:58 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34883

In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> > assumed based on experience.
>
> While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.

I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5325. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 15:54:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C751829.A672AC6A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34884

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> > > assumed based on experience.
> >
> > While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
>
> I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
> is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.

Not always. "CW gets through when other modes fail" implies always
and therefore is a false statement. Reference: "Introduction to Logic",
by Irving M. Copi

Other modes fail to get through to England from the US on 160m at
high noon. Does CW get through to England from the US on 160m at
high noon?

Why do you guys resist making true statements? Adding the qualifier
"often" to that statement is all that it takes to make it true.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5326. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:08:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C765F9D.EB987CBA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34885

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.
>
> > Obviously you are. If it isn't easy you pass. You said so.
>
> So you think that Amateur Radio should not include people who find the tests
> easy to pass. I see.

No, you DON'T see, evidently. I said if Cecil doesn't find it easy
HE passes. He said as much himself.

5327. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:15:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a536an0mit@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34889

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gruzxfe.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> Wrong there, my friend. We tried that approach in the _Hotz v Rich_
> case and the First District (California) Court of Appeal shot us
> down. The PRB-1 Order specifically states in a footnote that it
> does not apply to private agreements such as CC&Rs, and the
> appellate court judge's clerk must have read the fine print where
> the trial court judge's clery must have overlooked it.
>
> In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms
> are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation
> since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which
> came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of
> Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have
> turned a deaf ear to us hams.

Thank you for proving why I will never move to California.

5328. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:22:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7662E6.F1C1FE13@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34886

CAM wrote:

> > >
> > > The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different form
> > > than the tests.
> >
> > More trolling bullshit. You of all people, hold me and anyone
> > else you choose to the very letter of perfection, then have the brass
> > balls to make such a claim. The ARRL license manual was a
> > STUDY GUIDE in which entire pages were used in DISCUSSION
> > of the theory and background on much of the subject matter.
> > You're a worthless old lying idiot.
>
> I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.
> Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
> be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
> the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?
>
>
No, you're not the ARRL.

>
> It contained everything needed to pass the exam. Here's the first Q&A
> from the General Class section. The answer is the *exact* answer to
> one of the questions on the exam.
>
> Q: Name the basic unit of electrical resistance.
> A: The basic unit of electrical resistance is the ohm.
>

So? There was also one on the volt. What that shows is that
it was indeed a study guide, and the tests did cover some very
basic ground. So see N2EY's earlier post to see what the meat
of the tests was about.

Troll on, and on and on....

5329. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:23:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a536o40n9n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34891

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75DD66.80F833A0@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
> > > The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
> > > amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
> > > not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire
only
> > > after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
> > > proficiency.
> >
> > But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.
>
> Obviously you are. If it isn't easy you pass. You said so.

So if someone thinks the tests are difficult, they're lazy knuckle-draggers.
What a wonderful anology.

5330. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:27:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C766412.F02F2901@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34887

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:

> then Yugo,

I knew it!!! A Yugo jock!

5331. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:30:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a537620nsl@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34892

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C750342.E94C8413@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C7439F0.9FB4CC9F@IEEE.org...
> > > Here's an example, however:
> > > "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> > > Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> > > statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> > > One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.
> > >
> > Only when all relevant facts about a given statement are known can it be
> > determined to be true or false. Truth is subjective. A statement in one
> > context and/or circumstances may be true, while in another
> > context/circumstnaces, the same statement might be false.
>
> Not in formal logic. That's why formal logic has rules.

"Green is a good color." Is that statement true or false?

5332. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:37:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76665D.F6EEB307@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34888

KC8PMX wrote:

>If the morse code test is sooo important, there

> should be 100% copy and nothing less.

Hey, whatever you think. I think that's silly.

Actually the code test
isn't important, learning the code is. But will you learn it if you
aren't required to pass a test on it? I think you're already answered
that question for us.

KC8PMX wrote:

> I have asked the same question here and other groups before. No one wants
> to seem to provide any. I am sure that the tests back in the day when you
> had to go to a F.C.C. office are unobtainable, but there has got to be some
> VE teams that have kept that kind of stuff. Not that hams aren't anal
> retentive now. I know one ham who does the equivalent of a site survey just
> to figure out where to place the microphone from his rig.....
>
> If ya find any of these tests, or the question pools from years prior to the
> pools being public knowledge, let me know. I really want to see how many
> changes in the questions there were to make them "easier." I understand
> from other hams in my area, that most of the question changes are to
> improperly worded, or erroneous, or outdated questions.
>
> Speaking of real tests..... If the morse code test is sooo important, there
> should be 100% copy and nothing less. Then the term REAL HAM would have
> some relevance as it is flung around so often.
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...
> > I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
> >
> > Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> > before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
> >
> > And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> > something substantive here, not just "I know".
> >
> > - mike -

5333. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:40:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C766745.43675A21@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34890

CAM wrote:

>
> . That's why formal logic has rules.

Which you freely demand to be applied, or ignore, as fits the
instant situation.

5334. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 16:58:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C766B4B.17140DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34893

CAM wrote:

>The ARRL License Manual covered essentially the same
>material as the Bash books.

Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
like the ARRL License manuals. What Bash did was accost
persons exiting the FCC office who had just finished taking
ham radio exams and query them to find, as closely as they
could remember, what the questions were. Sometimes he
came pretty close. Other times his "information" was quite
vague. Some of his "questions" were based on the subject
only with little in the way of an answer. You were alerted
to be familiar with a specific subject. He wasn't able to
get the specifics.

I DID see a set of Bash books, in the late 70's when he was
going strong. I knew a former CBer who used them to get to Extra class. Being
curious about them I asked to look them over. What I
saw was useful to pass the exams but not at all like any other
study guide then in use nor very much like the exact question pools
of today. They were mostly conversationally written, a "study guide"
toward acquiring the correct answers. Nothing more. Most of the information was
not at all precise.
The ARRL License Manuals
included fairly detailed discussion of technical topics. Not the same at all.

And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
before Bash came along.

5335. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 17:13:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C752AAF.A616F83C@uci.edu>
Source record: 34894

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?

> If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.

Certainly true, if the word "all" is being implied. But that's not what I asked you. I asked how your example shows the statment to be false. You told someone to look it up in a logic book, and then you quoted from a logic book. But your quote didn't provide the evidence to prove your point. I was hoping your logic book would be able to tell us that the words "all" or "always" are always implied in the English language.

5336. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 17:18:24 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C752BE0.F2195EB1@uci.edu>
Source record: 34895

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
> >> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
> >> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any way
> >> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
> > >
> > >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
> >
> > You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction between the
> > two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.

It doesn't really matter what I find. It matters what the FCC finds.
The FCC has found that there is no such thing as federal premption of
private contracts and covenents as regards ham radio antennas.

5337. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 17:23:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C752D1F.F15BF668@uci.edu>
Source record: 34896

Krell wrote:
> "Green is a good color." Is that statement true or false?

No.

5338. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 18:26:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C753BE3.85DC1BA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34897

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
>
> > If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> > If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.
>
> Certainly true, if the word "all" is being implied. But that's not what
> I asked you. I asked how your example shows the statment to be false.
> You told someone to look it up in a logic book, and then you quoted from
> a logic book. But your quote didn't provide the evidence to prove your
> point. I was hoping your logic book would be able to tell us that the
> words "all" or "always" are always implied in the English language.

They are unless specified otherwise. I cannot produce the proof because
I cannot reproduce the symbolic logic symbols.

But here it is in a nutshell.
Premise 1: A is B (B is true)
Premise 2: A is not B (B is false)
A cannot be both true and false at the same time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5339. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 18:29:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C753C82.5DD06C93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34898

Krell wrote:
> "Green is a good color." Is that statement true or false?

That statement calls for a value judgement and cannot be
handled by formal logic. CW getting through when other
modes fail is not a value judgement except maybe in Dick's
imagination.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5340. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 18:33:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C753D62.C802FBEC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34899

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > So you think that Amateur Radio should not include people who find the tests
> > easy to pass. I see.
>
> No, you DON'T see, evidently. I said if Cecil doesn't find it easy
> HE passes. He said as much himself.

That's true, Dick. Someone who finds the amateur exams easy to pass is
likely to be highly technically knowledgeable. Of course, you wouldn't
want any more highly technically knowledgeable hams in amateur radio,
because that would show up your own lack of technical knowledge.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5341. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 18:38:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C753E90.80615684@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34900

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It contained everything needed to pass the exam. Here's the first Q&A
> > from the General Class section. The answer is the *exact* answer to
> > one of the questions on the exam.
> >
> > Q: Name the basic unit of electrical resistance.
> > A: The basic unit of electrical resistance is the ohm.
>
> So? There was also one on the volt. What that shows is that
> it was indeed a study guide, and the tests did cover some very
> basic ground.

So why are you arguing loud and long that it didn't cover the
material on the exams? All one had to do was word associations
and one would pass the exam. No other material required. The
ARRL License Manual said so.

> So see N2EY's earlier post to see what the meat
> of the tests was about.

See Ed's OCR posting of the actual Q&A. Dick, there was nothing on
the exam that wasn't covered by the ARRL License Manual. The answers
given in the ARRL License Manual were *exact*. Pray tell, what good
would non-exact answers have been?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5342. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 18:40:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34901

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >The ARRL License Manual covered essentially the same
> >material as the Bash books.
>
> Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> like the ARRL License manuals.

Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
the material on the exams. What good would either of them
have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?

> And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
> before Bash came along.

Feeling guilty, are we?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5343. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 19:06:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202211106.526d9a31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34902

<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3c745198_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020220202635.16913.00000119@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c730ea6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20020219211021.16502.00000191@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > >> In article <3C72614A.DDC282F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >N2EY wrote:
> > >> >> That makes no sense, Kim. Don't rely on something even though it is
> > >> >reliable?
> > >> >
> > >> >I think what Kim is saying, Jim, is that CW is less reliable for her
> and
> me
> > >> >than it is for you. :-)
> > >>
> > >> Because she would take the less-reliable vehicle on a long trip?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >I'd sacrifice mechanical reliability for more likelihood that there's
> > >someone out there who'd be around to fix it *in the event* of failure.
> >
> > Ah, I see. A car that is reliably unreliable is better because you can
> rely
> > on its being fixable.
> >
> > >Let's see...it's hard to equate this to automobiles because there really
> > >isn't such a rarity of people who can fix whatever make.
> >
> > So we need to find a car that is both rare and unreliable.
> >
> > >But, let's say
> > >there was a choice between a really reliable auto, though garages are few
> > >and far between that know it well; and a not-so-reliable auto with
> garages
> > >that know it well are quite common.
> >
> > With automatic transmissions only, too.

> >
> > >I'm banking on the likelihood that,
> > >knowing my luck, either auto is going to break down. I am going to go
> with
> > >the auto most likely to get repaired.
> >
> > So your recommendation is to rely on unreliable things because they may
> > be counted upon to be fixed reliably. But don't rely on reliable things
> because
> > their reliability works against them being reliable.
> >
> > Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> > condition.
> > So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Don't know about that...but maybe people think right off the top it's too
> expensive...

$100 is too expensive? That's my asking price - I'll take half that.

Repairs aren't free, either.

There are mathematical methods of figuring out the break-even point on the risk of equipment breakdown, based on the probability of a failure and the cost of repair vs. cost of prevention. A lot depends on how much you value your time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5344. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 19:30:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C754ADB.6227B8F3@uci.edu>
Source record: 34903

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
> > >
> > > If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> > > If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.
> > >
> > Certainly true, if the word "all" is being implied. But that's not what
> > I asked you. I asked how your example shows the statment to be false.
> > You told someone to look it up in a logic book, and then you quoted from
> > a logic book. But your quote didn't provide the evidence to prove your
> > point. I was hoping your logic book would be able to tell us that the
> > words "all" or "always" are always implied in the English language.

> They are unless specified otherwise. I cannot produce the proof because
> I cannot reproduce the symbolic logic symbols.

> But here it is in a nutshell.
> Premise 1: A is B (B is true)
> Premise 2: A is not B (B is false)
> A cannot be both true and false at the same time.

So in other words, if one speaks in generalities, and doesn't modify his
statement by saying the words "in general", he is lying (summing this
one with another discussion we had here).

5345. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 20:53:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C755E5D.CA4A40B1@uci.edu>
Source record: 34906

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 11:15:48 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms
> >> are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation
> >> since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which
> >> came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of
> >> Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have
> >> turned a deaf ear to us hams.
> > >
> > >Thank you for proving why I will never move to California.
> >
> > Would you like a list of states which have the finest courts and
> > police departments that money can buy??

I sure wish more people felt like he does.

5346. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 20:59:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grw9w82.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34904

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 11:15:48 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms
>> are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation
>> since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which
>> came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of
>> Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have
>> turned a deaf ear to us hams.
>
>Thank you for proving why I will never move to California.

Would you like a list of states which have the finest courts and
police departments that money can buy??

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5347. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 21:08:36 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0202211308.79900443@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34905

Steve,

It's a good point. But so much of testing SHOULD be based on the purpose of the test. If a test is a hurdle, one needs to keep some semblance of secrecy. If a test is an assessment of where a person is starting, and it can be used to confirm those things thought to be needed at that point, then secrecy is counter-productive. Often tests are used as part of the learning process.

In my humble opinion, most of us view tests as some sort of standard against which to measure everything. Most of us older folks grew up in the time when psychological testing was being touted as the way to sort and select any number of things. We know that, for example, that kids don't do as well on the XYZ test as kids did in the 1960's. Oh, really? Is the XYZ the same test? We assumed that a well-known aptitude test was a measure of how much someone knew (achievement) and even lobbied to compare kids and schools based on those scores. And, as result, the stakes got higher, leading folks to develop ways to "teach to the test." Doesn't that skew the results in some way?

Quite awhile ago I asked whether we had agreement on the purpose of the ham tests, and whether we had ever had psycometrists do any kind of analysis of the reliability or validity of our tests, based on those purposes. What we appear to have is a lot closer to a school-type multiple choice test that is correctly used to assess instruction but becomes used to assign a grade.

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message news:<20020220222423.16884.00001055@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: The tests that Real Hams took
> >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 02/20/02 13:46 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu>
>
> >I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the
> Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash,
> Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide
> folks.
>
> I think it absolutely ludicrous that we have a radio service that is
> supposed to promote some sort of self education on radio communication practice
> and theory, but we lay the answers out for all to see.
>

> Where's the learning in that?
>
> As a VE, I don't believe the tests themselves are "dumbed down". The
> questions are, as much as the lag time from concept to publication allows,
> pertinent.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

5348. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 21:33:14 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202212120480.19865-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34907

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 11:15:48 -0500, Krell wrote:
>>> In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms
>>> are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation
>>> since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which
>>> came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of
>>> Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have
>>> turned a deaf ear to us hams.
>>
>>Thank you for proving why I will never move to California.
>
> Would you like a list of states which have the finest courts and
> police departments that money can buy??

The real question here is: Bought by whom?

During my term with a certain federal agency, I was sometimes asked to "review" police officers. The CHP officers were the cleanest, and except for the L.A. housing police division, LAPD in general was the worst, with Long Beach PD a very close second (and second only probably because they have fewer cops; per capita, they were about the same). This was several years before the recent "Rampart Division" scandal whree the public leart about the creation of evidence and other such issues. None of the LAPD officers I reviewed were assigned to Rampart.

Sompe people may joke when one says: "LAPD treats everyone like royalty; ask Rodney King?" Although Mr. King may have been a career criminal, that never justifies the police's treatment of him.

Getting back to our main topic, there is BAD LAW and BAD decisions made every day by the courts. Additionally, cases that make it that far are often the exception, not the norm. Out of all the amateurs I know here in Southern California, I have heard of only one case where an antenna was removed, and that situation didn't use CC&R's as the justification (the [now former] amateur operator lived in a rented property). However, in that case, the landlord simply cut it down; no legal force of a court or anything of the like.

5349. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 21:40:59 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <LPdd8.17437$BR3.1026158@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34908

ZUI
Just a note to the group - ZBM-2 means 'put a qualified operator on'. It's
been a while, I'll just have to ZFR the whole thing.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:_RSc8.14662$BR3.876332@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...
> > I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
> >
> > Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> > before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
> >
> > And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> > something substantive here, not just "I know".
> >
> > - mike -
>
> Mike, it still would not work simply because the state of the art moves on
> and so do we. The first time I took Element 3, and I was 12 at the time,
> one of the cures given for spurious emissions was to neutralize the
> oscillator which caused me to break out laughing. Exams which would be
> and are trivial today to the groupies are hardly trivial at the time of
> first impression. And over the years the question pool changes depending
> upon among other things the problems the FCC is having at the moment and
> what their idea of the 'compleat' Amateur has been; this has cycled
> between 'Prairie Shit, let 'em all come' and the great post-Sputnik
> emphasis on the pool of skilled ops about the time the military said ZBM-2
> and gave up. Some of us took it in the prairie shit days like Ed's famous
> thin study guide and some did it when people compared the Advanced to the
> 2nd Phone and some of us managed to do both.
>
> The Second Phone in those days was 150 questions and the Advanced was 50
> and still the comparison is made which if nothing else illustrates
> sampling theory at work, it really doesn't take a whole lot of questions
> to make the point, especially when I would suspect the grade curve looks
> like Britney Spears from the top, distinctly bi-modal. Given that one
> does not select all the questions from variations on one from the pool and
> spreads them over the major areas and maintains some test security they
> will do the job.

>
> The trick, of course, is to define just what the job that is supposedly
> being done really is and what relationship that job has to privleges
> granted. One suspects that he is in one of those ceremonial things where
> the outcome is not nearly so important as the ritual itself.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>
>

5350. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 21:50:54 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <9A419EA522043390.E660E47220DB5EE9.39BFD481671913BB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 34909

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 19:25:57 -0600, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Good point. I think the ARRL is spinning its wheels with the issue, but
>they can have the fun. I think the FCC is right on this one and you do
>point out that workarounds can be made in restricted operating
>conditions--exactly the FCC's point when they state that there is mobile,
>club, EOC, and other ways in which to operate.

Sure, and while they're at it, they can get rid of those unsightly
phone, cable TV, and electric wires. After all, you can just get in
your car and drive to places that have all that stuff.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

5351. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 21:53:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0FBC411E151F9B19.3DA45C7BAB58E88A.1FDA4E8BD12189B5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 34910

On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 13:50:08 -0500, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> Well, tie a long wire onto them, and say it's a leash. Probably want to
>keep the power down, or have a steady supply of replacement cats and
>dogs. 8^)

ISTR someone accidentally dicovering that their cat was near resonance
on 70cm...

"Here, Fluffy, chew on the feedline some more"

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

5352. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 22:07:35 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0202211407.75c5f9b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34911

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7507EE.F53C7944@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > > > Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely to the
> > > > Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of Dick Bash,
> > > > Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim study guide
> > > > folks.

The verbatim Q&A stuff is a direct result of having VEs do all the
testing
and test preparation. This was being proposed by the FCCas far back as
1975.

I think the biggest reason the FCC did not go after Bash was that they
were
going to make the Q&A public anyway.

> > > The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different form
> > > than the tests.

It was in essay form, not multiple choice. There was no indication of
how
many questions of the actual test would be devoted to each subject.
>
> I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.

I have a whole bunch of them.

> Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
> be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
> the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?

Nope. Your interpretation is the problem. What the LM is saying is
that if you UNDERSTAND the stuff in the study questions you'll have
no problem with the actual test.
>
> It contained everything needed to pass the exam.

All the material, yes. The LMs also said the prospective ham should
study other books.

> Here's the first Q&A
> from the General Class section. The answer is the *exact* answer to
> one of the questions on the exam.

On the exam you took.
>
> Q: Name the basic unit of electrical resistance.
> A: The basic unit of electrical resistance is the ohm.

Is that the entire question? I think not. Here it is:

The first question in the General study guide in the LMs I have is:

"Name the basic units of electrical resistance, inductance,
capacitance, current, electromotive force or potential difference,
power, energy, quantity, magneto-motive force, and frequency".

That's ONE question in the study guide. 10 items in that one question.
How many
multiple choice questions could be made from that one study question?
At least
10.

The test was "about 50 questions, two thirds of which are on technical
subjects." That question requires pure memorization, of course. But
how about these others?

"6. Why is it advisable to use a plate power supply for the oscillator
of a transmitter separate from the final amplifier plate power
supply?"

"7. How does a swinging choke operate to improve the regulation of a
plate-supply filter system?"

"20. Describe the adjustment procedure for proper neutralization in a
radio-frequency power amplifier using an r.f. indicator coupled to the
plate tank circuit."

"32. A low-drift crystal for the 3500-4000 kc. amateur band is
guaranteed by a manufacturer to be calibrated to within 0.04% of its
specified frequency. Desiring to operate as close to the lower band
limit of 3500 kc. as safely as possible, for what whole-number
kilocycle frequency should you order your crystal, allowing 1 kc.
additional for variations from temperature and circuit constants?"

> That's even easier than multiple choice because there are no incorrect
> answers.

Maybe for you. Most people studying a multiple choice Q&A pool have
the sense
to block out the distractors and study only the right answers.

Fact is, though, Cecil, you can't pass the tests I took - and passed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5353. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 22:50:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7579BD.2CD2A46C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34912

N2EY wrote:
> It was in essay form, not multiple choice. There was no indication of
> how many questions of the actual test would be devoted to each subject.

So what? The questions were all in there along with exact answers.

> Your interpretation is the problem. What the LM is saying is
> that if you UNDERSTAND the stuff in the study questions you'll have
> no problem with the actual test.

So the ARRL was lying when they said their answers were sufficient to
pass the exam? They weren't lying, Jim. I rote-memorized word associations
to pass my Conditional exam. I studied *nothing* but the ARRL License
Manual.

> Fact is, though, Cecil, you can't pass the tests I took - and passed.

Produce one and I will give it a go.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5354. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:02:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C757C81.D0B7CBAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34913

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So in other words, if one speaks in generalities, and doesn't modify his
> statement by saying the words "in general", he is lying (summing this
> one with another discussion we had here).

In logic, generalities must be well defined. Here's a diagram of the CW
statement.

```
+--------------------------------------+
| set of times when CW gets through |
| ********************************* |
| * set of times when SSB * |
| * gets through and CW * |
| * gets through * |
| ********************************* |
| and SSB doesn't get through |
+--------------------------------------+
set of times when neither SSB
nor CW get through
```

Inside the outer rectangle and outside the inner
rectangle is the time when CW gets through and
SSB doesn't get through. Saying, "CW gets through
when SSB doesn't", ignores the area outside of
the outer rectangle and is therefore logically
a false statement.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5355. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:29:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a53vn901na9@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34914

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.grw9w82.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> >> In California, the burden of proof for showing that CC&R terms
> >> are unreasonable has been on the owner accused of the violation
> >> since the _Naarstadt_ case (ironically about keeping pets) which
> >> came down from the California Supreme Court after the Court of
> >> Appeal shot us down and before the retrial, and the courts have
> >> turned a deaf ear to us hams.
> >
> >Thank you for proving why I will never move to California.
>
> Would you like a list of states which have the finest courts and
> police departments that money can buy??

I've lived in Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. I've been on good terms with the law enforcement and judicial systems of all three. In addition, I prefer not to live in a state that is subject to rolling blackouts, or where use of one's private property is subject to the whims of a neighbor that doesn't like the looks of your antennas. IOW, you can have the "left coast."

5356. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:34:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5401q01nse@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 34915

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C753C82.5DD06C93@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > "Green is a good color." Is that statement true or false?
>
> That statement calls for a value judgement and cannot be
> handled by formal logic. CW getting through when other
> modes fail is not a value judgement except maybe in Dick's
> imagination.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Which goes back to what I posted earlier - Truth is subjective.

5357. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:40:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C75857C.A826546D@uci.edu>
Source record: 34919

Nice work, Cecil.

In a situation of all things being equal, noting that CW gets through
when SSB doesn't acknowleges a situation that exists in reality.

What about this rectangle?:

```
+--------------------------------------+
| set of times when CW gets through |
| ********************************* |
| * set of times when CW * |
| * gets through and SSB * |
| * doesn't get through * |
| ********************************* |
| and SSB gets through |
+--------------------------------------+
set of times when neither SSB
nor CW get through
```

The statment refers to the innermost rectangle.

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > So in other words, if one speaks in generalities, and doesn't modify his
> > statement by saying the words "in general", he is lying (summing this
> > one with another discussion we had here).
>
> In logic, generalities must be well defined. Here's a diagram of the CW
> statement.
>
> ```
> +--------------------------------------+
> | set of times when CW gets through |
> | ********************************* |
> | * set of times when SSB * |
> | * gets through and CW * |
> | * gets through * |
> | ********************************* |
> | and SSB doesn't get through |
> +--------------------------------------+
> set of times when neither SSB
> nor CW get through
> ```
>
> Inside the outer rectangle and outside the inner
> rectangle is the time when CW gets through and
> SSB doesn't get through. Saying, "CW gets through

> when SSB doesn't", ignores the area outside of
> the outer rectangle and is therefore logically
> a false statement.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5358. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:57:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grwfty3.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34916

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 21:33:14 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>During my term with a certain federal agency, I was sometimes asked
>to "review" police officers. The CHP officers were the cleanest,

I lived in a cul-de-sac with five CHP officers, and I agree, One
was borderline weird, and the department seized on an opportunity to
give him a mutually-agreed medical retirement - out and gone.

>except for the L.A. housing police division, LAPD in general was the
>worst, with Long Beach PD a very close second (and second only
>probably because they have fewer cops; per capita, they were about the
>same).

When I was on the street with the LA Sheriff's Office (Firestone
Station - unincorporated Watts ghetto) forty years ago we would
never call LAPD for backup unless forced by circumstances - we
never knew what they would do. And this was when they were under
Bill Parker, who had the reputation of bwing Mister Clean and not
standing for such things which seemed to happen anyhow. Not that
the LASO was any bunch of angels, either.

>None of the LAPD officers I reviewed were assigned to Rampart.

One of my co-workers in the late 1950s was the wife of a LAPD
Homicide detective. I got a whole bunch of stories from them.

>Getting back to our main topic, there is BAD LAW and BAD decisions
>made every day by the courts. Additionally, cases that make it that
>far are often the exception, not the norm.

As my Probate Law prof used to say, the reason that the cases are in
the lawbooks is because one or both sides didn't do their homework.
One of the first cases that is studied in California probate law
involves the will of the first Chief Justice of the Cal Supreme Court
that was written very badly.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5359. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-21 23:57:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grwg3q4.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34917

On 21 Feb 2002 14:07:35 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>I think the biggest reason the FCC did not go after Bash was that they
>were going to make the Q&A public anyway.

Not so. The reason was that the attorney that would have had to do
all the work didn't want to get involved in any of it (she's long
dead now).

Dick Bash did his dirty work in front of my office and we had several
confrontations. It was a hot button item for me. Washington OTOH
was 3000 miles away.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5360. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 00:02:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C758AA7.5070006@ieee.org>
Source record: 34918

Krell wrote:

> Which goes back to what I posted earlier - Truth is subjective.

Not in formal logic, it's not. In formal logic, truth is objective.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5361. Want Winradio Type Software For Icom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 00:49:38 UTC
From: ddmga@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <296ea75a.0202211649.17613502@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34920
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.marketplace,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I just got an Icom IC-R7100 receiver. I used to have a Winradio
Wr1000i. Is there a software package out there for the Icom that is
as good or better than the Winradio software?

Thanks for any help!

-David DDMGA@YAHOO.COM

5362. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:07:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7599BC.E611CE3D@uci.edu>
Source record: 34927

Keith wrote:
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> >If the Association or the Complainer is mean enough and has deep
> > enouch pockets, they can very well hire an engineering firm (such
> > as the one that I consult for) to sit and DF the signal. For us
> > retired spooks, it's like shooting fish in a barrel.
>
> SO what , Phil? If you use the antenna for TV reception you are not
> violating the law or rules. The occasional use for Ham Radio is irrelevant.

It seems this workaround may have occurred to the legislators at the
time they wrote the bill, evidenced by the fact that they specifically
refer to them as television receive only (TVRO) antennas.

5363. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:18:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E07A.DB9576F6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34921

CAM wrote:

>The answers

> given in the ARRL License Manual were *exact*.

OF COURSE!!! It was the *questions* that were not given!

5364. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:18:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221201845.26690.00000075@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34922

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>So if someone thinks the tests are difficult, they're lazy knuckle-draggers.
>What a wonderful anology.

And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5365. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:21:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221202132.26690.00000077@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34923

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
>condition.
>So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.

Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered are too lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will help them see that clothes washing is a good thing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5366. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:23:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E1A7.FAC794B8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34924

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >The ARRL License Manual covered essentially the same
> > >material as the Bash books.
> >
> > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > like the ARRL License manuals.
>
> Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
>

But Herr Trollmeister, you have yet once again skipped over
the point without coming close. Bash made no attempt to cover
any material. He just wanted the questions and their answers.
The material was *immaterial*
Of course you will argue that any rendition of tests and answers
that has as the subject covers the material. Of course that is wrong,
and indeed goes to the heart of exact Q&A pools-they make it
possibled for applicants to pass exams with insufficient knowledge
regarding the material via rote memorization of exact answers to
exact questions without learning. But you and the rest of us already
knew that.

>
> > And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
> > before Bash came along.
>
> Feeling guilty, are we?

Not me, I don't have any of your problems.

5367. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:23:28 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16df3cba4a7251d498968b@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34925

In article <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > like the ARRL License manuals.
>
> Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?

Cecil, I know you're a newcomer and all, so I'll go easy on you. The ARRL Manuals are geared towards understanding the underlying principles behind the FCC exams. The current ARRL Extra Class License Manual clocks in at over 400 pages - with dense text and hundreds of math equations. The other books out there generally just give the question pools with maybe a sentence or two about why the correct answer is, well, correct. A world of difference.

By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your endeavors in the ARS.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5368. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:28:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221202812.26690.00000079@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34926

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
>provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any
>way
>are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.

Absolutely incorrect. CC&Rs relating to amateur antennas are not pre-empted by
anything from the feds.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5369. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:33:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E408.9B758B7E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34928

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

> ZUI
> Just a note to the group - ZBM-2 means 'put a qualified operator on'. It's
> been a while, I'll just have to ZFR the whole thing.

Nowdays might as well ZMG...

5370. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:35:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221203557.26690.00000082@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34929

Phil.Kane@no.spam wrote:

>Maybe they didn't care. But
> beware the Neighborhood Nazi who does, and wants to make a case out
> of it. That's when we lawyers get into the picture.

As one who has had the opportunity to talk to a number of hams about the neighbor from hell, trust me; they are out there.

The usual advice is to familiarize yourself with the issues, then find a local attorney competent in RF and find out just where you stand. If the stand is CC&Rs, there is almost always no real recourse. If it is local or state law, PRB-1 does enter into the picture, but PRB-1 is NOT absolute. It calls for "reasonable accomodation" and if you are up against a legal process involving it, an attorney is almost a must. I am sure Phil can tell more tales than I, but a recent case in Syracuse NY involved a ham whose town had decided that the ham could put up a tower about a mile away, so their accomodation had been reasonable. A federal judge did not agree. But there is no way in hell that the ham could have prevailed without an attorney who was willing to go the mile.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5371. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:41:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E619.DEF900CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34930

CAM wrote:

> In logic, generalities must be well defined.

Which is why it isn't used to evaluate conversations situations
where context and knowledge imply certain facets of the situation.

5372. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:43:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221204303.26690.00000084@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34931

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> He probably does realize that you need your glasses changed. Carl
>apologized to
>> Bert for calling him a twit; perhaps Dick will be as noble with you.

> I'll just go ahead and call him a dumshit. Explanations are useless
>to him.

So Carl is a noble enough person to apologize for an insult and you are not. I
see.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5373. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:45:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221204511.26690.00000085@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34932

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:

>> >So because I believe that a code test is appropriate for licensing
>> >ham radio operators, I try to dictate.
>>
>> And Carl believes that a code test is not appropriate for licensing ham
>radio
>> operators. You both made comments to the FCC. Why is he dictating, and you
>not?

>To paraphrase Chevy Chase in Caddyshack, "Me dictating, no! You do!"

I bet it is another one of those "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things.
Kinda' like the time Larry got all offended because he felt I had been unkind
to him. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5374. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:49:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221204936.26690.00000087@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34933

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> Reference a college textbook on logic to see why "cars are black" is
>> a false statement.

>Why don't you just quote the one YOU'RE referencing? I don't see any
>mention of cars in mine.

I would assume that Cecil thinks that any statement that uses "all" is a
redundancy.

Cecils make mistakes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5375. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:51:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221205135.26690.00000088@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34934

From: Dick Carroll

>M R ducks.
>
>M R not ducks!
>
>O S A R 2 ducks! C M wangs?
>
>L I B! M *R* ducks!

We all saw the signs of this coming; Dick has gone 'round the bend.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5376. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:52:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E8AD.A2FCDDEF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34935

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com
>
> >So if someone thinks the tests are difficult, they're lazy knuckle-draggers.
> >What a wonderful anology.
>

That isn't even close to what was said.

>
> And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!

Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As always you conveniently "forget" the first half.

5377. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:53:24 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C75A494.4065C505@uci.edu>
Source record: 34945

Keith wrote:
> The FCC and congress passed a law saying CC&R's
> can not ban ham radio antennas,

Well, unfortunately they didn't pass a law like that. Read carefully.
PRB-1 only prevents _governments_ from banning amateur radio antennas
(sort of). CC&R's still can, and do legally ban them. And, the TVRO
law applies only the the reception of television signals. It does not
protect you from someone trying to stop you from transmitting on them.

5378. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 01:57:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76E99F.AD9B8840@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34936

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> >condition.
> >So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>
> Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered are too
> lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will help
> them see that clothes washing is a good thing.

Ah, yes. And washing clothing is so difficult task no one will learn
to do it unless there is a test to pass which results in a permit issued.

5379. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:00:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221210028.26690.00000090@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34937

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.
>> Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
>> be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
>> the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?

> No, you're not the ARRL.

That was non-responsive, Dick. That is what the old study guides said. Do you think that ARRL was lying about the fact that the information in the study guides was sufficient to pass the test?

All I studied for my General was the 16-pages in the ARRL study guide. I passed. I did what most hams do today -- a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and just plain hoping that a few questions didn't appear on my exam.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5380. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:02:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221210259.26690.00000092@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 34938

From: N2EY@aol.com (N2EY)

>Maybe for you. Most people studying a multiple choice Q&A pool have
>the sense to block out the distractors and study only the right answers.

Why would anyone ever want to learn the wrong answers?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5381. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:06:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76EBF0.50787082@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34939

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> He probably does realize that you need your glasses changed. Carl
> >apologized to
> >> Bert for calling him a twit; perhaps Dick will be as noble with you.
>
> > I'll just go ahead and call him a dumshit. Explanations are useless
> >to him.
>
> So Carl is a noble enough person

HAW, HAW, HAW!!! Carl noble? So was Henry the 8th.

> to apologize for an insult and you are not.

Short memory, Ed? What goes around comes back around, ya know.
Dish it out and you'd better be ready to take it.

5382. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:08:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76EC57.F5520512@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34940

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll
>
> >M R ducks.
> >
> >M R not ducks!
> >
> >O S A R 2 ducks! C M wangs?
> >
> >L I B! M *R* ducks!
>
> We all saw the signs of this coming; Dick has gone 'round the bend.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Just following your lead, Ed.

5383. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:11:57 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <NNhd8.18573$BR3.1061654@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34941

Ooops. I KNEW I should have watched the ads on the Lawrence Welk show - didn't take my Geritol. Ummm ... OK, I'll bite, what is ZMG? (**gasp** a brain cramp!)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (I should vanity callsign myself back to WB2OSP - or WN2CJV, my first call - but I liked the Old Sour Puss in Rottenchester, NY)

ps - this age stuff is starting to get not so funny!

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C76E408.9B758B7E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>
> > ZUI
> > Just a note to the group - ZBM-2 means 'put a qualified operator on'. It's
> > been a while, I'll just have to ZFR the whole thing.
>
> Nowdays might as well ZMG...
>

5384. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:14:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76EDB7.23B8F368@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34942

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.
> >> Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
> >> be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
> >> the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?
>
> > No, you're not the ARRL.
>
> That was non-responsive, Dick. That is what the old study guides said. Do you
> think that ARRL was lying about the fact that the information in the study
> guides was sufficient to pass the test?
>

No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
rote memorization of terms. Pure rote alone wouldn't get you a
pass on the exam. Under the question pools it will, still,
not withstanding the improvements you noted some time ago.

>
> All I studied for my General was the 16-pages in the ARRL study guide. I
> passed. I did what most hams do today -- a combination of learning,
> memorizing, lucky guessing and just plain hoping that a few questions didn't
> appear on my exam.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

5385. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:15:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76EDFA.581B9679@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34943

W1RFI wrote:

> From: N2EY@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Maybe for you. Most people studying a multiple choice Q&A pool have
> >the sense to block out the distractors and study only the right answers.
>
> Why would anyone ever want to learn the wrong answers?

Why on earth are distractors even included?

5386. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:18:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C76EEB2.51C6AB25@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34944

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

> Ooops. I KNEW I should have watched the ads on the Lawrence Welk show -
> didn't take my Geritol. Ummm ... OK, I'll bite, what is ZMG? (**gasp** a
> brain cramp!)
>

It means disregard.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA (I should vanity callsign myself back to WB2OSP - or WN2CJV, my
> first call - but I liked the Old Sour Puss in Rottenchester, NY)
>
> ps - this age stuff is starting to get not so funny!
>

Noticed that myself.

5387. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:43:52 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lfid8.18649$BR3.1065783@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34946

Good question, one that is 'somewhat' answered elsewhere. What everyone needs is experience. Without experienced operators that can handle traffic, we might be hurting to supply people for various emergencies - not necessarily of the 9/11 variety. There was a big ice storm in the North East back a few years ago. Stuff happens. The only example of experience vs Q&A manuals comes from my radio and television experience. One question on the 1st class radiotelephone (no longer issued, but was necessary for television) was 'what is the color burst frequency?'. Answers to that question all began 3.579 ... I am not too sure how important that was since it can be looked up, but I can assure you this - once you are at the master switching controls of a television station, the local news is on, they go to the weather, they pop up a chroma-key and the weatherperson's face turns purple .... and the director starts screaming - suddenly you understand that the exact frequency isn't important - the PHASE is!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...
> I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>
> And if not, how is this argument for dumbing down supported? We need
> something substantive here, not just "I know".
>
> - mike -

5388. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:50:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75b3ee_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34947

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220223852.16884.00001062@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 02/20/02 20:23 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c744df5_1@newsa.ev1.net
>
> >Outside my privilege...gotta be between 28.3 and 28.5
>
> Whoooops!......
>
> Well...darn the luck anyway...Perhaps this weekend, but we have a
rather
> popular regional hamfest in Dalton, GA Saturday.
>
> Pick a frequency, Kim, and I'll set up to monitor there.
>

OK, let me get the automatic antenna switcher installed as soon as it comes in (we actually found on that will switch one antenna automaticall between CB and ham radio!). Then, I'll get on 28.400 every day until we can make contact...it'll have to be after say 4:30 though, is that OK?

Kim W5TIT

5389. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 02:54:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C75B2DE.7403F128@uci.edu>
Source record: 34950

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
> the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
> all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
> there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
> relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
> rote memorization of terms.

It was evidently not necessary to rote memorize the material in the old license manuals. Apparently all you had to do was read the manual, since everything was in there. It's really not necessary to rote memorize the material in the question pools either, in order to pass. I sure couldn't have done that. But to be honest, I really didn't do much other than read the question pools and work the problems before I passed. I looked up anything I didn't understand so I would understand the question, or its answer. Don't you think most people would do the same thing, Dick?

Let me ask you a few things. Presuming you were not a radio engineer or a physicist at the time, how well did you understand tropospheric ducting and ionospheric refraction and absorption when you first got your license? Did you fully understand the purpose of the suppressor and screen grids in a power pentode when you passed? Could you draw a picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority carriers? Did you know how to design and implement a plate loading network? Could you calculate (or even describe) the exact effects of end loading for any given dipole antenna installation? How much did you actually know about RTTY? Could you have explained how two co-located repeaters might occupy the same frequency pair without being keyed-up simultaneously? Could you have explained how to use a SSB satellite transponder (if they had existed)? How well did you know your great circles? If a neighbor told you that you were getting into their phone line, their TV, and their record player, would you have been able to eliminate the problems for them?

If you were well versed is all those topics as a result of studying for your exams back then, then I will take your point. If not, then I would like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more technologically advanced.

73 de ac6xg

5390. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:09:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221220950.22292.00000015@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34948

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.grwg3q4.pminews@news.earthlink.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 21 Feb 2002 14:07:35 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>>I think the biggest reason the FCC did not go after Bash was that they
>>were going to make the Q&A public anyway.
>
> Not so. The reason was that the attorney that would have had to do
> all the work didn't want to get involved in any of it (she's long
> dead now).
>
> Dick Bash did his dirty work in front of my office and we had several
> confrontations. It was a hot button item for me. Washington OTOH
> was 3000 miles away.....
>
Thanks for the straight story, Phil. I stand corrected. Fact trumps opinions.

When was this? The Bash books started to show up here (EPA) in the late
1970s. To this day I've never seen one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5391. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:09:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221220950.22292.00000014@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34949

In article <3c73003b_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C7321DD.B37237A0@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>>
>> W5TIT - Kim wrote:

N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > > Car A will get me where I want to go 99% of the time
>> > > Car B will get me where I want to go 69% of the time
>> > > Car C will get me where I want to go 39% of the time.
>> > >
>> > > If it's really important that I get where I want to go, I'm
>> > > going to take Car A, if available. You're saying that I
>> > > should not "favor" Car A over Car B or Car C just
>> > > because it gets me where I want to go.
>> > >
>> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > Nope. Because even though Car A may get you where you want to go, you
>may
>> > be better off with Car C. What if Car A is *most* likely to get you
>where
>> > you want to go, but there's few garages that can trouble-shoot a problem
>> > with it, if one should occur, and less parts available since it's so
>darned
>> > reliable? Then, Car C--a less likely car to get you where you want to
>> > go--has a higher rate of mechanics who understand it and can fix it, and
>a
>> > much greater availability of parts. Guess which one I would take on a
>long
>> > trip?
>>
>> The clearest evidence yet that getting a ham radio license these days is
>NOT
>> rocket science! Kim the Brain would favor a Yugo over a Mercedes.
>
>Hmmm, no, you must have read backwards, Little Dick--and of course that is
>no surprise.

So you would favor the Mercedes over the Yugo.

>While the very first brand new car I ever bought all by myself
>was a Yugo (that ran perfectly fine the two years I had it), I would not
>choose a Yugo...neither then nor today.

The first new car I ever bought lasted me 17 years and 3 days. It never
broke down on the road in all that time. Four times it refused to start -
always because I tried to get one too many winters out of the battery.

It was finally traded in, still runing well, because the body rust was getting
to the point where I wasn't going to take any chances.

> I don't think they were reliable at
>all for a good run; nor would the availability of parts or mechanics be all
>that common (though the Yugo was quite a simple car to work on--they had the
>Fiat 128 engine in them by the way).

So many of them in the junkyard that parts should be easy to find.
>
>Mercedes? Hell no.

Why not? A Mercedes holds the world's record for most mileage on a passenger
car (something well over a million miles, last I saw).

> I'd not choose them and if you're implying you would
>your showing some true ignorance in this context.

Oh yeah - way too reliable. I forgot.

>In this context, for the
>reliability, availability of parts and more frequently found mechanics who
>would be able to repair, I'd probably pick a Ford or *maybe* a Buick. Ford
>first, Buick second.

I didn't see either of those in your list of vehicles owned.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

5392. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:10:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54eo8$a8a$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34958

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75DCAA.B74206CA@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > So how does that show that "cars are black" is a false statement?
> >
> > If there are any cars that are not black, it is a false statement.
> > If a statement is not 100% true, it is false.
>
> That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> assumed based on experience.

Take a logic class sometime. Cecil's construct
is 100% accurate.

> >>Troll rejected<<

i.e. logic rejected.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5393. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:12:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C75B72B.3382A67D@uci.edu>
Source record: 34962

Keith wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:

> >It seems this workaround may have occurred to the legislators at the
> >time they wrote the bill, evidenced by the fact that they specifically
> >refer to them as television receive only (TVRO) antennas.

> It won't hold up in court, I guarantee it.

What won't hold up in court? Your claim that you can't be legally prevented from using a TVRO antenna to transmit based on PRB-1 and the TVRO law? I think we'd all appreciate it greatly if you could actually make that happen. Get off the dime and cut the drivel.

5394. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:22:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75B987.C43A0934@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34951

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
> What about this rectangle?:
>
> +--------------------------------------+
> | set of times when CW gets through |
> | ********************************* |
> | * set of times when CW * |
> | * gets through and SSB * |
> | * doesn't get through * |
> | ********************************* |
> | and SSB gets through |
> +--------------------------------------+
> set of times when neither SSB
> nor CW get through
>
>
> The statment refers to the innermost rectangle.

Then any statement that omits boundaries is invalid. That's what
I have been saying all this time. For the statement to be valid,
the boundaries must be defined. There exists a set of times when
CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through. There also exists
a set of times when neither gets through. Therefore, "CW gets
through when SSB doesn't get through", is a false statement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5395. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:23:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54eo9$a8a$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34960

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a548560278e@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> >The League General Counsel and I and several other ham lawyers have
> > kicked this around for many years (we worked on a big California
> > vase in the 1990s) and we knew what the FCC was going to say long
> > before the League approached them. What we succeeded in was getting
> > the FCC to say out loud that they needed The Congress to order them
> > to do it.
>
>
> The ARRL keeps looking at this as a ham radio issue, but it is truly a
> issue for every citizen. How can people have free speech if they can not
> express that speech? Yes, it is legal to own a phone, but the CC&R doesn't
> allow telephone lines to be used in the neighborhood. Stop trying to
create
> special laws and rules for ham radio only. SWL, CBers and Ham Radio
> operators should be included in this effort. The reason is because all
> citizens of the United States of America should be allow to communicate by
> radio that they are allowed to by law.

Good point. When the ham community in NJ took on the
ancient "scanner law" in NJ which dated back to 1934, we
successfully got the old law totally superceeded by a new
law which allowed anyone to have a scanner in a car
as long as they weren't engaged in a criminal act. That
was better than just trying to get a unique exemption only
for amateurs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5396. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:25:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BA0D.4F8FF55A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34952

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > In logic, generalities must be well defined.
>
> Which is why it isn't used to evaluate conversations situations
> where context and knowledge imply certain facets of the situation.

However, we can all learn something from the rules of logic so that
our *technical* statements can be valid instead of virtually meaningless.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5397. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:26:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BA51.2938B04F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34953

W1RFI wrote:
> Cecils make mistakes.

Is believing Irving M. Copi a mistake?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5398. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:26:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54eo9$a8a$3@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34956

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75D3DE.BD7F45C2@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C751EA8.BA51F79@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > > From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
> > > >
> > > > >Get yourself a nice TV antenna for TV reception and use an antenna
> > tuner to
> > > > >use it for the ham bands.
> > > >
> > > > Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know?
:-)
> > >
> > > And if an unfriendly (to ham or CB radio) neighbor learns that it is
> > > not in use for TV he can cause you all sorts of problems.
> >
> > Most won't bother.
>
> Right, most people won't notice. The one who does is your worry, and your
> nemisis.

Nothing new there. That's why I won't buy in a CC&R community.
Never-the-less, apparently many hams do use "stealth" methods
and get away with it all the time. The number of front page
extremist cases are, apparently, relatively small.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5399. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:27:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BAA4.2075E505@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34954

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As always you
> conveniently "forget" the first half.

Dick, you have *initiated* more insults that anyone else on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5400. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:28:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54eoa$a8a$4@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34959

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.grv35uk.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002 23:31:20 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >> If the Association or the Complainer is mean enough and has deep
> >> enouch pockets, they can very well hire an engineering firm (such
> >> as the one that I consult for) to sit and DF the signal. For us
> >> retired spooks, it's like shooting fish in a barrel.
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >So Phil, if your firm was asked to ferret out a local ham in
> >a CC&R community, would you take the case for the $$$
> >or turn it down because of your being a ham and your being opposed
> >to CC&R restrictions against ham antennas?
>
> I and the owner would turn it down because it would require us to
> do something that we didn't believe in (support anti-ham CC&Rs) but
> I can name several competitors' firms who would take it, not that
> their work would be as precise, respected, and bullet-proof as ours
> is, you know.... <ggg>
>
> But I would be a bad lawyer if I didn't point out the risks to
> the person wanting to know if their action was supportable.

Agree completely, thanks for answering.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5401. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:30:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75bd7b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34963

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020220230024.23640.00000368@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c72f99d_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> It certainly did for me -- nothing else was able to accomplish that
> >> goal, including a lot of "selling of the mode" by hams who used and
> >> loved CW at the time.
> >>
> >
> >Welp, too bad you didn't recognize it for it's uniqueness right up front.
> >Maybe you wouldn't have wasted so many years in defiance of it.
>
> Kim:
>
> Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
> The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
> amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
> not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire only
> after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
> proficiency.
>

Well, then you must be a nobody, while a lot of people who don't fit into
that category. I've recognized CW as unique since I first ever heard of
it--probably in Girl Scouts.

> >> >
> >> >This is getting really confusing, Little Dick.
> >>
> >> That's MISTER Carroll to you, dear.
> >>
> >
> >Nope, sure isn't. Little Dick deserves no, zero, nada, respect from me.
>
> At the risk of speaking for Dick, I'm fairly certain the feeling is
> mutual.
>

Then why would you insist originally that I should address him as "Mister"?
That would imply respect, Larry...you were the one with the idea. Dick and
I already know we don't respect each other.

> >> >
> >> >It sounds more

> >> >like you wish to force CW on people. Is that right?
>
> I can't force anything on anyone, Kim. However, this "force" thing,
> as empty an argument as it is, is one of the mainstays of the NCTA
> debating syllabus. It's a meaningless, empty, illogical argument used
> by people who cannot justify their position.
>

Well, you're right, you can't force CW on anyone--can't even embarrass them into it. But I think that is much to your chagrin. If you don't have the desire to force CW on someone, then why would you equate a no-code ham as being "dumbed down?" If you have no ultimate goal with your name-calling and attitude toward others who don't share your fervor for CW, then why would you bother being so beligerant about how much less of a ham they are than you? Hmmmm?

> >>
> >> How can Dick, or anyone else, "force" CW on anyone? Nobody was
> >> able to "force" it on me -- I learned it because I wanted to be a ham
> >> with HF privileges, and code tests were required.
>
> >Somehow the word "required" doesn't go with "wanted" but whatever.
>
> What kind of an argument is "but whatever?" OIC, a Kim Walker kind of
> argument. Never mind.

I offered the argument: "required" doesn't go with "wanted." The whatever part of that is just that--whatever. If you see it as a match...whatever, not important to me; not my argument, etc.

>
> >> >Having CW as a phase of testing does not do anything one way or the
other
> >> >for whether someone is going to use it or not.
> >>
> >> Well, it certainly did for me, since I had no intention when initially
> >> licensed to become a CW operator.
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, but I think we all realize what a different kind of guy you are,
> >Larry.
>
> We're all different, Kim -- except for NCTA's, who are all strangely
alike.
>

Talk about "the mainstays of [a] debating syllabus." You ever look at your own posts? You ever look at Dick's, you ever look at lots of them on the debate?

> >>
> >> In fact, I was (at the time) a

> >> most vociferous NCTA kinda guy. If NCI had existed then, I may
> >> have joined. However, learning the code and getting on the air a
> >> few times got me "hooked," and before I even thought I was ready
> >> to take it, I had passed my 20 WPM code test! If code testing had
> >> never been a requirement, I very strongly doubt that I would have
> >> become a CW operator,
> >>
> >
> >And, that would have, what? Been bad? Who cared whether you became a CW
> >operator? I learned CW to pass a test. Dropped it right after the test.
>
> I'm sure you did. That took less effort than giving it a fair try
on-the-air,
> to see if you'd actually enjoy using it. The pity is, you don't know what
> you're missing -- and are too stupid to make the attempt to find out.
>

Larry, if I'd given it a "fair try" on the air for years, you'd come up with some inane name-calling about how I gave it up because I am "dumbed down." Why don't you get as equally upset about all the other modes I've never even tried? Does one have to try *every* mode to meet your expectation? Moreover, why do you *care* about it? If all us "dumbed-down" hams had decided we really liked the CW mode and jumped on the air with it...you'd be bitching about the crowded conditions.

> >
> >So, you were encouraged by learning for a test and I was discouraged by
> >learning it for a test. With just the two of us, that's 50/50 odds.
>
> And the difference between us is that I beat those odds by approaching
> CW with a mature, open-minded attitude. You've made up your mind
> about it without even giving it a fair chance. Typical NCTA laziness.
> However, you've got the whining and excuse-making down pat.
>

I'll ask again...why does that matter to you? I also have never tried PACTOR, AMTOR, moonbounce, nothing. Nothing but voice on 2M, 70cm, and the little HF I've done here at the house and on Field Days. That's it. Why aren't you as upset by that, Larry? And, speak of whining and excuse-making, you've got it down as well. You spent someone's money in college for a great degree--to do what with it? Nothing...because you gave up, you took the easy way out and got a bus driving job. So, you succeed in ham radio and you fail at a job market. Why is that, Larry? Why did you waste your time in college and then just get a job that any joe-blow can do? Huh? {For those I just offended, I am sorry--I am just turning the table for Larry--though he'll never get it).

> >>
> >> although I'm not saying it's impossible that
> >> I could have in the absence of the requirement.
> >>

> >
> >I think CW is "miraculous" enough and fun enough for people who like it,
> >that those who are inclined to use it in the longrun don't need to be
> >encouraged by having to learn it for a test.
>
> If you think this is true, PROVE it.
>

Larry, all you need to do is meet the many new hams who've picked up CW and
really enjoy it. But, again, that would take too much effort on your part,
wouldn't it?

> >
> >I wasn't tested for APRS or
> >packet, but I've tried both. Can't stand packet and dig playing with
APRS.
> >I wasn't tested for PSK31, watched my husband doing it one night, shook
my
> >head in bafflement and never will try it.
>
> What's so baffling about PSK-31? It's got to be one of the dead-easiest
> modes to operate, and it's a lot of fun. It's one of the few digital
modes
> I've tried that really CAN give CW a run for it's money -- though I've
still
> made CW contacts long after PSK-31 died out on me.
>

And, CW is a dead-easy mode for loads of people...probably yourself. So,
what's so baffling? In fact, you say it's the greatest mode because of its
convenience. Is that why you like it so well? It is beyond your capability
to set up a station other than a CW station? I get it now...easiest
antenna, easiest equipment setup, easiest this, easiest that...who *is* the
lazy one, Larry?

> >>
> >> After all, it was my
> >> umpteenth bad experience with a rabid Ten-Ten number chaser
> >> on 10-meters that put me off of SSB operation back in the early
> >> '90's.
>
> >You sure are easily discouraged. Imagine me giving up ham radio just
> >because of your rabidness on this newsgroup, Larry. That'd be
ridiculous.
> >You let others win too easily.
>
> My disenfranchisement with SSB was building up long before that
> particular incident on 10-meters, which was just the straw that broke
> the camel's back, as it were.
>

You didn't answer the greater part of that question, Larry, but you dodged it well. What if I gave up ham radio just because of your rabidness on this newsgroup, Larry? You do realize that you are acting exactly as you describe the Ten-Ten folks, don't you? Yep, you are their equal when it comes to the capability to act rabid.

> >>
> >> Of course, if I hadn't passed at least a 13 WPM code test,
> >> I wouldn't have been on SSB, wouldn't I? Therefore, knowing the
> >> code, and passing the tests, both got me ON the CW bands, and
> >> OFF of the phone bands! Talk about your unintended consequences!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Your unintended consequence there is that you seem to think that everyone
> >and anyone else must have the same experience as you.
>
> I get that a lot, but I've never said it. All I've ever done is relate my
own
> personal experiences using CW, from the point-of-view of a person who
> may never have done so in the absence of the testing requirement.
>

No, you haven't Larry. You have blinders on when it comes to your behavior. You have done far more than relate your own personal experiences using CW--you have attempted to belittle, berate, embarrass, and passed cyber-spit all over people who don't share your love of the CW mode. You have done that, everyone knows you have done that, and you know you have done that. You just deny it.

>
> In
> expecting you to understand this, perhaps I'm expecting too much, given
> the low intellectual level you consistently seem to demonstrate in this
NG.
>

You know? I'd rather be known as a dumb friendly person than a smart mean person.

> >
> >Or, that those who
> >don't are somehow much lesser a person than you.
>
> More whining. Yawn!
>

You mean every time you begin your same 'ol, same 'ol? Yep. Whining is all it is.

> >
> >You can wish forever that

> >someone would experience your life, Larry, because you think it is so
> >wonderful.
>
> My life is my life, Kim -- nobody can experience it other than myself.
All
> I'm doing is offering others the benefit of my own experiences.
>

Why don't you go ahead and accept the benefit of some of theirs for a
change? You are a one-sided person, Larry. Your way or the highway kind of
guy.

>
> A lot of
> people have listened, taken heed, and tried to do things they wouldn't
> have tried before -- and succeeded where they never expected to.
>

Yes, they have...but not because of any encouragement they got from you.
The great HR student-who-never-could because in an HR Department, you
probably would have had any company you worked for in court on a constant
basis.

>
> I guess
> that's the one thing I've learned the hard way -- to stretch myself beyond
> my own self-imposed limits, and learn that I'm not really limited at all!
>

Yeah, you've stretched alright.

> >
> >While you are wishing, you may completely miss the beauty of
> >their life. I am so tickled just to get someone on the air and into ham
> >radio that I couldn't care less if they ever even hear of CW.
>
> Merely getting "on the air" doesn't make a person a ham. It can do so,
> but it isn't likely that they will really be fulfilled as a ham unless
they
> also embrace the growth of the technical and operational learning
> experience. Just yakking into a microphone isn't even 1 percent of
> that. And someone who admits to "shaking [her] head in bafflement"
> at a mode like PSK-31, and vowing never to try it, isn't qualified to
judge
> me as a ham!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Bleh, bleh, bleh...more whining. You're nothing but a whiner. I haven't
judged you as a ham, Larry. I've decided (long ago) that I don't like you
at all...let alone as a ham.

Kim W5TIT

5402. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:33:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BBEE.ED0A8B2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34955

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >The answers
>
> > given in the ARRL License Manual were *exact*.
>
> OF COURSE!!! It was the *questions* that were not given!

All of the key words in the questions were given. Only an idiot
would have trouble picking out and memorizing the key words.
resistance = ohm
inductance = henry
capacitance = farad
current = ampere
See how easy it was?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5403. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:35:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75be8a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34967

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020220230026.23640.00000370@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c72febf_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> You may have accidentally stumbled on a good point.
> >>
> >
> >No accident. You're just beginning to realize how smart I am, like I
said
> >before.
>
> Kim:
>
> No, not likely. By that, I mean you're not as smart as you think you
> are.
>

Aw, you can deny it all you want Larry. You really do realize how smart I
am.

[SNIP]
>
> > "Their experimentation." Right. What have YOU experimented with
lately,
> >
> Kim -- besides newer and better ways to make a fool of yourself on rrap?
> What new modes have you developed? Heck, what new modes have you
> just *tried?* Ever used *any* mode other than FM/SSB voice? Why are
> you still just a Tech? Why don't you have your Extra, with full HF
> privileges? You don't have to take any more code tests, so what's
standing
> in your way?
>

You're dodging again, Larry. I am a professed non-experimenter. You are
the one professing to be a propenent of experimentation. The question is:
What have *YOU* experimented with lately?

> >
> >By the way, those who
> >wish to do nothing but pick up the microphone are probably a vast

minority
> >when it compares to the number of people who see the ARS as an exciting
> >laboratory for experimentation with internet/wireless and other endless
new
> >technologies.
>
> You know, Kim, with a bunch of tired old bromides like that, you could
> easily run for ARRL Section Manager! However, they do nothing to support
> your claim of how smart you are!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Then, your not as smart as you think you are...

Kim W5TIT

5404. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:35:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BC8F.999B0D5F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34961

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I have a 1957 ARRL License Manual, Dick, and I am talking about it.
> >> Here's a quote: "If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to
> >> be naive or incomplete, rest assured that they are sufficient for
> >> the purpose." Are you calling the ARRL a liar?
>
> > No, you're not the ARRL.
>
> That was non-responsive, Dick. That is what the old study guides said. Do you
> think that ARRL was lying about the fact that the information in the study
> guides was sufficient to pass the test?
>
> All I studied for my General was the 16-pages in the ARRL study guide. I
> passed. I did what most hams do today -- a combination of learning,
> memorizing, lucky guessing and just plain hoping that a few questions didn't
> appear on my exam.

At 14 years of age in the 8th grade, virtually all of my "learning" was
rote memorization. The only thing I had trouble memorizing were those
darned schematics. I had absolutely no idea what all those squiggly
lines meant.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5405. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:35:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54eob$a8a$5@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34957

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210539220.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
> >> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if
they
> >> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in
any way
> >> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
> >
> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
>
> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
between the
> two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.

There always is a clear distinction between the two.

CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
notices from zoning, etc.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5406. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:42:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BE1B.C33EF030@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34968

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
> the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
> all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
> there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
> relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
> rote memorization of terms. Pure rote alone wouldn't get you a
> pass on the exam.

Then I didn't get my Conditional in 1952, Dick - but I did, and I did
it primarily through rote memorization of the ARRL License Manual because
I had absolutely no other reference. You have a lot of nerve to accuse
me of lying about something that happened when you were nine years old.

How could I be lying about the meaning of the statement in the ARRL License
Manual? It says what it says. The meaning is absolutely crystal clear.
"If our answers sometimes seem to the initiated to be naive or incomplete,
rest assured that they are sufficient for the purpose." You are the one
who has to lie about the meaning. I just quote the words.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5407. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:42:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221224225.28547.00000011@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 34966

In article <196d8.1637$eI1.439551@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>I have suggested in certain circles, that maybe as a "happy medium" is to
>release the Questions only, not the four multiple guesses.... A person
>would still need to do the research, but would get an idea of what they are
>going to be tested on.

This sounds like a good idea and is basically what was done
prior to privatization of testing of ALL operator licenses. It will
not be acceptible without an extraordinary amount of legal
action on the part of lobbyists. The foreseeable failure of such
an activity can be seen by looking at the nature of the license
itself.

A radio operator license, professional or amateur, is NOT an
academic credential. It is simply an acknowledgement of a
regulating agency AUTHORIZING a licensee to transmit RF
energy in a specific part or specific parts of the EM spectrum
using emissions allocated therein by a regulatory agency. It
is literally no more an acknowledgement of expertise in any
radio endeavor than a driver's license being an automotive
engineering credential or a fishing license indicating academic
credit in ichthyology.

Unfortunately, a god-like mythos has developed in amateur
radio over the last century that has confused "qualification"
and "authorization." The contributing factors to that are:

1. The insufferable pride and self-glorification of a few who use
an authorization as an academic qualification to prove their
"worth" over others. This is especially noticeable among
the non-professionals constantly demeaning professionals
(insecurity and pride as internal motivators) about "radio
knowledge."

2. Promotion by organizations and businesses who make a
profit on "training aids" that implicitly promise the ability
to "pass tests." This includes self-promotional organizations
such as the ARRL who need the financial profit from sales of
publications and goods to maintain their organization.

3. The mystique of the technology itself to those not intimately
involved with radio or electronics. Such appears as a sort of
"magic" since its processes do not involve a direct sensory
understanding such as with machinery. While electric shock

is sensed, the human body cannot quantify anything about the electricity causing the shock except intensity. Physical laws are, to the general human understanding, abstract concepts which go beyond general human life experiences; e.g., no one has traveled at the speed of light (or even close to it) nor been able to pass through most solid objects as do radio waves. The basic radio arts are therefore considered arcane and its practitioners consider themselves akin to more-knowledgeable sorcerers possessing "secret knowledge" relative to the general population.

4. The "territorial imperative" basic to humans ("turf") in regards to "possession" of an ability or skill. The common manifestation is superiority of knowledge or skill based on long tenure in an activity, of being licensed (authorized) long ago under older rules. That becomes illegitimate when they cannot offer any valid proof of knowledge or skills acquired during a tenure in an activity which has been constantly advancing. The ultimate absurdity in "turf" is the personalized rationalization that a turf defender's long-ago standards and practices are the ultimate defining "qualifications" that all others should meet without question. That is allied with (1) above.

>I obtained the question pools and made my own flashcards after many reads of
>the instruction manuals. I wrote the actual test pool question on one side,

Very few methods of study apply to all...but those that have survived years of trial and error/success should all be useful. Success is indicated by passing a license test, the object of all the effort. The method of passing is irrelevant as long as the passing is legitimate and lawful.

Unfortunately there seems to be a fantastic amount of "brand-name bias" surrounding the test process; the ARRL can do no wrong among League supporters, the Bash books are unthinkable, evil things to those last tested before that company began. None have mentioned the license-test "Q&A" hardbounds that preceded all others.

>Overall, I believe the suggestion in the first paragraph may be one of many
>possible solutions.

Logically and by itself, yes. The problem yet unrecognized is that the "problem" with amateur radio license testing is so described only by those who last took tests long ago under different conditions, rules, and a less-advanced state of the radio art. Those critics do NOT regulate radio. The FCC regulates civil radio in the USA. The FCC establishes the final criteria in regulation.

The FCC has decided to privatize ALL radio operator testing (but reserves itself as a final testing agency if there are large disputes). The legal situation involving full disclosure of test questions and

answers is NOT due solely to the FCC nor does it have roots in amateur radio license testing.

To repeat, all radio operator licenses granted in the USA are authorizations to operate, not academic or intellectual ability qualifications. The FCC is a regulatory agency, not an academic agency.

5408. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:42:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221224226.28547.00000012@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 34964

In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
<jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
>> > assumed based on experience.
>>
>> While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
>
>I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
>is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.

"Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
with ANY radio?!?

Incredulosity abounds...

5409. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:42:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020221224228.28547.00000013@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 34965

In article <20020221101041.21470.00000001@mb-mg.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c744fcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>writes:
>
>>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>>news:3C73F010.6714CAE9@IEEE.org...
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>> >
>>> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>>> > > Because she cannot drive the more reliable stick shift. :-)
>>> >
>>> > Ah, I see. You are saying I should not use CW because Kim can't
>>> > drive a stick shift.
>>>
>>> If Kim is not skillful with a stick shift, it might be advisable
>>> to avoid stick shifts. If Kim is not skillful with CW, it might
>>> be advisable to avoid CW for emergency situations. For instance,
>>> her CB radio would probably be a lot more useful out on the
>>> road than HF CW even though HF CW is more reliable.
>>> --
>>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>>Yep.
>
>Nope.
>
>> Plus, with CB radio *and* ham radio, I have a greater chance of
>>reaching someone.
>
>In case one radio breaks, you have the others.
>
>>Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency.
>
>Including CW/Morse?

The word "any" includes WHATEVER radio is available.

The only reason for N2EY's "question" is gratuitous confrontation.

>> If I
>>thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also have
>>FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities.
>

>They are getting popular. An injured mountain hiker was rescued last year
>because his FRS HT was heard 80 miles away by a couple of kids. Love
>that tropo ducting.

Where? Last year a GROUP of mountain climbers were stranded
on Mt. Ranier in Washington. Their rescue was begun after their
FRS HT was heard accidentally by a nine-year-old girl only about
30 miles away. NO "tropo ducting" there, just line-of-sight. It was
in the Seattle, Tacoma, and Olympia papers, made national news.
The actual rescue (by Army helicopters) involved military and
public safety radios, the park service, and three Washington state
agencies.

Why distort the truth?

The US Army has had operational troposcatter radio relay units
for a quarter-century. That is not rocket science, nor is line-of-
sight communications.

>Mobile has its limitations, but home is another story. Ask the folks who
>dealt with the ice storms in 1997.

Ask the folks who dealt with an earthquake in 1994. You should
have no problem since there were at least 10 million of them
directly involved here in January of that year. The only evidence of
ham radio emergency communications appeared in the amateur
radio "press" over a week AFTER the event.

>>I suspect there are many who feel the same way.
>
>Kim, have you ever actually had a QSO on CW/Morse?

Why is that a "curiosity" question?

>Ever originated,
>received or relayed a formal message by CW/Morse?

Has N2EY ever relayed-transmitted a teleprinter message
over radio, any radio? I've relayed-transmitted about 1.32
million of them on HF between 1953-1955..

>Just curious.

So am I. Considering that the commercial communications
carriers and the US military had dropped "CW/Morse" from
fixed-point to fixed-point 24/7 HF messaging by 1948, I'm
still trying to understand "CW gets through when ALL other
modes fail."

If "CW/Morse" is so reliable, so robust, it would seem logical
that the Big Boys in communications would have kept the
mode. The threat of possible thermonuclear conflict during the
Cold War period after 1948 ought to rank as "emergency,"
wouldn't you think?

In my civilian life experience since 1960 I've sent about 7 telegrams and received about 10 telegrams, all over commercial teleprinter-telegraph communications providers. I've never, ever received a "formal" or informal amateur "radiogram." I don't know anyone who has, either licensed in some radio service or not.

Where is this blizzard of amateur "CW/Morse" radiograms blowing?

5410. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:42:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C75BE27.199C959@uci.edu>
Source record: 34976

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > What about this rectangle?:
> >
> > +--------------------------------------+
> > | set of times when CW gets through |
> > | ********************************* |
> > | * set of times when CW * |
> > | * gets through and SSB * |
> > | * doesn't get through * |
> > | ********************************* |
> > | and SSB gets through |
> > +--------------------------------------+
> > set of times when neither SSB
> > nor CW get through
> >
> >
> > The statment refers to the innermost rectangle.
>
> Then any statement that omits boundaries is invalid.

So then simply by omitting a boundary, one can invalidate an obviously
true statement such as "set of times when CW gets through and SSB gets
through".
That's a useful tool.

> That's what
> I have been saying all this time. For the statement to be valid,
> the boundaries must be defined. There exists a set of times when
> CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through. There also exists
> a set of times when neither gets through. Therefore, "CW gets
> through when SSB doesn't get through", is a false statement.

But that implies that CW doesn't get through when SSB does get through,
which is also a false statement.

:-)
```

5411. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:46:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54foirfm1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34973

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75DEBE.D8B83A3C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > > Contrary to Cecil's assertion that this assessment relates solely
to the
> > > Morse Code issue, I for one put "dumbing down" on the shoulders of
Dick Bash,
> > > Gordon West, Fred Maia and the other (yes, the League too) verbatim
study guide
> > > folks.
> >
> > The ARRL License Manual was essentially verbatim in a little different
form
> > than the tests.
>
> More trolling bullshit. You of all people, hold me and anyone
> else you choose to the very letter of perfection, then have the brass
> balls to make such a claim. The ARRL license manual was a
> STUDY GUIDE in which entire pages were used in DISCUSSION
> of the theory and background on much of the subject matter.
> You're a worthless old lying idiot.

Once again Dick's words (perjorative name calling again)
do more to erode his own credibility than anyone else's.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5412. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:47:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75BF6A.5F6890E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34969

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
>
> But Herr Trollmeister, you have yet once again skipped over
> the point without coming close. Bash made no attempt to cover
> any material.

The material was the questions and answers, Dick. Of course, he
covered the material. Get real. Why would anyone have bought the
books if he didn't cover the material.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5413. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:48:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c188_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34971

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C750342.E94C8413@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C7439F0.9FB4CC9F@IEEE.org...
> > > Here's an example, however:
> > > "Humans are mortal." true or false? "Humans are tall." true or false?
> > > Shirley, you can see the difference between the scope of those two
> > > statements. And every logic statement must be either true or false.
> > > One logic statement is not allowed to be more true than another.
> > >
> > Only when all relevant facts about a given statement are known can it be
> > determined to be true or false. Truth is subjective. A statement in one
> > context and/or circumstances may be true, while in another
> > context/circumstnaces, the same statement might be false.
>
> Not in formal logic. That's why formal logic has rules.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That's why good debate environments have rules, also....
```

5414. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:50:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75C013.25B7D460@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34970

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > > like the ARRL License manuals.
> >
> > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
>
> Cecil, I know you're a newcomer and all, so I'll go easy on you. The ARRL
> Manuals are geared towards understanding the underlying principles behind
> the FCC exams. The current ARRL Extra Class License Manual clocks in at
> over 400 pages - with dense text and hundreds of math equations. The
> other books out there generally just give the question pools with maybe a
> sentence or two about why the correct answer is, well, correct. A world
> of difference.

We're not talking about the current license manuals, Joshua. We are talking
about the ARRL License Manual that I rote memorized in 1951 in order to
obtain my Conditional license.

> By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your
> endeavors in the ARS.

Uhhhhhh Joshua, I had *ALL* amateur frequency privileges in 1952.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5415. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:56:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c384_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34975

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020221101041.21470.00000001@mb-mg.aol.com...
> In article <3c744fcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
>
> >Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency.
>
> Including CW/Morse?
>

Absolutely...if one knows the mode enough to be effective with it.

> >
> > If I
> >thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also
have
> >FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities.
>
> They are getting popular. An injured mountain hiker was rescued last year
> because his FRS HT was heard 80 miles away by a couple of kids. Love
> that tropo ducting.
>
> > But, the line must be drawn somewhere.
>
> Why?
>

Because how far would one go in seriousness to "be prepared." Do I equip
myself for each and every emergency that might come up? Do I buy the means
to use every mode available to use in ham radio in case of an emergency? Do
I become a doctor so that I may be fully prepared for an emergency?

The line is drawn at what one is comfortable giving. I don't plan on ever
sitting or standing around in the Texas heat while what I think is a
dumb-#$%@ biker wants to race. I would, though, never give my willingness a
second thought for a true emergency in the heat.

> >
> > 2M, 70cm, and CB are better than nothing.
>
> No cell phone?
>

Yep. But, I would rely last on a cell phone.

> >
> > And, all do me better than CW
> >capability.
>
> Ah, I understand. You need all those radios because the car breaks down
> so much.
>
> Mobile has its limitations, but home is another story. Ask the folks who
> dealt with the ice storms in 1997.
>
> >I suspect there are many who feel the same way.
>
> Kim, have you ever actually had a QSO on CW/Morse? Ever originated,
> received or relayed a formal message by CW/Morse? Just curious.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

One-half QSO, the night I passed my 5wpm test. No, never done any CW
traffic, never did CW after that night.

Kim W5TIT

5416. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:58:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C75C1DF.CFF64E94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34974

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> If you don't have the
> desire to force CW on someone, then why would you equate a no-code ham as
> being "dumbed down?"

Consider that a person of above intelligence walks into a VE session, passes his Tech exam, and walks out dumbed down. Then consider how much a person must get dumbed down by the time he gets to Extra. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5417. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 03:58:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a54fojrfm2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 34972

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C766B4B.17140DE@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >The ARRL License Manual covered essentially the same
> >material as the Bash books.
>
> Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> like the ARRL License manuals.

So what? Is there only one way to present "study"
information?

> What Bash did was accost
> persons exiting the FCC office who had just finished taking
> ham radio exams and query them to find, as closely as they
> could remember, what the questions were.

And all those people so ACCOSTED had to answer him?

> Sometimes he
> came pretty close. Other times his "information" was quite
> vague. Some of his "questions" were based on the subject
> only with little in the way of an answer. You were alerted
> to be familiar with a specific subject. He wasn't able to
> get the specifics.

So what?

> I DID see a set of Bash books, in the late 70's when he was
> going strong. I knew a former CBer who used them to get to Extra class.
Being
> curious about them I asked to look them over. What I
> saw was useful to pass the exams but not at all like any other
> study guide then in use nor very much like the exact question pools
> of today.

My my, almost sounds like the Bash books
were clandistine to obtain and own.

> They were mostly conversationally written, a "study guide"
> toward acquiring the correct answers. Nothing more. Most of the
information was
> not at all precise.
> The ARRL License Manuals

> included fairly detailed discussion of technical topics. Not the same at
all.

The ARRL manual was certainly "conversational" on some material.

> And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
> before Bash came along.

Who cares, so what?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5418. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:01:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c4a1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34977

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020221101042.21470.00000002@mb-mg.aol.com...
> In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > I do (my
> >Saturn and this truck are the only two automatics I have had since
> >driving--started in a SAAB, then Yugo, , then Subaru GLF, then VW Golf,
now
> >these two recent vehicles).
>
> What truck?
>

My new truck.

> >
> >An appropriate analogy, though, for the
> >stickshift would be that I can drive it, but why would I want to beat
myself
> >up with one?
>
> Shifting one of those cars is "beating yourself up"?
>

It is in this traffic around here.

> >
> >(I had to get out of stickshifts because of my back).
>
> Then you can't drive one, so now I'm not supposed to operate CW.
>

I don't know, Jim. Are you really going to base whether you can do
something or not, on what someone else does? Yes, I can still drive a
standard...if I want to run around with a painful back all the time.

> >
> > That is
> >to auto driving as CW is to radio: why would I want to beat myself and
> >others up with using CW when I can do lots of other things that may work
> >just as well?
>
> "Beat yourself up"? Good heavens.
>

> Besides, other things don't work "just as well". That's the point.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Back to radio. CW only works "just as well," Jim, if one is skillful or at least somewhat knowledgeable of its use and can intelligently use the mode. I don't do either, and don't wish to. I also don't wish to equip myself for packet (outside APRS) or mobile AMTOR, etc.

Kim W5TIT

5419. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:03:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34978

I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020221101043.21470.00000003@mb-mg.aol.com...
> In article <3c74529e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Maybe you men are just having a hard time with this.
>
> Who is "you men"? Heck, how do you even know I'm a man? Ever hear
> of actor James King?
>
> Of course if I made some sort of comment in that vein I'd be "sexist".
>
> I have found that some people take care of things and others tend to abuse
> them. Vehicles demonstrate this to an extreme degree - some people make
> sure all preventive maintenance is done, and drive carefully, while others
> ignore maintenance and abuse the vehicle, then wonder why it breaks
> down.
>
> >Let's say I can get a
> >European made sound system/stereo that is absolutely reliable.
>
> I don't know of any European sound systems. Almost all of the
> consumer-grade stuff I see is made in Pacific rim countries.
>
> If a thing is "absolutely reliable", then it never breaks down. So
> repairs aren't an issue.
>
> > The
> >components last and last, the sound is beautiful, the workmanship is top
> >notch.
>
> I want one of those. My Dynaco stereo components are getting up there
> in years, and I've already had to fix one of them.
>
> >BUT, if it ever breaks I have to ship it back over to Europe and pay
> >shipping both ways, as well as the inconvenience of the time it would
take.
>
> You said it was "absolutely reliable". That means it never breaks.
>

> >Then, let's say I can get a lot less reliable sound system/stereo that
has a
> >service and repair shop in nearly every major city, and some small towns.
>
> Have you ever tried to get consumer electronics fixed? Most of the time
they
> tell you to just buy a new one. Repair of those things is often
impractical
> unless it's something minor.
> >
> >I'm getting the less reliable sound system, unless I'm just in a really
> >crazy mood and take that chance that the super reliable system really
is
> >*always* that reliable.
>
> You said it was absolutely reliable, which means it never breaks.
>
> So what this comes down to is that people should not use CW, drive a
reliable
> vehicle or buy reliable consumer electronics because you might have to
ship
> them back to Europe. Maybe the idea is to keep me so busy fixing things
> that I won't have time to get on the air or post to rrap.
>
> > I am not a risk taker, never have been.
>
> So the safe path is to buy the unreliable thing and the risky path is to
> buy the reliable thing. OK.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5420. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:05:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c576$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34979

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C766412.F02F2901@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
>
> > then Yugo,
>
>
>
> I knew it!!! A Yugo jock!
>

Hey, Little Dick! The next you "know" something, how 'bout ya mention it
before it is revealed?

Kim W5TIT

5421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:11:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c6de_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34980

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202211106.526d9a31@posting.google.com...
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c745198_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > > Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very
good
> > > condition.
> > > So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > Don't know about that...but maybe people think right off the top it's
too
> > expensive...
>
> $100 is too expensive? That's my asking price - I'll take half that.
>

Have you got the price advertised, too? See...if I saw an ad for a Maytag
washer, I'd figure that the seller would have far higher value than $100.00.

> Repairs aren't free, either.
>
> There are mathematical methods of figuring out the break-even point on
> the risk of equipment breakdown, based on the probability of a failure
> and the cost of repair vs. cost of prevention. A lot depends on how much
> you value your time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I sure value my time more than using mathematical methods for nearly
anything...LOL I am a process person...and yet can't stand using pereto
charts, etc.

Kim W5TIT

5422. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:19:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c8c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34981

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020221220950.22292.00000014@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3c73003b_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
>
> >In this context, for the
> >reliability, availability of parts and more frequently found mechanics
who
> >would be able to repair, I'd probably pick a Ford or *maybe* a Buick.
Ford
> >first, Buick second.
>
> I didn't see either of those in your list of vehicles owned.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

I bought what seems to be the most reliable pickup truck on the road. I
didn't buy it for it's reliability, however, I bought it for its looks. The
truck that appeals to me most as eye candy is the Toyota Tacoma. So, I
bought it. Now, the guys at work tell me that I have the most reliable
truck on the road....is it? Even if it's not, there's a Toyota dealer on
every corner, so I think I'm safe...

Kim W5TIT

5423. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:21:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34982

I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've ever paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C75B987.C43A0934@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > What about this rectangle?:
> >
> > +--------------------------------------+
> > | set of times when CW gets through |
> > | ********************************* |
> > | * set of times when CW * |
> > | * gets through and SSB * |
> > | * doesn't get through * |
> > | ********************************* |
> > | and SSB gets through |
> > +--------------------------------------+
> > set of times when neither SSB
> > nor CW get through
> >
> >
> > The statment refers to the innermost rectangle.
>
> Then any statement that omits boundaries is invalid. That's what
> I have been saying all this time. For the statement to be valid,
> the boundaries must be defined. There exists a set of times when
> CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through. There also exists
> a set of times when neither gets through. Therefore, "CW gets
> through when SSB doesn't get through", is a false statement.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5424. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 04:22:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c75c985_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 34983

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C75BAA4.2075E505@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As
always you
> > conveniently "forget" the first half.
>
> Dick, you have *initiated* more insults that anyone else on this
newsgroup.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Maybe I just ignored Dick most of the time...but I think Larry is the record
holder on insults...

Kim W5TIT

5425. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:14:09 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16df72cf2fbd9a8b98968c@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34984

In article <3C75C013.25B7D460@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...

[snip]

> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > > > like the ARRL License manuals.

[snip]

> We're not talking about the current license manuals, Joshua. We are talking
> about the ARRL License Manual that I rote memorized in 1951 in order to
> obtain my Conditional license.

That is a logically false statement. Looks like Dick was talking about
the Bash guides.

> > By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your
> > endeavors in the ARS.
>
> Uhhhhhh Joshua, I had *ALL* amateur frequency privileges in 1952.

Hey, if you say you're a newcomer, I take you at your word. Capiche?

May I suggest the ARRL's "New Ham Companion"? Really a great collection
of articles from QST. After that, you may eventually want to step up to
the ARRL Handbook - although since you're still new, it may be a bit
overwhelming to you right now.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5426. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:33:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grwqnb7.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34985

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 16:19:01 -0800, Keith wrote:

> The trick is to actually use it for a TV antenna, then you not violating
>the law or CCR. Your use of it as a ham antenna is just an additional use.
>Now if you put up the TV antenna and only using for ham radio then you are
>violating the law & CCR.
>Get one of those cheap 19.95 B&W portable TV's and watch TV for one minute
>per day in the shack and you are using the antenna for a TV antenna.
>
>There are two ways to skin a elk. ;)

And the FCC will skin yours (not issue a Declaratory Order of
preemption) if you do the above scheme. Their viewpoint is
EXCLUSIVE use for broadcast, and no other radio service.

Good try, though. Better luck next time.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5427. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:33:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grwvl98.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34986

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 16:49:44 -0800, Keith wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> Until the Association bills you for their costs and attorney fees as
>> they can do by the standard terms of CC&Rs and Association by-laws
>> in California.
>
> What if I put up an antenna and use it for TV and ham radio? The law allows
>me to put up an antenna for TV and the use of it for ham radio is not
>relevant.

See my answer to another post and read Section 1.4000 and the
Memorandum Report and Order and the relevent Public Notices and
Decisions on OTARD cases. They're available on the web.

>Even though your are an attorney you are wrong on this point

What Points and Authorities back up your statement? Are you an
attorney who does work in the field of antenna permits and siting
as I do?

>the association will not be able to win. The antenna is used for reception
>of commercial TV stations, a free speech issue.

The OTARD pre-emption has nothing to do with "free speech". It has
everything to do with "marketplace forces" and "leveling the
playing field". Read the legislative history.

>The use for ham radio is
>irrelevant, the law does not saw that you can not use the TV antenna for
>other reasons.

The pre-emption Memorandum Report and Order (3 CR 1308) is very
specific in what transmission and reception uses the antenna in
question may carry to qualify for pre-emption. Non-broadcast/video
service related uses are NOT covered. Section C Paragraph 39 of the
MO&O discusses this at length.

>The association can file suit to rant and rave, but as long
>as I am using the TV antenna for reception of TV the use for ham radio is
>irrelevant.

The FCC won't back you up. Read the literature.

> The key is to actually use the TV antenna for reception of TV. Now if
>someone solely uses it for ham radio then the association can claim the
>antenna is used for ham radio.

> Another way to look at this is if someone has a TV antenna they use for TV
>and SWL. Are you saying it is violating the rules and law to hook up a SW
>receiver to the TV antenna on occasion?

The question is whether the FCC will issue a Declaratory Ruling that
the antenna meets the requirements of its MO&O and therefore
complies with Section 1.4000 of the Rules and the Association is
preempted from taking adverse action. Read the material to see
what they will or will not accept.

I would never embarass myself or a client by taking such a case
to them knowing in advance that they won't, and I have reprsented
both users and associations in my practice (not in the same case,
although I have mediated a few cases).

>The court will not be able to say you can't have a TV antenna and use
>it for SWL. The reason is the main purpose is the reception of TV
>signals. As long as you are using the TV antenna for actually
>receiving TV signals then the use for SWL is irrelevant.

The Congressional legislation is specific on which services qualify
for pre-emption. The FCC Rules, cases, and the associated Declaratory
Orders are specific on which services qualify for pre-emption.
Amateur radio is not one of them. SWL reception is not one of
them. Believe it or not, FM broadcast reception is not one of them.
The definitions are that specific.

> I know hams and SWL's that today use their TV antenna for use on the
>ham/SWL bands, but the main reason for the antenna is because it is used for
>TV.

If the Association does not complain, then they are permitting it,
case closed. If they object, what legal grounds does the user have
if the FCC will not support them? None.

Don't get me wrong. I passionately want to have CC&R
restrictions on antennas preempted for all uses, but the
OTARD law and Section 1.4000 as it stands won't give it to us,
and neither will the "subterfuge" methods which you advocate.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5428. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:33:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grww889.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34987

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 17:08:41 -0800, Keith wrote:

> Now lets turn this around. The FCC and congress passed a law saying CC&R's
>can not ban ham radio antennas,

>Well Phil do you
>think the courts would rule that such a law is legal or *reasonable*?

The courts look to the intent of The Congress which in the case of
OTARDs is very clear as to what services get protection and why.

>If you do then you must have graduated from the draconian school of law. ;)

I've been around communications law cases long enough to see what
the FCC and the courts will do in cases like this. I was quite
fortunate to have several judges as law school professors and
mentors so I learned what things courts would buy and not buy
early on. One principle that I learned was never to go forward with
a case when the law is against you and you have no grounds to
get the court to change it.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5429. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:45:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220545160.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34988

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Keith wrote:
>W1RFI wrote:
>>Technically not kosher (covered in the rules), but who's to know? :-)
>
> The trick is to actually use it for a TV antenna, then you not violating
>the law or CCR. Your use of it as a ham antenna is just an additional use.
>Now if you put up the TV antenna and only using for ham radio then you are
>violating the law & CCR.
>Get one of those cheap 19.95 B&W portable TV's and watch TV for one minute
>per day in the shack and you are using the antenna for a TV antenna.

...Or use it for ATV! Most people, if they're nosey enough, will notice the TV
but not be able to see what's on....

5430. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:48:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C771FFC.F5DBB5AF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34989

Joshua Houk wrote:

> In article <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > > like the ARRL License manuals.
> >
> > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
>
> Cecil, I know you're a newcomer and all, so I'll go easy on you. The ARRL
> Manuals are geared towards understanding the underlying principles behind
> the FCC exams. The current ARRL Extra Class License Manual clocks in at
> over 400 pages - with dense text and hundreds of math equations. The
> other books out there generally just give the question pools with maybe a
> sentence or two about why the correct answer is, well, correct. A world
> of difference.
>
> By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your
> endeavors in the ARS.

See Cecil? If you act green that's the way you get treated.

5431. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:48:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220547400.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34990

On 22 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>
>>You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if they
>>provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in any
>>way
>>are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>
>Absolutely incorrect. CC&Rs relating to amateur antennas are not pre-empted by
>anything from the feds.

Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those INVOLUNTARILY entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).

5432. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 05:52:37 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220552280.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34991

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210539220.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> >> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if
>they
>> >> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in
>any way
>> >> are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>> >
>> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
>>
>> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
>between the
>> two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.
>
>There always is a clear distinction between the two.
>
>CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
>private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
>vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
>are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
>notices from zoning, etc.)

That "governmental" action is still a civil matter. No difference.

5433. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:21:25 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Frld8.7513$ZC3.600032@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34992

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> trotted out (again his military credentials and dazzled the group

> Has N2EY ever relayed-transmitted a teleprinter message
> over radio, any radio? I've relayed-transmitted about 1.32
> million of them on HF between 1953-1955..
>
> >Just curious.

Now note, using Cecilian logic, Len states HE relayed-transmitted....(cars are black, etc)

Let's do some math

If over 2 years.........

That comes to 660,000 per year

OR

1808 per day.

Assuming that Col Len is a sleepless superman, that means that Len, was responsible for relaying 75 teletype messages every hour or 1 1/4 messages 24/7 for 2 years.

Or, if Len counters with, IT'S NOT 2 YEARS, IT WAS OVER 3 YEARS TIME...

OK...that's 440,000 per year
1205 per day
50 per hour or
just under 1 message every minute 24/7 for 3 years without a rest

I thin not Lucy.

Dear Santa,

For this coming Christmas, please send me a calculator that actually works

Love Len HA
.

5434. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:32:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C772A37.3A295F79@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34993

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
> > the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
> > all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
> > there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
> > relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
> > rote memorization of terms.
>
> It was evidently not necessary to rote memorize the material in the old
> license manuals. Apparently all you had to do was read the manual,
> since everything was in there. It's really not necessary to rote
> memorize the material in the question pools either, in order to pass. I
> sure couldn't have done that. But to be honest, I really didn't do much
> other than read the question pools and work the problems before I
> passed. I looked up anything I didn't understand so I would understand
> the question, or its answer. Don't you think most people would do the
> same thing, Dick?

I learned that most people only want the license and will do
whatever is required to get it. For some it's not difficult, and for
others it's nearly impossible. But I never saw anyone who was
determined to do it that failed. I remember one older gentleman
that came to 10 different sessions before he took home his General
and each time he got the encourgement required to keep him
coming back. He lived 75 miles away, but I still remember his name.

>Let me ask you a few things. Presuming you were not a radio >engineer or

> a physicist at the time, how well did you understand tropospheric
> ducting and ionospheric refraction and absorption when you first got
> your license? Did you fully understand the purpose of the suppressor
> and screen grids in a power pentode when you passed? Could you draw a
> picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority
> carriers? Did you know how to design and implement a plate loading
> network? Could you calculate (or even describe) the exact effects of end
> loading for any given dipole antenna installation? How much did you
> actually know about RTTY? Could you have explained how two co-located
> repeaters might occupy the same frequency pair without being keyed-up
> simultaneously? Could you have explained how to use a SSB satellite
> transponder (if they had existed)? How well did you know your great
> circles? If a neighbor told you that you were getting into their phone
> line, their TV, and their record player, would you have been able to
> eliminate the problems for them?

>
> If you were well versed is all those topics as a result of studying for
> your exams back then, then I will take your point.

That depends entirely on which test you're talking about. Of course
initially I was as uninformed as most newcomers are. But when it came time to
go for the Extra, I did indeed have a pretty good knowledge base built.
Today, that's not required for Extra. Just
read the pools.

> If not, then I would
> like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more
> technologically advanced.

I think Jim N2EY said it best, in that since you had no way to know
how much of what subject you would be tested on, you tended to make sure you
were prepared. The trip to the FCC district office
was not trivial, and today much of the time the trip to the VE test probably
is.
I've said before that studying for a ham radio license then sure didn't
turn anyone into anything like an expert. But with a few years as a
Conditional/General class ham behind me, when I landed in the Army Signal
school in a 6 month course of study that took us from electron
theory through color TV studio equipment, Vidicon and Image
Orthicon cameras and microwave links, I quickly found that I was
way, way ahead of everyone else in the class except for one fella who already
had his First Phone, and another who had 2 1/2 years
of EE college program behind him. The three of us finished the top
three, all within less than a single point separating us. So I learned
that my ham radio technical training, while quite incomplete, was
indeed a very good beginning, and I *did* know a bit of radio theory.
Not on an design engineering level, but certainly on a technical level.
Some of it was gained in the few years following licensing, but by
no means all of it. No one ever said study for a ham license affords
a high degree of skill. Perhaps that's a big part of the reason it concerns
some of us to see evidence that it has slipped further.
When a VE team tests in an area where lots of technical people
reside, the technical level of applicants will be much higher than
it is where few technically oriented people live. Yet the national
pass-fail average was 66% when I served as a VE, and our team's
average always was almost exactly the national average. Yet there
were few technically trained people in that rural area, and most
new hams did indeed come from CB. Either the tests are easy to
pass and applicants easily learn the material, regardless of their
lack of technical background, or the tests are easily compromised.
An area where lots of highly trained persons live should have a
higher pass-fail ratio. It doesn't seem to be working out
that way. So one can deduce that evidently the tests don't test for
knowledge, rather mastering testing technique. Or else they're dead-
easy, and that's perhaps just as bad.

5435. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:36:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C772B1A.FB37A862@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34994

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >The answers
> >
> > > given in the ARRL License Manual were *exact*.
> >
> > OF COURSE!!! It was the *questions* that were not given!
>
> All of the key words in the questions were given. Only an idiot
> would have trouble picking out and memorizing the key words.
> resistance = ohm
> inductance = henry
> capacitance = farad
> current = ampere
> See how easy it was?

Only 4 correct out of 40? You fail.

5436. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:44:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C772CED.95D67329@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34995

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
> > >
> > But Herr Trollmeister, you have yet once again skipped over
> > the point without coming close. Bash made no attempt to cover
> > any material.
> >
> The material was the questions and answers, Dick. Of course, he
> covered the material. Get real. Why would anyone have bought the
> books if he didn't cover the material.

Why indeed? Simply - to match questions and answers so that
at least 70% of them match correctly.

5437. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:45:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C772D39.511A50F8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34996

CAM wrote:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > > > like the ARRL License manuals.
> > >
> > > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
> >
> > Cecil, I know you're a newcomer and all, so I'll go easy on you. The ARRL
> > Manuals are geared towards understanding the underlying principles behind
> > the FCC exams. The current ARRL Extra Class License Manual clocks in at
> > over 400 pages - with dense text and hundreds of math equations. The
> > other books out there generally just give the question pools with maybe a
> > sentence or two about why the correct answer is, well, correct. A world
> > of difference.
>
> We're not talking about the current license manuals, Joshua. We are talking
> about the ARRL License Manual that I rote memorized in 1951 in order to
> obtain my Conditional license.
>
> > By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your
> > endeavors in the ARS.
>
> Uhhhhhh Joshua, I had *ALL* amateur frequency privileges in 1952.

Cecil had "good luck" on his test in 2001.

5438. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 06:49:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C772E48.1EA47427@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34997

CAM wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > If you don't have the
> > desire to force CW on someone, then why would you equate a no-code ham as
> > being "dumbed down?"
>
> Consider that a person of above intelligence walks into a VE session, passes
> his Tech exam, and walks out dumbed down. Then consider how much a person must
> get dumbed down by the time he gets to Extra. :-)

You've got it bass-ackwards as usual. It was the Extra class that
got dumbed down.

5439. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 07:36:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C75F513.C3C2FFBD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 34998

There's the old flagpole J pole trick. Anyone who objects to
your flying Old Glory nowdays must be a member of the Talaban....

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 16:19:01 -0800, Keith wrote:
>
> > The trick is to actually use it for a TV antenna, then you not violating
> >the law or CCR. Your use of it as a ham antenna is just an additional use.
> >Now if you put up the TV antenna and only using for ham radio then you are
> >violating the law & CCR.
> >Get one of those cheap 19.95 B&W portable TV's and watch TV for one minute
> >per day in the shack and you are using the antenna for a TV antenna.
> >
> >There are two ways to skin a elk. ;)
>
> And the FCC will skin yours (not issue a Declaratory Order of
> preemption) if you do the above scheme. Their viewpoint is
> EXCLUSIVE use for broadcast, and no other radio service.
>
> Good try, though. Better luck next time.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:31:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222063141.13180.00000125@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34999

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...

Jim does not do that. If he says it, he believes and means it. I think his record here speaks to his sincerity.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5441. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:35:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222063522.13180.00000126@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35000

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>CAM wrote:

>> Consider that a person of above intelligence walks into a VE session,
>passes
>> his Tech exam, and walks out dumbed down. Then consider how much a person
>must
>> get dumbed down by the time he gets to Extra. :-)
>
> You've got it bass-ackwards as usual. It was the Extra class that
>got dumbed down.

Yup, that's what he said you said. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5442. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:42:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222064213.13180.00000128@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34801

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>When was this? The Bash books started to show up here (EPA) in the late
> 1970s. To this day I've never seen one.

I have glanced at the one in the ARRL library. It ranges from being a bit more specific than the Q&A examples in the ARRL study guides to "this answer is wrong but the FCC says it is right" to "beats me." I recall when I looked at it, I wondered what all the hoopalah had been about. That could be just a first impression, though.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

5443. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:46:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222064639.13180.00000129@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34802

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>It was evidently not necessary to rote memorize the material in the old
>license manuals. Apparently all you had to do was read the manual,
>since everything was in there. It's really not necessary to rote
>memorize the material in the question pools either, in order to pass.

Of note, there are more correct answer in the current entry-level question pool (Tech) than there were sentences in the Novice study guide of 1963. I haven't counted the questions for the general. In reading the question pools of today, you are probably getting more information than you would have gotten in 1963.

>sure couldn't have done that. But to be honest, I really didn't do much
>other than read the question pools and work the problems before I
>passed. I looked up anything I didn't understand so I would understand
>the question, or its answer. Don't you think most people would do the
>same thing, Dick?

Sounds reasonable to me, too, though all I recall studying for my General was the General study guide. Like many Generals today, I had been fairly active as a ham before taking the test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5444. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:49:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222064945.13180.00000130@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34803

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>. I remember one older gentleman
>that came to 10 different sessions before he took home his General
> and each time he got the encourgement required to keep him
>coming back.

Do you think you would have remembered him if he had come back 9 times and not come back that 10th?

>But when it came time to
>go for the Extra, I did indeed have a pretty good knowledge base built.
>Today, that's not required for Extra. Just
>read the pools.

Yes, but when you took your Extra, did it grant any extra priveleges other than the ability to get a 1X2 call, or was it a vanity accomplishment like it would have been in 1964 for me?

And I contend that you could not pass a test that had a question pool the size of today's amateur pools on a subject you knew nothing about. Are you ready to try it with 1000 definitions in Russian to prove me wrong?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5445. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:51:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222065139.13180.00000131@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34804

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>At 14 years of age in the 8th grade, virtually all of my "learning" was
>rote memorization. The only thing I had trouble memorizing were those
>darned schematics. I had absolutely no idea what all those squiggly
>lines meant.

I suspect you are stretching it a bit here, Cecil. Did you really not know
that a resistor schematic represented a resistor? I can believe that you may
not have understood how they all worked together as a circuit, but I do expect
that you had some understanding of what you were looking at.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5446. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:52:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222065228.13180.00000132@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34805

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!

>Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As always
>you conveniently "forget" the first half.

When did I ever tell you to go soak your head, Dick?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5447. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:54:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222065458.13180.00000133@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34806

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Then any statement that omits boundaries is invalid. That's what
>I have been saying all this time.

No, you have not been saying that his statement is invalid, you have been
saying:

>Therefore, "CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through", is a false
statement.

An invalid statement is neither true or false -- it is just invalid.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5448. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:58:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222065825.13180.00000134@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34807

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>However, we can all learn something from the rules of logic so that
>our *technical* statements can be valid instead of virtually meaningless.

I think that even you manage to take meaning from context, Cecil, otherwise you could never understand anything. Otherwise one could never make most statements about cars without being "invalid," or more complex than we find in normal conversation. "Cars have wheels" cannot be said under the rules you have set up because there is a car in my yard up on blocks, making the statement "invalid." If rules of logic are enforced to the point of absurdity, then discourse comes to an end.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5449. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 11:59:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222065934.13180.00000135@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34808

From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>So then simply by omitting a boundary, one can invalidate an obviously
>true statement such as "set of times when CW gets through and SSB gets
>through".
>That's a useful tool.

I am sure it will be the next time Cecil omits a boundary. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5450. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:03:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222070342.13180.00000136@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34809

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org

>Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those INVOLUNTARILY
>entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
>inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).

I am not an attorney, so I don't know how the fine points of state law may apply in each of the 50 states, but I believe your premise to be flawed. The person giving up the inheritance may do so involuntarily, but I don't believe one can inherit real property without agreeing to do so. If so, do you thini the law would force you to involuntarily inherit a polluted property with less value than the cost to clean it up?

Ditto with tax sales and foreclosures. The person obtaining the property does so voluntarily.

Nice try, but if it was that easy, do you think that everyone would be making all this fuss?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5451. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:08:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222070840.13180.00000137@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34810

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>What
>you are defending is the intrusion of the government into my home.

He is not defending that law, he is explaining what that law is.

> As long as that antenna is within the bonds of the law then I can do with
>it as I please as far as reception or transmission of radio signals.

Yes, and that law clearly says that if the antenna is used for any purpose
other than OTARD, it is not pre-empted.

> You can have a phone, but you can't call Nevada on it and if you do the
>courts will come after you.

No, you can have a phone, but you can't put 100 watts of RF onto the phone
wire. :-)

>The ARRL will sit around defending this law with Phil
>leading the charge.

> Good Lord, Why do I support the ARRL at all?

Because ARRL is not defending this law at all. They have expended considerable
resources with the FCC trying to change it and now that they have been told to
take it to Congress, they are taking it to Congress.

Why would you take a clear explanation of a law that Phil says he doesn't like
as "defending" it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5452. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:10:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222071020.13180.00000138@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34811

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>Just let the courts decide if you are a criminal for listening to Radio
>Moscow on it also.

I am sure that there are a number of hams who would like to avoid the costs of "just letting the courts decide." I don't know about you, but in the cases where I have seen a ham end up in court, one way or the other, it was a losing proposition.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5453. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:13:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222071343.13180.00000139@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34812

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>The number of front page
>extremist cases are, apparently, relatively small.

Relatively small, but also relatively painful for the unlucky ham who gets
wrapped up in them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5454. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:22:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222072255.13180.00000140@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34813

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> What the
>congress and FCC are saying is that you are a criminal if you also
>use that antenna for other purposes

No, what congress and the FCC are saying is that they will not pre-empt the CC&R on that antenna if it is used for other purposes. At that point, your liability is civil, where the other side has to prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence, if my layman's understanding is correct.

>What gives the Congress the right to
>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?

The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto with state constitutions for state lawmakers.

And Congress is not telling you how to use your private property in a legal manner; it is saying that it will not pre-empt the CC&Rs that you accepted when you purchased that property if you have an OTARD antenna that is also used for other purposes.

And that notwithstanding, there are plenty of laws that tell me what I can and cannot do with my property. If I build a garage, I cannot do so less than 10 feet from the side property line, or 35 feet if it is located even with or in front of the house.

> The Congress can say you can have an antenna in your
>private home, but they can not tell you how to use it as long as the use is
>legal.

The US constitution tells me I can have a gun in my private home, but there are plenty of laws that tell me how to use it.

> You can have a printing press, but you must only use blue ink to print
>newspapers is what they have done.

There are plenty of things that I cannot print on a printing press. And we have a lot more than CC&Rs and pre-emption backing freedom of the press. And guess what, if there is a CC&R prohibiting business equipment on a residential property, that freedom of the press issue doesn't help. I may be able to use that press for personal printing, but the minute I go commercial, I am in violation of the CC&Rs. Claiming that I also use it for legal personal printing will not get me off the hook.

It is a bad law, but flouting the law is not the answer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5455. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:25:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222072528.13180.00000141@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34814

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> Phil, but since the CC&R was not enforced then all the neighbors can put up
>antennas too. Isn't that wonderful?

Until one neighbor does the research and choses to initiate action.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5456. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:32:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222073203.13180.00000142@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34815

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> I see so the law is against private property rights and if I use my legal
>antenna to listen to 90.3 MHz I am a criminal.

The antenna is neither legal nor illegal. If there are CC&Rs that prohibit antennas, they are either pre-empted because the law pre-empts CC&Rs for antennas used for reception of some broadcast signals or not pre-empted because antennas that are also used for other purposes do not have a pre-emption. The law is pretty clear.

If it is violation of the CC&R, you are not a criminal. This becomes a civil matter; the homeowners association or other affected party can seek remedy through the courts, or, even worse, depending on the contract you signed when you bought your property, through its own bylaws, some of which can be truly draconian.

>but they can't come along and throw me in
>jail for listening to Radio Moscow on that same antenna.

You are correct, the government will not put you in jail. You may, however, be the subject of a civil action, not for the act of listening to Rado Moscow, but for putting up a multi-purpose antenna that is not permitted under the private CC&R you bought when you bought your property.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5457. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:33:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222073306.22292.00000019@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 34816

In article <a54phb0r6o@enews2.newsguy.com>, Keith <nospamplease@newsguy.com>
writes:

> It is my private home and property and if I use the antenna to
>receive broadcasts on 88.6 MHz or Radio Moscow they have NO say in the
>matter. The antenna is legal and I can listen to any radio transmission I
>please, TV's broadcasts are radio transmissions in case you are not aware. I
>can also use my private property to legally broadcast radio signals.

We are talking about CC&Rs, not ordinances or other laws. Since I am a
layman, not a lawyer, the following is in layman's terms as I understand them.

CC&Rs, in this case specifically deed covenants and restrictions, are not laws.
They are private contracts. When you signed on the dotted line to buy the
property, you agreed by legal contract to abide by ALL of the restrictions.

What the FCC's preemption does is to state that TV reception from
broadcasters and satellite services meant for direct reception is a legal
right of homeowners that cannot impeded by CC&R. (You can't make a
legal contract that impedes certain rights). But the FCC's exemption ONLY
extends to TV reception. And they only did it because Congress told them to.

> What
>you are defending is the intrusion of the government into my home.

To enforce contracts that YOU freely signed when you bought that home.

> As long as that antenna is within the bonds of the law then I can do with
>it as I please as far as reception or transmission of radio signals. It is
>not the place of the government to make it illegal for the lawful use in
>regards to radio signals.

The govt. isn't doing that. You did it when you signed the paper to buy the
place
with anti-antenna restrictions.

> You can have a phone, but you can't call Nevada on it and if you do the
>courts will come after you. Geez, talk about an apologist for draconian
>laws. No wonder the ARRL is unable to be effective, you can't see the forest
>for all the trees.

In many areas you can't have a business in a residential district. Same
principle.
You can have your neighbor's kids over every day after school, but if you
charge money it becomes a day care business and there are different rules.

> You can scream the history of the law and all kinds of neat things, but it
>is my private property and I can do as I please with it.

I wish it were that way, wrt antennas.

> Come and get us FCC & FBI I want to blow this portion of the law out of the
>water. Of course, The ARRL will sit around defending this law with Phil
>leading the charge.

Just the opposite - ARRL and Phil have been leading the charge to get the FCC to extend the law to cover ham antennas.
>
> Good Lord, Why do I support the ARRL at all?

If you understood the issue, you'd know.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5458. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:33:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222073353.13180.00000143@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34817

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> From: Dick Carroll

>> >M R ducks.

>> >M R not ducks!

>> >O S A R 2 ducks! C M wangs?

>> >L I B! M *R* ducks!

>> We all saw the signs of this coming; Dick has gone 'round the bend.

> Just following your lead, Ed.

Well, at least that was English. I don't understand your post or your reply,
but somehow, I think we are both better off that way.

I am glad you are feeling better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5459. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 12:37:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222073728.13180.00000144@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 34818

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Of course that is wrong,
>and indeed goes to the heart of exact Q&A pools-they make it
>possibled for applicants to pass exams with insufficient knowledge
>regarding the material via rote memorization of exact answers to
>exact questions without learning. But you and the rest of us already
>knew that.

Actually, Dick, I don't think the "rest of us" know that, so please don't
presume to speak for the entire world.

Although some idiot savante may be able to memorize the answers to over 1000
questions without understanding the underlying material, for most people, that
would be the hard way. It is easier to memorize a single formula and apply
6th-grade math than to try to word associate answers to formulae-based
questions, wouldn't you say?

I know that you think that ham radio should be work instead of fun, so that may
explain why you are trying to convince people to memorize the pools.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>>
>> > And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
>> > before Bash came along.
>>
>> Feeling guilty, are we?
>
> Not me, I don't have any of your problems.

5460. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:09:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222080950.16371.00000018@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34820

In article <3c75c6de_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>> > Don't know about that...but maybe people think right off the top it's
>too
>> > expensive...
>>
>> $100 is too expensive? That's my asking price - I'll take half that.
>>
>
>Have you got the price advertised, too?

Yes. Sold the dining room set, though - it wasn't right for this house.

>See...if I saw an ad for a Maytag
>washer, I'd figure that the seller would have far higher value than $100.00.

It's a basic model and several years old. Came with the house. I already
had a better model, so it became surplus. I may just give it to charity.

My new dishwasher is a Maytag, too. Worth every penny. Stainless steel tub.

>> Repairs aren't free, either.

Neither in money nor time.
>>
>> There are mathematical methods of figuring out the break-even point on
>> the risk of equipment breakdown, based on the probability of a failure
>> and the cost of repair vs. cost of prevention. A lot depends on how much
>> you value your time.
>>
>I sure value my time more than using mathematical methods for nearly
>anything...LOL

Then you really don;t value your time enough to apply scientific methods to
maximizing its use. I have found many of the things I learned in computer
engineering to be very applicable to daily life. Amdahl's Law, for one.

>I am a process person...and yet can't stand using pereto
>charts, etc.

That seems contradictory. The whole point of process is scientific analysis.
Why do something you can't stand?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5461. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:09:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34819

In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim.

No, Kim, I'm trying to understand what you wrote. That's all I have to
go on. Your philosophy seems to be that people should not rely on
that which is reliable but rather on that which is fixable.

>As usual...

Seems to me that when someone doesn't understand and agree with
your posts, you put the blame on them, rather than consider that
perhaps what you said wasn't clear, or perhaps isn't entirely logical or
based on fact.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5462. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:09:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222080952.16371.00000020@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 34821

In article <3c75c384_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020221101041.21470.00000001@mb-mg.aol.com...
>> In article <3c744fcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency.
>>
>> Including CW/Morse?
>
>Absolutely...if one knows the mode enough to be effective with it.

That's what I'm saying. Glad you recognized that it has usefulness.
>
>> > If I
>> >thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also
>have
>> >FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities.
>>
>> They are getting popular. An injured mountain hiker was rescued last year
>> because his FRS HT was heard 80 miles away by a couple of kids. Love
>> that tropo ducting.
>>
>> > But, the line must be drawn somewhere.
>>
>> Why?
>
>Because how far would one go in seriousness to "be prepared." Do I equip
>myself for each and every emergency that might come up?

Not for every conceivable emergency. For the ones that are most probable and
would be the most damaging, a prudent person becomes prepared.

> Do I buy the means
>to use every mode available to use in ham radio in case of an emergency?

Nope. Just the most common and effective ones. As well as the license and
skills to use them.

I think one of the things that bothers some people about CW/Morse is that
the skill to use it cannot be bought.

>Do
>I become a doctor so that I may be fully prepared for an emergency?

If preparation for a medical emergency is a concern, yes. But as radio
amateurs we're talking about communications emergencies.

>The line is drawn at what one is comfortable giving.

In any volunteer activity, that's all that can be done.

> I don't plan on ever
>sitting or standing around in the Texas heat while what I think is a
>dumb-#$%@ biker wants to race.

Why is the biker "dumb-#$%@" ?

>I would, though, never give my willingness a
>second thought for a true emergency in the heat.

Based on what youdefine as a true emergency. Again, that's all that
can be done in a volunteer activity.
>
>> > 2M, 70cm, and CB are better than nothing.
>>
>> No cell phone?
>
>Yep. But, I would rely last on a cell phone.
>
I don't understand. The cell phone is usually most reliable. It should be the
first thing to try in most cases, unless there is no service or the system is
overloaded.

>>
>> Kim, have you ever actually had a QSO on CW/Morse? Ever originated,
>> received or relayed a formal message by CW/Morse? Just curious.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>One-half QSO, the night I passed my 5wpm test.

What is "one-half QSO"? Started but not finished?

>No, never done any CW
>traffic, never did CW after that night.

I don;t mean to be critical, but that strikes me as kind of like the person
who learns to drive a manual shift car around the parking lot in first gear,
stalls it when trying to shift to second, and simply says "not for me" and
walks away. Of course in a voluntary activity, there's no requirement for
doing any mode.

For the record, I've done QSOs and formal messages by CW/Morse,
voice (SSB, FM, even AM) and RTTY. RTTY in the paper-tape days was
a slightly different animal than, say, PSK31, but lotsa noisy oily smelly fun.
The neat thing about it was that once the system was set up it was almost

completely automatic for the relaying of messages - little or no operator involvement at all. Yet it is little used in amateur emergency comms.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5463. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:18:04 UTC
From: Hamaholic <hamaholic@msn.comm>
Message-ID: <gyrd8.60146$X64.21756244@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 34822

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222073306.22292.00000019@mb-fm.aol.com...

> Just the opposite - ARRL and Phil have been leading the charge to get the
FCC
> to extend the law to cover ham antennas.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The Arrl and Phil Kane, Chris Imlay should concentrate on other Amatuer Antenna Issues first before they tackle CCR's, since these people knowingly agreed to this when they signed on the dotted line. There are many towns with height restrictions of 8' off the ground or building to which it is attached which effectivly precludes effective amatuer communication. How would you like your town to tell you that you cannot erect an antenna higher than 8' on your property and less than 200' away a 150' cell phone tower was erected that you have to see everyday you walk out your front door.

5464. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:40:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222084017.28774.00000164@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 34823

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> Phil wants to validate this law as some kind of right of the government
>to regulate TV reception.

Phil has said that he doesn't CC&Rs that affect amateur antennas at all.

> Yes, the government can over rule a CC&R regarding
>an antenna, but it can not tell the private home owner or apartment dweller
>you can't receive any other type of radio transmission except TV.

Unless you expend more than just bits on a newsgroup, yes, as the law is written, you cannot obtain pre-emption for an antenna that serves more than OTARD purposes.

The government is not telling you what to do in your home, it is just telling you that some of what you do in your home is not pre-empted from the CC&R contract you signed when you bought your property.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5465. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:43:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222084332.28774.00000165@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 34824

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> What you are defending is the intrusion of the government into my home.

>To enforce contracts that YOU freely signed when you bought that home.

Just to be clear, the only role the government will play in any CC&R difficulties he finds himself in over multi-purpose antennas is to provide any aggrieved parties access to the civil court system to address their grievance. They would do the same if his neighbor tripped over his rug.

The enforcment of a wide range of contracts are a civil matter, with long standing in law.

He does have every right to try to get the law changed. He is just advocating a method that I don't believe will be very effective.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5466. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:46:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202220546.770bd4ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34825

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message news:<3C75B2DE.7403F128@uci.edu>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
> > the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
> > all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
> > there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
> > relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
> > rote memorization of terms.
>
> It was evidently not necessary to rote memorize the material in the old
> license manuals. Apparently all you had to do was read the manual,
> since everything was in there. It's really not necessary to rote
> memorize the material in the question pools either, in order to pass. I
> sure couldn't have done that. But to be honest, I really didn't do much
> other than read the question pools and work the problems before I
> passed. I looked up anything I didn't understand so I would understand
> the question, or its answer. Don't you think most people would do the
> same thing, Dick?

I think most people do a mixture of rote memorizing, learning concepts,
developing new skills, and vague word association. The difference is that
having the exact Q&A in front of you makes it much easier to pass by rote
memorizing and vague word association.
>
> Let me ask you a few things. Presuming you were not a radio engineer or
> a physicist at the time, how well did you understand tropospheric
> ducting and ionospheric refraction and absorption when you first got
> your license?

Well, I was 13 and had just entered the 7th grade. I knew tropospheric
ducting could cause VHF/UHF DX, but that was about all. I knew the
ionosphere had layers with the names D, E and F, and that D absorbed,
E and F refracted/reflected, and that F became F1 and F2. I knew the
day/night and 11 year solar sunspot cycle connections, too. I didn't
know lots of detail but I knew the basic concepts and how they played
out on the air.

> Did you fully understand the purpose of the suppressor
> and screen grids in a power pentode when you passed?

From a practical point of view, yes. Not from an electron optics
point of view, though.

> Could you draw a
> picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority
> carriers?

Yup.

> Did you know how to design and implement a plate loading
> network?

You mean an impedance matching network for a transmitter?

> Could you calculate (or even describe) the exact effects of end
> loading for any given dipole antenna installation?

Yup.

> How much did you
> actually know about RTTY?

That it existed, used FSK, and was pretty much limited to those hams who could afford to buy the machines or get them through MARS and other channels. I knew what it sounded like on the air, too.

> Could you have explained how two co-located
> repeaters might occupy the same frequency pair without being keyed-up
> simultaneously?

Nope - repeaters were all but unknown here in '67.

> Could you have explained how to use a SSB satellite
> transponder (if they had existed)?

Maybe.

> How well did you know your great
> circles?

Really well. Had a globe, knew the time zones and all that stuff. SWLing taught me a lot. Used to get into arguments about what time it was elsewhere in the world and which way it was to foreign countries.

>If a neighbor told you that you were getting into their phone
> line, their TV, and their record player, would you have been able to
> eliminate the problems for them?

I would help. But I never had those problems.
>
> If you were well versed is all those topics as a result of studying for
> your exams back then, then I will take your point. If not, then I would
> like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more
> technologically advanced.

You wanna talk about what I knew when I got my Extra?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5467. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:47:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222084740.28774.00000166@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 34826

From: "Hamaholic" hamaholic@msn.comm

>The Arrl and Phil Kane, Chris Imlay should concentrate on other Amatuer
>Antenna Issues first before they tackle CCR's, since these people knowingly
>agreed to this when they signed on the dotted line. There are many towns
>with height restrictions of 8' off the ground or building to which it is
>attached which effectivly precludes effective amatuer communication. How
>would you like your town to tell you that you cannot erect an antenna higher
>than 8' on your property and less than 200' away a 150' cell phone tower was
>erected that you have to see everyday you walk out your front door.

As a national regulatory matter, that has been addressed by the FCC through
PRB-1. Although ARRL would like to see it strengthed, it has been a very
effective tool with local governements who have regulations that unduly
restrict amateur antennas.

See:
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/antenna-restrictions.html

for information and resources.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5468. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 13:52:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222085202.28774.00000167@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 34827

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Why would anyone ever want to learn the wrong answers?

>Why on earth are distractors even included?

Because otherwise the question would contain only the correct answer and most people would score 100%.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5469. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 14:37:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7657BA.F97BB4FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34828

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...
>
> Jim does not do that. If he says it, he believes and means it. I think his
> record here speaks to his sincerity.

Watch out for his tongue-in-cheek stuff, however. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5470. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 14:42:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7658C2.E8739A57@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34829

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So then simply by omitting a boundary, one can invalidate an obviously
> true statement such as "set of times when CW gets through and SSB gets
> through".

No, no, no, using the words, "the set of times", implies that there
is another different set of times somewhere. "CW gets through" doesn't
imply any other set of times - it implies the set of all times.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5471. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 14:43:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C76591C.4E8A6293@IEEE.org>
Source record: 34830

W1RFI wrote:
> An invalid statement is neither true or false -- it is just invalid.

By the rules of formal classical logic, all invalid statements are
false, by definition.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5472. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 14:55:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A033.93118B0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34831

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
> >
> > But Herr Trollmeister, you have yet once again skipped over
> > the point without coming close. Bash made no attempt to cover
> > any material.
>
> The material was the questions and answers, Dick. Of course, he
> covered the material. Get real. Why would anyone have bought the
> books if he didn't cover the material.

Simple - to pass the tests. You make an erroneous assumption that
most applicants want to learn the background material. Wrong.
The objective is to get the license. If it can be done without
learning
the material most will do it that way. Ask Kim. Or better yet, find
her earlier posts on the subject and read them, that way she won't
be able to modify her story.

5473. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:04:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A218.98152D5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34832

Keith wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > See my answer to another post and read Section 1.4000 and the
> > Memorandum Report and Order and the relevent Public Notices and
> > Decisions on OTARD cases. They're available on the web.
>
> I don't think the statement that I can not use my TV antenna for the
> lawful reception of legal transmissions such as shortwave, CB, FM Stereo
> and the use also for transmitting legally will hold up in Phil. What the
> congress and FCC are saying is that you are a criminal if you also
> use that antenna for other purposes. So if John Q. Public hooks up his FM
> Stereo to the antenna he also uses for TV then he is violating the law.
>
> It is my private property and it is legal to listen to NPR or Radio Moscow
> on that antenna. You can have a antenna, but you can't receive 90.3 MHz on
> it is what the government is saying. What gives the Congress the right to
> tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner? It is legal to
> transmit or receive radio transmissions and the antenna simply allows me to
> do so. If I use that antenna for reception of broadcasts on radio
> frequencies the government can't say if you hook up any other type of radio
> broadcast you are violating the law, especially in my private home.
>
> The courts have ruled before that the reception of radio transmissions is a
> free speech issue. They have opened the barn door Phil, stop being an
> apologist for a portion of the law that is ill conceived.
>
> The Congress says, hey you have the right to receive this 88.6 MHz legal
> transmission on that antenna, but you are a criminal for listening to the
> legal transmission on 90.3 MHz.
> Think about this absurd law, Phil! I don't think this portion of the law
> holds any water. The Congress can say you can have an antenna in your
> private home, but they can not tell you how to use it as long as the use is
> legal.

I truly believe you have a good point, though I wouldn't want to guarantee it
would be upheld in any court in our
bought-and-paid-for judicial system. Remember, judges are only
lawyers with political connections. Sometimes those connections
call in chits..... Of course some are too independent to make rulings
that way. Many obviously are not.

5474. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:07:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A301.FEF69B5D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34833

Keith wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> >And the FCC will skin yours (not issue a Declaratory Order of
> > preemption) if you do the above scheme. Their viewpoint is
> > EXCLUSIVE use for broadcast, and no other radio service.
> >
> > Good try, though. Better luck next time.
>
> Sorry Phil. It is my private home and property and if I use the antenna to
> receive broadcasts on 88.6 MHz or Radio Moscow they have NO say in the
> matter. The antenna is legal and I can listen to any radio transmission I
> please

Actually, I believe you have a case that could be won in court here.
Of course the problem would be taking it through the court system to
a point where it could be won. That would cost a LOT of green stuff
and is the biggest reason it probably won't be done.

5475. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:12:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A407.E17EE19F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34834

Keith wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > One principle that I learned was never to go forward with
> > a case when the law is against you and you have no grounds to
> > get the court to change it.
>
> I see so the law is against private property rights and if I use my legal
> antenna to listen to 90.3 MHz I am a criminal. Gee, Phil so much for privacy
> rights in the home.
> The government can overrule CC&R's for the use of antennas at the home for
> reception of radio transmissions, but they can't come along and throw me in
> jail for listening to Radio Moscow on that same antenna.
>

That seems to be a very good point. To say that you may have
a particular antenna for the express purpose ONLY of watching
TV and if you decide to also use it for other purposes you are in
violation would seem to be completely in violation of your
rights to use your own property. Surely somewhere there is a court
that could and would rule in your favor on this basic point. Paying the
bill and finding that court is your problem.

5476. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:16:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A50C.D4ABFC83@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34835

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >CAM wrote:
>
> >> Consider that a person of above intelligence walks into a VE session,
> >passes
> >> his Tech exam, and walks out dumbed down. Then consider how much a person
> >must
> >> get dumbed down by the time he gets to Extra. :-)
> >
> > You've got it bass-ackwards as usual. It was the Extra class that
> >got dumbed down.
>
> Yup, that's what he said you said. :-)

Yep. And it was the dumbed down TEST that did it.

5477. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:17:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C766118.3060307@ieee.org>
Source record: 34836

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>CAM wrote:
>>>Consider that a person of above intelligence walks into a VE session,
>>>passes his Tech exam, and walks out dumbed down. Then consider how much a person
>>>must get dumbed down by the time he gets to Extra. :-)
>>>
>>You've got it bass-ackwards as usual. It was the Extra class that
>>got dumbed down.
>
> Yup, that's what he said you said. :-)

I sure am glad Dick has had a much longer time to get dumbed
down than I have. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5478. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:28:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C7663B7.7080809@ieee.org>
Source record: 34838

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>At 14 years of age in the 8th grade, virtually all of my "learning" was
>>rote memorization. The only thing I had trouble memorizing were those
>>darned schematics. I had absolutely no idea what all those squiggly
>>lines meant.
>
> I suspect you are stretching it a bit here, Cecil. Did you really not know
> that a resistor schematic represented a resistor? I can believe that you may
> not have understood how they all worked together as a circuit, but I do expect
> that you had some understanding of what you were looking at.

I knew what a resistor was and that it obeyed ohm's law but I had
absolutely no idea what a resistor did or why it was placed where
it was in a circuit. It was a very large conceptual leap to realize
why a cathode resistor was really needed in a single supply amplifier.
I didn't learn that until college.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5479. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:29:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A7FB.1EE6A3F7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34837

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >. I remember one older gentleman
> >that came to 10 different sessions before he took home his General
> > and each time he got the encourgement required to keep him
> >coming back.
>
> Do you think you would have remembered him if he had come back 9 times and not
> come back that 10th?

Can't you think up a real question?

People like him are the ones you remember. No whining, just
dedication. I remembered him the first time he returned. I'm sure
I would remember him the 9th.

>
> >But when it came time to
> >go for the Extra, I did indeed have a pretty good knowledge base built.
> >Today, that's not required for Extra. Just
> >read the pools.
>
> Yes, but when you took your Extra, did it grant any extra priveleges other than
> the ability to get a 1X2 call, or was it a vanity accomplishment like it would
> have been in 1964 for me?

I wasn't even interested in the Extra license until Incentive Licensing was
instituted.
I already had all privileges with my Conditional. "Vanity" meant
nothing to me, and for sure it wasn't worth 520 miles of driving roundtrip to the
FCC office and an overnight stay to make sure I
was there by 9am on test day. Add to that the fact that I knew that
since I held a Conditional Genenral license I would be required to
retake everything but Novice. So I would get General, Advanced
and Extra writtens, plus 13 and 20wpm code tests. Which is how it went. I took and
passed -all of them- in a 2 1/2 hour test session.
I did it because I want all frequency privileges back.
Does that anwer your question?

>
>
> And I contend that you could not pass a test that had a question pool the size
> of today's amateur pools on a subject you knew nothing about.

Contend all you want, I've seen it happen repeatedly.

> Are you ready to
> try it with 1000 definitions in Russian to prove me wrong?

With such lame questions you prove yourself silly.

5480. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:30:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77A848.C6092CC7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34839

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!
>
> >Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As always
> >you conveniently "forget" the first half.
>
> When did I ever tell you to go soak your head, Dick?

You're just a little more subtle than I.

5481. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:36:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C766584.50903@ieee.org>
Source record: 34840

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>However, we can all learn something from the rules of logic so that
>>our *technical* statements can be valid instead of virtually meaningless.
>
> I think that even you manage to take meaning from context, Cecil, otherwise you
> could never understand anything. Otherwise one could never make most
> statements about cars without being "invalid," or more complex than we find in
> normal conversation. "Cars have wheels" cannot be said under the rules you
> have set up because there is a car in my yard up on blocks, making the
> statement "invalid." If rules of logic are enforced to the point of absurdity,
> then discourse comes to an end.

"Cars have wheels" is not likely to be misunderstood. "CW gets through
when SSB doesn't" is more likely to be misunderstood. What is wrong with
adding a simple five-letter word to make the statement accurate?

CW gets through when SSB gets through.
CW gets through when SSB doesn't get through.
SSB *ALWAYS* either gets through or doesn't get through.
Therefore: CW *ALWAYS* gets through.

I want new hams to use CW but I don't want them to think CW has
supernatural powers. What is wrong with the statement:
"CW often gets through when SSB doesn't get through."?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5482. Re: Will i lose my novice hf privliges?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:41:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202220741.30caa73d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34841

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<196d8.1637$eI1.439551@monger.newsread.com>...
> I have suggested in certain circles, that maybe as a "happy medium" is to
> release the Questions only, not the four multiple guesses....

Nice idea, but how would it work in practice unless the FCC took over testing
again?

The way it has worked since 1983 or so is that volunteer amateurs write the
actual Q&A, and submit them to the FCC for approval. Volunteer examiners
make up the tests and grade them. The whole thing is publicly accessible
and wide open, which also makes errors in the system stick out and be
corrected.

How would you maintain the secrecy yet still permit the VE system to work?
What would prevent some "Son Of Bash" from adding the answers?

And the entire Q&A pool would have to be completely re-done because the
existing pool is already known.

Seems to me the only practical thing is for the FCC to take over testing. And
I'm all for that. But the only way to get them to do it is to convince the FCC
that the VE system is not working. Simply showing that today's tests are much
easier to pass isn't enough - the FCC can simply say "So? What's the problem
with easy tests? The major enforcement problems in the ARS are operating
issues, not technical or ones".

In the restructuring the FCC reduced the number of written tests and the
overall amount of testing needed for any amateur license. That says it all.

> A person
> would still need to do the research, but would get an idea of what they are
> going to be tested on.

Only until somebody wrote answers to the questions.
>
> I obtained the question pools and made my own flashcards after many reads of
> the instruction manuals. I wrote the actual test pool question on one side,
> and the correct answer according to the book or other research on the other
> side. Some of the questions were really easy to complete the answer without
> research, and other questions I had to do more research. When I was not in
> an area where keeping a book was conducive, I kept a stack of the cards with
> me and kept on pounding the information into my head. When I reached a
> point where I knew around 90 percent of the cards, I went an took the tests.
> Perfect score on the tech, missed two on the general, and missed the extra
> by one.

Interesting study method!

> Overall, I believe the suggestion in the first paragraph may be one of many
> possible solutions.

If it were only practical.
>
> > could not "memorize the test". You had to know the answer. Note, that
> > even using the question pool as a study guide, the answers were
> rearranged.

Common sense dictates that one only study the correct answers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5483. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:42:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C7666D4.4010903@ieee.org>
Source record: 34842

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>>So then simply by omitting a boundary, one can invalidate an obviously
>>true statement such as "set of times when CW gets through and SSB gets
>>through". That's a useful tool.
>
> I am sure it will be the next time Cecil omits a boundary. :-)

The words, "set of times", in the above segment *IS* stating
the boundary conditions because it implies a set of times when
CW doesn't get through. Nothing wrong with the above segment.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5484. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 15:51:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C77AD2F.78D983B9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 34843

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Of course that is wrong,
> >and indeed goes to the heart of exact Q&A pools-they make it
> >possibled for applicants to pass exams with insufficient knowledge
> >regarding the material via rote memorization of exact answers to
> >exact questions without learning. But you and the rest of us already
> >knew that.

>
> Actually, Dick, I don't think the "rest of us" know that, so please don't
> presume to speak for the entire world.

You're right, Ed. Only VE's who have seen it up close and personal
would know. Sorry, I won't again accuse you having knowledge you don't have.

>
> Although some idiot savante may be able to memorize the answers to over 1000
> questions without understanding the underlying material, for most people, that
> would be the hard way. It is easier to memorize a single formula and apply
> 6th-grade math than to try to word associate answers to formulae-based
> questions, wouldn't you say?

Memorizing a single formula will get the answers to 1,000
questions? Gee, I had no idea...

>
> I know that you think that ham radio should be work instead of fun, so that may
> explain why you are trying to convince people to memorize the pools.

So it's very easy for you to sit there and discount the experiences of
others on the basis that you haven't had the experience yourself, of seeing the
evidence. And BEING TOLD THAT WAS WHAT WAS DONE. When one of the "memorizers" on
this NG states in no
uncertain terms that SHE had done exactly that, and
learned nothing from the process, you totally overlook it. We see
where you're coming from.
Meanwhile I get accused of trying to
convince people to do what they have been doing all along, and what I finally came
to realize, as a VE, they were doing.

You're quite a perceptive fellow, Ed. You perceive exactly
what you want to perceive.

5485. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 16:00:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C766B18.9090801@ieee.org>
Source record: 34845

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>>The material was the questions and answers, Dick. Of course, he
>>covered the material. Get real. Why would anyone have bought the
>>books if he didn't cover the material.
>
> Simple - to pass the tests. You make an erroneous assumption that
> most applicants want to learn the background material. Wrong.
> The objective is to get the license.

Of course, the objective is to get the license and that has always
been the case. When I got my Conditional in 1952, the objective was
to get the license because my Novice license had expired. The most
efficient way to achieve the license objective is to learn the
minimum necessary to pass the exam. I cut it too close and flunked
my first Conditional exam. I studied a little more and passed it
30 days later. I recognized then as I do now that most of the worth
of an amateur license is in the privileges granted. If I had waited
until I understood the material, I would have had to wait for another
six or seven years. I rote-memorized my way to a ham license in 1951
and 1952. I understood the material when I later passed the Advanced
and Extra exams.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5486. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 16:01:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 34844

Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >> > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> >> > assumed based on experience.
> >>
> >> While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
> >
> >I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
> >is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.
>
> "Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
> with ANY radio?!?
>
> Incredulosity abounds...

Joshua probably doesn't have a handle on your decades of experience,
Len. This will provide yet another opportunity for you to blow the dust
off your resume and to outline your amazing exploits. We mere radio
amateurs are sure to be spellbound by your tales.

In case Joshua hasn't been clued in, you are not yet a newcomer to
amateur radio though you hope to be one day. You may become more
motivated as you compile one of your frequent restatements of the
obvious while wearing your spiffy new ARRL tee shirt. Let me know if Ed
doesn't come through for you and I'll be happy to buy you one myself.

Dave K8MN

5487. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 16:07:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C766CCE.4010209@ieee.org>
Source record: 34846

Dick Carroll wrote:

> I did it because I want all frequency privileges back.
> Does that anwer your question?

I didn't do it because getting all frequency privileges
back wasn't worth the effort to me. Why would a ham who
wasn't even on HF at the time care about having an Extra
license?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5488. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 16:15:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C766EB2.6090601@ieee.org>
Source record: 34847

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Meanwhile I get accused of trying to
> convince people to do what they have been doing all along, and what I finally came
> to realize, as a VE, they were doing.

Nope, Dick, you have it backwards, as usual. Human nature has not
changed. People will tend to learn the absolute minimum to pass
the exam. That has been true ever since there have been amateur
license exams. You are accused of trying to convince people not
to do what they have been doing all along and it is a losing
battle. Nobody is going to choose to do more work than is necessary
to achieve the goal.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5489. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 16:24:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202220824.391dcf6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 34848

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3c75c4a1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020221101042.21470.00000002@mb-mg.aol.com...
> > In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > > I do (my
> > >Saturn and this truck are the only two automatics I have had since
> > >driving--started in a SAAB, then Yugo, , then Subaru GLF, then VW Golf,
> now
> > >these two recent vehicles).
> >
> > What truck?
>
> My new truck.

Ah, the Tacoma you wrote about in another post.
>
> > >An appropriate analogy, though, for the
> > >stickshift would be that I can drive it, but why would I want to beat
> myself
> > >up with one?
> >
> > Shifting one of those cars is "beating yourself up"?
>
> It is in this traffic around here.

Thought you lived out in the "boonies".

> > >(I had to get out of stickshifts because of my back).
> >
> > Then you can't drive one, so now I'm not supposed to operate CW.

> I don't know, Jim. Are you really going to base whether you can do
> something or not, on what someone else does?

You do it all the time. For example, consider the following:

"I didn't buy it for it's reliability, however, I bought it for
its looks. The truck that appeals to me most as eye candy is the
Toyota Tacoma. So, I bought it."

Of course you don't see how the truck looks on the outside while
driving it - only other people do. So choosing a vehicle by how it
looks is really an

exercise in wanting to project a certain image to other people, and
hopefully get a desired reaction. So your choice of vehicle was
largely
driven by what others do (reaction to its appearance).

> Yes, I can still drive a
> standard...if I want to run around with a painful back all the time.

Must be some sort of serious problem if shifting and clutching a
Saturn
or similar car causes constant pain. Sorry to hear that.

> > > That is
> > >to auto driving as CW is to radio: why would I want to beat myself and
> > >others up with using CW when I can do lots of other things that may work
> > >just as well?
> >
> > "Beat yourself up"? Good heavens.
> >
> > Besides, other things don't work "just as well". That's the point.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Back to radio. CW only works "just as well," Jim, if one is skillful or at
> least somewhat knowledgeable of its use and can intelligently use the mode.

The same is true of any mode. The point is that CW/Morse works better
than
many other modes (mostly voice modes), given equivalent levels of
skill in
the operators.

> I don't do either, and don't wish to.

The discussion was about choosing reliable vs. unreliable things. It
seemed that you were pushing the idea of choosing less relaible over
more reliable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5490. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 18:50:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76930A.9C070C49@uci.edu>
Source record: 35008

Keith wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> >What won't hold up in court? Your claim that you can't be legally
> >prevented from using a TVRO antenna to transmit based on PRB-1 and the
> >TVRO law? I think we'd all appreciate it greatly if you could actually
> >make that happen. Get off the dime and cut the drivel.

> No, what the congress is saying that I can't use that antenna to receive
> transmissions on 90.3 MHz. What I listen to with that antenna is not the
> governments business. They only have the right to say CC&R's can not prevent
> antennas to for the reception of radio signals and they can set up
> regulations for the placement or size of that antenna, but they can't say if
> you listen to FM Stereo on that antenna it is illegal. Think about privacy
> rights for God's sake!
> Let's pretend that Joe Smith uses his TV antenna for FM Stereo also, the
> association finds out and goes to court. What will the judge rule? Think
> about it! You are not a criminal for listening to NPR on your antenna in
> your home. This thinking and portion of the law is absurd and can not be
> supported by the law.
> The Congress can allow antennas in CC&R neighborhoods for the reception of
> radio transmissions, but they can not say if you listen to Radio Moscow on
> it you are a criminal.

You HAD been talking about using the antenna for ham radio. Now you're
talking about listening to radio broadcasts. Broadcast reception is
what the legislation provides for, so that really isn't even an issue.
But I do understand why you've switched topics.

5491. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:02:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202221857240.21507-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 34849

On 22 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those INVOLUNTARILY
>>entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
>>inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).
>
>I am not an attorney, so I don't know how the fine points of state law may
>apply in each of the 50 states, but I believe your premise to be flawed. The
>person giving up the inheritance may do so involuntarily, but I don't believe
>one can inherit real property without agreeing to do so. If so, do you thini
>the law would force you to involuntarily inherit a polluted property with less
>value than the cost to clean it up?
>
>Ditto with tax sales and foreclosures. The person obtaining the property does
>so voluntarily.

But a "person" obtaining a foreclosure usually does so by buying the property from the bank which foreclosed at auction. The bank isn't subject to the CC&R's. One of the properties in my tract was foreclosed on (30 years ago), and the people who bought it told me that during escrow, they were informed that the CC&R's that originally existed had been voided by the foreclosure. I have these details because their son is a licensed amateur and one of my friends. (The CC&R's themselves did not have a provision regarding foreclosure - their voiding was an operation of state law due to the foreclosure).

>Nice try, but if it was that easy, do you think that everyone would be making
>all this fuss?

Many people don't buy previously foreclosed properties nor acquire them via tax sales.

5492. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:04:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C769622.5D2408D@uci.edu>
Source record: 35010

Keith wrote:
> I said if the Congress passed a law
> supporting ham radio antennas in CC&R neighborhoods, they could not say you
> can't listen to Radio Moscow or watch TV on it.

No you didn't. I included a quote of what you did say, but I notice you deleted it. You said "The FCC and congress passed a law saying CC&R's can not ban ham radio antennas, but if hams use the antenna for SWL or TV
then the FCC and law doesn't allow it."

> They can't pass a law to allow antennas for the reception of radio
> transmissions and say the use for listening to 90.3 MHz is illegal.

I think you're right, but what does that have to do amateur radio antennas?

5493. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:06:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxv4f0.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 34850

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 22:15:38 -0800, Keith wrote:

>> See my answer to another post and read Section 1.4000 and the
>> Memorandum Report and Order and the relevent Public Notices and
>> Decisions on OTARD cases. They're available on the web.
>
> I don't think the statement that I can not use my TV antenna for the
>lawful reception of legal transmissions such as shortwave, CB, FM Stereo
>and the use also for transmitting legally will hold up in Phil. What the
>congress and FCC are saying is that you are a criminal if you also
>use that antenna for other purposes. So if John Q. Public hooks up his FM
>Stereo to the antenna he also uses for TV then he is violating the law.

Using your "installed" TV antenna to receive or transmit in other
services is not against the law and the government is not saying
that you can't do it.

The issue is whether the FCC will pre-empt the CC&R provisions and
keep the Association from banning the antenna installation or not.
There is no criminal component in any of that.

Until and unless the legislation gives the FCC the clear direction
and authority to pre-empt the terms of a CC&R provision, courts are
not going to order the FCC to do so. _Shelley v Kraemer_ this one
isn't.

> It is my private property and it is legal to listen to NPR or Radio Moscow
>on that antenna. You can have a antenna, but you can't receive 90.3 MHz on
>it is what the government is saying.

What the "government" is saying is that if you do so you are on
your own with regard to wrestling with the Association and its rules.

Are you not understanding the process, or are you playing the
complete fool?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5494. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:06:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxw1p1.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35001

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 22:46:05 -0800, Keith wrote:

> You can scream the history of the law and all kinds of neat things, but it
>is my private property and I can do as I please with it.

You sure can, but you will be on your own when 'rassling with the
Association and its rules. You won't have a piece of paper from the
FCC telling the Association to "cease and desist" nor will you have
the ammunition that you will need if you were to bring suit to force
the Association to let you do that.

In the 70s there was a cartoon that said "Is it OK to wear jeans in
school? Yes, it's OK to wear jeans in school. It's just not OK to
wear jeans in THIS school."

Same same.

> Come and get us FCC & FBI I want to blow this portion of the law out of the
>water. Of course, The ARRL will sit around defending this law with Phil
>leading the charge.

Are you blind or just dense? As a lawyer I can read, research and
interpret what the law says with skill and authority, but all the
screaming and posturing in the world is not going to make it say what
it doesn't say.

I am passionately in favor of complete pre-emption with regard to
all antennas of any type and use. but this law doesn't provide it,
and the FCC was very clear recently about their refusal to exert
such pre-emption absent clear directions from The Congress.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5495. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:06:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxwev2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35002

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 05:08:56 -0800, Keith wrote:

>>Until one neighbor does the research and choses to initiate action.
>
> The antennas have been up for 10 years and the most any violation of a
>civil contract can be enforced is two years at most in the states.

Every day that the antenna is up starts the clock again. It's called
a continuing non-conformance.

>There was
>an article about this in QST quite a few years ago. If the neighborhood
>association does not enforce the CC&R within a certain time frame then it is
>too late. Others can now do the same with their properties.

No they can not. The Defense of Laches (failure of the Association
to act) applies only to the non-conformer. It does not confer the
same rights on others. Basic California civil law.

What California law school did you graduate from?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5496. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:06:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxwl23.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35003

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 05:48:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those INVOLUNTARILY
>entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
>inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).

Those safe harbors went away in California quite a while ago,
obligating the devisee or purchaser to do due diligence.

More full employment act for us lawyers..... <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5497. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:07:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxxvb4.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35004

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 13:18:04 GMT, Hamaholic wrote:

>would you like your town to tell you that you cannot erect an antenna higher
>than 8' on your property and less than 200' away a 150' cell phone tower was
>erected that you have to see everyday you walk out your front door.

Another misconception. The 8 or 12 foot limit is that which requires
no permits of any type - just go ahead and do it. If it falls
down, it's your roof that will be damaged.

Higher than that, the municipality can require a building
and/or use permit (some do and some don't) and the terms and
procedures for thise permits must afford a reasonable
accommodation per PRB-1 and/or state law. If they deny you a
permit they have to tell you why and offer the opportunity for
a hearing or appeal. This is known as "procedural due process".

Hey, be glad that there is a cellphone tower there - most local
municipalities are far more restrictive of them than they are
of ham towers. I've gone to battle on behalf of cell phone and
broadcast tower clients, too, and you should see the opposition
that comes out of the woordwork on those cases.

Offer to have your structural engineer and contractor design and
build your ham tower to the same engineering standards and to
carry the same liability insurance as the cellphone tower and
you'll get your permit.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5498. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:07:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grxzdp6.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35005

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 06:39:00 -0800, Keith wrote:

>We are just
>modern day civil law violators and what do we have to lose?

Have you ever been INSIDE a jail cell?

It's not the kind of place I would want to spend my days off in,
and they don't "reasonably accommodate" ham radio. <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5499. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:09:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222140943.21422.00000001@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35007

In article <3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've ever
>paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
>seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...

Well, I've been on 33 Field Days, and I can tell ya that OFTEN, when the
SSB stations are having a tough time of making any contacts at all due to
poor conditions the CW stations are cranking them out one after the other -
on the same band. And the CW stations are often doing it with inferior
antennas and less power than the 'phone stations.

And it's not just a signal-strength question. Sometimes the distortion on
HF is so bad that SSB is unintelligible but CW is copyable.

Just my experience on the ham bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5500. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:09:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222140945.21422.00000002@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35006

In article <20020221202132.26690.00000077@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
>>condition.
>>So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>
>Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered are
>too
>lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will help
>them see that clothes washing is a good thing.

I don't think so, Ed. What brought on that outburst? You ever see me call anyone "lazy"?

All I wanna do is sell the extra washer. Space is at a premium here, compared to the old place on RadioTelegraph Hill.

Around here, laundry on the line on a nice day is a common thing. But I'm not selling the dryer - it's a Maytag, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5501. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:15:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7698ED.20F3198C@uci.edu>
Source record: 35011

Keith wrote:

> The law says what I can do the privacy in my home with an antenna that the
> government has preempted from the CC&R regulations.

Not really. It just allows people to sign agreements with an
association who makes rules which do that.

> To say it is illegal to
> use an antenna for any other purpose is not correct.

You may not like it, but it is the truth. Nobody can force you to agree
to sign an agreement which binds you to these things you know, Keith.

Do you even LIVE in an association? I'm guessing not. You don't seem
to know much about them.

5502. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:23:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <dVwd8.20076$BR3.1158330@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35009

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222140945.21422.00000002@mb-mr.aol.com...
>
> Around here, laundry on the line on a nice day is a common thing. But
I'm
> not selling the dryer - it's a Maytag, too.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Made over in Newton IA, the county seat of Jasper County. Of no giant significance except that Newton and Jasper have a way of being neighbors as in Missouri (Dick) or the seat of a county named the other in several states.

Who in hell was Jasper Q Newton or Newton Z Jasper???

5503. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:43:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C769F74.1F1EEDB1@uci.edu>
Source record: 35013

N2EY wrote:
> The difference is that
> having the exact Q&A in front of you makes it much easier to pass by rote
> memorizing and vague word association.

I assume you're speaking for yourself, Jim. I certainly don't find rote memorization to be easier. That's what I had to do for my first code test. I sweated bullets for that one. By the way, did you study from question pools back when you took your exams, Jim? If not, I hope you won't mind my asking why I should consider you to be an authority on that subject.

> Well, I was 13 and had just entered the 7th grade. I knew tropospheric
> ducting could cause VHF/UHF DX, but that was about all.

Well, I was 35, and studying for my Technician license when I found out about it.

> I knew the
> ionosphere had layers with the names D, E and F, and that D absorbed,
> E and F refracted/reflected, and that F became F1 and F2. I knew the
> day/night and 11 year solar sunspot cycle connections, too.

Me too!! I read about them in the question pool.

> I didn't
> know lots of detail but I knew the basic concepts and how they played
> out on the air.

Roger that. I listened to guys talking about all that stuff for hours on end on my first ham radio.

> > Did you fully understand the purpose of the suppressor
> > and screen grids in a power pentode when you passed?

> From a practical point of view, yes. Not from an electron optics
> point of view, though.

Define the practical purpose of suppressor and screen grids from a non-electron optics point of view - from your perspective when you were first licensed.

> > Could you draw a
> > picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority
> > carriers?

> Yup.

And you learned that from the ARRL handbook? When were you licensed
again?

> > Did you know how to design and implement a plate loading
> > network?

> You mean an impedance matching network for a transmitter?

Would you mind explaining the difference to me?

> > Could you calculate (or even describe) the exact effects of end
> > loading for any given dipole antenna installation?

> Yup.

As a novice? Remind me again who these questions were addressed to. I
don't think I would have posed them to you, Jim. ;-)

> > How much did you
> > actually know about RTTY?

> That it existed, used FSK, and was pretty much limited to those hams who
> could afford to buy the machines or get them through MARS and other
> channels. I knew what it sounded like on the air, too.

That's about the extent of the coverage in the current question pool as
well.
You still have to know those things for the test, except for how it
sounds on the air. But I don't find that explained in my handbook.
Wonder if you did.

> > Could you have explained how two co-located
> > repeaters might occupy the same frequency pair without being keyed-up
> > simultaneously?

> Nope - repeaters were all but unknown here in '67.

Pretty common knowlege among new licensees today.

> > Could you have explained how to use a SSB satellite
> > transponder (if they had existed)?

> Maybe.

It was a yes or no question. I have to mark you off for that one. ;-)

> > How well did you know your great
> > circles?

> Really well. Had a globe, knew the time zones and all that stuff. SWLing
> taught me a lot. Used to get into arguments about what time it was
> elsewhere in the world and which way it was to foreign countries.

And were most of the other new hams you knew equally conversant on the
subject?

> >If a neighbor told you that you were getting into their phone
> > line, their TV, and their record player, would you have been able to
> > eliminate the problems for them?

> I would help. But I never had those problems.

Yes, or no? You don't seem to be getting the point here.

> > If you were well versed is all those topics as a result of studying for
> > your exams back then, then I will take your point. If not, then I would
> > like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more
> > technologically advanced.

> You wanna talk about what I knew when I got my Extra?

I gather you do.

73, AC6XG

5504. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:52:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76A194.9017FA7F@uci.edu>
Source record: 35014

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > So then simply by omitting a boundary, one can invalidate an obviously
> > true statement such as "set of times when CW gets through and SSB gets
> > through".
>
> No, no, no, using the words, "the set of times", implies that there
> is another different set of times somewhere.

Now you're directly disputing what you said before. "Then any statement that omits boundaries is invalid." I simply applied your rule, Cecil. I hate to say it OM, but you sound a little like you don't know what you're talking about.

> "CW gets through" doesn't
> imply any other set of times - it implies the set of all times.

This is the statement you said was invalidated by omitting it's boundaries:
"set of times when CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through".

This is the statement you now say is not invalidated by omitting it's boundaries: "set of times when SSB gets through and CW gets through".

I'm going to go out on a limb here and claim that you appear to be applying your logical rules arbitrarily.

5505. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:53:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76A1D6.11B85094@uci.edu>
Source record: 35015

CAM wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > An invalid statement is neither true or false -- it is just invalid.
>
> By the rules of formal classical logic, all invalid statements are
> false, by definition.

So if it's a true statement, then it must be by definition, not invalid.

5506. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 19:58:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76A300.B9CBB357@uci.edu>
Source record: 35017

CAM wrote:
> "Cars have wheels" is not likely to be misunderstood. "CW gets through
> when SSB doesn't" is more likely to be misunderstood. What is wrong with
> adding a simple five-letter word to make the statement accurate?

Nothing at all. I think where the dispute arises are your claims about
false and invalid statements. Just speculating, of course.

> I want new hams to use CW but I don't want them to think CW has
> supernatural powers. What is wrong with the statement:
> "CW often gets through when SSB doesn't get through."?

It's certainly less misleading to people than when you imply that CW
DOESN'T get through when SSB gets through.

> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

I still like W6RCA.

5507. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 20:02:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76A3C2.41CFA0C3@uci.edu>
Source record: 35016

CAM wrote:
> Why would a ham who
> wasn't even on HF at the time care about having an Extra
> license?

Are you asking why YOU would care about having an Extra license? Or are
you asking why anyone else might care about having an Extra license?

5508. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 20:02:43 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202221959070.21730-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35012

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 05:48:58 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those INVOLUNTARILY
>>entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
>>inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).
>
> Those safe harbors went away in California quite a while ago,
> obligating the devisee or purchaser to do due diligence.
>
> More full employment act for us lawyers..... <ggg>

Maybe so. Makes me feel glad that I'm in a tract where the CC&R's are 50 years old. There was even an anti-"African-American" clause in it, which went poof in 1964 with a certain change in federal law (that has never been amended out).

This just goes to show you: One has to simply pick the correct tract!

5509. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:08:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76B339.E11F9014@uci.edu>
Source record: 35023

CAM wrote:
> Jim, a statement that includes "the set of" is supplying the boundaries.
> Why is that so difficult to understand?

Cecil, both statements, yours and mine, included "the set of" as their
boundaries. Why is that so hard for you to see?

> >>"CW gets through" doesn't
> >>imply any other set of times - it implies the set of all times.
> >
> > This is the statement you said was invalidated by omitting it's
> > boundaries: "set of times when CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through".

> Nope, I didn't. I have not said any statement that includes the
> words, "the set of", is invalid. Those words make it valid, Jim.

Check the quotes, the attributions, and back up in the thread if you
need to. Evidently you need to. You're incorrect, sir.

> > This is the statement you now say is not invalidated by omitting it's
> > boundaries: "set of times when SSB gets through and CW gets
> > through".

> Because the boundaries are ***NOT*** omitted. You are saying something
> that is not true.

Please try to follow along, Cecil. You've apparently got too many
threads running. I'm already tired of requoting for you what has been
said.

> > I'm going to go out on a limb here and claim that you appear to be
> > applying your logical rules arbitrarily.

> You appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.

Nope. Ur the one who claims to be the chain jerker around here. I'm
just trying to make sure you do it correctly.

5510. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:11:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76B406.3DD8D636@uci.edu>
Source record: 35024

CAM wrote:
> >>By the rules of formal classical logic, all invalid statements are
> >>false, by definition.
> >
> > So if it's a true statement, then it must be by definition, not invalid.

> Please look up "truth" and "validity" in a logic text, Jim

Why? Would I find out that a true statement is invalid rather than not
invalid?

> I don't have time to quote the whole text.

I don't care what you have time for, to be honest. But thanks for
sharing.

5511. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:11:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C76B41C.2090801@ieee.org>
Source record: 35018

Jim Kelley wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>>No, no, no, using the words, "the set of times", implies that there
>>is another different set of times somewhere.
>
> Now you're directly disputing what you said before. "Then any statement
> that omits boundaries is invalid." I simply applied your rule, Cecil.
> I hate to say it OM, but you sound a little like you don't know what
> you're talking about.

Jim, a statement that includes "the set of" is supplying the boundaries.
Why is that so difficult to understand? "The set of" includes everything
within the boundary that defines the set.

>>"CW gets through" doesn't
>>imply any other set of times - it implies the set of all times.
>
> This is the statement you said was invalidated by omitting it's
> boundaries: "set of times when CW gets through and SSB doesn't get through".

Nope, I didn't. I have not said any statement that includes the
words, "the set of", is invalid. Those words make it valid, Jim.

> This is the statement you now say is not invalidated by omitting it's
> boundaries: "set of times when SSB gets through and CW gets
> through".

Because the boundaries are ***NOT*** omitted. You are saying something
that is not true.

> I'm going to go out on a limb here and claim that you appear to be
> applying your logical rules arbitrarily.

You appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5512. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:14:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C76B4B4.5080704@ieee.org>
Source record: 35019

Jim Kelley wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>
>>W1RFI wrote:
>>>An invalid statement is neither true or false -- it is just invalid.
>>>
>>By the rules of formal classical logic, all invalid statements are
>>false, by definition.
>
> So if it's a true statement, then it must be by definition, not invalid.

Please look up "truth" and "validity" in a logic text, Jim
I don't have time to quote the whole text.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5513. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:17:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C76B55D.7050806@ieee.org>
Source record: 35020

Jim Kelley wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>>I want new hams to use CW but I don't want them to think CW has
>>supernatural powers. What is wrong with the statement:
>>"CW often gets through when SSB doesn't get through."?
>
> It's certainly less misleading to people than when you imply that CW
> DOESN'T get through when SSB gets through.

I have never implied that SSB gets through when CW doesn't, Jim.
That state has been a null set in everything I've presented.

> I still like W6RCA.

You can have it in a couple of years.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5514. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:20:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C76B616.3090304@ieee.org>
Source record: 35021

Jim Kelley wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>>Why would a ham who
>>wasn't even on HF at the time care about having an Extra
>>license?
>
> Are you asking why YOU would care about having an Extra license? Or are
> you asking why anyone else might care about having an Extra license?

Why would any ham who is inactive on HF want to upgrade from Advanced
in 1975? Dick keeps ragging on me for not upgrading at a time when
I was only active on 2m.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5515. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:22:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76B687.47D39A35@uci.edu>
Source record: 35025

CAM wrote:
> I have never implied that SSB gets through when CW doesn't, Jim.

Saying that "CW gets through when SSB doesn't" is a false statement
implies that when SSB doesn't get through, CW doesn't either. That's
the misleading thing you're saying.

> > I still like W6RCA.

> You can have it in a couple of years.

I meant to say it looks better on you.

5516. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:24:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76B6F6.A564A819@uci.edu>
Source record: 35027

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > CAM wrote:
> >>Why would a ham who
> >>wasn't even on HF at the time care about having an Extra
> >>license?
> >
> > Are you asking why YOU would care about having an Extra license? Or are
> > you asking why anyone else might care about having an Extra license?

> Why would any ham who is inactive on HF want to upgrade from Advanced
> in 1975?

Well, there's got to be a reason. People do it all the time - even if
they get on the air on any bands.

> Dick keeps ragging on me for not upgrading at a time when
> I was only active on 2m.

I wish he wouldn't.

> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5517. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:36:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76B9C8.F3AA5E09@psu.edu>
Source record: 35022

Thanks a lot, Ed and Jim! I'm going to digest this a bit, and post
back. Sorry, I've been away from the computer for a couple days.

- Mike -

N2EY wrote:

> And for passing the Novice you got a license that was good for one or
> two years <snip>

5518. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 21:56:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202221356.60e2258a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35026

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C77A407.E17EE19F@worldnet.att.net>...

> To say that you may have
> a particular antenna for the express purpose ONLY of watching
> TV and if you decide to also use it for other purposes you are in
> violation would seem to be completely in violation of your
> rights to use your own property.

Seems that way, but that's how it works. I don't like it, but I
understand how it works.

What's really going on is that by buying a no-antennas-CC&R house, the
owner has agreed to have no outside antennas of any kind, for any purpose
whatsoever.

Then the FCC preempts (overrides) the no-antenna-CC&R for a single, very
specific type of antenna, to be used for a specific purpose: TV reception.
And for no other purpose. FCC only did it because The Congress told them to.

Here's an analogy: Suppose a ham helps other hams fix their rigs. Suppose
this ham lives in a "no businesses in the residence" CC&R house. (Very
common, btw). He/she can fix anything as long as it's for free, or the cost
of parts, but when he/she starts charging for the repair it becomes a
business. The tools and test gear can be used for ham radio but not for a
basement business. Because by buying the restricted house, the owner agreed
not to do so in a legal contract called a deed restriction or covenant.

> Surely somewhere there is a court
> that could and would rule in your favor on this basic point. Paying the
> bill and finding that court is your problem.

Would that it were that easy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5519. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:06:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222170601.03941.00000043@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 35029

In article <Frld8.7513$ZC3.600032@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
a UFO (Unidentified Freaking Object) wrote some snarly text:

>> Has N2EY ever relayed-transmitted a teleprinter message
>> over radio, any radio? I've relayed-transmitted about 1.32
>> million of them on HF between 1953-1955..
>>
>> >Just curious.
>
>Now note, using Cecilian logic, Len states HE relayed-transmitted....(cars
>are black, etc)
>
>Let's do some math
>
>If over 2 years.........
>
>That comes to 660,000 per year

Wrong.

History: US Army press release in 1956 had stated some facts
of Army communications which included 1.25 million messages
PER MONTH relayed by Washington Army Radio in 1955 and
included ADA in Tokyo in the listing as "third" in Army message
traffic at 220,000 per month. Either AGA in San Francisco or
AHA in Honolulu was second (irrelevant as to discussion, there
were no "DX Contests" in military message traffic related to
military traffic).

I was at ADA 1953 to 1956, first 25 months at transmitters with a
one month pause for a new microwave equipment course, the
remainder as microwave radio relay operations and maintenance
supervisor at both ADA transmitters and Control Center at Chuo
Kogyo (outside of Camp Drake, NW of Tokyo outskirts). Between
January 1953 and mid-1955, ADA had 36 transmitters on HF
ranging from 1 KW to 15 KW, FSK TTY (single or time-multiplexed
circuits), AFSK TTY on "commercial" SSB (12 KHz BW, four
voice channels, two voice channels with AFSK TTY via frequency-
multiplexed "carrier" for 6 to 12 circuits per SSB transmitter).
The Chuo Kogyo Control Center had approximately 220 TTY p-tape
transmitter-receiver machines in the manual p-tape message
relay section taking one whole floor of a converted warehouse.
ADA served the Far East Command Headquarters and Far East
Army Command Headquarters then located in and around Tokyo.

ADA message traffic was slowing down by the mid-1950s with
the Korean War entering a so-called Truce state in July 1953.
While I have no referencible documents for message traffic at
ADA prior to 1955, this was probably closer to 250,000 messages
per month evidenced by the temporary 12-hour work shifts in 1954
and the amount of finished p-tape in the two-story tall burn hopper
at Chuo Kogyo.

Figuring just 220 K messages per month over 24 months, that
would be 5280 K total. Discounting the temporary 12-hour shift
period and assuming the normal 8-hour shift (ADA was a 24-hour
operation), that would be 1760 K average message rate per
shift over the 2-year period. ADA transmitters had 4 operating
and maintenance teams on a 12-day cycle, three days per
shift (day, swing, midnight) with three days off. That comes
out to 75% of the per-shift for each team in that 2-year period or
1320 thousand messages.

The math is correct. The math is also extremely conservative
since it does not include the higher rate prior to 1955 nor the
temporary 12-hour shift period of 1954.

NONE OF THE ADA RADIO CIRCUITS USED OOK CW.

None of the US military fixed-point to fixed-point HF radio
circuits were planned to use OOK CW from 1948 onwards.
That was long before satellites, before troposcatter, before
the transistor and IC era. The communications modes on HF
were, in order of max-min use: TTY, Voice, Facsimile. TTY
carried the maximum message traffic in all branches. The
USAF was the largest user of Facsimile for weather imagery
at the time but even USAF (a new service branch then) relied
on TTY as the main message handling mode.

Washington Army Radio TTY relay center used semi-automatic
reader-router switching that was a precursor of AUTODIN, the
"hidden" (inaccessible) automatic digital-teleprinter data network
of the military. WAR carried more landline circuits than other
Army communications facilities so it becomes difficult to
separate radio from landline traffic directly in the general DC area.

EXACT determination of "message handling" is not readily
possible in terms that the average troll or average radio amateur
can understand. Military messages originate at some unit
command and are directed to another unit command but are
handled by signal personnel at signal centers (exact names of
these centers vary with service branches) which may be part
of radio communications centers or work in conjunction with
such radio units. Military communications methodology and
technology has evolved since the 1950s but DATA modes
(which include teleprinter) are still the mainstay of messaging
in the US military.

>Assuming that Col Len is a sleepless superman, that means that Len, was
>responsible for relaying 75 teletype messages every hour or 1 1/4 messages
>24/7 for 2 years.
>
>Or, if Len counters with, IT'S NOT 2 YEARS, IT WAS OVER 3 YEARS TIME...

The UFO imaginator runs off at the keyboard, not able to do simple
arithmetic.

I did not count the last year's duty which involved the 9 microwave
radio relay terminals which had 4 terminals carrying ALL
communications (telephone through SSB modulation) to the new
transmitters site at Kashiwa (two 24-voice-channel terminals plus
a duplicate set always on-line as backup), 3 terminals to FEC Hq
at Pershing Heights, 2 terminals to the receiver site NW of CK and
Camp Drake. The total number of radio circuits outgoing through
transmitters can only be approximated due to a variation of the
number of TTY circuits on the "SSB" links (those could be anywhere
from 6 to 16 depending on frequency diversity necessity or doubled
tone-pairing or not). USN-contract equipment could time-multiplex
four TTY circuits on a single wire or voice-grade pair at the then-
standard rate of 60 WPM and required "electronic" FS keying (a
single tube replacing the normal pre-war polar relay in a transmitter
exciter). "SSB" in the military sense referred to four voice-grade
channels, one voice orderwire, one "overseas radiotelephone" circuit
with the two remaining channels carrying AFSK TTY.

From memory, the ADA trans-Pacific HF transmissions went to
San Francisco (1 SSB, 1 4-TTY MUX), Honolulu (1 SSB, 1 single-
channel TTY), Seattle (1 4-TTY MUX), Anchorage (1 single-channel
TTY), Manila (1 single-channel TTY), Pusan and Seoul, Korea
(variable from 1 single-channel TTY to 4-TTY MUX each, an adjunct
to wireline and VHF radio relay circuits across the Sea of Japan),
Okinawa (1 SSB), Saigon (increasing from 1 single-channel TTY to
4-TTY MUX to MAG there after the French defeat). All of those
were 24/7, doesn't count the FEC staff transmitter (voice and AFSK
TTY) for their airborne mobile needs, another transmitter, doesn't
count a "rover" which could be brought up as single-channel TTY
to handle peak loading on at least four circuits mentioned. Lose one
microwave radio relay terminal and HALF of the transmitters were
inoperative. That happened only twice and resulted in a terrible
two-minute outage while 24 channels were manually patched over,
checked and verified. Two minutes times a hundred-plus radio
circuits is a LOT of outage. Each circuit cut-out meant bringing up
a spare on the proper frequency or QSY (due to propagation effects),
tune-align (except for the one WE SSBs and lone Collins Autotune
rover), check the Fox-test keying, receiver site's "frequency" sub-
section getting the exact Mark and Space frequency (orderwire on-
line between Control, Transmitters, Receivers 24/7). Average QSY
time was also two minutes, no benefit from PLL or DDS synthesizers
and TCXOs, no "split" with memory, none of which existed prior to
1957 for military HF communications...or anyone else.

NONE of that is a "military secret" or "classified to prevent damage to national defense." It is simply unknown by all those who think that "radio" for everyone else works on 1930s standards and practices.

Those who don't want to learn about the rest of the world can remain in their closed-cycle never-never land. I can explain much more, more contemporary radio in the REST of the world...but why bother? Closed minds don't want new input, want to remain static and locked into "amateur-only" knowledge, and sneer at anyone who has done something else in radio. You, UFO, want to bring down everyone to your level, but not all wish to drop down to your sociopathic level.

>Dear Santa,
>
>For this coming Christmas, please send me a brain that actually
>works and something to cure my ignorance and sociopathy.
>
>Love UFO

5520. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:06:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222170603.03941.00000044@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 35028

In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
>Houk
>> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>
>> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >>
>> >> > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
>> >> > assumed based on experience.
>> >>
>> >> While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
>> >
>> >I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
>> >is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.
>>
>> "Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
>> with ANY radio?!?
>>
>> Incredulosity abounds...
>
>Joshua probably doesn't have a handle on your decades of experience,
>Len.

He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.

>This will provide yet another opportunity for you to blow the dust
>off your resume and to outline your amazing exploits.

I have no "amazing exploits." I don't portray myself as Heil does,
giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from
an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.

Way, way back in newsgroup prehistory somebody named Heil
tried to pull off a fast one by parading his fantastic exploits in
State Department radio by an "example," that of using CW as
an "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. What he was banking on
was no one knowing anything about HF comm anywhere else
but in amateur radio practice. The term "order-wire" is not in the

jargon of amateurs. Open opportunity for snow-jobbery, chest-thumping and self-praise. Problem was that someone DID know about order-wires, RTTY, and had actually DONE that a quarter century before. Tsk, tsk, snow got melted, BS revealed for the stinky stuff it was. Poor baby got all hurt and upset. Awww...

Yeah, it was rated right up there along with the yo-yo who claimed His Son operated CW "behind enemy lines in Iraq" sending "intel" back to the coalition. Jay-suss, another SNOW JOB in the desert. Dumbass didn't know that the equipment for "intel reporting" by UHF with data and COMMSEC was already publicly-available, even to hams (link to ATDLS and TM 11-24 on at least two ham-oriented sites). That man-pack AN/PSC-2 has been augmented by manpacks going up to AN/PSC-5, but I digress.

>We mere radio amateurs are sure to be spellbound by your tales.

Poor baby, feeling poorly that no one is spellbound by Heil's Mighty Radio Accomplishments?

>In case Joshua hasn't been clued in, you are not yet a newcomer to
>amateur radio though you hope to be one day.

Wrong on both statements, clueless. I am a "newcomer" in sort of the same sense that Dale Earnhardt, Jr., is a "newcomer" to vehicles. Do you think the Zamboni is an ultimate vehicle?!?

Hint: Ice is a near relative of snow. There's a job for you there someplace but you retired.

>You may become more
>motivated as you compile one of your frequent restatements of the
>obvious while wearing your spiffy new ARRL tee shirt.

Awww...poor baby is all upset and snarly again.

Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.

>Let me know if Ed
>doesn't come through for you and I'll be happy to buy you one myself.

No problem, happy Dave, you just keep on making all the snow and I might even buy you a shovel. [shovels are also good for removing your BS on CW and ham radio as you and only you judge it]

No, make that a mirror where happy Dave can preen and posture repeating the noble mantra "ham radio is ALL working DX on HF, there is no other, and the expert grades all do 20 WPM morse to the max." You are superior. All must meet your criteria or be judged inferior. The inferior may be treated with all the sociopathy you think they should. Understood.

5521. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:06:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222170605.03941.00000045@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 35030

In article <3C772A37.3A295F79@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > No, I'm sure Cecil is lying (with your assistance evidently) about
>> > the meaning of the statement in the ARRL license manual. Of course
>> > all the *information* needed to pass the tests was there. What was NOT
>> > there is the exact questions and their exact answers, save the very few
>> > relating to the definitions such as Ohm, Volt etc which really are
>> > rote memorization of terms.
>>
>> It was evidently not necessary to rote memorize the material in the old
>> license manuals. Apparently all you had to do was read the manual,
>> since everything was in there. It's really not necessary to rote
>> memorize the material in the question pools either, in order to pass. I
>> sure couldn't have done that. But to be honest, I really didn't do much
>> other than read the question pools and work the problems before I
>> passed. I looked up anything I didn't understand so I would understand
>> the question, or its answer. Don't you think most people would do the
>> same thing, Dick?
>
> I learned that most people only want the license and will do
>whatever is required to get it. For some it's not difficult, and for
>others it's nearly impossible. But I never saw anyone who was
>determined to do it that failed. I remember one older gentleman
>that came to 10 different sessions before he took home his General
> and each time he got the encourgement required to keep him
>coming back. He lived 75 miles away, but I still remember his name.

The name isn't given... :-)

>> If not, then I would
>> like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more
>> technologically advanced.
>
> I think Jim N2EY said it best, in that since you had no way to know
>how much of what subject you would be tested on, you tended to make sure you
>were prepared. The trip to the FCC district office
>was not trivial, and today much of the time the trip to the VE test probably
>is.

I live in an urban area of about 10 million in what was the heart of
the aerospace industry. The local FCC office has been in Long

Beach since 1956 (35 minute drive on clear freeways). I can count
at least five VE ham test locations within that distance today.

> I've said before that studying for a ham radio license then sure didn't
>turn anyone into anything like an expert. But with a few years as a
>Conditional/General class ham behind me, when I landed in the Army Signal
>school in a 6 month course of study that took us from electron
>theory through color TV studio equipment, Vidicon and Image
>Orthicon cameras and microwave links, I quickly found that I was
>way, way ahead of everyone else in the class except for one fella who already
>had his First Phone, and another who had 2 1/2 years
>of EE college program behind him.

Very impressive, Dickie, but STUDIO BROADCASTING EQUIPMENT
classes aren't "real" communications, are they? Doesn't go into
HF radio at all, nor troposcatter or comm satellites, does it?

>The three of us finished the top
>three, all within less than a single point separating us.

Oh my, must have been much later than my 9 months at the
Signal School in Fort Monmouth in 1952. We didn't get "points"
except Pass or Fail. The Fails got reassigned. The Pass
group got a nice group picture and a notation on orders.
Color TV hadn't been standardized yet in the USA so it must
have been much, much later than my time learning microwave
radio relay operation-maintenance. How much microwave
radio had been installed anywhere in the rest of the radio world
in your time?

Oh, and my time at Monmouth did not include "the FCC coming
to the Signal School to give tests" as you claimed earlier. Four
years later I had to travel 90 miles to Chicago without any subsidy
to pass all four parts of the Commercial 'Phone to get a First.
But you said earlier you only got a Second commercial phone.
The fourth part needed at most 45 minutes to complete after
passing the first three parts (examiners would check each part,
fail at any stage and bye-bye). I passed all of them (they didn't
"grade" anything other than pass or fail, no CSCEs or anything).
No, none, nada experience in broadcasting prior to test...needed
the First to GET a job in broadcasting or most civil radio then.
I didn't have all those advantages of vast ham experience, all
that schooling on TV studio equipment at Monmouth, and the
FCC coming to you for testing...and I passed the First at one
sitting. You only got to a Second.

> So I learned
>that my ham radio technical training, while quite incomplete, was
>indeed a very good beginning, and I *did* know a bit of radio theory.
>Not on an design engineering level, but certainly on a technical level.
>Some of it was gained in the few years following licensing, but by
>no means all of it. No one ever said study for a ham license affords

>a high degree of skill.

YES you have. Indeed you have!

>Perhaps that's a big part of the reason it concerns
>some of us to see evidence that it has slipped further.

The grant of a radio operator license is NOT, nor has it EVER been
any sort of academic skill test. It is simply an AUTHORIZATION
by the federal government for the licensee to operate on a certain
part of the EM spectrum

> Either the tests are easy to
>pass and applicants easily learn the material, regardless of their
>lack of technical background, or the tests are easily compromised.
>An area where lots of highly trained persons live should have a
>higher pass-fail ratio. It doesn't seem to be working out
>that way. So one can deduce that evidently the tests don't test for
>knowledge, rather mastering testing technique. Or else they're dead-
>easy, and that's perhaps just as bad.

...or some have inflated their own IDEAS of What Should Be...

Since the start of privatized testing for ALL radio operator licenses,
there has been ample opportunity for ALL "concerned amateurs" to
communicate with the Question Pool Committee. Has Carroll ever
done that?

5522. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:20:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222172016.08443.00000030@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 35031

In article <20020222140943.21422.00000001@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Just my experience on the ham bands.

The ham bands go up from 1.2 GHz, on up to 300 GHz.

What is N2EY's experience on CW or SSB above UHF?

5523. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:24:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76C529.D809C673@uci.edu>
Source record: 35033

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020222140943.21422.00000001@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Just my experience on the ham bands.
>
> The ham bands go up from 1.2 GHz, on up to 300 GHz.
>
> What is N2EY's experience on CW or SSB above UHF?

Tell us about yours, Len (he said reluctantly).

5524. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 22:33:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222173310.18505.00000087@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35032

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>Here is Phil Kane explaining the law. If you listen to 90.3 MHz on that
>antenna you are violating the law.

You have apparently done some research. Can you cite the statute or regulation that you are violating by using an antenna that would be pre-empted by FCC regulation to listen on 90.3 MHz, thereby not being pre-empted by FCC regulation? I would like to see the language that shows exactly what is forbidden by the law you cite as potentially being broken.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5525. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:26:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222182638.17617.00000075@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35034

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I learned that most people only want the license and will do
> whatever is required to get it

That's what I did in 1963. I met the requirements. Hams today meet the requirements. And the easiest way to to do that is to learn the underlying material. Why do you keep trying to convince new hams not to do that?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5526. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:28:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222182821.17617.00000076@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35035

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Do you think you would have remembered him if he had come back 9 times and
>> not come back that 10th?

> Can't you think up a real question?

I know what I asked. What did you hear? I only ask that because of some past misundertandings.

> People like him are the ones you remember.

Exactly. If he had given up after 5 tries, you would not remember him. That is why I asked you the question.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5527. Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:31:05 UTC
From: ValleyArts1@webtv.net
Message-ID: <7189-3C76D4B9-31@storefull-117.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Source record: 35038

Hello,

I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking my general test? I realize that even if I was able to take the general test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech privileges until I passed the morse code exam.

Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount still accurate? Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go into a test session and take the exams? Sorry for all the questions, but I need the information. Thank you.

5528. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:32:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C76D510.5E0F7B0D@uci.edu>
Source record: 35044

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
>
> > The antennas have been up for 10 years and the most any violation of a
> >civil contract can be enforced is two years at most in the states. There was
> >an article about this in QST quite a few years ago. If the neighborhood
> >association does not enforce the CC&R within a certain time frame then it is
> >too late. Others can now do the same with their properties. It doesn't
> >matter if the guy snowed them with the PRB-1, they should have applied the
> >CC&R 8 years ago.
>
> Phil might be able to fill us in on whether the principle of delayed discovery
> would apply here.

I sir am no Phil Kane, ;-) but in my experience with CC&R's and large
home owners associations, one would typically have to cite other
examples of the lack of antenna enforcement over a period of years in
order to be successful with that tact. Saying "I've been in violation
for years" won't quite cut it.

5529. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:35:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222183509.17617.00000078@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35036

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
>>>condition.
>>>So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.

>>Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered are
>>too
>>lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will help
>>them see that clothes washing is a good thing.

>I don't think so, Ed. What brought on that outburst? You ever see me call
>anyone "lazy"?

It was a joke, Jim. I thought it so obvious that I didn't bother with the
smiley.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>All I wanna do is sell the extra washer. Space is at a premium here, compared
>to the old place on RadioTelegraph Hill.
>
>Around here, laundry on the line on a nice day is a common thing. But I'm
>not selling the dryer - it's a Maytag, too.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>
>
>

5530. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:38:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222183817.17617.00000079@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35037

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

>Hey, be glad that there is a cellphone tower there - most local
> municipalities are far more restrictive of them than they are
> of ham towers.

I think that cell phone towers are what many neighbors of hams envision when a ham wants to put up a tower. Some 'o them suckers are BIG!

I know of one ham who won over some of his neighbors by showing them what a 10-foot section of tower is all about.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5531. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:47:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222184732.17617.00000080@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35039

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>It is like saying you can
>have a garage but you can't use it for any purposes but to store 10 books in
>it.

It's like having a garage and telling you that you can only store cars in it,
not run a repair business.

OTARD antennas are covered by a pre-emption of CC&Rs, multi-purpose antennas
are not.

>Look it up and tell me I
>can't receive radio transmissions in my home with an antenna.

You can. You just can't put that antenna up in a neighborhood restricted by
CC&Rs that you voluntarily accepted. That is not a matter of criminal law, it
becomes a civil matter, not initiated by the government, but by that party that
is agrieved by the presence of your antenna.

>W1RFI is just really showing me the errors of my ways. We have speeding
>laws, but we all break them once in a while, so what the hell. We are just
>modern day civil law violators and what do we have to lose?

Let me know how your court case turns out. When do you plan to take this to
court?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5532. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:50:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222185019.17617.00000082@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35040

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> The antennas have been up for 10 years and the most any violation of a
>civil contract can be enforced is two years at most in the states. There was
>an article about this in QST quite a few years ago. If the neighborhood
>association does not enforce the CC&R within a certain time frame then it is
>too late. Others can now do the same with their properties. It doesn't
>matter if the guy snowed them with the PRB-1, they should have applied the
>CC&R 8 years ago.

Phil might be able to fill us in on whether the principle of delayed discovery
would apply here.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5533. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-22 23:54:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222185414.17617.00000083@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35041

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You're right, Ed. Only VE's who have seen it up close and personal
> would know. Sorry, I won't again accuse you having knowledge you don't have.

Is this going to turn into one of those "all cars are black" things? If you say
that some people pass tests by rote memorization, I might agree. Some people
did that in the 60s, too. I came close.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5534. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 00:01:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222190124.17617.00000086@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35042

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Short memory, Ed? What goes around comes back around, ya know.
>Dish it out and you'd better be ready to take it.

Well, at least you admit what your real agenda is.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5535. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 00:05:03 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020222190503.15066.00000081@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 35043

>Hello,

Howdy,

>I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
>the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
>would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
>session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
>my general test?

Yep.

> realize that even if I was able to take the general
>test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
>privileges until I passed the morse code exam.

True.

>Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
>still accurate?

Nope. $10, no matter how many elements you take at that particular session. If
you fail an element, you will have to fork over another $10 to retest though.

>Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
>into a test session and take the exams?

Nope.

>Sorry for all the questions, but
>I need the information.

Never...NEVER be sorry for asking for help. I've learned that this is an aspect
of AR that's almost as gratifying as the actual radio hobby itself, the
willingness of fellow hobbyists to help one another.

>Thank you.

You're quite welcome.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

5536. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 00:29:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C76E274.A61202A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35045

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Jim, a statement that includes "the set of" is supplying the boundaries.
> > Why is that so difficult to understand?
>
> Cecil, both statements, yours and mine, included "the set of" as their
> boundaries. Why is that so hard for you to see?

It's not hard to see, Jim. Both our statements are valid. I have never
said that they were invalid. What is it about that that is so hard for
you to understand? The invalid statement is:
"CW gets through when SSB doesn't." It contains no boundary conditions.

> Check the quotes, the attributions, and back up in the thread if you
> need to. Evidently you need to. You're incorrect, sir.

If I am, it is a ****MISTAKE****!!!!!!! You clearly didn't understand
what I said. If you can produce the posting where I said a bounded statement
is invalid, I will apologize.

> > You appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
>
> Nope.

You still appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5537. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 00:39:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C76E4AE.48143485@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35046

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I have never implied that SSB gets through when CW doesn't, Jim.
>
> Saying that "CW gets through when SSB doesn't" is a false statement
> implies that when SSB doesn't get through, CW doesn't either. That's
> the misleading thing you're saying.

You sure need a lesson in logic, Jim, more than can be done in a newsgroup. If "CW gets through when SSB doesn't" can be false, it implies absolutely nothing additional. May I recommend a logic textbook for you: "Logic, an Introduction", by Ruby. I'm surprised you can lead a successful life believing what you believe. There are at least four conditions possible regarding CW and SSB, 00, 01, 10, 11. Even Ed knew that. :-)

> > > I still like W6RCA.
>
> > You can have it in a couple of years.
>
> I meant to say it looks better on you.

Nope, I'm a died-in-the-wool Texan. You, OTOH, obviously deserve a call from the land of fruits and nuts.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5538. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 00:53:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C76E817.7BF80A63@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 35047

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> When a VE team tests in an area where lots of technical people
> reside, the technical level of applicants will be much higher than
> it is where few technically oriented people live. Yet the national
> pass-fail average was 66% when I served as a VE, and our team's
> average always was almost exactly the national average. Yet there
> were few technically trained people in that rural area, and most
> new hams did indeed come from CB. Either the tests are easy to
> pass and applicants easily learn the material, regardless of their
> lack of technical background, or the tests are easily compromised.
> An area where lots of highly trained persons live should have a
> higher pass-fail ratio. It doesn't seem to be working out
> that way. So one can deduce that evidently the tests don't test for
> knowledge, rather mastering testing technique. Or else they're dead-
> easy, and that's perhaps just as bad.

Maybe the applicants in the tech regions are younger on average?
Maybe that 66% success rate indicates when applicants feel
confident enough to go to a VE session and take the tests. Also,
how does that statistic handle an applicant that passed say the
general but failed the extra?

I took my advanced and old extra in Jan 2000, got the CSCEs and
cashed them in Apr 15th, 2000. The VE said I missed one
question on the advanced, and two on the extra. Though I'm
a double E, I still looked at the question pools to prepare, like
any good student would.

Back in the old days, I took my tech in July 76 at the NYC field
office located near Greenwich Village part of Manhattan. I aced
the code and nearly failed the written, backwards to my expectations.
I remember one question asking something like: "Your CW transmitter
has a power supply of 800V DC. Up to how much current
can you draw from the supply and still be legal?" At the time 1KW "plate
power"was the
legal limit, so 1.24 amps would be the answer. That question was
a two pronged attack at your knowledge, as you needed to know
how power was calculated, and what the legal limit of the amount of
power in the ham radio service. At the time, power was defined in
the rules as the voltage on the output tube(s) times the DC current drawn.
If it were a SSB transmitter, there was this "Peak envelope power"
which IIRC would allow you to peak at 2KW but average 1KW
while you were talking. But don't forget that your analog amp meter

has lag, which doesn't let you see the max peak. I forgot if the
meter reading would give a close approximation of PEP power,
i.e., that if it says 1.25 amp on 800VDC supply, that if that would
give the reading to tell you that you're at the legal limit.

5539. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 01:01:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222200152.17627.00000029@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35048

In article <3C76C529.D809C673@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20020222140943.21422.00000001@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >Just my experience on the ham bands.
>>
>> The ham bands go up from 1.2 GHz, on up to 300 GHz.
>>
>> What is N2EY's experience on CW or SSB above UHF?
>
>Tell us about yours, Len (he said reluctantly).

Why? My only ham experience is contributing to a ham
experiment on a microwave band. It doesn't involve CW or
SSB.

Kelley failed to note the ever-popular phrase "ham bands."

To the code-loving beeper on HF the ONLY bands for hams
are those below 30 MHz. There's a fair chunk of the spectrum
above 30 MHz allocated for ham use, ainit? Do you want to
sneer at microwave-band experimenters like this one did? -

"Gigahertz for gigasquirts" - big badass KH2D

I've "worked" microwave DX two-way on a 240,000 mile path,
but not in the "ham bands." I don't consider that any big thing
but there is NO terrestrial DX that can come close to that range.

Didn't need a single morse skill to do that. Why not?

5540. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 01:10:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222201027.19404.00000010@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 35049

In article <3C769F74.1F1EEDB1@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> The difference is that
>> having the exact Q&A in front of you makes it much easier to pass by rote
>> memorizing and vague word association.
>
>I assume you're speaking for yourself, Jim.

For myself and many that I have helped to get ham licenses.

>I certainly don't find rote
>memorization to be easier. That's what I had to do for my first code
>test. I sweated bullets for that one. By the way, did you study from
>question pools back when you took your exams, Jim?

Nope. They were not available in 1967.

>If not, I hope you
>won't mind my asking why I should consider you to be an authority on
>that subject.

I don't claim to be an authority or an expert on anything. Just a voice of
reason with some knowledge and experience. I know some of the things
I write are electropolitically incorrect, but that doesn't make them untrue.

Over the years I have always kept my knowledge up to at least the level needed
to pass the current exams. Every few months I take a simulated online test just
to keep my hand in. I purposely do all the math in my head to make it more of
a sporting course. Never a problem.
>
>> Well, I was 13 and had just entered the 7th grade. I knew tropospheric
>> ducting could cause VHF/UHF DX, but that was about all.
>
>Well, I was 35, and studying for my Technician license when I found out
>about it.

I learned about it earlier but didn't get a license until I was 13.
>
>> I knew the
>> ionosphere had layers with the names D, E and F, and that D absorbed,
>> E and F refracted/reflected, and that F became F1 and F2. I knew the
>> day/night and 11 year solar sunspot cycle connections, too.
>
>Me too!! I read about them in the question pool.

I read about them in the ARRL Handbook. Nice diagrams, too.
>
>> I didn't
>> know lots of detail but I knew the basic concepts and how they played
>> out on the air.
>
>Roger that. I listened to guys talking about all that stuff for hours
>on end on my first ham radio.

75 meter AM was my first exposure to ham radio. Heard those guys on
my two-tube homemade receiver.
>
>> > Did you fully understand the purpose of the suppressor
>> > and screen grids in a power pentode when you passed?
>
>> From a practical point of view, yes. Not from an electron optics
>> point of view, though.
>
>Define the practical purpose of suppressor and screen grids from a
>non-electron optics point of view - from your perspective when you were
>first licensed.

Sure. Remember, this is what I knew back then.

One problem with triode tubes is that the capacitance from control grid to
plate
can be high enough to cause oscillation in some applications. One cure for this
problem is to insert another grid between the control grid and plate, to act as
a
shield. It is called a screen because it screens the grid from the plate, in a
way.
The screen is usually bypassed to ground at the signal frequencies but operated
at a DC potential so that it does not reduce electron flow to the plate much.
Some
current flows in the screen circuit, but not as much as in the plate circuit.
Tubes
with screens are called tetrodes because they have 4 elements.

But adding the screen causes other problems. Under some conditions, electrons
hitting the
plate cause other electrons to be knocked loose. This effect is called
secondary emission.
It can cause problems if the electrons are attracted to the screen. So a third
grid, called a
suppressor, is inserted between screen and plate. It usually has only a few
widely-spaced
turns of fine wire, and is operated near ground potential. Electrons knocked
off the plate are
repelled by the screen and usually wind up back at the plate. Tubes with
screens and suppressors
are called pentodes because they have five elements.

How's that?

>> > Could you draw a
>> > picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority
>> > carriers?
>
>> Yup.
>
>And you learned that from the ARRL handbook?

Dig out a 1967 Handbook. Transistors are in there.

I had other books, too. For example, I had an old RCA receiving tube handbook. Learned
a lot from that.

>When were you licensed again?

Novice, 1967. Tech and Advanced, 1968. Extra, 1970. Would have had the Extra at least
a year earlier but for the mandatory two-year wait.
>
>> > Did you know how to design and implement a plate loading
>> > network?

>> You mean an impedance matching network for a transmitter?
>
>Would you mind explaining the difference to me?

I've never heard of a "plate loading network". Not in any of my radio books, and they didn't
use the term in EE school either. So I guessed you meant "pi-network" or some such.

I had to make one for my first transmitter. I used link coupling, though, but I understood how to
do it.
>
>> > Could you calculate (or even describe) the exact effects of end
>> > loading for any given dipole antenna installation?
>
>> Yup.
>
>As a novice?

Yep. Lots of antenna stuff in the Handbook. Mobile chapter.

>Remind me again who these questions were addressed to.

I don't recall. I do recall that I've always read everything about radio I could get
my mitts on. I went to EE school in large part because of ham radio.

>I don't think I would have posed them to you, Jim. ;-)

Why not? Would I upset the curve? ;-)
>

>> > How much did you
>> > actually know about RTTY?
>
>> That it existed, used FSK, and was pretty much limited to those hams who
>> could afford to buy the machines or get them through MARS and other
>> channels. I knew what it sounded like on the air, too.
>
>That's about the extent of the coverage in the current question pool as
>well.
>You still have to know those things for the test, except for how it
>sounds on the air. But I don't find that explained in my handbook.
>Wonder if you did.

I learned what RTTY was from the Handbook, and saw it in the shack of
a ham in the area. He was heavy into Navy MARS at the time. Vietnam era.
>
>> > Could you have explained how two co-located
>> > repeaters might occupy the same frequency pair without being keyed-up
>> > simultaneously?
>
>> Nope - repeaters were all but unknown here in '67.
>
>Pretty common knowlege among new licensees today.

If it was common knowledge back then I woulda known it. But subtones and CTCSS
and such were not common ham practice then. How many hams today would
understand
things like "gotta redip the plate" or "you're closing the eye here, OM" or
what a "halo" is?
>
>> > Could you have explained how to use a SSB satellite
>> > transponder (if they had existed)?
>
>> Maybe.
>
>It was a yes or no question. I have to mark you off for that one. ;-)

Would you know what a throttle condenser is for? ;-)
>
>> > How well did you know your great
>> > circles?
>
>> Really well. Had a globe, knew the time zones and all that stuff. SWLing
>> taught me a lot. Used to get into arguments about what time it was
>> elsewhere in the world and which way it was to foreign countries.
>
>And were most of the other new hams you knew equally conversant on the
>subject?

Some were. I was all over geography and astronomy, too.
>

>> >If a neighbor told you that you were getting into their phone
>> > line, their TV, and their record player, would you have been able to
>> > eliminate the problems for them?
>
>> I would help. But I never had those problems.
>
>Yes, or no? You don't seem to be getting the point here.

I don't know if I would have been able because I never had to actually solve
any problems.

Would YOU let the 13 year old neighbor kid tear into your new wide-screen TV
that cost
big bucks?
>
>> > If you were well versed is all those topics as a result of studying for
>> > your exams back then, then I will take your point. If not, then I would
>> > like to suggest that things are not ALL that different today. Just more
>> > technologically advanced.
>
>> You wanna talk about what I knew when I got my Extra?
>
>I gather you do.

Just to satisfy your obvious curiosity ;-)

The point I'm making with the Extra is that while you are focusing on what
beginners know, it's
also important to look at what those with the other classes of license know.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5541. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:40:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QiDd8.9887$jH2.1434062902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35050

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C712B7F.DB14094F@worldnet.att.net...
> The VE
> testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the
extra exam
> and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
> Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.

Dick, it's always possible that the government will take away your
priveleges and make you test to "earn" them back. It's happened before, and
can happen again.

Who wants to be on that VE team?

73 and best wishes, Brian

5542. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:41:12 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <cjDd8.7265$lm1.485829@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35151

For what it is worth, my wallet is a heck of a lot smaller than any association's or the government's. We live by the golden rule; he who has the gold, rules. Such fighting is probably best left to the political process. The ARRL is likely to do a lot more for us than any of us can do for ourselves.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020222173310.18505.00000087@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
>
> >Here is Phil Kane explaining the law. If you listen to 90.3 MHz on that
> >antenna you are violating the law.
>
> You have apparently done some research. Can you cite the statute or regulation
> that you are violating by using an antenna that would be pre-empted by FCC
> regulation to listen on 90.3 MHz, thereby not being pre-empted by FCC
> regulation? I would like to see the language that shows exactly what is
> forbidden by the law you cite as potentially being broken.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

5543. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:49:02 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <CF3A544F3D3A0A1E.91BEF46496CF6028.9602903FCB90A7C8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 35154

On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 18:56:38 -0800, Keith <nospamplease@newsguy.com>
wrote:

>http://www.petitiononline.com/AL2002/petition.html

Can't hurt, but we'd do a lot better with prewritten 'print, sign &
mail' letters for everybody to send to their city, state, and federal
lawmakers.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

5544. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:51:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202230248510.22359-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35152

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002, David Williams wrote:
>I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
>the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
>would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
>session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
>my general test? I realize that even if I was able to take the general
>test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
>privileges until I passed the morse code exam.
>
>Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
>still accurate? Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
>into a test session and take the exams? Sorry for all the questions, but
>I need the information. Thank you.

If you go to an ARRL sponsored test, the fee is $10, and as long as you keep passing elements, that single fee covers everything (i.e. fail and retake something and that will be another $10). GLAARG charges less. You might be up where the Sunnyvale VEC has coverage; I don't know what they charge.

The written elements pretty much must be passed in order (as enforced by the VEC group you test with). The code element is a "separate track" and can be taken at any time.

5545. Re: Kim, I agree

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:52:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222215209.18416.00000168@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35155

>Subject: Re: Kim, I agree
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 2/21/2002 8:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c75b3ee_1@newsa.ev1.net>

>Then, I'll get on 28.400 every day until we can make
>contact...it'll have to be after say 4:30 though, is that OK?

Works for me. I am going to a Hamfest tomorrow (Saturday) in Daltaon, GA,
then have a CAP drill in the afternoon......So it looks like Sunday?

73
Steve

5546. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:52:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202230251440.22359-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35153

On 23 Feb 2002, Bert Craig wrote:
>>Hello,
>
>Howdy,
>
>>I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
>>the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
>>would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
>>session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
>>my general test?
>
>Yep.

WRONG. He can still take the general and extra tests, but he won't get a
license (or upgrade), only element credit.

>> realize that even if I was able to take the general
>>test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
>>privileges until I passed the morse code exam.
>
>True.
>
>>Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
>>still accurate?
>
>Nope. $10, no matter how many elements you take at that particular session. If
>you fail an element, you will have to fork over another $10 to retest though.
>
>>Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
>>into a test session and take the exams?
>
>Nope.
>
>>Sorry for all the questions, but
>>I need the information.
>
>Never...NEVER be sorry for asking for help. I've learned that this is an aspect
>of AR that's almost as gratifying as the actual radio hobby itself, the
>willingness of fellow hobbyists to help one another.
>
>>Thank you.
>
>You're quite welcome.
>
>73 de Bert

>KC2HMN
>

5547. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 02:59:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mADd8.684$FE4.27029@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35156

"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:7189-3C76D4B9-31@storefull-117.iap.bryant.webtv.net...
> Hello,
>
> I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
> the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
> would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
> session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
> my general test? I realize that even if I was able to take the general
> test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
> privileges until I passed the morse code exam.
>
> Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
> still accurate? Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
> into a test session and take the exams? Sorry for all the questions, but
> I need the information. Thank you.
>

You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would be allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.

When you go to test, bring:
1) a picture ID. You will be asked to prove that you are who you say you are.

2) Ten bucks

3) Original and photocopy for the examiners of any previous or current licenses. Originals only of previous testing certificates.

If you succeed in what you are asking you will be issued the Tech license and a cert for Element 3 which you have to redeem within 365 days by passing the code test; they do not last forever.

Suggest that three websites should be bookmarked:

http://www.arrl.org for all kinds of good poop
http://www.qrz.com for some good sample exams
http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which comes out of the box at test speeds. Follow directions and use your compooter. Stop off at Walmart for an el cheapo set of headphones or your family will berate you strongly about the head and shoulders to stop the infernal beeping.

And finally, Good Luck.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5548. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:02:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1DDd8.9893$hb3.1436111020@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35158

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C71A188.143C8DC7@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Krell, stuff it. You jump into the crap with both feet and no clue.

You mean when you don't have him soaking his head, right?

The Amateur's Code
The Radio Amateur is

CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
pleasure of others.

LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local
clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in
the United States is represented nationally and internationally.

PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient
station and operation above reproach.

FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and
counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.

BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to
family, job, school or community.

PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and
community.

--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.

5549. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:02:34 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e0a55aa2969e8a98968d@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35157

In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
>
> > "Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
> > with ANY radio?!?
> >
> > Incredulosity abounds...

Thanks Dave - I'd missed this since it found it generally pointless to open any of Len's posts.

Len, seeing how fastidious a reader you are of r.r.a.p. (for god knows what reason - but in the event that you actually *are* interested in amateur radio, come on in, the water's fine), I'm a bit surprised that you missed Cecil's post where he berated Dick for turning him of amateur radio, since he was a newcomer and therefore impressionable.

Am I a newcomer to radio? I don't understand why that would be a bad thing (we amateurs tend to help each other out, y'know), but to sate your appetite, no.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5550. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:05:16 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e0a612d6c5f9f98968e@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35159

James at 15, er, Len over 21 says...

> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.

You're entirely correct - I don't have a handle.

I have a "call sign".

joshua houk
kd7pos

5551. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:05:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222220523.18416.00000171@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35160

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 4:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020222170605.03941.00000045@mb-ck.aol.com>

>I can count
>at least five VE ham test locations within that distance today.

Too bad you are too incompetent to pass those tests, eh...?!?! Wouldn't have to go far at all to find out just how little you really do know. I'll foot the fee, Lennie.

>You only got to a Second.

Matters not, Oh Creepy one...He STILL has a license to emit RF WITHOUT needing somone else's station license and authorization to do it.

You don't.

>The grant of a radio operator license is NOT, nor has it EVER been
>any sort of academic skill test. It is simply an AUTHORIZATION
>by the federal government for the licensee to operate on a certain
>part of the EM spectrum.

Not on "a certain part", Oh Flailing One, on MANY certain parts. And in more modes and techniques than YOU are presently "authorized" to emit!

Laughingly Yours,

Steve

5552. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:06:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c770940_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35163

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.grwqnb7.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002 16:19:01 -0800, Keith wrote:
>
> > The trick is to actually use it for a TV antenna, then you not violating
> >the law or CCR. Your use of it as a ham antenna is just an additional
use.
> >Now if you put up the TV antenna and only using for ham radio then you
are
> >violating the law & CCR.
> >Get one of those cheap 19.95 B&W portable TV's and watch TV for one
minute
> >per day in the shack and you are using the antenna for a TV antenna.
> >
> >There are two ways to skin a elk. ;)
>
> And the FCC will skin yours (not issue a Declaratory Order of
> preemption) if you do the above scheme. Their viewpoint is
> EXCLUSIVE use for broadcast, and no other radio service.
>
> Good try, though. Better luck next time.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

This is a "family" hobby, after all...and here is a discussion about
circumventing the rules :|

Kim W5TIT

5553. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:07:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c77096b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35164

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C771FFC.F5DBB5AF@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> > In article <3C753F3A.977C584C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Clearly you never saw a Bash book. They were nothing at all
> > > > like the ARRL License manuals.
> > >
> > > Uhhhhhhh Dick, they covered the same material. Both covered
> > > the material on the exams. What good would either of them
> > > have been if they didn't cover the material on the exams?
> >
> > Cecil, I know you're a newcomer and all, so I'll go easy on you. The
ARRL
> > Manuals are geared towards understanding the underlying principles
behind
> > the FCC exams. The current ARRL Extra Class License Manual clocks in at
> > over 400 pages - with dense text and hundreds of math equations. The
> > other books out there generally just give the question pools with maybe
a
> > sentence or two about why the correct answer is, well, correct. A world
> > of difference.
> >
> > By the way, welcome to the world of amateur radio! Good luck on all your
> > endeavors in the ARS.
>
> See Cecil? If you act green that's the way you get treated.
>

Seems more like Joshua is speaking out of ignorance...

Kim W5TIT

5554. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:09:38 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e0a71b39c2a26b98968f@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35161

In article <20020222200152.17627.00000029@mb-mo.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com says...

> To the code-loving beeper on HF the ONLY bands for hams
> are those below 30 MHz. There's a fair chunk of the spectrum
> above 30 MHz allocated for ham use, ainit? Do you want to
> sneer at microwave-band experimenters like this one did? -

Isn't CW pretty much obligatory ('cept for the odd masochist) at the
10GHz+ level? Above that - and yes, it's the largest bandwidth in the
amateur bands - CW is the predominant mode.

> I've "worked" microwave DX two-way on a 240,000 mile path,
> but not in the "ham bands." I don't consider that any big thing
> but there is NO terrestrial DX that can come close to that range.
>
> Didn't need a single morse skill to do that. Why not?

See above comment on masochism.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5555. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222221020.20827.00000014@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 35162

In article <20020222183509.17617.00000078@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
>>>>condition.
>>>>So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>
>>>Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered are
>>>too
>>>lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will help
>>>them see that clothes washing is a good thing.
>
>>I don't think so, Ed. What brought on that outburst? You ever see me call
>>anyone "lazy"?
>
>It was a joke, Jim.

"I made a funny. Hey, son, I'm pitchin' but you ain't catchin' " - Foghorn Leghorn

>I thought it so obvious that I didn't bother with the
>smiley.
>
MY BAD!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Got somebody coming to see the washer tomorrow.

5556. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:17:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c770bbe$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35167

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222063141.13180.00000125@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...
>
> Jim does not do that. If he says it, he believes and means it. I think
his
> record here speaks to his sincerity.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

And I think he's having more fun with the discussion than really considering what things are being expressed. Bottom line: CW may be a very reliable mode, maybe even the *most* reliable mode. But, if there are few who use it and few who understand it, then its reliability is pretty much a moot point. The reliability of CW is definitely a moot point for me...

Kim W5TIT

5557. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:20:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222222004.18416.00000173@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35165

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/22/2002 12:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Frld8.7513$ZC3.600032@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>
>Now note, using Cecilian logic, Len states HE relayed-transmitted....(cars
>are black, etc)

Thanks, Ron...! I love seeing Lennie the Liar Anderson getting his balls busted!

I rolled even harder watching him try to spin his way out of this in the post that followed!

Part of Lennie's arrogance, Ron, is that he refuses to accept that we KNOW what an arrogant putz he is, and he continues to post so-easily unravelled stories.

Stay tuned...His attempts to un-spin this faux pas will be "Classic Lennie".

73

Steve, K4YZ

5558. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:23:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DWDd8.9899$Qz3.1437705312@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35166

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C75DC4D.4DABD3FB@worldnet.att.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Cecil: FISTS memberships do not expire.
> > > > >
> > > > Memberships don't expire. They just drop you from the membership
> > > > lists. I see.
> > > >
> > > You see what you want to see. The UK membership is separate from the
> > > US membership.
> > >
> > Hmmmmmmm, these don't look like UK calls. Your W0EX just isn't there.
> >
> > W0DAM Dick 6623
> > W0DYD Gary 8446
> > W0FCL David 6754
> > W0FF Jim 5020

KA2 EWH BILL 4643
VA3 EWK ELMER 6781
VA3 EWP VINCENT 8070
WB2 EXI JOHN 2760
KB1 EXP BRUCE 7926
N9 EXY BARBARA 4532
K6 EY BECKY 2961
K8 EY FISTS CW Club of Michigan 3400
KF8 EY ROB 8027
WA2 EYA JOHN 7039
K1 EYB GEORGE 6225
KC2 EYG JOE 7368
WA0 EYJ BOB 7414
N5 EYX ROY 7270
AD6 EZ DENNY 4570

No W0EX in the USA list, either.

> I paid dues and got the newsletter for a couple years after I
> signed on, but dropped it then. Wasn't much in it other than new

> members stuff,

You've repeatedly shown disdain for new members to the ARS, so why should this be different?

I guess new members in a Pro-CW Use (and testing) organization and a concern for the perpetuation of CW really aren't that important to Dick.

There is only one requirement to join FISTS

A love of MORSE and a concern for its perpetuation

ACCURACY
TRANSCENDS
SPEED

COURTESY
AT ALL
TIMES

WHEN YOU'VE
WORKED A FIST
YOU'VE WORKED
A FRIEND

5559. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:23:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35171

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim.
>
> No, Kim, I'm trying to understand what you wrote. That's all I have to
> go on. Your philosophy seems to be that people should not rely on
> that which is reliable but rather on that which is fixable.
>
> >As usual...
>
> Seems to me that when someone doesn't understand and agree with
> your posts, you put the blame on them, rather than consider that
> perhaps what you said wasn't clear, or perhaps isn't entirely logical or
> based on fact.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its reliability is a moot point.

Kim W5TIT

5560. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:29:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222222934.18416.00000175@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35168

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 4:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020222170601.03941.00000043@mb-ck.aol.com>

>History: US Army press release in 1956 had stated some facts
>of Army communications which included 1.25 million messages
>PER MONTH relayed by Washington Army Radio in 1955

No, no, no, Your Putziness..You said YOU transmitted or relayed those
messages.

>The math is correct. The math is also extremely conservative
>since it does not include the higher rate prior to 1955 nor the
>temporary 12-hour shift period of 1954.

And still does not support ANY claim by you, Leonard HaHa Anderson, that
YOU transmitted or relayed 1.25 million messages.

>None of the US military fixed-point to fixed-point HF radio
>circuits were planned to use OOK CW from 1948 onwards.

Which does not have anything to do with YOUR claim of passing 1+ million
messages. What do you call it..."misdirected"...?!?!

>EXACT determination of "message handling" is not readily
>possible in terms that the average troll or average radio amateur
>can understand.

For once you are right...since you are not an "average" troll,
Lennie...And it's obvious that you tripped yourself with your own lies....

Again......

>The UFO imaginator runs off at the keyboard, not able to do simple
>arithmetic.

You are the mathematically deficient one, Your Lyingness.

>From memory, the ADA trans-Pacific HF transmissions went to
>San Francisco....(SNIP)

Mythological historical events snipped. Yor wifey has her leather's on,
Lennie...run along.

Steve and the Boys

5561. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:30:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020222223021.17754.00000077@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 35169

In article <3C747682.3EF40C4D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Nobody recognizes the "uniqueness" of Morse/CW until they've tried it.
>> The thing that got me to try it was my desire to be a licensed radio
>> amateur with HF phone privileges. I met the code testing requirement,
>> not at all expecting to become a CW operator. I gained that desire only
>> after my exposure to CW at a speed which gave me useful operating
>> proficiency.
>
>But not everybody is a lazy knuckle-dragger like you, Larry.

Thank goodness for that, Cecil!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5562. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:30:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020222223021.17754.00000076@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 35170

In article <20020221201845.26690.00000075@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com
>
>>So if someone thinks the tests are difficult, they're lazy knuckle-draggers.
>>What a wonderful anology.
>
>And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!

Ed:

Axeually, I have a lot of sympathy for lazy knuckle-draggers. From a strictly ham radio perspective, I used to be one myself. However, I was able to overcome those tendencies, and attain 20 WPM and Extra class with relative ease, once I got started. At that time, the only thing keeping me out of ham radio was my own lack of willingness to learn a useful communications skill. It "filtered" me out. Had I not had to earn my privileges under the set of testing requirements in place at the time, it is not very likely that I would have done a fraction as much on-the-air as I have, nor would I have had a fraction as much fun. I really feel sorry for future hams who will never know the satisfaction of being "Real Hams" because they simply won't learn Morse code in the absence of a meaningful license testing requirement to do so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5563. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:36:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020222223632.18416.00000177@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35172

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 4:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020222170603.03941.00000044@mb-ck.aol.com>

>I have no "amazing exploits."

Ooops...Pathologically lying again!

QUOTE:

Subject: Re: Radio Policy
From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 2/21/2002 9:42 PM Central Standard Time
Message-id: <20020221224228.28547.00000013@mb-fl.aol.com

Has N2EY ever relayed-transmitted a teleprinter message
over radio, any radio? I've relayed-transmitted about 1.32
million of them on HF between 1953-1955..

UNQUOTE

Thanks again, Lennie. I needed the laugh!

Steve

5564. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:41:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c77114f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35174

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222080952.16371.00000020@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c75c384_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >Never discount *any* radio source in an emergency.
> >>
> >> Including CW/Morse?
> >
> >Absolutely...if one knows the mode enough to be effective with it.
>
> That's what I'm saying. Glad you recognized that it has usefulness.
>

I don't know why you'd ever be under the impression that I don't recognize
CW's significance.

> >
> >> > If I
> >> >thought there were that many people always "within range" I would also
> >have
> >> >FRS, GMRS, etc., capabilities.
> >>
> >> They are getting popular. An injured mountain hiker was rescued last
year
> >> because his FRS HT was heard 80 miles away by a couple of kids. Love
> >> that tropo ducting.
> >>
> >> > But, the line must be drawn somewhere.
> >>
> >> Why?
> >
> >Because how far would one go in seriousness to "be prepared." Do I equip
> >myself for each and every emergency that might come up?
>
> Not for every conceivable emergency. For the ones that are most probable
and
> would be the most damaging, a prudent person becomes prepared.
>
> > Do I buy the means
> >to use every mode available to use in ham radio in case of an emergency?
>
> Nope. Just the most common and effective ones. As well as the license and
> skills to use them.

>

I agree with that only to a point. I believe your inference there is that if someone is all that serious about being prepared, they will have CW skill in their repertoire. However, there is a training effort there that some--me included--are not willing to spend time on. There are some people who, for whatever reason, don't know CW well enough to use it at all, let alone in an emergency. I certainly don't have the desire to learn better skills with CW so that I can stay in practice with it and have the ability just in case. I don't enjoy it enough for that kind of effort.

> I think one of the things that bothers some people about CW/Morse is that
> the skill to use it cannot be bought.
>

If there are people with that kind of issue, they have way too much time on their hands.

> >Do
> >I become a doctor so that I may be fully prepared for an emergency?
>
> If preparation for a medical emergency is a concern, yes. But as radio
> amateurs we're talking about communications emergencies.
>

I would hope that any radio amateur who is has the dedication and perserverence to put into emergency communication would certainly go to the extreme of being a doctor, *IF* that is what they desired to do. Emergency Communication services in amateur radio are beginning, just barely beginning, to take on some new challenges in defining the limitations of their services.

> >The line is drawn at what one is comfortable giving.
>
> In any volunteer activity, that's all that can be done.
>
> > I don't plan on ever
> >sitting or standing around in the Texas heat while what I think is a
> >dumb-#$%@ biker wants to race.
>
> Why is the biker "dumb-#$%@" ?
>

Because I am of the opinion they are pretty dumb #$%@s if they race in this heat. I also think jumping off a high place with a huge rubber band is pretty stupid. However, that is my opinion of people who live like that and, as long as they don't involve me--who'm I to care?

> >
> >I would, though, never give my willingness a
> >second thought for a true emergency in the heat.
>
> Based on what youdefine as a true emergency. Again, that's all that

> can be done in a volunteer activity.
> >
> >> > 2M, 70cm, and CB are better than nothing.
> >>
> >> No cell phone?
> >
> >Yep. But, I would rely last on a cell phone.
> >
> I don't understand. The cell phone is usually most reliable. It should be
the
> first thing to try in most cases, unless there is no service or the system
is
> overloaded.
>

In nearly every emergency response where cellular phones have been
distributed it is learned quickly how overloaded and useless the system
becomes.

> >>
> >> Kim, have you ever actually had a QSO on CW/Morse? Ever originated,
> >> received or relayed a formal message by CW/Morse? Just curious.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >One-half QSO, the night I passed my 5wpm test.
>
> What is "one-half QSO"? Started but not finished?
>

Yeah. He called me, I responded to him. He asked me how I liked CW, I told
him I didn't. He said something...and I told him I was going back to phone.

> >
> >No, never done any CW
> >traffic, never did CW after that night.
>
> I don;t mean to be critical, but that strikes me as kind of like the
person
> who learns to drive a manual shift car around the parking lot in first
gear,
> stalls it when trying to shift to second, and simply says "not for me" and
> walks away. Of course in a voluntary activity, there's no requirement for
> doing any mode.
>

It may strike you however you'd like. I didn't like the entire learning
process of CW, hated sitting down and studying it, can't stand the
monotonous tone, and far better enjoy hearing someone's voice. I rather
think that listening to a person beep is about as cold a method of
communication one could possibly experience. You may like it, I do not.

>
> For the record, I've done QSOs and formal messages by CW/Morse,
> voice (SSB, FM, even AM) and RTTY. RTTY in the paper-tape days was
> a slightly different animal than, say, PSK31, but lotsa noisy oily smelly
fun.
> The neat thing about it was that once the system was set up it was almost
> completely automatic for the relaying of messages - little or no operator
> involvement at all. Yet it is little used in amateur emergency comms.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Well, that's my point about all "those other modes." While some may be darned dandy applications for emergency communication, they just aren't picked up. The reliability becomes moot when there's no one there...

Kim W5TIT

5565. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:42:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c771195_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35175

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7657BA.F97BB4FA@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> > >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...
> >
> > Jim does not do that. If he says it, he believes and means it. I think
his
> > record here speaks to his sincerity.
>
> Watch out for his tongue-in-cheek stuff, however. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Uh huh, you got it.

Kim W5TIT

5566. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:51:32 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35173

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote and wrote AND WROTE..in message
news:20020222170601.03941.00000043@mb-ck.aol.com...
> In article <Frld8.7513$ZC3.600032@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> a UFO (Unidentified Freaking Object) wrote some snarly text:
>
> >> Has N2EY ever relayed-transmitted a teleprinter message
> >> over radio, any radio? I've relayed-transmitted about 1.32
> >> million of them on HF between 1953-1955..
> >>
> >> >Just curious.
> >
> >Now note, using Cecilian logic, Len states HE
relayed-transmitted....(cars
> >are black, etc)
> >
> >Let's do some math
> >
> >If over 2 years.........
> >
> >That comes to 660,000 per year
>
> Wrong.
>
> History: US Army press release in 1956 had stated some facts
> of Army communications which included 1.25 million messages
> PER MONTH relayed by Washington Army Radio in 1955 and
> included ADA in Tokyo in the listing as "third" in Army message
> traffic at 220,000 per month. Either AGA in San Francisco or
> AHA in Honolulu was second (irrelevant as to discussion, there
> were no "DX Contests" in military message traffic related to
> military traffic).

See, that's the problem Len. It's so much self congradulatory back patting
by the US Military. If I remember correctly,
someone here keeps stating that puff pieces that are outside the mainstream
press are not considered reliable. Now who said that?? hmmmmmmm

Did the LA Times, or the NY Times or the Washington Times carry this
information for the average Joe to read? I didn't think so. Guess it's
from a unreliable source there Len. Always cite references. 1st rule of Jr
High debate class ya know

Guess we'll just have to have ANOTHER HISTerical lesson about that splendid
military career just to justofy the claim

OH MY GOD I WAS ONLY KIDDING!!!! DAMN..too late here it comes.

>
> I was at ADA 1953 to 1956, first 25 months at transmitters with a

I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass. Hey guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or what?

The rest of history is snipped cause it's just boring as shit to actually read.....

> The math is correct. The math is also extremely conservative
> since it does not include the higher rate prior to 1955 nor the
> temporary 12-hour shift period of 1954.
>
> NONE OF THE ADA RADIO CIRCUITS USED OOK CW.

NONE A DUMB ASS' RADIO CIRCUITS WERE OOK CW!!!

Sooooo???????????????

Only YOU seem to weave this thread into every post there Len. OH WELL..on with the lesson and dere snipping

>
>
> EXACT determination of "message handling" is not readily
> possible in terms that the average troll or average radio amateur
> can understand.

Translated: onl;y those that live their lives continually in the past can understand the BULLSHIT they spew...Mission accomplished ADA Anderson.

>
>
> >Assuming that Col Len is a sleepless superman, that means that Len, was
> >responsible for relaying 75 teletype messages every hour or 1 1/4
messages
> >24/7 for 2 years.
> >
> >Or, if Len counters with, IT'S NOT 2 YEARS, IT WAS OVER 3 YEARS TIME...
>
> The UFO imaginator runs off at the keyboard, not able to do simple
> arithmetic.

WELL ADA ANderson, not having access to all this precious and less than mainstream news, how can anyone make accurate claims. Not everyone can make up shit like you there LENOF21..LENOVER21..AVERY FINE..NOCWTEST. Did I miss any other troll names of yours?

>
> From memory, the ADA trans-Pacific HF transmissions went to
> San Francisco

Sorry..memory posts are not allowed per the specifications as defined by ADA Anderson

>
> NONE of that is a "military secret" or "classified to prevent damage
> to national defense." It is simply unknown by all those who think
> that "radio" for everyone else works on 1930s standards and
> practices.

Really? I alwasy thought that the rules governing radio were finite since they were firts discovered. Are you suggesting that your radio goes beyond the law of physics and in your case, I am not referring to an enema, although it seems your life is a tad constipated :-) (note smiley)

>
> Those who don't want to learn about the rest of the world can remain
> in their closed-cycle never-never land. I can explain much more,
> more contemporary radio in the REST of the world...but why
> bother? Closed minds don't want new input, want to remain static
> and locked into "amateur-only" knowledge, and sneer at anyone
> who has done something else in radio.

EXCEPT SIR STUP_A_LOT, this is an amateur related newgroup, a concept you still have difficulty in understanding. Your experienec in our radio does not mean squat here to anyone but yourself. Get it Len. AMATEUR RADIO..AMATEUR RADIO, not AM Rush Limbaugh type Imus in the Morning type radio. Get with the program man. You can't beleiev just how pathetic you look when you make there statements.

If you're so keen on showing off your radio expertice, find a newsgroup that would best serve that inflated ego oif your, like rec.radio.experiemtning.

You, UFO, want to bring
> down everyone to your level, but not all wish to drop down to
> your sociopathic level.

WOW BIG WORDS FROM A BIG MAN... oh my didums feewings get hurt. Did the big bad mans scare the whittle Whennie Anderson?? Oh my.

Geez Len, You make a statement that trivialized the death of over 3000 innocent people and then rant about some earthquake 10 years ago. You seem to think your military experience is something that everyone needs to know and know and know and know and yet you offer nothing. I am willing to gamble that 1/3 of the people here are ex-military and yet you are the only one that seems to rate. Wow, you sat at a desk and relayed teletype messages...SILVER STARS all around Yep, that certainly ranks right up there. I, personally was responsible for hurling Volkswagen Beetles over the horizon at unseen targets in support of ground troops....big whoop. I had a job and I did it. And guess what..the gun ready enunciators had a light that showed green and, although not OOK CW MORSE, did sound the letter "R", to show that the gun(s) were ready for firing. My two index fingers were all that was needed on the triggers to send those VW size projectiles skyward. Big deal. At the recent dedication of the ship, I was able to explain the procedure for firing the guns. Ya know what...the people were

more impressed with the loading and handling of the shells in the turrets. OH well, that's life.

You, on the other hand are so god damn insecure you have to beat everyone continually with your "war" stories. NO YOU CARES LEN.

You rant about how hams are stuck in the past, yet your entire existence revolves around 1953-1956. If math stands...THAT IS THE PAST you FOOL.

You refuse to accept the position that in many MANY instances hams volunteer their time to emergencies with no thought of credit and glory AND THAT GALLS YOU TO DEATH doesn't it Len? You refuse to accept the fact that these are ordinary people helping out in extraordinary circumstances and that eats you up like a cancer WELL TOUGH SHIT. In fact, take your little Lonnie TS card, place it over your Ken doll type groin and I'll be happy to stamp it with my TS stamp.

So regal us again with your increasing dull and boring military career. Tell us how amateurs don't contribute because YOU never see it in the paper. Funny, that's what I thought volunteerism is..doing something for others without having to bring attention to ones self. You aren't that definition..and you have the gall to call me a psycho.....wow you da man. you da bomb.

The others were right when they suggested to come here and see for myself that morons like you actually exist and prove on a daily basis that they can embarrass themselves with ever increasing frequency.

Keep on keeping on Len, but remember, just because you say it certainly means it ain't so.

Cecil logic test ADA Leonard H Anderson is a human being

BTW, you made 7 spelling mistakes, but who's counting right??? ;-)

5567. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:54:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c77145f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35176

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202220824.391dcf6d@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3c75c4a1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020221101042.21470.00000002@mb-mg.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c744ae5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > > I do (my
> > > >Saturn and this truck are the only two automatics I have had since
> > > >driving--started in a SAAB, then Yugo, , then Subaru GLF, then VW
Golf,
> > now
> > > >these two recent vehicles).
> > >
> > > What truck?
> >
> > My new truck.
>
> Ah, the Tacoma you wrote about in another post.
> >
> > > >An appropriate analogy, though, for the
> > > >stickshift would be that I can drive it, but why would I want to beat
> > myself
> > > >up with one?
> > >
> > > Shifting one of those cars is "beating yourself up"?
> >
> > It is in this traffic around here.
>
> Thought you lived out in the "boonies".
>

I live in the boonies, but I work right smack dab in downtown Dallas. Takes
me 1hr 15 min to go 32 miles. And, that is in "normal" traffic jams. If
there's an accident...well, add about 20 min to that.

> > > >(I had to get out of stickshifts because of my back).
> > >
> > > Then you can't drive one, so now I'm not supposed to operate CW.
>
> > I don't know, Jim. Are you really going to base whether you can do
> > something or not, on what someone else does?

>
> You do it all the time. For example, consider the following:
>
> "I didn't buy it for it's reliability, however, I bought it for
> its looks. The truck that appeals to me most as eye candy is the
> Toyota Tacoma. So, I bought it."
>

I'm sure you understand your analogy. I do not.

>
> Of course you don't see how the truck looks on the outside while
> driving it - only other people do. So choosing a vehicle by how it
> looks is really an
> exercise in wanting to project a certain image to other people, and
> hopefully get a desired reaction. So your choice of vehicle was
> largely
> driven by what others do (reaction to its appearance).
>

You may see it that way. *I* like the way it looks. (Also really enjoy the way it sounds inside, and feels inside. Not a top-notch sound system, but a lot better than I've ever had!) I don't care what someone else thinks of the way it looks. Would you also say that I might own a dog because of how other people see the dog? I am sorry, but I am not into projecting anything to anyone, Jim.

> > Yes, I can still drive a
> > standard...if I want to run around with a painful back all the time.
>
> Must be some sort of serious problem if shifting and clutching a
> Saturn
> or similar car causes constant pain. Sorry to hear that.
>
> > > > That is
> > > >to auto driving as CW is to radio: why would I want to beat myself
and
> > > >others up with using CW when I can do lots of other things that may
work
> > > >just as well?
> > >
> > > "Beat yourself up"? Good heavens.
> > >
> > > Besides, other things don't work "just as well". That's the point.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Back to radio. CW only works "just as well," Jim, if one is skillful or
at
> > least somewhat knowledgeable of its use and can intelligently use the
mode.

>
> The same is true of any mode. The point is that CW/Morse works better
> than
> many other modes (mostly voice modes), given equivalent levels of
> skill in
> the operators.
>

I don't know that I disagree with that. And, I don't know that I ever
challenged that.

> >
> > I don't do either, and don't wish to.
>
> The discussion was about choosing reliable vs. unreliable things. It
> seemed that you were pushing the idea of choosing less relaible over
> more reliable.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think the point you missed because it wasn't relayed well is that the MODE
CW may be reliable...but it's moot if there's few people around to use it,
hear it and understand it.

Kim W5TIT

5568. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 03:58:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c771554_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35181

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222221020.20827.00000014@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <20020222183509.17617.00000078@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> >>>Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> >>>>condition.
> >>>>So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
> >
> >>>Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered
are
> >>>too
> >>>lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will
help
> >>>them see that clothes washing is a good thing.
> >
> >>I don't think so, Ed. What brought on that outburst? You ever see me
call
> >>anyone "lazy"?
> >
> >It was a joke, Jim.
>
> "I made a funny. Hey, son, I'm pitchin' but you ain't catchin' " - Foghorn
> Leghorn
>
> >I thought it so obvious that I didn't bother with the
> >smiley.
> >
> MY BAD!!!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Got somebody coming to see the washer tomorrow.

The washer selling experience may have Jim in a more sensitive mood.

Kim W5TIT

5569. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:04:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7716ca$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35182

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020222223021.17754.00000076@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <20020221201845.26690.00000075@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com
> >
> >>So if someone thinks the tests are difficult, they're lazy
knuckle-draggers.
> >>What a wonderful anology.
> >
> >And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!
>
> Ed:
>
> Axeually, I have a lot of sympathy for lazy knuckle-draggers. From
> a strictly ham radio perspective, I used to be one myself. However,
> I was able to overcome those tendencies, and attain 20 WPM
> and Extra class with relative ease, once I got started. At that time,
> the only thing keeping me out of ham radio was my own lack of
> willingness to learn a useful communications skill. It "filtered" me
> out. Had I not had to earn my privileges under the set of testing
> requirements in place at the time, it is not very likely that I would
> have done a fraction as much on-the-air as I have, nor would I have
> had a fraction as much fun. I really feel sorry for future hams who
> will never know the satisfaction of being "Real Hams" because they
> simply won't learn Morse code in the absence of a meaningful
> license testing requirement to do so.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

heh heh heh...look at it this way: At least Larry found something he was
actually good at...

Kim W5TIT

5570. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:06:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gryknm8.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35177

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 20:02:43 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Maybe so. Makes me feel glad that I'm in a tract where the CC&R's
>are 50 years old. There was even an anti-"African-American" clause in
>it, which went poof in 1964 with a certain change in federal law (that
>has never been amended out).

Those types of restrictions were thrown out by the _Shelley v
Ktaemer_ decision by the SCOTUS in 1948, Fred Vinson, C.J.

>This just goes to show you: One has to simply pick the correct tract!

It's become harder and harder. My 1965-era tract house CC&Rs don't
talk about antennas but do talk about maximum height limits of
structures and appurtinances. Fortunately I can get a 50-foot tower
under that radar and get into a wresting match with the city over
engineering standards.

My former 1988-vintage condo CC&Rs did, but had a provision for the
Association board to permit the installation. No sweat - I was on
the board. One of my neighbors wanted an amplified SWL antenna
(small box and 3 foot whip). No problem. Another neighbor wanted a
DSS dish pre-OTARD. No problem.

Just gotta pick the right association, especially one that has a
pro-antenna ham attorney on the board.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5571. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:07:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gryl0c9.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35178

On 22 Feb 2002 23:38:17 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>I think that cell phone towers are what many neighbors of hams envision when a
>ham wants to put up a tower. Some 'o them suckers are BIG!

Pac Bell put up one along side our congregation's parking lot (guess
who the latter's negotiator was). They put up a 50-foot monopole
between two existing 40-foot pine trees, and enclosed the equipment
housing in a side-and-top fence enclosure that looks like a redwood
packing crate. After a month we didn't even notice that it was
there. The payment rolls in month after month.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5572. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:07:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gryl9fa.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35179

On 22 Feb 2002 23:50:19 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Phil might be able to fill us in on whether the principle of delayed
>discovery would apply here.

The clock starts when the violation is discovered or when it
should have been discovered by due diligence, whichever is
earlier.

---
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

5573. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:08:18 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <SAEd8.10334$ZC3.778591@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35180

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222222004.18416.00000173@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> >Date: 2/22/2002 12:21 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Frld8.7513$ZC3.600032@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> >
> >Now note, using Cecilian logic, Len states HE
relayed-transmitted....(cars
> >are black, etc)
>
> Thanks, Ron...! I love seeing Lennie the Liar Anderson getting his
balls
> busted!
>
> I rolled even harder watching him try to spin his way out of this in
the
> post that followed!
>
> Part of Lennie's arrogance, Ron, is that he refuses to accept that we
KNOW
> what an arrogant putz he is, and he continues to post so-easily unravelled
> stories.
>
> Stay tuned...His attempts to un-spin this faux pas will be "Classic
> Lennie".
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Too late, he's already gone off and shot his load of blanks AGAIN!!. I can't understand how a man (loosely affiliated with the definition he is) can repeatedly berate a group that he is no part of, wants no part of and will never be a part of, for supposedly living in the past, yet continually posts his 1953-1956 military career as if that's some sort of modern day bible for all to read.

Right now, he's the laughing to of the North Shore of Long Island. We have club members who are real life electrical engineers working for Grumman, or what's left of it, and read this stuff and just about have strokes laughing so hard. I am sure there are several here on rrap lurking to see what other 1950's revelations ADA (A Dumb Ass) Anderson. I've heard some praise for

Carl as they seem to be on similar wavelengths but when it comes to Len, they compare him to Fred Flintstone. It's priceless

I noticed that Len failed to acknowledge the fact that Pres. Bush praised amateur radio operators in Florida or them Mayor Giuliani for their tireless work in the 1st 5 days of 911 when phone service was so dramatically disrupted. I see Len grinding his teeth when things like that are posted, because it proves him so wrong as to look even more foolish that normal.

Oh BTW, as with Kim, 28.525 is a tad too high. I've been a tech+ for years..see no real reason to upgrade, still have my original WB call as well. I'd give the rest but with nut cases like Len, you can't been too careful.

Have a good weekend. I see some decent DX is on, maybe I'll fire up the Kenwood 440 and see if I can break a pile-up or 2 with 100 watts and a G5RV

Later, and keep fighting the good fight. Len makes it way too easy.

73, Ronnie

5574. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 04:41:54 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35183

In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> reliability is a moot point.

Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?

joshua houk
kd7pos

5575. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:25:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C786C09.95B58D66@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35184

N2EY wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C77A407.E17EE19F@worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > To say that you may have
> > a particular antenna for the express purpose ONLY of watching
> > TV and if you decide to also use it for other purposes you are in
> > violation would seem to be completely in violation of your
> > rights to use your own property.
>
> Seems that way, but that's how it works. I don't like it, but I
> understand how it works.
>
> What's really going on is that by buying a no-antennas-CC&R house, the
> owner has agreed to have no outside antennas of any kind, for any purpose
> whatsoever.
>
> Then the FCC preempts (overrides) the no-antenna-CC&R for a single, very
> specific type of antenna, to be used for a specific purpose: TV reception.
> And for no other purpose. FCC only did it because The Congress told them to.

Of course that's correct. No one is keeping a CCR'ed homeowner
from using his property any way he wants except the people who are
intent on enforcing the contract he signed. Entirely different function from governmental
law
enforcement.

5576. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:35:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223003516.26927.00000031@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35185

In article <MPG.16e0a612d6c5f9f98968e@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>James at 15, er, Len over 21 says...
>
>> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
>> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
>
>You're entirely correct - I don't have a handle.
>
>I have a "call sign".

The UFO trying to pass himself off as "Ronnie D." has no callsign.

5577. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:35:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223003516.26927.00000030@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35186

In article <MPG.16e0a55aa2969e8a98968d@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
>> Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > "Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
>> > with ANY radio?!?
>> >
>> > Incredulosity abounds...
>
>Thanks Dave - I'd missed this since it found it generally pointless to
>open any of Len's posts.

The reason for that is an inability to reply (so far) on anything technical in regards to radio or electronics. There is no evidence to support it.

>Len, seeing how fastidious a reader you are of r.r.a.p. (for god knows
>what reason - but in the event that you actually *are* interested in
>amateur radio, come on in, the water's fine), I'm a bit surprised that
>you missed Cecil's post where he berated Dick for turning him of amateur
>radio, since he was a newcomer and therefore impressionable.

Good humor has to be written so that it will be written as humor. Attempting to disguise sarcasm as "humor" will leave it looking as sarcasm to readers.

>Am I a newcomer to radio? I don't understand why that would be a bad
>thing (we amateurs tend to help each other out, y'know), but to sate your
>appetite, no.

A newcomer to the world is recognized by their expressions on matters to others. The recognition in a newsgroup is limited to the written word, no other clues possible. The recognition from Joshua Hook is that of a PCTA who is a "new gun" in the newsgroup looking for a "reputation." Joshua Hook has earned one. It isn't a high one, it isn't a good one.

Joshua Hook seems to have NO knowledge of any other communications but amateur radio. Upon seeing that other world he would realize that amateur radio is really only a minority group in all the radio world. Such a realization does not bode well for those who seek self-proclamation of greatness in a technical pursuit solely by means of credentialism, articles of status, rank, and, especially, putting down those who are

not devoted to the promotion of more of the same of an amateur
radio hobby..

5578. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:35:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223003517.26927.00000032@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35188

In article <MPG.16e0a71b39c2a26b98968f@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>In article <20020222200152.17627.00000029@mb-mo.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com says...
>
>> To the code-loving beeper on HF the ONLY bands for hams
>> are those below 30 MHz. There's a fair chunk of the spectrum
>> above 30 MHz allocated for ham use, ainit? Do you want to
>> sneer at microwave-band experimenters like this one did? -
>
>Isn't CW pretty much obligatory ('cept for the odd masochist) at the
>10GHz+ level? Above that - and yes, it's the largest bandwidth in the
>amateur bands - CW is the predominant mode.

The "obligatory" modes at frequencies above 30 MHz (as well as those below) are given in Part 97, Title 47 CFR. Those who wish to operate legally as radio amateurs in allocated bands are obligated to obey FCC regulations. NOTHING else is "obligatory" except to those who have done nothing but read about the subject, developing attitudes fostered by elder hams who are rather highly biased to their own particular "standards."

Any communications link can use any mode which is agreeable to those operating the link and within regulations. Hook may find, on journeying outside the cloisters of amateur regimentation maintained by the PCTAs, that CW is neither "obligatory," useful, nor of any real value (except to QST editors who are obliged to add that "CW was used for initial contact" on some described earth-shaking event by hams in the microwave region) above UHF.

>> I've "worked" microwave DX two-way on a 240,000 mile path,
>> but not in the "ham bands." I don't consider that any big thing
>> but there is NO terrestrial DX that can come close to that range.
>>
>> Didn't need a single morse skill to do that. Why not?
>
>See above comment on masochism.

Irrelevant. The above is another posting of sarcasm that will be rationalized as "humor" in a later reply...and not accepted as anything but rationalization. By sane individuals.

The rest of the radio world uses a great many modes above UHF, many many more than are allocated to amateurs. MOST of the rest of the radio world does not require the masochism of trying to

use 1930s standards and practices in an advanced technology by a rigid adherence to old mindsets and an almost prussian discipline of "precise" methods, jargon, and tradition. MOST of the rest of the radio world does not require the operators of non-amateur radio to be licensed; stations are licensed for regulatory purposes and the station owners see that operation is kept legal by overseeing the operators.

Nearly all of the rest of the radio world has migrated up above 30 MHz and there is where the future of radio communications is located. To all except for the minority who are still rooted in old standards and practices, trying to force everyone to conform to their personal desires because they like to see others "enjoying" masochism.

As to being a "newcomer," Hook may be able to pull off a good snow job with words (the future will tell) on his abilities, knowledge, age, everything, but so far he has done little but try to play "the new gun in town."

5579. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:35:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223003519.26927.00000033@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35189

In article <20020222222934.18416.00000175@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>History: US Army press release in 1956 had stated some facts
>>of Army communications which included 1.25 million messages
>>PER MONTH relayed by Washington Army Radio in 1955
>
> No, no, no, Your Putziness..You said YOU transmitted or relayed those
>messages.

For one shift as part of one of four operating teams, ABSOLUTELY, but only at ADA, not at WAR. Please try to read carefully before apoplexy clouds the big badass ex-marine's vision.

Me and a few hundred others all working together. Everyone's abilities and cooperation was required. Lose one part and the whole circuit goes down.

>>The math is correct. The math is also extremely conservative
>>since it does not include the higher rate prior to 1955 nor the
>>temporary 12-hour shift period of 1954.
>
> And still does not support ANY claim by you, Leonard HaHa Anderson, that
>YOU transmitted or relayed 1.25 million messages.

I did not claim "1.25 million messages." I claimed an approximation of 1.32 million based on known statistics of 1955 and clarified in sufficient detail.

>>None of the US military fixed-point to fixed-point HF radio
>>circuits were planned to use OOK CW from 1948 onwards.
>
> Which does not have anything to do with YOUR claim of passing 1+ million
>messages. What do you call it..."misdirected"...?!?!

No misdirection, just IGNORANCE of a claimed military veteran based on his never being part of any branch's signal operations and not demonstrating knowledge or familiarity with any military radio operations or equipment other than some avionics black boxes.

To repeat, military message transmission in a signals unit is NOT done by some solo operator in front of a single radio. It is the cooperative, coordinated effort and skills of ALL in the unit.

> For once you are right...since you are not an "average" troll,
>Lennie...And it's obvious that you tripped yourself with your own lies....

No lies. It is not surprising that a great deal of ignorance of the rest of the world of radio exists among radio amateurs...the publications seldom carry such information and too many amateurs are loathe to attempt understanding the radio professionals.

> You are the mathematically deficient one, Your Lyingness.

No. The calculations were described.

>>From memory, the ADA trans-Pacific HF transmissions went to
>>San Francisco....(SNIP)
>
> Mythological historical events snipped. Yor wifey has her leather's on,
>Lennie...run along.

Military signals operations are not "mythology." They are not recorded in any near-past history in amateur radio publications...except as very brief, very minor mentions on conversion of military surplus equipment if at all. The bigbadass ex-marine has demonstrated NO knowledge whatsoever of military radio skills, knowledge, or familiarity and has attempted to bluff his way in knowledge several times. Those of us who have actually worked in communications know and recognize him for the bluffing fake he is.

A gratuitous insult of my wife is way out of place. This is about the fourth such remark, equally uncalled-for, equally out of place.

Does such an insulting attitude portray amateur radio "leadership" in a good light? None. No light at all.

>Steve and the Boys

"Steve and the Boys" ought to relax, go out in the streets, look for old people to beat up and laugh at their agony. So far the "boys" haven't done so with me. Mosquito bites are not agony but are rather irritating. "The Boys" are mosquitoes.

5580. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:35:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223003520.26927.00000034@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35187

In article <20020222220523.18416.00000171@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I can count
>>at least five VE ham test locations within that distance today.
>
> Too bad you are too incompetent to pass those tests, eh...?!?! Wouldn't
>have to go far at all to find out just how little you really do know. I'll
>foot the fee, Lennie.

I have no keen interest on joining an activity which has such a high percentage of sociopathic technical morons as demonstrated by "Steve and the Boys."

"Incompetence in radio?!?" After a career in it that covered a wider span of the EM spectrum than ever allocated amateurs, using more modes and modulations than ever allocated amateurs, and getting paid for it IN engineering? Not hardly.

What can Steve of "Steve and the Boys" claim? Changing black boxes in aircraft? Being a purchasing agent? [good luck on your new job] Or sitting around waiting for some elderly people to show up so you can show off your manly skills at beating up old folks?

Knowledge gained and applied is not signified by "credentials" of this or that, nor of generalized claims of greatness in a newsgroup. It is signified by direct evidence. See the CD-ROM of the contents of 22 years of articles in Ham Radio magazine, 3-disk set resold by the ARRL. See some more publications...unfortunately for "the Boys" not concerning amateur radio.

> Matters not, Oh Creepy one...He STILL has a license to emit RF WITHOUT
>needing somone else's station license and authorization to do it.
>
> You don't.

Actually, most other radio services in the big radio world in the USA do NOT need an operator license to legally emit. Several radio services do NOT even need station licenses.

>>The grant of a radio operator license is NOT, nor has it EVER been
>>any sort of academic skill test. It is simply an AUTHORIZATION
>>by the federal government for the licensee to operate on a certain
>>part of the EM spectrum.
>
> Not on "a certain part", Oh Flailing One, on MANY certain parts. And in
>more modes and techniques than YOU are presently "authorized" to emit!

>
>Laughingly Yours,

Then go and EMIT. Look around you, there may be more targets
for you to EMIT more bile and vomit, certainly some old folks that
look weak to you that you think you can beat up.

So far you don't present a good example of the US ARS...or even
as a human being unless as a barbarian sub-species...
Attilla the Ham.

5581. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:40:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C786F8D.F3228E30@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35190

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > I learned that most people only want the license and will do
> > whatever is required to get it
>
> That's what I did in 1963. I met the requirements. Hams today meet the
> requirements.

So maybe the requirements are inadequate.

> And the easiest way to to do that is to learn the underlying
> material.

That's your opinion, one not shared by a large percentage of
applicants who have no technical background and find it more
of a problem to acquire one than to just study the question and
answer pools.

> Why do you keep trying to convince new hams not to do that?

Why do you keep wrongfully accusing me of that while ignoring
all the Kim's who plainly state that they did it that way?
All your braying about "1,000 questions and answers" and your
"Russian words" or whatever is pure deviant distraction.
People with a technical background will find it easier to learn
the material while those with no technical background for the most
part will not. For the most part they find it much quicker and easier
to just memorize.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

5582. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:45:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7870C2.BCCA311E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35191

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Short memory, Ed? What goes around comes back around, ya know.
> >Dish it out and you'd better be ready to take it.
>
> Well, at least you admit what your real agenda is.

I see that your assumer is working well.

5583. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 05:59:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7873E1.45CB20F7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35192

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > When a VE team tests in an area where lots of technical people
> > reside, the technical level of applicants will be much higher than
> > it is where few technically oriented people live. Yet the national
> > pass-fail average was 66% when I served as a VE, and our team's
> > average always was almost exactly the national average. Yet there
> > were few technically trained people in that rural area, and most
> > new hams did indeed come from CB. Either the tests are easy to
> > pass and applicants easily learn the material, regardless of their
> > lack of technical background, or the tests are easily compromised.
> > An area where lots of highly trained persons live should have a
> > higher pass-fail ratio. It doesn't seem to be working out
> > that way. So one can deduce that evidently the tests don't test for
> > knowledge, rather mastering testing technique. Or else they're dead-
> > easy, and that's perhaps just as bad.
>
> Maybe the applicants in the tech regions are younger on average?

I didn't see that at all, in fact we had a high percentage of persons
ujnder 40. I think that would be considered as young for the average
new ham today.

>
> Maybe that 66% success rate indicates when applicants feel
> confident enough to go to a VE session and take the tests.

I've seen people set down, go down the sheet checking one after the next and
turn it in within 15 minutes, with not a mark on the scratch
sheet. Not problem worked, not a formula written down and make a good passing
score. I can only conclude they had done the memory
thing till they could instantly
pick out the matching answer to any question on whatever exam they prepared
for.

> Also,
> how does that statistic handle an applicant that passed say the
> general but failed the extra?
>

A passed element is a plus, a failed element is a negative. Calculated
separately from upgrades.

5584. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 06:05:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223010538.17627.00000034@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35193

In article <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

>I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass. Hey
>guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or
>what?

Sorry, lil' Stevie, but MOS 281.6 was NOT clerk-typist.

Steve Adell, KF2TI, in yet-another personna but losing his MicroPlanet Gravity v2.50. Tsk, tsk.

Multiple Personality Disorder can be treated and kept in check by proper medical treatment. Too bad he hasn't done it. Another fine example of the sterling qualities to add to amateur radio public relations - MPD with overtones of schizophrenia. That works well with sociopathy shown by others. Could it be all the morseodist beeping causing that?

5585. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 06:09:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C787642.AE6B8F31@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35194

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C712B7F.DB14094F@worldnet.att.net...
> > The VE
> > > testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the
> extra exam
> > > and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
> > > Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.
>
> Dick, it's always possible that the government will take away your
> priveleges and make you test to "earn" them back. It's happened before, and
> can happen again.

Finally drew the gnat out of hiding! Hi, Gadfly! Skood to seeja!
Guess ya must have missed it in ur rush to Extra lite,eh? The one
mistake FCC wasn't about to repeat was taking away privileges
already granted. Comprende?

>
> Who wants to be on that VE team?
>

Hey, I just do it. You and Kandid Karl just whine about it.
If they came out with Super Extra I'd have one 30 years before you, like last
time..

>

5586. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 06:10:35 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <vnGd8.9848$0C1.832349@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35195

What..no war stories..no military career resume???

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223003516.26927.00000031@mb-ma.aol.com...
> In article <MPG.16e0a612d6c5f9f98968e@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
Houk
> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >James at 15, er, Len over 21 says...
> >
> >> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> >> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
> >
> >You're entirely correct - I don't have a handle.
> >
> >I have a "call sign".
>
> The UFO trying to pass himself off as "Ronnie D." has no callsign.

Sure I do Len. Have had it for years. You're a clever lad, look it up in the callbook. Give you a hint, I've had my license for quite some time, try some time in the 80's perhaps. I've had problem with mental defectives like you suddenly have this desire to be my friend. Phone calls in the middle of the night...100's of e-mails sent, 100's of mailing lists subscribed to. You fit the profile perfectly. What next? You'll want to come to NY to visit me and the family. Maybe to pay a visit to Ground Zero and spit on the site. Explain to the crowds how trivial it all must seem because you lived through an earthquake. Nah Len..stay home. LA needs nuts like you. You're the local color. Without you, LA would be just another city

As to my callsign, you show me yours and I'll show you mine. ;-o

Wow, some word warrior. I've seen better fights from school children. BTW, are you related to Burt Fisher, K1OIK. He's another mental defective with a chip on his shoulder when it comes to amateur radio. Maybe long lost twins. You both seem so brave as long as you can hide behind your 15" LCD flat screens.

Keep posting..the laugh riot never seems to end with you.

No regards or cheers for you Left coast loser

Ronnie

5587. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 06:25:05 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <5BGd8.9880$0C1.830076@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35196

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223003517.26927.00000032@mb-ma.aol.com...

>
> The rest of the radio world uses a great many modes above UHF,
> many many more than are allocated to amateurs.

But this not the rest of the world Len, this is amateur radio..a
hobby/service. You lose points here for making no points in dealing with
the obvious SORRY

MOST of
> the rest of the radio world does not require the operators of non-
> amateur radio to be licensed

But this not the rest of the world Len, this is amateur radio..a
hobby/service. You lose points here for making no points in dealing with
the obvious SORRY

; stations are licensed for regulatory
> purposes and the station owners see that operation is kept legal
> by overseeing the operators.

The ley word being licensed I see. Still waiting to sdhare my amateur
callsign with with you when you share yours with us.

>
> Nearly all of the rest of the radio world has migrated up above 30
> MHz and there is where the future of radio communications is
> located.

Then I suggest you go there were you'll be more comfortable amongst you own
kind. I am sure you thrill the Braodcast world with your daring feats of
dare-doing when YOU send/relay 1.32 million teletypes. You did say YOU Len.
Your original statement never said anything about being a team. Nice try
through with that tap dance backwards you did. You got the goodies caught
in the door there old man and I can call you that cause you're a tad older
than me (I'm only 58) hint hint another clue to my identity. Besides, I
doubt you are any type of team player.

To all except for the minority who are still rooted in old
> standards and practices, trying to force everyone to conform to
> their personal desires because they like to see others "enjoying"
> masochism.

They are partctpants in amateur radio....not professional radio Get the
difference. I guess it's like people who fly model planes..never getting

the satisfaction of flying the real thing. Wannabe's, nothing more, nothing less. They ones that can't be pilots are always ragging on those that are. Seems they are a minority subset of amateur radio as well.

>
> As to being a "newcomer," Hook may be able to pull off a good
> snow job with words (the future will tell) on his abilities, knowledge,
> age, everything, but so far he has done little but try to play "the
> new gun in town."

again with this fascination with guns. Gee Len, bet you polish your gun regularly huh?? Bet the barrel is nice a shiny from all that gun polishing. Are you a spit and polish man? Knew several onboard ship...Always kept polishing their guns.

Thanks again Len. Just finished watching a William Holden movie..he's a Korean Pilot gets shot down in the end with Mickey Rooney. Saw a shot of the radio room with all sorts of electronic equipment. Didn't see in the credits you were there. But you must have been..relaying those 1.32 million teletypes all by yourself

5588. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 06:28:41 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <tEGd8.9890$0C1.828327@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35197

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223010538.17627.00000034@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Ronnie
> D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass.
Hey
> >guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or
> >what?
>
> Sorry, lil' Stevie, but MOS 281.6 was NOT clerk-typist.
>
> Steve Adell, KF2TI, in yet-another personna but losing his
> MicroPlanet Gravity v2.50. Tsk, tsk.

???????

5589. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 08:07:10 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e0ecb3419c044d989691@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35198

In article <20020223003516.26927.00000030@mb-ma.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com says...
> In article <MPG.16e0a55aa2969e8a98968d@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Thanks Dave - I'd missed this since it found it generally pointless to
> >open any of Len's posts.
>
> The reason for that is an inability to reply (so far) on anything
> technical in regards to radio or electronics. There is no
> evidence to support it.

Oh, don't put yourself in too high regard there. The reason for a general
lack of response is, as seen here, because you're an uncouth functionally
illiterate nabob of negativism prone to bouts of logorrhea.

> Good humor has to be written so that it will be written as humor.
> Attempting to disguise sarcasm as "humor" will leave it looking
> as sarcasm to readers.

And the more perceptive among us would realize that I meant my words as
sarcasm.

> A newcomer to the world is recognized by their expressions on
> matters to others. The recognition in a newsgroup is limited to
> the written word, no other clues possible.

George W. Bush hasn't posted here recently, but we recognize him anyhow.
Funny how that works...

> The recognition from Joshua Hook is that of a PCTA who is a "new gun"
> in the newsgroup looking for a "reputation." Joshua Hook has earned
> one. It isn't a high one, it isn't a good one.

Well, good thing my name's Joshua Houk instead...

Don't bother replying - I won't bother opening another one of your
petulant screeds again.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5590. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:32:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223053209.03609.00000188@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35199

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

>>I think that cell phone towers are what many neighbors of hams envision when
>a
>>ham wants to put up a tower. Some 'o them suckers are BIG!
>
> Pac Bell put up one along side our congregation's parking lot (guess
> who the latter's negotiator was). They put up a 50-foot monopole
> between two existing 40-foot pine trees, and enclosed the equipment
> housing in a side-and-top fence enclosure that looks like a redwood
> packing crate. After a month we didn't even notice that it was
> there. The payment rolls in month after month.

And some o' them suckers are not big. :-)

I think that ones that stand out in people's minds are the ones that stand out on the sides of the interstates. I have seen some that I sure wouldn't want in my yard. That may be the origin of some of the anti-tower hysterial.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5591. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:35:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223053509.03609.00000189@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35200

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
>mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
>reliability is a moot point.

That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5592. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:38:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223053809.03609.00000191@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35051

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>The washer selling experience may have Jim in a more sensitive mood.

If it was the worst misunderstanding here, we could all live with it. Some of the others remind me of the "What he said, what she heard" series that is running in the current funny papers.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5593. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:41:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223054115.03609.00000193@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35052

From: "JAMES HAMPTON" j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net

>The ARRL is likely to do a lot more for us than any of us can do
>for ourselves.

They tried, and the Commission was quite clear -- the FCC is not going to
pre-empt CC&Rs about Amateur antennas unless Congress tells them to do so.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5594. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:43:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223054302.03609.00000194@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35053

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Who wants to be on that VE team?

I want to ask him about how field strength varies in the far field of an antenna. He actually said that it varied as the inverse square of the distance. We had a great big argument, ending in his saying that everybody knows that fields vary as the inverse of the distance.

He might get that one right now. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5595. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:49:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223054930.03609.00000195@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35054

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> That's what I did in 1963. I met the requirements. Hams today meet the
>> requirements.

> So maybe the requirements are inadequate.

The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level requirments of 1963. The requirements today to obtain all amateur priveleges require the studying of a lot more than a 16-page study guide. If you are claiming Amateur Radio is in the tubes because of the requirements, you are claiming that it has been broken for almost 40 years. That is quite a bit to expect people to believe, considering the evidence of the continuous growth and evolution of Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5596. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 10:52:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223055200.03609.00000196@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35055

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> >Short memory, Ed? What goes around comes back around, ya know.
>> >Dish it out and you'd better be ready to take it.
>>
>> Well, at least you admit what your real agenda is.
>
> I see that your assumer is working well.

Okay, then by your above quip, can I assume that you are telling us that your intent is not to dish it out and watch others take it?

Just what can one infer from what you say, Dick?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5597. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 11:51:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c778474$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35056

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
reliable
> > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> > reliability is a moot point.
>
> Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I don't
think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.

Kim W5TIT

5598. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 11:59:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c778607_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35057

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7873E1.45CB20F7@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Maybe the applicants in the tech regions are younger on average?
>
> I didn't see that at all, in fact we had a high percentage of persons
> ujnder 40. I think that would be considered as young for the average
> new ham today.
>
> >
> > Maybe that 66% success rate indicates when applicants feel
> > confident enough to go to a VE session and take the tests.
>
> I've seen people set down, go down the sheet checking one after the next
and
> turn it in within 15 minutes, with not a mark on the scratch
> sheet. Not problem worked, not a formula written down and make a good
passing
> score. I can only conclude they had done the memory
> thing till they could instantly
> pick out the matching answer to any question on whatever exam they
prepared
> for.
>
> > Also,
> > how does that statistic handle an applicant that passed say the
> > general but failed the extra?
> >
>
> A passed element is a plus, a failed element is a negative. Calculated
> separately from upgrades.
>
>

Dick doesn't have statistics...that's hilarious!!! All Dick has are
opinions and innuendoes.

Kim W5TIT

5599. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 12:06:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35058

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223053509.03609.00000189@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> >reliability is a moot point.
>
> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.

Kim W5TIT

5600. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 12:32:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223073215.26465.00000159@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35059

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/22/2002 9:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>WOW BIG WORDS FROM A BIG MAN... oh my didums feewings get hurt. Did the
>big bad mans scare the whittle Whennie Anderson?? Oh my.

I LOVE THIS GUY!!

Ronnie, I owe you steak and lobster, or your preferred meal of choice not requiring the sacrificing of any of my offspring!

DUDE!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5601. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 12:41:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223074119.26465.00000160@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35060

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/2002 12:05 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223010538.17627.00000034@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
>In article <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie
>D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass. Hey
>>guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or
>>what?
>
>Sorry, lil' Stevie, but MOS 281.6 was NOT clerk-typist.
>
>Steve Adell, KF2TI, in yet-another personna but losing his
>MicroPlanet Gravity v2.50. Tsk, tsk.
>
>Multiple Personality Disorder can be treated and kept in
>check by proper medical treatment. Too bad he hasn't
>done it. Another fine example of the sterling qualities to
>add to amateur radio public relations - MPD with overtones
>of schizophrenia. That works well with sociopathy shown
>by others. Could it be all the morseodist beeping causing
>that?

Hmmmm.....Lennie, otherwise known as "NOCWTEST", "Lenovover21",
:"Lenof21", "Avery Fine", and I am sure others, alleging someone ELSE of having
"Multiple Personality Disorder".

The same Lennie whose previous AOL "profile" suggested that he enjoyed
being the little old man being assaulted by Ruth Bozzy's purse.

Not that I believe your assertions of your wife's credentials anymore than
I believe yours, (what self-respecting woman with those credentials would marry
a scumbag like you?), you should seek some counselling.

Of course, in those Nazi dominitrix leathers, I doubt she'll let you get
much said.................Bad boy.......

5602. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 12:48:33 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e12ea7d2001cc6989692@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35061

In article <3c778474$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I don't
> think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.

Let's take a look at the numbers, shall we?

Before the 2000 restructuring, there were approximately 289,000 amateurs
with Extra, Advanced, or General licenses. That's a couple hundred of
thousand of people the understand CW.

In the United States.

And that only includes licensed amateurs, not other people who would know
morse, e.g., Coast Guard members and folks who were telegraphers by
trade.

That's not exactly chump change.

Sure - SSB would be your first option, but you'd want a backup to rely
on. And the numbers clearly indicate that there are quite enough people
familiar with morse to rely on it.

I'm a bit baffled to you're comment that people need to *like* CW in
order to rely on it. Do you know someone that would pass over a *** ---
*** when scanning the bands because they don't like the mode?

joshua houk
kd7pos

5603. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 12:59:14 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a583o1jbr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35063

In article <tEGd8.9890$0C1.828327@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
ronaldd@yahoo.com says...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020223010538.17627.00000034@mb-mo.aol.com...
> > In article <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "Ronnie
> > D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> > >I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass.
> Hey
> > >guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or
> > >what?
> >
> > Sorry, lil' Stevie, but MOS 281.6 was NOT clerk-typist.
> >
> > Steve Adell, KF2TI, in yet-another personna but losing his
> > MicroPlanet Gravity v2.50. Tsk, tsk.
>
> ???????

http://cws.Internet.com/news.html

Is the highly successful Stroud Winapp website where MPG newsreader can be downloaded for free. It has a wide variety of user friendly features and in cases like this one VERY useful feature - the BOZO BIN aka killfile. Click on a post, send the poster to the BOZO BIN, which in my case has 6 permanent residents, 5 from some DX NG's and the RRAP Resident old timer Lennie H, the wonderful wizard of Geezer.

Now on to our show HOLY SHIT LEN R U GAY OR WHAT? What is this fascination with me? Is every person here without a "handle" that you can't identify me? Are you a closet homoerotic or what? This is not normal, but then again, for you it may be.

Len, I am not Ronnie D. nor am I Jay of Westchester, nor Aaron nor Krell. I have always been posting under the same address and certainly you flatter yourself when you continually insist that I post under various nomme de plume. What a world class ass you are Len. WORLD CLASS to think I would go through ANY trouble to prove to the group what a shithead you truly are. From some of the responses, I'd saw you have that well in hand. Speaking of which..loved the comments Ron about Anderson being a gun barrel polisher... classic

Anyway, back to Sir Borings accusations

I have always used this newsreader, having upgraded just recently to V2.50. They have an automatic upgrade feature built in by I don;t like downloading anything without my seeing it first. You, Anderson have been a permanent fixture in the killfile since a month ago when I got an email from John J from Westchester detailing a plan to yank your chain. Seems you figured out I was him as well. What a great time Len, it was too easy as your chain is so easily yanked.

Any, I would have never seen this if Ron hadn't responded. Hell Anderson, I figured out who he was and all I'll say is he lives on LI..the north shore affectionately referred to as the land of big $$$ but rocky beaches. Gee Lennie, it took 5 minutes based on information he gave. Guess you're not that great a FBI man huh?

Gee Len, I looked something up follow me know...I'll go slow.

I accused by YOU of being all these people?? You, the master of the changing screen name based on what? My newsreader? How about young blood Josh Houk (BTW Josh, Len purposely mispells peoples name..he gets his jollies from it). Now young Josh uses Gravity v2.50 so, am I him as well?

But follow me here, based on your logic there are 3 people on this newsgroup who use the newsreader Session Scheduler. Therefore they all have to be the same person...but wait there's more. Not only do they use the same newsreader, but they all use the same Internet provider..Aye Oh EL.

So tell me Anderson, in reality who's the fake person in the NG. You, the call-less toad, Larry, K3LT, the callsigned toad or Jim, N2EY? You all use the same newsreader and Internet service. Hmmmmm makes you think (but not too hard Len, you give yourself a hemmoroid) :-) = smiley!!!!

Come to think of it Bill Sohl and I use the same Internet service. In fact, we've both had the same provider since they were Planet.net..many purchases and mergers ago. That being the case, maybe I'm him or he's me. Hmmmmm no..Bill is into little tiny British cars that have rotten electrical systems always wanted a TR6 still do, best call Moss Motors and see if they now of anything I digress

You're a rotten person Len. You were when you were NOCWTEST and you have only gotten worse.

In conclusion, based on this abnormal infatuation with me, I am e mailing the abuse department of AOL and filing a complaint about you. I am forwarding copies of these unsubstantiated accusations of yours. In short Anderson, I am putting you on notice. I see one piece of spam coming from an AOL account, I hold you responsible and will file complaints to AOL.

So respond Len, do your best. I have another week of vacation and then back on the road and so long RRAP. I missed it not last year.

So in closing Nice try cuddles Thanks for playing and drop dead, do everyone a favor. ;-) note winking smiley

Now..scoot back into the closet for you before some sprays you with Raid Bug Killer. Now we all want to see that gun barrel shine Sgt Anderson so keep polishing CLASSIC!!!!

No nothing for you Anderson

Oh wait...Cecil

cars are black I understood how about

Model T cars are black

That would be proven positive, correct? because of the qualifier?

5604. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 13:04:07 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a58414jbr2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35062

In article <20020223073215.26465.00000159@mb-fx.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com says...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> >Date: 2/22/2002 9:51 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> >WOW BIG WORDS FROM A BIG MAN... oh my didums feewings get hurt. Did the
> >big bad mans scare the whittle Whennie Anderson?? Oh my.
>
> I LOVE THIS GUY!!
>
> Ronnie, I owe you steak and lobster, or your preferred meal of choice not
> requiring the sacrificing of any of my offspring!
>
> DUDE!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Forget it Steve, didn't you read Ron is me hehehehehe

Can't eat lobster..the shell gets stuck in my teeth.

Ron is almost 60 so he's more than a match for geezer Anderson. He's ex-military (Navy) and is a pretty good DX'er for having only a tech+. I hear him the pile-ups some times.

But then again...maybe he's not!!! What evil lurks in the hearts of men....The Anderson do or is it doo-doo? Either way, they both define the same west coast louse.

Dayton this year?

5605. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 13:09:58 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a584c4jbr3@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35064

In article <20020223074119.26465.00000160@mb-fx.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
says...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/23/2002 12:05 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020223010538.17627.00000034@mb-mo.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ronnie
> >D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com> writes:

Wait, I missed this. How come my posts as well as Bill, K2UNK's show
our posts coming from mindspring.com and these are earthlink.net and yet
I am suppose to be all these other persons of Lennie's homoerotic
imagination.

As the FST album sez How can you be in 2 places at once when you're not
anywhere at all?

Wow, I forgot how much fun it is to bust LHA's master race balloons

> >
> >>I know this one I know this one. ADA = militaryspeak for A Dumb Ass. Hey
> >>guys and gals..I was right. Ol Len here was a clerk. Can I call them or
> >>what?
> >
> >Sorry, lil' Stevie, but MOS 281.6 was NOT clerk-typist.
> >
> >Steve Adell, KF2TI, in yet-another personna but losing his
> >MicroPlanet Gravity v2.50. Tsk, tsk.
> >
> >Multiple Personality Disorder can be treated and kept in
> >check by proper medical treatment. Too bad he hasn't
> >done it. Another fine example of the sterling qualities to
> >add to amateur radio public relations - MPD with overtones
> >of schizophrenia. That works well with sociopathy shown
> >by others. Could it be all the morseodist beeping causing
> >that?
>
> Hmmmm.....Lennie, otherwise known as "NOCWTEST", "Lenovover21",
> :"Lenof21", "Avery Fine", and I am sure others, alleging someone ELSE of having
> "Multiple Personality Disorder".
>
> The same Lennie whose previous AOL "profile" suggested that he enjoyed
> being the little old man being assaulted by Ruth Bozzy's purse.
>

> Not that I believe your assertions of your wife's credentials anymore than
> I believe yours, (what self-respecting woman with those credentials would marry
> a scumbag like you?), you should seek some counselling.
>
> Of course, in those Nazi dominitrix leathers, I doubt she'll let you get
> much said..................Bad boy.......
>
>

5606. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 16:20:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gryp75b.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35065

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 20:49:02 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>Can't hurt, but we'd do a lot better with prewritten 'print, sign &
>mail' letters for everybody to send to their city, state, and federal
>lawmakers.

We'd do a lot better by not making the inaccurate statements about
the law forbidding the use of a TV antenna for other purposes, and
if it was rewritten concisely and in more coherent English. And
cool it on "free speech". The courts have long ruled that there's
no "free speech" rights issues in radio, let alone ham radio.

Just a few minor corrections.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5607. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 16:20:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.grypdkc.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35066

On Fri, 22 Feb 2002 21:06:50 -0600, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>> And the FCC will skin yours (not issue a Declaratory Order of
>> preemption) if you do the above scheme. Their viewpoint is
>> EXCLUSIVE use for broadcast, and no other radio service.
>>
>> Good try, though. Better luck next time.

>This is a "family" hobby, after all...and here is a discussion about
>circumventing the rules :|

There's no rule violation involved. Anyone is free to use whatever
they want for whatever they want. Just depends on how much 'rasslin'
one wants to do with their "friends and neighbors" in the Association.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5608. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 16:44:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C77C6B3.3E656666@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35067

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
> >Houk
> >> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> >> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> > That only works in math. Spoken language has modifiers that can be
> >> >> > assumed based on experience.
> >> >>
> >> >> While spreading falsehoods to the inexperienced.
> >> >
> >> >I know that you're a newcomer to amateur radio and all, but Dick really
> >> >is telling the truth: CW does get through when other modes fail.
> >>
> >> "Newcomer?!?" Just how long has Joshua Hook been involved
> >> with ANY radio?!?
> >>
> >> Incredulosity abounds...
> >
> >Joshua probably doesn't have a handle on your decades of experience,
> >Len.
>
> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.

Cecil is a ham. You aren't.

> >This will provide yet another opportunity for you to blow the dust
> >off your resume and to outline your amazing exploits.
>
> I have no "amazing exploits."

For once, we are in agreement.

> I don't portray myself as Heil does,
> giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
> as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from

> an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
> wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.

There was no snow job. It wasn't my idea. I did not describe it as
"wonderful". I used a system which was in place. That you don't
understand the reasons for its use make it no less true and no less
effective.

> Way, way back in newsgroup prehistory somebody named Heil
> tried to pull off a fast one by parading his fantastic exploits in
> State Department radio by an "example," that of using CW as
> an "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. What he was banking on
> was no one knowing anything about HF comm anywhere else
> but in amateur radio practice. The term "order-wire" is not in the
> jargon of amateurs. Open opportunity for snow-jobbery, chest-
> thumping and self-praise. Problem was that someone DID know
> about order-wires, RTTY, and had actually DONE that a quarter
> century before. Tsk, tsk, snow got melted, BS revealed for the
> stinky stuff it was. Poor baby got all hurt and upset. Awww...

You didn't understand it then. You don't understand it now. The
discussion back then was government use of morse. It was then used.
That you don't accept that is of not much consequence.

> >We mere radio amateurs are sure to be spellbound by your tales.
>
> Poor baby, feeling poorly that no one is spellbound by Heil's
> Mighty Radio Accomplishments?

You've gotten more than this part twisted, Leonardo. I'm not attempting
to constantly post my past exploits. I am a ham. You aren't. You're
an SWL with attitude. You've made no attempt to actually become a ham.
You simply haunt a ham radio newsgroup on the internet.

> >In case Joshua hasn't been clued in, you are not yet a newcomer to
> >amateur radio though you hope to be one day.
>
> Wrong on both statements, clueless. I am a "newcomer" in sort
> of the same sense that Dale Earnhardt, Jr., is a "newcomer" to
> vehicles. Do you think the Zamboni is an ultimate vehicle?!?

You won't become a newcomer until you enter amateur radio. I'm not
discussing vehicles or Zambonis. I'm discussing Leonard H. Anderson,
non-ham, newcomer-to-be (maybe).

> Hint: Ice is a near relative of snow. There's a job for you there
> someplace but you retired.

I'm not even sure what this is.

> >You may become more
> >motivated as you compile one of your frequent restatements of the
> >obvious while wearing your spiffy new ARRL tee shirt.

>
> Awww...poor baby is all upset and snarly again.

You've misread my statement much as you've misread others. This one was simply an observation.

> Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that
> tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did
> they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.

Another Nazi reference, Len? In which statement did I mention CW?

> >Let me know if Ed
> >doesn't come through for you and I'll be happy to buy you one myself.
>
> No problem, happy Dave, you just keep on making all the snow
> and I might even buy you a shovel. [shovels are also good for
> removing your BS on CW and ham radio as you and only you
> judge it]

Does this mean you already have an ARRL tee-shirt?

> No, make that a mirror where happy Dave can preen and posture
> repeating the noble mantra "ham radio is ALL working DX on HF,
> there is no other, and the expert grades all do 20 WPM morse to
> the max." You are superior. All must meet your criteria or be
> judged inferior. The inferior may be treated with all the sociopathy
> you think they should. Understood.

I work DX, contest, handle traffic and rag-chew using a number of modes, Len. Which modes do you use when you frequent the ham bands? I even have 2m FM QSOs with those who have never passed a code test. After all, THEY are hams.

Dave K8MN

5609. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 16:44:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C77C708.43E88200@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35068

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I've seen people set down, go down the sheet checking one after the next and
> turn it in within 15 minutes, with not a mark on the scratch
> sheet. Not problem worked, not a formula written down and make a good passing
> score. I can only conclude they had done the memory
> thing till they could instantly
> pick out the matching answer to any question on whatever exam they prepared
> for.

I took about ten minutes for my Extra exam and made no marks on the
scratch sheet. Do you think I didn't know the material, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5610. Re: News Update for www.ab7sl.com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 17:04:04 UTC
From: Brian Short <k7on@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e1d8feff3ccfd09896d0@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35069
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Charlie:

You are quite an advertiser of your web site.

Maybe you could put a link to my page?

Brian

In article <3c77c5d9$1@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> Some new stuff and some updates since last month....
> found at http://www.ab7sl.com
>
> 1. NEW - Cushcraft R7 / R7000 page.
> includes black box photos and component values
> w/schematic also R7 / R7000 instruction and assembly manuals
> Note: (all downloadable too..)
>
> 2. Prescott, Arizona Page has many all-new photos
>
> 3. Equipment Photos Page has some all-new photos added
>
> 4. Downloadable DXCC List updated - 16-Feb-2002
>
> 5. AB7SL - DXCC "Need List" - pls check it out....
>
> 6. Weather Page has real-time conditions for 12 selected US cities
> and links for complete USA / World real-time weather data
>
>
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston
> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com

--
People who think they know it all are annoying

to those of us who do.
--
See my web page: http://www.qsl.net/k7on/
--

5611. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 17:08:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C77CC93.6DB3ABAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35070

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> >
> > > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
> reliable
> > > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> > > reliability is a moot point.
> >
> > Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
> >
> > joshua houk
> > kd7pos
>
> I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I don't
> think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.

Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
s t r e t c h.

Dave K8MN

5612. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:06:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yKRd8.33869$yn5.957356230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35071

Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C787642.AE6B8F31@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C712B7F.DB14094F@worldnet.att.net...
> > > The VE
> > > testing system was still over 15 years in the future when I passed the
> > extra exam
> > > and was thus finished with ham radio testing for life.
> > > Sorry you had a problem with that, but that's just how you are.
> >
> > Dick, it's always possible that the government will take away your
> > priveleges and make you test to "earn" them back. It's happened before,
and
> > can happen again.
>
> Finally drew the gnat out of hiding! Hi, Gadfly! Skood to seeja!
> Guess ya must have missed it in ur rush to Extra lite,eh?

Dixie, I've been too busy kickstarting a new career to hang out with the unemployed, but thanks for the thought. And I thought we agreed that I'd take care of that upgrade biddness in 2027AD when I can go on Social Security or some kind of disability like you. Why you always pushin other people who are so much more productive with their time than you are? Do you have any idea how many non-working people I'm carrying on my back? I'll even bet you've got some of my money in your pocket.

> The one
> mistake FCC wasn't about to repeat was taking away privileges
> already granted. Comprende?

Weren't you on the incentive licensing kick not so long ago? I'm sure there are things that the gubm'nt could make you learn that would be worthy of you re-earning your license, like programming in a tone in modern handheld transceiver with an lcd display, or finally figuring out how to work split on HF.

> > Who wants to be on that VE team?
>
> Hey, I just do it.

Dixie, you cannot be on your own testing team. That would be incestuous. Lemme go look up your QSL address to see if that's legal over there.

> You and Kandid Karl just whine about it.
> If they came out with Super Extra I'd have one 30 years before you, like
last
> time..

That you're 30 years older than me probably has nothing to do with it. Time for you to get out that file and work on that long tooth.

Hey, don't be a stranger (or get any stranger). I'm good in the book.

73 and best wishes, Brian

5613. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:10:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yORd8.33870$tt5.957744286@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35073

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223054302.03609.00000194@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Who wants to be on that VE team?
>
> I want to ask him about how field strength varies in the far field of an
> antenna. He actually said that it varied as the inverse square of the
> distance. We had a great big argument, ending in his saying that
everybody
> knows that fields vary as the inverse of the distance.
>
> He might get that one right now. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

No Ed, he might know the right answer, but he'd answer it wrong just to
spite you. You know how he is. Brian

5614. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:10:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223141033.15095.00000042@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 35072

In article <3C76B9C8.F3AA5E09@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Thanks a lot, Ed and Jim! I'm going to digest this a bit, and post
>back. Sorry, I've been away from the computer for a couple days.
>
> - Mike -
>
>N2EY wrote:
>
>> And for passing the Novice you got a license that was good for one or
>> two years <snip>
>
Mike,

Have you seen my article on the history of US ARS licensing since WW2? I can post the latest updated version here if you like.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5615. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:38:14 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a58t1b$ac9$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 35076

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C76E274.A61202A6@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Jim, a statement that includes "the set of" is supplying the
boundaries.
> > > Why is that so difficult to understand?
> >
> > Cecil, both statements, yours and mine, included "the set of" as their
> > boundaries. Why is that so hard for you to see?
>
> It's not hard to see, Jim. Both our statements are valid. I have never
> said that they were invalid. What is it about that that is so hard for
> you to understand? The invalid statement is:
> "CW gets through when SSB doesn't." It contains no boundary conditions.

You said that omitting boundaries invalidates that statement. Remember?
Try to keep up.

> > Check the quotes, the attributions, and back up in the thread if you
> > need to. Evidently you need to. You're incorrect, sir.

> If I am, it is a ****MISTAKE****!!!!!!! You clearly didn't understand
> what I said.

Perhaps you just misspoke. I suspect that is the case since you've been
dancing around it ever since.

If you can produce the posting where I said a bounded statement
> is invalid, I will apologize.

You said unbounding the statement invalidates it. I then unbounded your
statement, you dodged, and here we are, once more, going around in circles.

> > > You appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
> >
> > Nope.
>
> You still appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.

You obviously don't like being held to task for what you write.

5616. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:39:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a58t3daci1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 35075

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
ever
> paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
>
> Kim W5TIT

As far as you know.

5617. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 19:58:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fvSd8.33888$am6.961363147@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35074

Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a58414jbr2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> In article <20020223073215.26465.00000159@mb-fx.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> says...
> > >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> > >Date: 2/22/2002 9:51 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <8lEd8.10299$ZC3.775852@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
> >
> > >WOW BIG WORDS FROM A BIG MAN... oh my didums feewings get hurt. Did
the
> > >big bad mans scare the whittle Whennie Anderson?? Oh my.
> >
> > I LOVE THIS GUY!!
> >
> > Ronnie, I owe you steak and lobster, or your preferred meal of
choice not
> > requiring the sacrificing of any of my offspring!
> >
> > DUDE!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Forget it Steve, didn't you read Ron is me hehehehehe
>
> Can't eat lobster..the shell gets stuck in my teeth.

You eat the shells? I'm gonna buy you a bucket of oysters.

> Ron is almost 60 so he's more than a match for geezer Anderson. He's
> ex-military (Navy) and is a pretty good DX'er for having only a tech+. I
> hear him the pile-ups some times.

On CW, no doubt.

And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers weren't
DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your argument)
Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.

> But then again...maybe he's not!!! What evil lurks in the hearts of
> men....The Anderson do or is it doo-doo? Either way, they both define
> the same west coast louse.

Evil? Yes, I guess the patriot honeymoon is over with and its time to scrape off the Old Glory bumper stickers and crap on the veterans again.

> Dayton this year?

Yes, there's a hamfest in Dayton again this year. Are you the featured speaker at the DX dinner or something, singing the virtues of the Tech Plus DXer? I hope they're serving oysters on the half-shell.

Brian

5618. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 20:45:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C77FF6C.DFB3A806@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35077

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You said that omitting boundaries invalidates that statement. Remember?
> Try to keep up.

The statement, "CW gets through when SSB doesn't", is the ***ONLY***
statement so far that doesn't contain boundary conditions. What appears
to be the problem is that you don't recognize boundary conditions when
they are staring you in the face.

> Perhaps you just misspoke. I suspect that is the case since you've been
> dancing around it ever since.

Perhaps I did, and perhaps I didn't. Everyone, even you, makes mistakes.

> You said unbounding the statement invalidates it. I then unbounded your
> statement, you dodged, and here we are, once more, going around in circles.

No, you did *NOT* unbound my statement. That is your error. You just didn't
recognize the boundaries. Any time you use the words, "the set of", the
statement is automatically bounded because "the set of" points is contained
within a conceptual logic circle that possesses boundaries.

> > > > You appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
> > >
> > > Nope.
> >
> > You still appear to arbitrarily be trying to jerk me around.
>
> You obviously don't like being held to task for what you write.

I don't like being jerked around by someone who doesn't fathom
what is contained in his own statements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5619. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 20:48:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C780005.74580A6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35078

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
> ever
> > paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> > seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> As far as you know.

What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
where CW gets through and SSB doesn't. When the atmospheric effect can vary
by 120dB, 15dB of advantage can soon disappear.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5620. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 20:53:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steven - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a4f1t8pdu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> In article <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> > Hello John,
> > The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted
> > at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service
> > is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> > verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card.
> > This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for
> > all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic
> > qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> > website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk
> > verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> > DXCC.
>
> However, if the sender of the QSL card objects to having Eqsls act as a
> "qsl manager", they can notify the Eqsl and the DXCC desk
> and then the cards will not be accepted for DXCC credit.

Steve, what is the motivation for this? Couldn't the DXer simply refrain
from sending his logs to Eqsl?

And once the DXer does submit his/her log to Eqsl, did the DXer not work the
DX because the confirmation came from this manager and not that manager?
I'm inclined to think that the issue is money related.

Just to avoid all the hand wringing that this appears to be causing, I'm
satisfied with whatever I've recorded in my log book. I'd rather have
pictures of my kids on the wall anyway. All my real awards are in the top
drawer of my dresser, and my kids will get to throw them out someday, same
as any paper I put on the wall.

> I have noticed a number of people requesting that their logs be
> "returned" as they do not want Eqsl acting in this capacity. The prime
> reason given is that the logs were sent with the understanding that no
> money was needed (other than a donation. Now Eqsl wants to charge for a
> contact (which is fine, I guess). but they "object" to having Eqsl
> represent itself as a qsl manager for them without 1st asking.

What else would Eqsl be doing if not acting as a qsl manager? You send them
your logs and... they're not supposed to recover their costs?

Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you meant
to say charging for a "confirmation." At least thats what a KF2 is supposed
to be saying in America, given Part 97 as it exists.... unless we "just

ignore" the rules.

73, Brian

5621. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:05:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223160503.23819.00000028@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 35080

In article <3C77C6B3.3E656666@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over and over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
>> >Houk
>> >> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>> >> >> Dick Carroll wrote:

>> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
>> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
>
>Cecil is a ham. You aren't.

Like me, Cecil Moore is a thinking human being. You aren't.

Like me, Cecil Moore is a retired professional in radio-electronics
of long experience in industry. Dave Heil worked for government.

>> I don't portray myself as Heil does,
>> giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
>> as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from
>> an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
>> wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.
>
>There was no snow job. It wasn't my idea. I did not describe it as
>"wonderful".

The exact words were more like a "neat idea" and the claim was
as a "personal innovation." it was intended to prove some kind of
point on the superiority of CW over teleprinter. It did not prove
anything except that snow jobs can grow in hot weather.

>I used a system which was in place. That you don't
>understand the reasons for its use make it no less true and no less
>effective.

The first excuse/rationalization was that "the circuit needed to be synchronized." That was a technically false statement since teleprinters are all designed to be self-synchronizing to the remote transmitter.

Heil later "amended" that to mean "synchronizing schedules and frequencies" which is not yet understandable in commercial-government practice. If a teleprinter terminal is working at all, a full set of "schedules" and other data can be transmitted to both ends of a circuit, identical in content at each end.

Had the excuse/rationale been given that a teleprinter was "down" (not working), then use of CW would be perfectly understandable and acceptible. That was NOT given.

>You didn't understand it then. You don't understand it now. The
>discussion back then was government use of morse. It was then used.
>That you don't accept that is of not much consequence.

Incorrect. Heil made the initial remark claiming some personally-conceived innovation, not on "government use of morse" but of trying to prove a point of morse modes over teleprinter.

A much later excuse/rationale claimed that such switchover in modes was some kind of State Department "radio doctrine" or "procedure" to use morse modes as an order-wire on a teleprinter circuit. That defies understanding considering that teleprinters over radio had already been in use throughout the US government and military for over 30 years prior to the 1980s. USN and other military procedures on teleprinter circuits are given in a 1967 USN text used by all branches. Existing for 15 years prior to this alleged innovation, it explains "synchronization" and also "order-wires."

>You've gotten more than this part twisted, Leonardo. I'm not attempting
>to constantly post my past exploits.

Again, incorrect. Heil has done so in the past.

>I am a ham. You aren't.

Heil is a radio amateur. I am a radio professional.

>You're an SWL with attitude.

My attitude as a BCL, SWL, TVW and as a radio professional is that I enjoy all of it. Wouldn't do it if there was no enjoyment.

I might enjoy amateur radio as well, but certain attitudinally-oriented rank-status-privilege-by-mode-and-tenure "superiors" insist that I must only enjoy what they personally enjoy.

>You've made no attempt to actually become a ham.

Incorrect. I've never carried it as far an amateur radio license examination.

>You simply haunt a ham radio newsgroup on the internet.

Incorrect again, a false assumption.

>You won't become a newcomer until you enter amateur radio. I'm not
>discussing vehicles or Zambonis. I'm discussing Leonard H. Anderson,
>non-ham, newcomer-to-be (maybe).

Heil is not "discussing" but venting frustration on an individual
he has not been able to best on a newsgroup.

>You've misread my statement much as you've misread others. This one was
>simply an observation.

Not at all. Heil exhibits an extreme need to win all "discussions"
including methods of deprecating and denigrating others who do
not share his viewpoints. Standard Operating Procedure. :-)

>> Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that
>> tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did
>> they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.
>
>Another Nazi reference, Len? In which statement did I mention CW?

"Uber" (over) and "alles" (all) and "bund" are all German words.
Not all Germans are/were NAZIs. "Heil" as a surname is
Germanic and means a salute or honor as a German word.
Is Heil a NAZI?!?

>Does this mean you already have an ARRL tee-shirt?

No.

>I work DX, contest, handle traffic and rag-chew using a number of modes,
>Len. Which modes do you use when you frequent the ham bands?

I have no authorization to be a control operator of an amateur
radio station. I do not "frequent the ham bands" (presuming Heil
means only those bands below 30 MHz). Why would Heil imply
that I break the law?!?

>I even
>have 2m FM QSOs with those who have never passed a code test. After
>all, THEY are hams.

We had ham last night (Thursday) for supper. Quite good.
Tasted just like ham. ;-)

I have semi-regular communications on UHF above the amateur
70 cm band, moved from above the amateur 2m band. NONE of
the communicators need or needed code testing. After all, WE
are professionals, carrying on business. :-)

I am well aware of the elitist attitude of some that NO ONE can
possibly discuss ANYTHING involving amateur radio until they
are authorized by a government amateur license. That includes

petitioning my government for a redress of grievances, a right supposedly granted by the US Constitution.

I'm also postitive that Heil will be upset (to some degree) by this response and will continue with his regular routine of insisting on conformist attitudes and demanding that others enjoy what he enjoys whether they like it or not. He is not correctable even if wrong. Matters not. :-)

5622. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:05:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223160505.23819.00000029@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 35081

In article <5BGd8.9880$0C1.830076@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
a pseudonym wrote:

>But this not the rest of the world Len, this is amateur radio..a
>hobby/service. You lose points here for making no points in dealing with
>the obvious SORRY

Wrong in several areas.

Amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio service which is primarily
an avocation ("hobby"). It is a "service" to the nation, the community
hardly more than the Citizens Band Radio SERVICE is a "service."

The word "service" used throughout Title 47, CFR, is a regulatory
term that denotes a type and kind of radio activity.

There is nothing wrong with amateur radio as a HOBBY and
there should be little doubt that the majority of amateur radio
licensees derive great pleasure in its recreational aspects.

The aspect that is suspect is the self-glorification by organizations
and fantasizing individuals that it is more noble and glorious and of
greater service to the nation by its existance than any other radio
service. It is common practice of all organizations to engage in
selective phrasing and factual omissions to promote themselves.
An organization's existance depends on it. Organizations carefully
choose their wordings, phrasings, and highlighting of factual
information (and careful omission) so as to sway opinions of
interested individuals and government agencies. That is accepted
practice in any organization for any activity. Such is known as
propaganda (which can be both positive or negative), lobbying
(in reference to swaying government opinions), and in less-desired
forms psychological warfare, brainwashing, and "spin."

Armed with tools of mass media (publications), an organization
can make its appearance large, formidable, expert, and "official."
When the target of the media is relatively isolated, as with radio
amateurs who are not employed/engaged in the rest of the radio
world, the propaganda can seem truthful, official, and emotionally
fulfilling. Emotional satisfaction must exist on many levels and it
is not unknown for organizations to all but demand unswerving
loyalty to itself. See the second ("loyalty") item in the Amateur's
Code, long published in the front of every ARRL Amateur Handbook.
That "loyalty" phrasing binds the ARRL in irrevocal, intimate
partnership with national patriotism, local or regional patriotism, so
much so that it excludes any other organization from consideration.

It is an absolute based solely on its own definition.

Such loyalty is emotionally fulfilling to those who have a Need of Belonging, of becoming a part of a group, tribe, or clan. It is a survival mechanism inherent in humans but on an emotional level, not a physical survival mechanism. In extremes there is a great confusion between physical and emotional needs, demands to exclude "outsiders," over-identification of self to the group and group "leadership", ultimately to a fanaticsm that reaches irrational levels. Fanatics cannot accept reality or rational thought since they have crossed over mere survival to exist in a fantasy world.

A problem with the emotional extremists and fanatics in certain activities involving physics is that the Laws of Physics are not changeable. Electromagnetic waves and electrons cannot be persuaded to obey any humans' emotional desires or concepts. Humans must meet Physics at Physic's terms, not theirs. That may be at the heart of myth formation.

Myths are fantasy concepts, itself a psychological-emotional survival trait to explain the unexplainable, to attempt coming to grips with intangibles, things that require dispassionate learning efforts when they are beyond human sensory capability. The easy way out is to buy into myths, to accept group thought as truth because the group is big and disagreement means censure and possible exclusion from the group. One of the most prevalent myths is the old phrase "CW gets through when nothing else gets through." Morse codings directly involve human sensory input and rhythm cognition, have existed since before 1840 and all of radio.

Other modes exist that "get through" better, are used elsewhere in the radio world, have been used for decades, and a few of them are useable in the amateur allocations made by federal agencies. They are rejected by the extremists as "unsuitable for amateur use" not on a technical basis (too hard to understand intangibles) but solely on an emotional basis. Why? The reason is simple. Those extremists were able to learn it and use it at high rates because their personal aptitudes allowed them to succeed. Rhythmic cognition of representative monotonic sounds to letters and numbers of an alphabetic language is not a common human trait, not a predominant one.

The over-identification of a singular communications mode to an avocational radio activity resulted in a deeply divided amateur radio service worldwide. The amateur radiotelegraphers fight the amateur radio hobbyists with all kinds of specious reasons, many of which defy rationality. The radiotelegraphers consider themselves elite, superior, important to the nation, possessors of a "vital skill" that "must be kept alive" even when they are the only claimants.

Amateur radio is a small part of the entire radio world. It is no longer the only avocational radio activity possible but it may be the last avocational radio activity which requires a strict adherence to everything from authorizations and callsigns to rigidity in acceptance of attitudes, behavior, desires of the "leadership." To the extremists it may seem a psychological militia "at war" with those inferiors who cannot see their manly martial magnificence. To the majority it is simply a hobby.

Amateur radio does not operate by different physical laws from all other radio services. All work by the same physical laws. Laws of physics, not laws of humans. The technology of all radio is adaptable to amateur use, including other radio service operating methods, practices. That is not acceptible to emotional extremists. Those demand rigid, even secular obediance to their beliefs...for no good reason except to force all others in their own image. Few can see that image as attractive or superior. It is not a pretty picture.

5623. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:10:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223161018.20570.00000035@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35086

In article <3c770bbe$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020222063141.13180.00000125@mb-mf.aol.com...
>> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>>
>> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim. As usual...
>>
>> Jim does not do that. If he says it, he believes and means it. I think
>his
>> record here speaks to his sincerity.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>And I think he's having more fun with the discussion than really considering
>what things are being expressed.

I'm doing both, Kim. I'm quite interested in issues of reliability,
availability,
time utilization and technological choices. We seem to have very different
philosophies, that's all.

For example, I have found that it pays to buy the most reliable appliances and
vehicles I can afford, even if it means sacrificing bells and whistles, if the
appliances and vehicles are needed for the smooth operation of my family's
life. That's one of the main reasons we bought a Honda Odyssey when the
purchase of a minivan became unavoidable. The Dodge Caravan and Ford
Windstar were less money, but less reliable.

>Bottom line: CW may be a very reliable
>mode, maybe even the *most* reliable mode. But, if there are few who use it
>and few who understand it, then its reliability is pretty much a moot point.

There are many of us who use and understand it.

>The reliability of CW is definitely a moot point for me...

Only because of your choice.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5624. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:10:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223161019.20570.00000037@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35082

In article <20020223053809.03609.00000191@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
>>The washer selling experience may have Jim in a more sensitive mood.
>
>If it was the worst misunderstanding here, we could all live with it. Some
>of
>the others remind me of the "What he said, what she heard" series that is
>running in the current funny papers.

The was a movie with a title something like "He said...she said" which addressed the issue.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5625. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:10:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223161019.20570.00000036@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35085

In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim.
>>
>> No, Kim, I'm trying to understand what you wrote. That's all I have to
>> go on. Your philosophy seems to be that people should not rely on
>> that which is reliable but rather on that which is fixable.
>>
>> >As usual...
>>
>> Seems to me that when someone doesn't understand and agree with
>> your posts, you put the blame on them, rather than consider that
>> perhaps what you said wasn't clear, or perhaps isn't entirely logical or
>> based on fact.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
>mode.

Yep. May be.

> But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
>reliability is a moot point.
>
True - but there are lots us who do use it and like it. More than some folks
here on rrap want to admit.

Your opinion of the reliability of CW/Morse is understandable, given your
lack of experience with the mode and the amateur bands where it is most
commonly used. That's not meant as a criticism, Kim, just a simple statement
of fact.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5626. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223161020.20570.00000039@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35083

In article <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
>> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
>> >reliability is a moot point.
>>
>> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
>that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.

Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5627. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223161020.20570.00000038@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35084

In article <MPG.16e12ea7d2001cc6989692@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
<jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>n article <3c778474$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
>says...
>
>> I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I don't
>> think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
>
>Let's take a look at the numbers, shall we?
>
>Before the 2000 restructuring, there were approximately 289,000 amateurs
>with Extra, Advanced, or General licenses. That's a couple hundred of
>thousand of people the understand CW.
>
>In the United States.

That's about the right number, give or take a few thousand. And it doesn't
include
about 180,000 Novices and Tech Pluses of that time.

>And that only includes licensed amateurs, not other people who would know
>morse, e.g., Coast Guard members and folks who were telegraphers by
>trade.
>
>That's not exactly chump change.

As a matter of fact, that 289,000 is more than the entire number of US hams
licensed back when I got started in 1967.
>
>Sure - SSB would be your first option, but you'd want a backup to rely
>on. And the numbers clearly indicate that there are quite enough people
>familiar with morse to rely on it.

I think the mode used would depend in large part on the band used, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5628. ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:46:18 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c780dab$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 35087
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted for
DXCC....this remark from the eQSL Webmaster found at this

URL: http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are mailed. AG or
not" (Webmaster)
15-Feb-2002

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

5629. Re: NCI Members have no FREE SPEECH

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:50:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <K8Ud8.10519$z%4.1508666481@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35088

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c719cbf$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020217185635.03325.00001088@mb-ch.aol.com...
> > Isnt this cute:
> >
> > 2. Openly making statements in any public forum, opposing the
primary
> goal
> > of NCI, abolition of mandatory Morse code testing in order to hold an
> amateur
> > license.
> >
> > You can join, but you can only say what we want you to say. You say a
bad
> word
> > and we will throw you out.
>
> You're not going to like this, WA8ULX:
>
> From http://www.arrl.org/aabl.html#bylaws
>
> ARRL BY-LAWS
>
> Members
>
> 2. Applications for membership or renewal of membership shall be submitted
> to the Secretary. In the case of any applicant whose character, reputation
> or conduct might make him an undesirable member, the Secretary shall refer
> the application to the Executive Committee for review; in all other cases,
> the Secretary shall have the authority to grant membership.
>
> Hmmmm, while I don't have a problem with the above, just as I don't have a
> problem with NCI's #2, above, I wonder if you'd place the same scrutiny on
> the ARRL--especially since "character, reputation or conduct *MIGHT*
> (emphasis mine) make him an undesirable member" is pretty darned loosely
> defined. At least the NCI #2 is clear and leaves little ambiguity.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Broose hates the ARRL also, so the ARRL by-laws don't work either. Now if
you check the by-laws of the VCR Repair Society, you might get his
attention.

5630. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 21:53:06 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a59312aim1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
bpburke@prodigy.net says...
>
> "Steven - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:a4f1t8pdu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > In article <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> > > Hello John,
> > > The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted
> > > at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service
> > > is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> > > verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card.
> > > This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for
> > > all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic
> > > qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> > > website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk
> > > verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> > > DXCC.
> >
> > However, if the sender of the QSL card objects to having Eqsls act as a
> > "qsl manager", they can notify the Eqsl and the DXCC desk
> > and then the cards will not be accepted for DXCC credit.
>
> Steve, what is the motivation for this? Couldn't the DXer simply refrain
> from sending his logs to Eqsl?

The whole premise was a paper-less qsl medium. The major problem being
that people who participated in the DXCC program could not submit eqsls
for DXCC credit or clicks as some call them. And yes, the DX'er can
refrain, but when this was announced it was a sudden done deal and a
few, not all of the DX'ers felt that they should have had a say as to
whether or not Eqsl would represent them.

>
> And once the DXer does submit his/her log to Eqsl, did the DXer not work the
> DX because the confirmation came from this manager and not that manager?
> I'm inclined to think that the issue is money related.

It isn't a matter of the confirmation per say, I contact you, you reply,
we're both in the log..confirmed. I download my logs, or visa versa and
we pick them up from the Eqsl site. It's become a matter that now,
again for participation in the DXCC, WAZ and several other programs, if
your contact is in Eqsl's, you have to pay to A $1 have them print out
the card, mail it to you, then you have to turn around and submit it to
whatever program your are participating in. So yes, it is a money

issue.

>
> Just to avoid all the hand wringing that this appears to be causing, I'm
> satisfied with whatever I've recorded in my log book. I'd rather have
> pictures of my kids on the wall anyway. All my real awards are in the top
> drawer of my dresser, and my kids will get to throw them out someday, same
> as any paper I put on the wall.

Ands as Carl had said, he doesn't either, but there are lots of people,
myself included that do.

>
> > I have noticed a number of people requesting that their logs be
> > "returned" as they do not want Eqsl acting in this capacity. The prime
> > reason given is that the logs were sent with the understanding that no
> > money was needed (other than a donation. Now Eqsl wants to charge for a
> > contact (which is fine, I guess). but they "object" to having Eqsl
> > represent itself as a qsl manager for them without 1st asking.
>
> What else would Eqsl be doing if not acting as a qsl manager? You send them
> your logs and... they're not supposed to recover their costs?

According to the various programs, there must be an understanding that
the QSL manager is representing the particular DX station. There are
several instances right now where the are bogus QSL managers for a
number of pirate stations. My understanding from discussion with Wayne
Mills and Bill Moore is that you can't arbitrarily declare yourself the
QSL manager without specific permission form the DX station. Up and
till recent Eqsl was a clearinghouse for qsl confirmations. Now
recently, they have gone into the business of selling cards if you wish
to participate in these various programs.

>
> Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you meant
> to say charging for a "confirmation."

Correct, my error. The contact has already been made. If you want a
"valid" confirmation that can be submitted for DXCC or WAS or WAZ, you
have to pay.

> At least thats what a KF2 is supposed
> to be saying in America, given Part 97 as it exists.... unless we "just
> ignore" the rules.

Yep, Part 97 specifically states you can't accept money for a contact,
but then again, as you correctly point out, this is not a contact, it's
a confirmation of the contact already made. I'm aware of several DX
stations that actually required a cash contribution above and beyond the
normal SASE or IRC, before they would release a card, one formerly being
on Roatan Island and the other being on Reunion Island. But then their
foreign stations and Part 97 does not apply. The point is, it seems to
go against the very principles that Eqsl has been trying to develop. A

paper-less qsl format that requires virtually no $$$ except for a voluntary donation to the upkeep of the site. Yet, now they are printing cards for cash. You can't have one that you can use for these programs unless you pay. In this case, are you paying for the contact or paying for the confirmation? The contact has already been made, as proven by the downloaded card. The confirmation is another story and is not covered anywhere by Part 97.

It all boils down to the principle. If you want to play, you are being forced to pay. Illegal, no, just a tad strange that they'd set the bar and when more and more people complain they lower it themselves.

I doubt, at least for the time being that you are going to see any of the big DX operations use Eqsls. Again, for one thing, the card won't count for any clicks, as Jim calls them. For another, there is the voluntary donations that some people make with their cards to help offset/recover some of the costs. What I've seen is the basic DX stuff, essentially from contests, etc. I doubt you'll see the TI9M or the H40T downloading their logs to eqsls. LOTW maybe, but for the time being not Eqsls

But as you said previously, if you aren't participating in these programs, what difference does it make if they print cards or not, the point is moot. The confirmations are their in the computer and the archives.

Up until your last sentence Brian, it was nice to have a rational conversation with you for a change. You just can't let a good thing go by without going true to form. Too bad.

Have a good weekend

5631. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 22:50:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223175008.01358.00000056@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 35090

In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>What else would Eqsl be doing if not acting as a qsl manager? You send them
>your logs and... they're not supposed to recover their costs?
>
>Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you meant
>to say charging for a "confirmation." At least thats what a KF2 is supposed
>to be saying in America, given Part 97 as it exists.... unless we "just
>ignore" the rules.

Brian, go easy on the poor feller. It's not easy for them to figure out
who they are when they are and have been several different peoples.

I liked "fungi" the best with the "suddenly-activated-to-national-
defense-duties" ossifer from under the bridge a close second.
But that's just an entertainment review... :-)

They haven't risen to Ebert and Roeper level yet and Hollywood
isn't calling even though it should be ripe..."cast of thousands!"

Len
(always the same name and signed although screen names for log-in
purposes changed)

5632. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-23 22:50:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223175009.01358.00000057@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 35091

In article <20020222201027.19404.00000010@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>> > Could you draw a
>>> > picture of a PN junction and explain about majority and minority
>>> > carriers?
>>
>>> Yup.
>>
>>And you learned that from the ARRL handbook?
>
>Dig out a 1967 Handbook. Transistors are in there.

The so-called "military" transistors 2N2222 and 2N2218 were on the market then with the complementary PNP-NPN 2N390n and 2N412n families debuting the following year. All of them are still on the market, still being used in new designs for general-purpose work in electronics and radio. They have been widely accepted and survive after 30+ years.

Principles of semiconductor operation (minority, majority carriers) aren't of much use in designing, apply, testing, debugging circuits. Such things as stable-over-temperature biasing and the V-sub-BE drift go unmentioned as does BV-sub-CBO (especially driving inductors). It may be nice to know some vacuum tube principles and all that good stuff about making them when hardly any amateur ever made his or her own tubes but that seems out of place today.

Anyone who read Radio Craft magazine in 1947 could have found out "all about vacuum tubes" as I did as a teen-ager but that was NOT "all about them." Far from it. And it was not immediately-useable information on how to apply them, trouble-shoot circuits containing them. 1947 was 55 years ago. Radio technology of today and of the last two decades has been predominantly solid-state. Vacuum tubes are quaint curiosities of the past useful only in a very few disciplines in radio.

The radio world keeps evolving and advancing in its state of the art. Its too bad that so many long-timers affixed themselves to the past and refuse to budge, claiming greatness when they look more like has-beens. They should call themselves members of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service? :-)

5633. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 00:38:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35092

Brian P Burke wrote:

> And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers weren't
> DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your argument)
> Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.

You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
year-and-a-half now. Please update your database. I've never commented
on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only stated
that YOU don't know much about DXing.

Dave K8MN

5634. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 00:46:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7839c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35093

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e12ea7d2001cc6989692@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c778474$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I
don't
> > think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
>
> Let's take a look at the numbers, shall we?
>
> Before the 2000 restructuring, there were approximately 289,000 amateurs
> with Extra, Advanced, or General licenses. That's a couple hundred of
> thousand of people the understand CW.
>

You aren't seriously under the impression that because there are that many
of those license classes, that there are that many who routinely use CW, are
you? I am a Tech+ and I never use CW.

>
> In the United States.
>
> And that only includes licensed amateurs, not other people who would know
> morse, e.g., Coast Guard members and folks who were telegraphers by
> trade.
>
> That's not exactly chump change.
>
> Sure - SSB would be your first option, but you'd want a backup to rely
> on. And the numbers clearly indicate that there are quite enough people
> familiar with morse to rely on it.
>

I didn't say not to have backups, Joshua, I said I don't share in the
opinion that CW is all that reliable--because I believe that phone is the
mode of choice among most operators.

>
> I'm a bit baffled to you're comment that people need to *like* CW in
> order to rely on it. Do you know someone that would pass over a *** ---
> *** when scanning the bands because they don't like the mode?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

One need not know CW to know SOS.

Kim W5TIT

5635. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 00:51:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35094

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C77CC93.6DB3ABAF@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > > In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > says...
> > >
> > > > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
> > reliable
> > > > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it,
its
> > > > reliability is a moot point.
> > >
> > > Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
> > >
> > > joshua houk
> > > kd7pos
> >
> > I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I
don't
> > think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
>
> Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
> like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
> there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
> s t r e t c h.
>
> Dave K8MN

I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW message
sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?

I doubt it.

Kim W5TIT

5636. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 00:53:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c783b7e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35096

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a58t3daci1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
> ever
> > paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> > seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> As far as you know.
>

What are you saying, Jim? Are you thinking that there are no CW operators
at Field Days?

Kim W5TIT

5637. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:00:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35097

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223161019.20570.00000036@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim.
> >>
> >> No, Kim, I'm trying to understand what you wrote. That's all I have to
> >> go on. Your philosophy seems to be that people should not rely on
> >> that which is reliable but rather on that which is fixable.
> >>
> >> >As usual...
> >>
> >> Seems to me that when someone doesn't understand and agree with
> >> your posts, you put the blame on them, rather than consider that
> >> perhaps what you said wasn't clear, or perhaps isn't entirely logical
or
> >> based on fact.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> >mode.
>
> Yep. May be.
>
> > But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> >reliability is a moot point.
> >
> True - but there are lots us who do use it and like it. More than some
folks
> here on rrap want to admit.
>
> Your opinion of the reliability of CW/Morse is understandable, given your
> lack of experience with the mode and the amateur bands where it is most
> commonly used. That's not meant as a criticism, Kim, just a simple
statement

> of fact.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And, not meant as a criticism, just simple statement: it seems you are still discussing the reliability of the mode...in spite of its popularity of use among amateurs in emergency situations. Not just my personal feelings about the mode, but my experience since being a ham of listening to hams discuss disaster situations, watching discussions in other venues on disaster communication, etc., tells me that CW is little used/relied upon in most disaster situations. In fact, other than simple traffic handling routines, I know of no instance where CW has been used in an emergency.

Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's worst. I don't think you'll find one. I am not saying anything against the mode, its users, etc. I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a preferred mode in an emergency.

Kim W5TIT

5638. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:02:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240102230.23952-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35095

On Sat, 23 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
>news:7189-3C76D4B9-31@storefull-117.iap.bryant.webtv.net...
>> Hello,
>>
>> I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
>> the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
>> would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
>> session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
>> my general test? I realize that even if I was able to take the general
>> test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
>> privileges until I passed the morse code exam.
>>
>> Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
>> still accurate? Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
>> into a test session and take the exams? Sorry for all the questions, but
>> I need the information. Thank you.
>>
>
>You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would be
>allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the
>code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.

If this is saying that one cannot take element 4 before passing element 1, that
is incorrect.

>When you go to test, bring:
>1) a picture ID. You will be asked to prove that you are who you say you
>are.
>
>2) Ten bucks
>
>3) Original and photocopy for the examiners of any previous or current
>licenses. Originals only of previous testing certificates.
>
>If you succeed in what you are asking you will be issued the Tech license
>and a cert for Element 3 which you have to redeem within 365 days by
>passing the code test; they do not last forever.
>
>Suggest that three websites should be bookmarked:
>
>http://www.arrl.org for all kinds of good poop
>http://www.qrz.com for some good sample exams
>http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which comes out of the box at test
>speeds. Follow directions and use your compooter. Stop off at Walmart

>for an el cheapo set of headphones or your family will berate you strongly
>about the head and shoulders to stop the infernal beeping.
>
>And finally, Good Luck.
>
>Dick NØBK
>
>
>

5639. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:03:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c783dd9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35098

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
weren't
> > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
argument)
> > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
>
> You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> year-and-a-half now. Please update your database. I've never commented
> on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only stated
> that YOU don't know much about DXing.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yeah, Brian ;) Didn't you know that you tread on a sacred circle?
Sheesh...

Kim W5TIT

5640. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:18:07 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e1de60fc4e2e98989693@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35099

In article <3c7839c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e12ea7d2001cc6989692@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Before the 2000 restructuring, there were approximately 289,000 amateurs
> > with Extra, Advanced, or General licenses. That's a couple hundred of
> > thousand of people the understand CW.
>
> You aren't seriously under the impression that because there are that many
> of those license classes, that there are that many who routinely use CW, are
> you? I am a Tech+ and I never use CW.

And if you read my statement again, you'll see that I never mentioned
Tech+. And if you read my statement yet *again*, I simply said that they
"understand" CW, not "use" CW.

The General Class and above licensees before April 2000 demonstrated an
ability to copy 13wpm and above. They showed that they were functionally
literate in morse, and that learning really doesn't fade much over time,
even if they predominantly or only use voice or digital modes other than
CW. If an emergency communication in morse was received by them, I'm
quite confident that they'd be able to deal with it effectively.

> I didn't say not to have backups, Joshua, I said I don't share in the
> opinion that CW is all that reliable--because I believe that phone is the
> mode of choice among most operators.

So what? Voice isn't my mode of choice, yet people could definitely rely
on me to communicate with them via SSB/FM if they needed me to.

300,000+ functionally CW-literate amateurs (and again, the number
increases when you account for foreign hams) isn't enough for you?

> > I'm a bit baffled to you're comment that people need to *like* CW in
> > order to rely on it. Do you know someone that would pass over a *** ---
> > *** when scanning the bands because they don't like the mode?
>
> One need not know CW to know SOS.

Again, reread what I said. I used the word "like", not "know".

But, addressing your divergence, the operator would be up the proverbial
creek if you recognized the ... --- ... yet didn't understand .--. .-.. .
.- ... . -. -.. .- ... ... - .- -. -.-. . - --- (...
..- -.-. .... .- -. -.. ... ..- -.-. .... .- .-.. --- -.-. .- -
.. --- -.), neh?

joshua houk
kd7pos

5641. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:33:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223203357.11714.00000218@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35100

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 11:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223003516.26927.00000030@mb-ma.aol.com>

>The reason for that is an inability to reply (so far) on anything
>technical in regards to radio or electronics. There is no
>evidence to support it.

(pausing....rechecking name of newsgroup...there it is,
"rec.radio.amateur. POLICY"....)

Sorry Your Deceiveingness...Its not about technical subjects...As much as
you wish it was, it isn't.

>Good humor has to be written so that it will be written as humor.
>Attempting to disguise sarcasm as "humor" will leave it looking
>as sarcasm to readers.

Being the genderless cynic that you are, you WOULD take that
interpretation.

Perhaps because you are a coward?

>The recognition in a newsgroup is limited to
>the written word, no other clues possible.

In this case you have spewed enough words that you left a trail, and that
trail has been your undoing.

>Joshua Hook is that of....

His name is "Houk". You COULD try to at least LOOK like you are civil.
WE know better, but you go right on ahead....

>....a PCTA who is a "new gun" in the
>newsgroup looking for a "reputation." Joshua Hook has earned
>one. It isn't a high one, it isn't a good one.

In YOUR opinion..?!?!?!

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

WHAT A CARD, LENNIE!!

Putz!

5642. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:41:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <dxXd8.9800$Im1.653384@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35201

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240102230.23952-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
On Sat, 23 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
>
>You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would be
>allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the
>code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.

If this is saying that one cannot take element 4 before passing element 1,
that
is incorrect.

Stussman, you got a problem reading or are you just a nitpicking twit?

When Element 1 becomes a written exam and pink pigs fly you may have a
point.

5643. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:47:39 UTC
From: paul friedman <pfriedman8426@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <%CXd8.5215$Or3.771236@typhoon.mn.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 35202

David:

I just passed the exams in October. Hamming is GREAT hobby and I encourage you to take the exams, buy some equipment, throw up an antenna and get on the air.

The cost is $10 per session, It's the same $10 if you take one element, all 4 of them or anything in between. I do not know if it is always done this way, but at the session I attended, the code test was given first. Whether or not you pass this element, you can then sit for the Tech written test. If you pass that, you can take the General written and if you pass that you can take the Extra.

If you unfortunately fail the code test but pass the Tech and General, you will be licensed as a Tech and if you pass the code test within one year you will not need to retake the General exam. Similarly, if you pass the Code test and the Tech test, but fail the General, you will be licensed as a Tech Plus (with limited HF privileges in addition to the full Tech rights) and can later sit for the General without needing to repass the code test.

Not that you asked, but let me share with you my study methods -- they worked for me as I passed all four elements at one sitting:

1) Code: The exam is given with the di-dahs at 15 wpm with long spaces between letters and words so that actual speed is 5 wpm. Any of the computer based code programs (some quite good ones are free) can do this for you. I never listened to code at slower then 8 wpm. That way, when I took the exam (nerves, a different tone, etc), I had a nice cushion.

2) To pass the code test you need to either copy 1 solid minute "clean" (no errors) or get 7 out of 10 fill in the blank questions correctly -- that is a fairly recent change, I hear, as the questions used to be multiple guess. You get to try both ways if needed. The test is a simulated QSO, NOT random characters or words. So if you copy "My ??? is Austin? TX" you can fill in the misses easily enough and get "My QTH is Austin, TX" So, while studying the code, also learn the format of a standard QSO.

Good luck and let me know if I can help in any way.

73

Paul AB0SI

"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:7189-3C76D4B9-31@storefull-117.iap.bryant.webtv.net...
> Hello,
>

> I am located in the central california area and am thinking about taking
> the exam to acquire my ham radio license. I would like to know if it
> would be possible to take my tech & general exams at the same test
> session, or would I have to pass my morse code exam first before taking
> my general test? I realize that even if I was able to take the general
> test after the tech exam, and I passed it, that I would only have tech
> privileges until I passed the morse code exam.
>
> Also, as I understand it, the fee per exam is $7. Is this fee amount
> still accurate? Are there any other costs that I would need to pay to go
> into a test session and take the exams? Sorry for all the questions, but
> I need the information. Thank you.
>

5644. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:57:56 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35203

In article <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW message
> sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
>
> I doubt it.

Of course you would doubt it.

And, needless to say, you would be wrong.

The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
beneath the iron and concrete.

Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up and
ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall to
try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?

joshua houk
kd7pos

5645. Re: Call Sign as your Dot.com name $11.95

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:58:09 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c7848af@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 35204
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello News Editor,
I have used domain forwarding for years and it is very useful. However
I pay only $16 / year for the domain registration, the email forwarding,
URL forwarding, full-frame forwarding, toll-free tech support, domain
parking, and full-featured DNS....all found at.....
http://www.buydomains.com/

Your price (from your site) is $23. IMHO if smart people shop around
for these kinds of services they won't be contacting you.....your
competition has already got you whipped but good.....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

5646. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 01:59:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223205947.11714.00000219@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35205

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/23/2002 12:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5BGd8.9880$0C1.830076@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>The ley word being licensed I see. Still waiting to share my amateur
>callsign with with you when you share yours with us.

As you can see, Ron...Don't hold your breath for Lennie.

Lennie can't even keep the legal parameters of HIS license in perspective.

October a year ago, Lennie announced to the NG that he was allowing his GROL to expire. Of course anyone who HAS a GROL knows that they are lifetime issues.

The Lennie got into it with us about where he can "legally" operate with his GROL as opposed to an Amateur license.

I quickly pointed out to him that his GROL SPECIFICALLY prohibits him from operating a transmitter that does not have a valid station license....In otherwords he cannot operate ANY radio transmitter that does not have a callsign.

And of course WE (yes, Lennie...WE) know that the Amateur Radio Service grants BOTH operator AND station license priviliges. Of course this means that except for PArt 95 and PArt 15, Lennie the Loser is kaput as far as emmiting RF goes.

Futhermore, he has NEVER been able to "operate" on more than a few specified frequencies or "authorized" bands as issued to the company for whom he was contracted.

Bottom line? Lennie has NEVER been a COMMUNICATOR. He's turned on boxes, pushed the right buttons, and processed traffic over pre-established nets or circuits. he could nevr even approach that feat on his own.

> I am sure you thrill the Braodcast world with your daring feats of
>dare-doing when YOU send/relay 1.32 million teletypes. You did say YOU Len.
>Your original statement never said anything about being a team. Nice try
>through with that tap dance backwards you did.

Lennie's posts are ripe with "I".

>They are partctpants in amateur radio....not professional radio Get the
>difference.

He does, Ron. His presence here is solely for the purpose of antogonism
and irritation.

>Thanks again Len. Just finished watching a William Holden movie..he's a
>Korean Pilot gets shot down in the end with Mickey Rooney. Saw a shot of
>the radio room with all sorts of electronic equipment. Didn't see in the
>credits you were there. But you must have been..relaying those 1.32 million
>teletypes all by yourself.

"The Bridges Of Toko-Ri". Some interesting portrayals of Naval Aviation
in that era you don't see in any other film...

And no pictures of Lennie the Liar Anderson at his keyboard.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5647. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:02:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223210216.11714.00000221@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35206

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/2002 3:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223160505.23819.00000029@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio service which is primarily
>an avocation ("hobby"). It is a "service" to the nation, the community
>hardly more than the Citizens Band Radio SERVICE is a "service."

Lennie further endears himself to those he'd wish to dominate by insulting
them.

Actually, I think Lennie just invited the nearest Amateur to know on his
dor and knock his lights out.

Thee's one just down the street from him...Maybe I'll forward
this.....

Hmmmmmmmmmmmm.....

5648. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:18:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C784D72.9994758B@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'm a little ambivalent regarding the traditional qsl vs eqsl
comparison. I do think that the electronic form of qsl'ing takes away
some of the preciousness of the event. I remember my first regular qsl,
but would have to look up my first eqsl.

That being said, I think it is inevitable that the electronic form of
qsl is the way things are going to go.

It won't destroy DXpeditions, it will just change the way they work.
Wanna give a donation? Perhaps the donations will be looked for before
the DXpedition starts. The other "problems can probably be worked around
also.

The time of transition will be the rough time. We'll be using direct,
Bureau, and eqsl at the same times.

-Mike-

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
>
> In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
> bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> >
> > "Steven - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:a4f1t8pdu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > In article <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> > > > Hello John,
> > > > The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now accepted
> > > > at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card" service
> > > > is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> > > > verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the card.
> > > > This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item " for
> > > > all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of electronic
> > > > qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> > > > website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC desk
> > > > verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> > > > DXCC.
> > >
> > > However, if the sender of the QSL card objects to having Eqsls act as a
> > > "qsl manager", they can notify the Eqsl and the DXCC desk
> > > and then the cards will not be accepted for DXCC credit.
> >
> > Steve, what is the motivation for this? Couldn't the DXer simply refrain
> > from sending his logs to Eqsl?
>

> The whole premise was a paper-less qsl medium. The major problem being
> that people who participated in the DXCC program could not submit eqsls
> for DXCC credit or clicks as some call them. And yes, the DX'er can
> refrain, but when this was announced it was a sudden done deal and a
> few, not all of the DX'ers felt that they should have had a say as to
> whether or not Eqsl would represent them.
>
> >
> > And once the DXer does submit his/her log to Eqsl, did the DXer not work the
> > DX because the confirmation came from this manager and not that manager?
> > I'm inclined to think that the issue is money related.
>
> It isn't a matter of the confirmation per say, I contact you, you reply,
> we're both in the log..confirmed. I download my logs, or visa versa and
> we pick them up from the Eqsl site. It's become a matter that now,
> again for participation in the DXCC, WAZ and several other programs, if
> your contact is in Eqsl's, you have to pay to A $1 have them print out
> the card, mail it to you, then you have to turn around and submit it to
> whatever program your are participating in. So yes, it is a money
> issue.
>
> >
> > Just to avoid all the hand wringing that this appears to be causing, I'm
> > satisfied with whatever I've recorded in my log book. I'd rather have
> > pictures of my kids on the wall anyway. All my real awards are in the top
> > drawer of my dresser, and my kids will get to throw them out someday, same
> > as any paper I put on the wall.
>
> Ands as Carl had said, he doesn't either, but there are lots of people,
> myself included that do.
>
> >
> > > I have noticed a number of people requesting that their logs be
> > > "returned" as they do not want Eqsl acting in this capacity. The prime
> > > reason given is that the logs were sent with the understanding that no
> > > money was needed (other than a donation. Now Eqsl wants to charge for a
> > > contact (which is fine, I guess). but they "object" to having Eqsl
> > > represent itself as a qsl manager for them without 1st asking.
> >
> > What else would Eqsl be doing if not acting as a qsl manager? You send them
> > your logs and... they're not supposed to recover their costs?
>
> According to the various programs, there must be an understanding that
> the QSL manager is representing the particular DX station. There are
> several instances right now where the are bogus QSL managers for a
> number of pirate stations. My understanding from discussion with Wayne
> Mills and Bill Moore is that you can't arbitrarily declare yourself the
> QSL manager without specific permission form the DX station. Up and
> till recent Eqsl was a clearinghouse for qsl confirmations. Now
> recently, they have gone into the business of selling cards if you wish

> to participate in these various programs.
>
> >
> > Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you meant
> > to say charging for a "confirmation."
>
> Correct, my error. The contact has already been made. If you want a
> "valid" confirmation that can be submitted for DXCC or WAS or WAZ, you
> have to pay.
>
> > At least thats what a KF2 is supposed
> > to be saying in America, given Part 97 as it exists.... unless we "just
> > ignore" the rules.
>
> Yep, Part 97 specifically states you can't accept money for a contact,
> but then again, as you correctly point out, this is not a contact, it's
> a confirmation of the contact already made. I'm aware of several DX
> stations that actually required a cash contribution above and beyond the
> normal SASE or IRC, before they would release a card, one formerly being
> on Roatan Island and the other being on Reunion Island. But then their
> foreign stations and Part 97 does not apply. The point is, it seems to
> go against the very principles that Eqsl has been trying to develop. A
> paper-less qsl format that requires virtually no $$$ except for a
> voluntary donation to the upkeep of the site. Yet, now they are
> printing cards for cash. You can't have one that you can use for these
> programs unless you pay. In this case, are you paying for the contact
> or paying for the confirmation? The contact has already been made, as
> proven by the downloaded card. The confirmation is another story and is
> not covered anywhere by Part 97.
>
> It all boils down to the principle. If you want to play, you are being
> forced to pay. Illegal, no, just a tad strange that they'd set the bar
> and when more and more people complain they lower it themselves.
>
> I doubt, at least for the time being that you are going to see any of
> the big DX operations use Eqsls. Again, for one thing, the card won't
> count for any clicks, as Jim calls them. For another, there is the
> voluntary donations that some people make with their cards to help
> offset/recover some of the costs. What I've seen is the basic DX stuff,
> essentially from contests, etc. I doubt you'll see the TI9M or the H40T
> downloading their logs to eqsls. LOTW maybe, but for the time being not
> Eqsls
>
> But as you said previously, if you aren't participating in these
> programs, what difference does it make if they print cards or not, the
> point is moot. The confirmations are their in the computer and the
> archives.
>
> Up until your last sentence Brian, it was nice to have a rational
> conversation with you for a change. You just can't let a good thing go

> by without going true to form. Too bad.
>
> Have a good weekend

5649. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:22:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223212241.11714.00000227@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35208

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 11:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223003520.26927.00000034@mb-ma.aol.com>

>I have no keen interest on joining an activity which has such a
>high percentage of sociopathic technical morons as demonstrated
>by "Steve and the Boys."

Then I suggest that you leave this forum since you are highly unlikely to
meet anyone who shares your foolish regard for it....

>"Incompetence in radio?!?" After a career in it that covered a wider
>span of the EM spectrum than ever allocated amateurs, using more
>modes and modulations than ever allocated amateurs, and getting
>paid for it IN engineering? Not hardly.

Yes...Incompetent.

You talk a good talk, but so far we have not seen you demonstrate one iota
of skill or competence in ANY radio discipline.

And as pointed out earlier, any "spectrum" that you may have had the
opportunity to cause RF to be emitted on was NOT allocated to YOU. It was
granted to you by course of employment, and was not "yours" to play with
outside the scope of that employment.

I, on the otherhand, (as with most everyone else here...) can get up from
this chair and be "on the air" from DC to daylight in a matter of seconds...

>What can Steve of "Steve and the Boys" claim? Changing black
>boxes in aircraft?

Once upon a time.

>Being a purchasing agent? [good luck on your
>new job]

Lennie's not been paying attention.....

>Or sitting around waiting for some elderly people to show
>up so you can show off your manly skills at beating up old folks?

....mostly becuase he's sitting around thinking up mean things like this.

>Actually, most other radio services in the big radio world in the USA
>do NOT need an operator license to legally emit.

Nope...they don't. And without being in the employ of that company which holds the station license, you can't even use THOSE!

>Several radio
>services do NOT even need station licenses.

Sure....FRS, MURS, CB, Part 15. In as much as >>I<< can use those services IN ADDITION to my Amateur license, I am STILL ahead of the game as far as YOU are concerned, Oh Licenseless One!

>Then go and EMIT. Look around you, there may be more targets
>for you to EMIT more bile and vomit, certainly some old folks that
>look weak to you that you think you can beat up.

Hmmmm....Accusations of elderly abuse in order to try and deter me from pointing out just how foolish and deceptive you are.

Cowardly, Lennie...very cowardly. Not unexpected, but cowardly nonetheless.

>So far you don't present a good example of the US ARS...or even
>as a human being unless as a barbarian sub-species...

Since we are talking about you, it matters not. You have already demonstrated your vileness and foolishness.

>Attilla the Ham.

Atilla conqured continents. You can't even get a signal across town.

G'nite, Lennie!

5650. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:27:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C784F76.35DBC3C6@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35209

That would be great, Jim. Thanks, - Mike -

N2EY wrote:

> Mike,
>
> Have you seen my article on the history of US ARS licensing since WW2? I
> can post the latest updated version here if you like.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5651. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:27:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240222480.24082-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35210

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240102230.23952-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>On Sat, 23 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>>"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
>>
>>You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would be
>>allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the
>>code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.
>
>If this is saying that one cannot take element 4 before passing element 1,
>that
>is incorrect.
>
>Stussman, you got a problem reading or are you just a nitpicking twit?
>
>When Element 1 becomes a written exam and pink pigs fly you may have a
>point.

Your statement with reference to the code test was unclear. If your point was with regard to only the written tests, then why did you mention the code test at all? One possible reading of your response is that one must attempt (if not having passed) element 1 when holding element 3 credit and simultaneously (i.e. at the same session) attempting element 4.

Nitpicking? When one interpretation of your statement is correct, and another is wrong, isn't it better to communicate clearly?

5652. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 02:40:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5oYd8.9960$lm1.659831@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35211

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240222480.24082-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240102230.23952-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >On Sat, 23 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
> >>"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >>You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would
be
> >>allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the
> >>code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.
> >
> >If this is saying that one cannot take element 4 before passing element
1,
> >that
> >is incorrect.
> >
> >Stussman, you got a problem reading or are you just a nitpicking twit?
> >
> >When Element 1 becomes a written exam and pink pigs fly you may have a
> >point.
>
> Your statement with reference to the code test was unclear. If your
point was
> with regard to only the written tests, then why did you mention the code
test
> at all? One possible reading of your response is that one must attempt
(if not
> having passed) element 1 when holding element 3 credit and
simultaneously (i.e.
> at the same session) attempting element 4.
>
> Nitpicking? When one interpretation of your statement is correct, and
another
> is wrong, isn't it better to communicate clearly?
>

Let us say you have a talent for selective mis-interpretation.

5653. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:02:39 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a59l1l0a8t@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35216

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> And, needless to say, you would be wrong.
>
> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> beneath the iron and concrete.
>
> Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up and
> ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall to
> try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

Do you have a source for this story?

5654. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:03:52 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a59l7m$v6f$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35212

In article <qrjg7uogfsit684imr673e0i9ivdtcai3c@4ax.com>,
UseAddressInSig@pandora.orbl.org says...
> On Sat, 23 Feb 2002 14:46:18 -0700, in
> <3c780dab$1@news.bnb-lp.com>, "Charles Johnston"
> <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote:
>
> >The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
> >historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted for
> >DXCC....this remark from the eQSL Webmaster found at this
> >
> >URL: http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
> >"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are mailed. AG or
> >not" (Webmaster)
> >15-Feb-2002
>
> Can you point to anything on the ARRL website supporting this? I
> can't find word one, even in Members Only areas.

You won't find it because there was no official comment made. n A
question was put to Bill Moore and the response was forwarded to EQSL
and the thing snowballed from there.

>
> Conflicting rumors say ARRL is placing added requirements on
> eQSLs that basically can't be met, possibly making the eQSL
> statement either untrue or grossly incomplete. My take on things
> is that eQSL is not telling the whole story involving all
> requirements.

The requirements are that the card is printed out and sent to the person
requesting the card. The card is then sent to the DXCC desk for
submission. It will be considered the same as if you received a card
from a QSL manager..HOWEVER, if the originator tells the ARRL and EQSL
that he/she does not want EQSL to act as their QSL manager, the card
will not be accepted for DXCC, WAS, VUCC, etc. There is a gray area
about the fact that EQSL charges for the card, as opposed to a voluntary
donation to cover costs. The jury is still out on that though.

>
> Also, and I feel stupid asking, but is there more to this
> Webmaster comment than this one line? I went to eQSL and can't
> find anything but this one sound bite. I think that's most
> unusual given how important this is to eQSL and DXCCers in
> general.

Seeing that the onus is on EQSL for getting their cards accepted for these various programs, you have to take it at face value.

Personally it seems to defeat the purpose of a paper-less qsl card. But it's going to be the wave of the future as far as your standard DX confirmations are concerned. I doubt you'll ever see a major DXpedition will upload their logs to EQSL. The ARRL's LOTW is a different matter. That's being touted as a way to electrically submit for awards, not get the cards.

Here's the message from the EQSL site.....

From: Moore, Bill, NC1L [mailto:bmoore@arrl.org]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2002 12:31 PM
To: 'Richard B. Drake'
Cc: DXCC
Subject: RE: Professionally Printed and mailed eQSL's
Hi Rich:
Something does not sound right here. You are saying that Dave is physically mailing out QSL cards by the US postal system? This is news to me.

If you are my QSL manager and I send you my logs by e-mail, I am sending them direct from point A to point B. Just as if I was sending them to you by regular mail. This is OK. I remember somewhere several years ago that some people used to get their logs over the air on RTTY and another digital mode (AMTOR I think). Not a problem.

However, if as the result of a log being sent to E-QSL, someone goes in and receives a card electronically and uses it for DXCC, that e-QSL cannot be accepted for DXCC credit under rule 2. I spent a bit of time with a simple shareware program to prove the unreliability of that method.

However, if Dave, acting as QSL manager with station logs completes a card (even one from his printer) and sends it by mail to you, this is an acceptable exchange and we have see this often for several years now. (assuming he phyiscally checks the log). Many people use self-made cards from their printer. Each one is evaluated on a case by case basis, and many times under Section IV rule 4(b) we have conducted an audit to insure the vaildity of a card like this.

In cases like this it would be REAL nice if they used a stamp or placed their initials or signature on it, but this is not required by the rules. However, this issue has been discussed and has been given some consideration.

To clarify, if Dave is sending out cards through the US Postal System as the result of the log(s) he receives, this is OK. (This would basically be operating as QSL manager).

Regards,

Bill Moore NC1L
DXCC Manager

Have a good weekend

73, Steve

5655. Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:12:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223221217.17512.00000218@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35213

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/2002 11:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223003519.26927.00000033@mb-ma.aol.com>

>For one shift as part of one of four operating teams, ABSOLUTELY,
>but only at ADA, not at WAR. Please try to read carefully before
>apoplexy clouds the big badass ex-marine's vision.

Ohhhhhh! >>> NOW<<< it's a "TEAM"....

Of course that's NOT what you said, Lennie...and that's already an
archived fact in Google.

>Me and a few hundred others all working together. Everyone's
>abilities and cooperation was required. Lose one part and the
>whole circuit goes down.

Sorry, Your Foolishness....That's NOT what you said! backpeddle as much
as you'd care to, your dirty underwear is now fully exposed!

>I did not claim "1.25 million messages." I claimed an approximation
>of 1.32 million based on known statistics of 1955 and clarified in
>sufficient detail.

"1.25"..."1.32"....Matters not...It's NOT what YOU said! =) (>>>laughing
it off as Lennie thinks he's "clarifying" this to his satisfaction!<<<)

>No misdirection, just IGNORANCE of a claimed military veteran
>based on his never being part of any branch's signal operations
>and not demonstrating knowledge or familiarity with any military
>radio operations or equipment other than some avionics black
>boxes.

Lennie, whatever I did in the Armed Forces is absolutely irrelevent when it
comes to being able to see through your veil of foolishness. Stevie Wonder and
Ray Charles could see through your BS!

>To repeat, military message transmission in a signals unit is
>NOT done by some solo operator in front of a single radio.

Then when you mean "we" or "team", may I suggest that YOU keep YOUR
fingers off of the " I " key?

> It is
>the cooperative, coordinated effort and skills of ALL in the unit.

"Well golly, gee whillikers, Mr Wilson!" Lennie finally says something I can agree with and even admire! TOO BAD he finally said it after having got his short pipe caught in his zipper and now he's trying to cover his tracks!

>No lies. It is not surprising that a great deal of ignorance of the
>rest of the world of radio exists among radio amateurs...the
>publications seldom carry such information and too many amateurs
>are loathe to attempt understanding the radio professionals.

Oh I have the GREATEST admiration and respect for "radio professionals"...It's YOU, and liars LIKE you I loathe.

>The bigbadass ex-marine has demonstrated NO knowledge
>whatsoever of military radio skills, knowledge, or familiarity and has
>attempted to bluff his way in knowledge several times.

And if I quote and plagarize the works and sources of others like YOU do, I will be "knowledgeable"? That's a reputation I don't need......YOU keep it, Lennie! Fit's you like a GLOVE!!

>Those of us
>who have actually worked in communications know and recognize him
>for the bluffing fake he is.

Your last "exposure" to "communications" was in 1955. Unfortunately for YOU, your frame of reference is grossly deficient.

But you keep on, Lennie. We're getting a good laugh from it!

>"Steve and the Boys" ought to relax, go out in the streets, look for
>old people to beat up and laugh at their agony. So far the "boys"
>haven't done so with me. Mosquito bites are not agony but are
>rather irritating. "The Boys" are mosquitoes.

"The Boys" are just about every licensed Amateur Radio operator....That YOU...Lennie the Licenseless, consider them "mosquitoes", is not unexpected. Your "true colors" are showing through.

5656. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:18:20 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <0YYd8.12137$0C1.1017092@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35214

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223205947.11714.00000219@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
> >Date: 2/23/2002 12:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <5BGd8.9880$0C1.830076@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> >The ley word being licensed I see. Still waiting to share my amateur
> >callsign with with you when you share yours with us.
>
> As you can see, Ron...Don't hold your breath for Lennie.

I think I got the point. He's got nothing better to do with his time but
hang aroung street corners molesting people.

>
> Lennie can't even keep the legal parameters of HIS license in
perspective.
>
> October a year ago, Lennie announced to the NG that he was allowing
his
> GROL to expire. Of course anyone who HAS a GROL knows that they are
lifetime
> issues.
>
> The Lennie got into it with us about where he can "legally" operate
with
> his GROL as opposed to an Amateur license.

He has this peculiar affliction of forgetting that this amateur radio, not
professional radio. Somehow he verified yet denied the fact that amateur
radio is both a hobby for many and a service as defined by the government.
I deleted the post after the 1st couple of paragraphs. He uses lots of
words to make the simplest points. Maybe he gets paid by the word like the
Monty Pyhton skit where you paid for an argument :-)

>
> I quickly pointed out to him that his GROL SPECIFICALLY prohibits him
from
> operating a transmitter that does not have a valid station license....In
> otherwords he cannot operate ANY radio transmitter that does not have a
> callsign.
>
> And of course WE (yes, Lennie...WE) know that the Amateur Radio
Service

> grants BOTH operator AND station license priviliges. Of course this
means
> that except for PArt 95 and PArt 15, Lennie the Loser is kaput as far as
> emmiting RF goes.
>
> Futhermore, he has NEVER been able to "operate" on more than a few
> specified frequencies or "authorized" bands as issued to the company for
whom
> he was contracted.

But he IS a professional remember that because he'll have to tell you again
and again.

>
> Bottom line? Lennie has NEVER been a COMMUNICATOR. He's turned on
boxes,
> pushed the right buttons, and processed traffic over pre-established nets
or
> circuits. he could nevr even approach that feat on his own.
>
> > I am sure you thrill the Braodcast world with your daring feats of
> >dare-doing when YOU send/relay 1.32 million teletypes. You did say YOU
Len.
> >Your original statement never said anything about being a team. Nice try
> >through with that tap dance backwards you did.
>
> Lennie's posts are ripe with "I".

I noticed that as well.

>
> >They are partctpants in amateur radio....not professional radio Get the
> >difference.
>
> He does, Ron. His presence here is solely for the purpose of
antogonism
> and irritation.

I spelled participants wrong. Spell check didn't catch it. Good thing Mr.
Anal Retentaive didn't either

>
> >Thanks again Len. Just finished watching a William Holden movie..he's a
> >Korean Pilot gets shot down in the end with Mickey Rooney. Saw a shot of
> >the radio room with all sorts of electronic equipment. Didn't see in the
> >credits you were there. But you must have been..relaying those 1.32
million
> >teletypes all by yourself.
>
> "The Bridges Of Toko-Ri". Some interesting portrayals of Naval
Aviation
> in that era you don't see in any other film...

That's the one Thanks. Mikey Rooney and his green hat and scarf.

>
> And no pictures of Lennie the Liar Anderson at his keyboard.

There's still hope yet

Enjoy your Sunday. I know I'll spend mine trying to figure out who I am because Len sez I'm not he, although the name on my FCC issued amateur radio license verifies that I is me. Wonder how he figures this stuff out. I'm not me but I am many others yet they are all me?? Did I get this right.

Love some lobster, but I see you're in Tenn? and I have to have my lobster fresh, as in just pulled from the cool depths of the LI Sound. Problem is there is a mysterious die-off of LI lobsters. No one can pinpoint the source and the catch, according to the papers is off 80%. Still, there's nothing finer.

CU later dude. remember, if you're going to polish your gun, do it in private

5657. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:18:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C785BA0.B23C2016@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35215

I've had the chance to look at some of the evidence provided, and I'm now pretty convinced that a person who passes the exam for a particular class is qualified to operate within their privileges.

I'm also pretty convinced that not only are the tests not "dumbed down", but If I were to make a suggestion, it would be that holders of licenses issued older than say 10 years should have to retake the tests to maintain their license.

I would have to agree with Ed that a person would have to be an idiot savant to memorize the huge amount of questions in the question pool just so they could pass the 50 questions that are asked. They would have to be "extra" special to then have somehow memorized the exact answer, because the ABCD answers are not in the same position as in the study guide.

I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to get the correct answer. I learned a lot when I was using the pool. It took several days to go through the pool and it's over 1000 questions. Anyone who tried to learn the answers via rote memorization would have to do more much work than simply learning the subject matter at hand. It took days to get through the thing.

The pool was a great help and learning tool. I then used an on-line test to check out my new knowledge.

My final thoughts are that I am now having a lot of fun, experimenting with the new computer based modes, some initial contesting activities, and having fun doing public service with my local club. I've also worked a little bit at recruiting new hams into the fold. I homebrew a fair amount of my own equipment also. The studying I've had to do has prepared me pretty well for all that.

I suspect my upbeat attitude may be seen by some as distinctly out of place. Too bad about that! ;^)

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Of course that is wrong,
> >and indeed goes to the heart of exact Q&A pools-they make it
> >possibled for applicants to pass exams with insufficient knowledge
> >regarding the material via rote memorization of exact answers to

> >exact questions without learning. But you and the rest of us already
> >knew that.
>
> Actually, Dick, I don't think the "rest of us" know that, so please don't
> presume to speak for the entire world.
>
> Although some idiot savante may be able to memorize the answers to over 1000
> questions without understanding the underlying material, for most people, that
> would be the hard way. It is easier to memorize a single formula and apply
> 6th-grade math than to try to word associate answers to formulae-based
> questions, wouldn't you say?
>
> I know that you think that ham radio should be work instead of fun, so that may
> explain why you are trying to convince people to memorize the pools.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> >
> >>
> >> > And before you troll into it, I had passed the Extra exams long
> >> > before Bash came along.
> >>
> >> Feeling guilty, are we?
> >
> > Not me, I don't have any of your problems.

5658. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:25:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C785D3E.C998356A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35217

"Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> From the ARRL Web-zine...
>

> handling all phases of radio support; start area, length of the course, and
> finish line," said Paul Topolski, W1SEX.

I suspect that in this group, Mr Topolski's Callsign will be the major subject of commentary. Wouldn't you agree, Kim? 8^)

- Mike -

5659. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:31:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223223130.03222.00000194@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35218

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 2/23/2002 1:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <fvSd8.33888$am6.961363147@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

> Yes, I guess the patriot honeymoon is over with and its time to
>scrape off the Old Glory bumper stickers and crap on the veterans again.

Not on "veterans"...On LENNIE!...There's never been ANY argument from ANYONE that I am aware of, least of all me, over Lennie's service in the Armed Forces.

That he insists that what he did in Japan in the 50's gives him any rank, status or priviledge OVER Amateur Radio Operators in the new millenium IS an argument!

I have, every year since i joined this forum, made some sort of "Happy Veterans Day" note to all herein, Lennie the Loser included.

All "knocks" were stowed for the day, as on THAT day, we are all one.

But Lennie has never said so much as "Back At Ya", "thanks", You too", etc etc etc, which leads me to believe that for all his pontification on such matters, it is LENNIE that holds such things in contempt.

I have no doubt he does.

PS...Note you switched screen names....AGAIN! Found an ISP that hasn't caught on to you yet? Or just trying to hide your own shameful bile from Goggle-searchers?

5660. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:35:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240335530.24143-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35219

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240222480.24082-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202240102230.23952-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >On Sat, 23 Feb 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>> >>"David Williams" <ValleyArts1@webtv.net> wrote in message
>> >>
>> >>You can take the written exams in sequence - I do not think you would
>be
>> >>allowed to take Element 4 having failed Element 3 - without taking the
>> >>code test at all or even having failed it. Shop til you drop.
>> >
>> >If this is saying that one cannot take element 4 before passing element
>1,
>> >that
>> >is incorrect.
>> >
>> >Stussman, you got a problem reading or are you just a nitpicking twit?
>> >
>> >When Element 1 becomes a written exam and pink pigs fly you may have a
>> >point.
>>
>> Your statement with reference to the code test was unclear. If your
>point was
>> with regard to only the written tests, then why did you mention the code
>test
>> at all? One possible reading of your response is that one must attempt
>(if not
>> having passed) element 1 when holding element 3 credit and
>simultaneously (i.e.
>> at the same session) attempting element 4.
>>
>> Nitpicking? When one interpretation of your statement is correct, and
>another
>> is wrong, isn't it better to communicate clearly?
>>
>
>Let us say you have a talent for selective mis-interpretation.

No. Let us say the TRUTH: Your statement was ambiguous.

5661. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:37:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223223738.03222.00000195@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35220

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/2002 3:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223160503.23819.00000028@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Like me, Cecil Moore is a thinking human being. You aren't.

No...Cecil Moore is anything EXCEPT "like (you)", your Putziness! Cecil knows how to say such things as "I was wrong"..."I am sorry", etc etc.

>Like me, Cecil Moore is a retired professional in radio-electronics
>of long experience in industry.

Cecil I believe...You, I think, rode the coat-tails of real professionals. You talk the talk, but the walk is a short one for you.

Jsut a little further, Your Meaninglessness, and you can stroll right off that pier.

Steve and the Boys

5662. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:41:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223224112.03222.00000196@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35221

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/2002 4:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020223175008.01358.00000056@mb-de.aol.com>

>Len
>(always the same name and signed although screen names for log-in
>purposes changed)

Actually, this would be a bit more factual if you said something like "occassionally I sign my name, and frequently I change log-in's to dilute the archive searchers from being able to see what a TOTAL Putz I am".

But that's a bit windy, eh? Well...windy for me...it's not a hiccup for you.....

5663. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 03:54:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020223225458.03222.00000200@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35222

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: "Ronnie D." ronaldd@yahoo.com
>Date: 2/23/2002 9:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <0YYd8.12137$0C1.1017092@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>> He does, Ron. His presence here is solely for the purpose of
>antogonism
>> and irritation.
>
>I spelled participants wrong. Spell check didn't catch it. Good thing Mr.
>Anal Retentaive didn't either

That's OK...I got "antagonism" wrong...but who cares? =)

Not only can I "spell" license..I HAVE one!

>Enjoy your Sunday. I know I'll spend mine trying to figure out who I am
>because Len sez I'm not he, although the name on my FCC issued amateur radio
>license verifies that I is me. Wonder how he figures this stuff out. I'm
>not me but I am many others yet they are all me?? Did I get this right.

Yeah...pretty much...Lennie trieds to throw these wrenches into the works
on occassions to try and throw the dogs off, but no matter what he does, he's
still Lennie and the stench is still there!

>Love some lobster, but I see you're in Tenn? and I have to have my lobster
>fresh, as in just pulled from the cool depths of the LI Sound. Problem is
>there is a mysterious die-off of LI lobsters. No one can pinpoint the
>source and the catch, according to the papers is off 80%. Still, there's
>nothing finer.

OK...Well, maybe some other time! We'll find something!

>CU later dude. remember, if you're going to polish your gun, do it in
>private

My wife's a vet too...Maybe I will get HER to polish my gun!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5664. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:09:18 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2069376441b29989695@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35223

In article <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...

> I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW message
> sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
>
> I doubt it.

"Ismael Quinones, a traffic enforcement agent in a scooter at a stoplight
at Cortlandt and Church streets, reached for his radio. "Traffic 191, we
just had an explosion at One World Trade Center by a jet," he told his
dispatcher and left his car to order civilians to leave the area. "They
hadn't heard about it yet," said Quinones, 39. "People were hanging out
the window, sending morse code [by flicking the blinds]."

http://www.newsday.com/ny-nyresc232380685sep23.story

joshua houk
kd7pos

5665. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:18:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35224

Joshua Houk wrote:
> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> beneath the iron and concrete.

One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5666. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:33:43 UTC
From: xpyttl <xpyttl_nospam@earthling.net>
Message-ID: <u7gr9lknrdoe61@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35225
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

It's obviously SPAM since it's followed up to all sorts of groups that don't
care!

Somewhere (I think it was on the eQSL site) I saw where you had to have the
card mailed from eQSL (at a buck a card). Seemed to me exactly like the
sort of thing the League would dream up. Still, a buck is better than 3
IRCs.

In any case, you're right. If it were the case, there would be something on
the ARRL site. The last mention I could see was a year ago where the league
was working with a software vendor to provide a secure eQSLing service.

..

"Jim Higgins" <UseAddressInSig@pandora.orbl.org> wrote in message
news:qrjg7uogfsit684imr673e0i9ivdtcai3c@4ax.com...
>
> Can you point to anything on the ARRL website supporting this? I
> can't find word one, even in Members Only areas.
>
> Conflicting rumors say ARRL is placing added requirements on
> eQSLs that basically can't be met, possibly making the eQSL
> statement either untrue or grossly incomplete. My take on things
> is that eQSL is not telling the whole story involving all
> requirements.
>
> Also, and I feel stupid asking, but is there more to this
> Webmaster comment than this one line? I went to eQSL and can't
> find anything but this one sound bite. I think that's most
> unusual given how important this is to eQSL and DXCCers in
> general.
>
> --
> Jim Higgins, quasimodo AT yahoo DOT com
> icbm: 33.55.34N, 80.24.21W

5667. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:35:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C786DA3.497369BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35226

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C77C6B3.3E656666@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
> >> >Houk
> >> >> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> >> >> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> >> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
> >
> >Cecil is a ham. You aren't.
>
> Like me, Cecil Moore is a thinking human being. You aren't.

How pathetic you are.

> Like me, Cecil Moore is a retired professional in radio-electronics
> of long experience in industry. Dave Heil worked for government.

...and the point of this is? You aren't Cecil. You aren't me. You
aren't a ham.

> >> I don't portray myself as Heil does,
> >> giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
> >> as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from
> >> an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
> >> wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.
> >
> >There was no snow job. It wasn't my idea. I did not describe it as
> >"wonderful".
>
> The exact words were more like a "neat idea" and the claim was

> as a "personal innovation." it was intended to prove some kind of
> point on the superiority of CW over teleprinter. It did not prove
> anything except that snow jobs can grow in hot weather.

Post it or stuff it. There was no claim that it is something I
originated. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not at issue.

> >I used a system which was in place. That you don't
> >understand the reasons for its use make it no less true and no less
> >effective.
>
> The first excuse/rationalization was that "the circuit needed to
> be synchronized." That was a technically false statement since
> teleprinters are all designed to be self-synchronizing to the
> remote transmitter.

I don't know what sort of crypto devices you used on asynchonous
circuits back in the dark ages, Len. You write now as you wrote then,
from an uninformed point of view. My work in Guina-Bissau is not an
issue.

> Heil later "amended" that to mean "synchronizing schedules and
> frequencies" which is not yet understandable in commercial-
> government practice. If a teleprinter terminal is working at all,
> a full set of "schedules" and other data can be transmitted to
> both ends of a circuit, identical in content at each end.
>
> Had the excuse/rationale been given that a teleprinter was "down"
> (not working), then use of CW would be perfectly understandable
> and acceptible. That was NOT given.

We had no teleprinter down and I've never offered an "excuse". Morse
was used for openings, closings, QSYs and crypto set. For more than
this you have no need to know and no clearance. My work in Guina-Bissau
is not at issue.

> >You didn't understand it then. You don't understand it now. The
> >discussion back then was government use of morse. It was then used.
> >That you don't accept that is of not much consequence.
>
> Incorrect. Heil made the initial remark claiming some personally-
> conceived innovation, not on "government use of morse" but of
> trying to prove a point of morse modes over teleprinter.

Show us the statement I made, Len or clam up. This is simply another of
your attempts at diversion. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue.

> A much later excuse/rationale claimed that such switchover in
> modes was some kind of State Department "radio doctrine" or
> "procedure" to use morse modes as an order-wire on a teleprinter
> circuit. That defies understanding considering that teleprinters
> over radio had already been in use throughout the US government
> and military for over 30 years prior to the 1980s. USN and other

> military procedures on teleprinter circuits are given in a 1967
> USN text used by all branches. Existing for 15 years prior to this
> alleged innovation, it explains "synchronization" and also "order-
> wires."

That you don't understand it does not negate its reality or its value.
Instead of saying that something "defies understanding", why not just
admit that YOU don't understand it?

My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue. By the way, I didn't work for
the Navy or any other branch of the U.S. military in Africa.

> >You've gotten more than this part twisted, Leonardo. I'm not attempting
> >to constantly post my past exploits.
>
> Again, incorrect. Heil has done so in the past.

All anyone needs to do is research your past posts and research mine.
They are there for all to see and they'd reveal you to be a fabricator
as well as a non-radio amateur.

> >I am a ham. You aren't.
>
> Heil is a radio amateur. I am a radio professional.

You aren't a radio anything. The past is past. You eat up the present
with your posts here. Ham radio can only be in the future for you.

> >You're an SWL with attitude.
>
> My attitude as a BCL, SWL, TVW and as a radio professional is
> that I enjoy all of it. Wouldn't do it if there was no enjoyment.

Bully for you. Continue your enjoyment as listener, viewer and sidewalk
superintendent.

> I might enjoy amateur radio as well, but certain attitudinally-
> oriented rank-status-privilege-by-mode-and-tenure "superiors"
> insist that I must only enjoy what they personally enjoy.

Piffle! If you are holding back for those reasons, I'm afraid you'll be
doomed to being forever an onlooker.

> >You've made no attempt to actually become a ham.
>
> Incorrect. I've never carried it as far an amateur radio license
> examination.

So you rocketed to the fore only to skip taking the exam through which
you'd actually have become a ham.

> >You simply haunt a ham radio newsgroup on the internet.

> Incorrect again, a false assumption.

It's the only conclusion which can be made about you given the
information available.

> >You won't become a newcomer until you enter amateur radio. I'm not
> >discussing vehicles or Zambonis. I'm discussing Leonard H. Anderson,
> >non-ham, newcomer-to-be (maybe).
>
> Heil is not "discussing" but venting frustration on an individual
> he has not been able to best on a newsgroup.

Len you don't even realize when you've been bested. Ask around.

> >You've misread my statement much as you've misread others. This one was
> >simply an observation.
>
> Not at all. Heil exhibits an extreme need to win all "discussions"
> including methods of deprecating and denigrating others who do
> not share his viewpoints. Standard Operating Procedure. :-)

What does "Anderson" do? Could it be that he attributes to others the
characteristics he himself possesses?

>
> >> Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that
> >> tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did
> >> they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.
> >
> >Another Nazi reference, Len? In which statement did I mention CW?
>
> "Uber" (over) and "alles" (all) and "bund" are all German words.
> Not all Germans are/were NAZIs. "Heil" as a surname is
> Germanic and means a salute or honor as a German word.
> Is Heil a NAZI?!?

The word "Heil" has several meanings. I'm not German but American.
Perhaps you noticed that I don't have a DL, DK or DJ callsign. I don't
speak or read German. I do know that "gesundheit" is a German word.
You didn't use it. In which statement did I mention CW?

> >Does this mean you already have an ARRL tee-shirt?
>
> No.
>
> >I work DX, contest, handle traffic and rag-chew using a number of modes,
> >Len. Which modes do you use when you frequent the ham bands?
>
> I have no authorization to be a control operator of an amateur
> radio station. I do not "frequent the ham bands" (presuming Heil
> means only those bands below 30 MHz). Why would Heil imply
> that I break the law?!?

You assume too much. I said "ham bands". Do you frequent ham bands
above 30 MHz?

> >I even
> >have 2m FM QSOs with those who have never passed a code test. After
> >all, THEY are hams.
>
> We had ham last night (Thursday) for supper. Quite good.
> Tasted just like ham. ;-)

That is simply sophomoric.

> I have semi-regular communications on UHF above the amateur
> 70 cm band, moved from above the amateur 2m band. NONE of
> the communicators need or needed code testing. After all, WE
> are professionals, carrying on business. :-)

This is an amateur radio newsgroup, Len. I asked you about the ham bands. We don't carry on commercial business.

> I am well aware of the elitist attitude of some that NO ONE can
> possibly discuss ANYTHING involving amateur radio until they
> are authorized by a government amateur license. That includes
> petitioning my government for a redress of grievances, a right
> supposedly granted by the US Constitution.

I feel your pain, Len. All of those lengthy posts here; all of that hard work prepping your anti-code testing diatribe for the Commission and STILL no one takes you seriously!

> I'm also postitive that Heil will be upset (to some degree) by this
> response and will continue with his regular routine of insisting on
> conformist attitudes and demanding that others enjoy what he
> enjoys whether they like it or not. He is not correctable even if
> wrong. Matters not. :-)

Naw, Len. By this time I realize that you've reached true geezerhood and that you'll never actually attempt entry into amateur radio. You exist here simply to stir up crap. To my knowledge, that is your only purpose in showing up.

Dave K8MN

5668. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:42:09 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C786F20.455C62F0@attbi.com>
Source record: 35227
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Jim Higgins wrote:

> >The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
> >historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted for
> >DXCC....this remark from the eQSL Webmaster found at this
> >
> >URL: http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
> >"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are mailed. AG or
> >not" (Webmaster)
> >15-Feb-2002
>
> Can you point to anything on the ARRL website supporting this? I
> can't find word one, even in Members Only areas.
>
> Conflicting rumors say ARRL is placing added requirements on
> eQSLs that basically can't be met, possibly making the eQSL
> statement either untrue or grossly incomplete. My take on things
> is that eQSL is not telling the whole story involving all
> requirements.
>
> Also, and I feel stupid asking, but is there more to this
> Webmaster comment than this one line? I went to eQSL and can't
> find anything but this one sound bite. I think that's most
> unusual given how important this is to eQSL and DXCCers in
> general.

What's the difference? Ain't nothin' "historical" about this announcement.
What the ARRL (may have) said is that they will accept the (e)QSLs that are
mailed. I fail to see the difference between a mailed QSL that had been
verified and printed by a QSL manager and a mailed eQSL that had been
verified and printed by the eQSL service.

73 .... Zoran WA7AA

5669. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:42:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C786F28.8E6E661A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35228

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The radio world keeps evolving and advancing in its state of
> the art. Its too bad that so many long-timers affixed themselves
> to the past and refuse to budge, claiming greatness when they
> look more like has-beens. They should call themselves
> members of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service? :-)

Maybe you can claim distinction as an Archaic Non-participant.

Dave K8MN

5670. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:45:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C786FF8.1EB13F51@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35229

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C77CC93.6DB3ABAF@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > > says...
> > > >
> > > > > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
> > > reliable
> > > > > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it,
> its
> > > > > reliability is a moot point.
> > > >
> > > > Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
> > > >
> > > > joshua houk
> > > > kd7pos
> > >
> > > I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I
> don't
> > > think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
> >
> > Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
> > like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
> > there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
> > s t r e t c h.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW message
> sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
>
> I doubt it.

It matters no whether there was or not, Kim. What I said was:

"Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you
don't like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion
that there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's

some s t r e t c h."

Go debate your "what ifs" with someone else.

Dave K8MN

5671. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:51:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C787171.4918C822@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35230

Keith wrote:
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > I am passionately in favor of complete pre-emption with regard to
> > all antennas of any type and use. but this law doesn't provide it,
> > and the FCC was very clear recently about their refusal to exert
> > such pre-emption absent clear directions from The Congress.
>
> I have an antenna for TV reception only with the TV preemption and I have
> it hooked up to my TV, stereo & Shortwave Radio , what are you going to do
> about it as a association lawyer?
>
> --
> Best Regards,
>
> Keith

You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
decade or two.

Dave K8MN

5672. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 04:58:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a59tn2$2t4$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35237

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a59l1l0a8t@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > And, needless to say, you would be wrong.
> >
> > The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> > later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > beneath the iron and concrete.
> >
> > Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up and
> > ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall
to
> > try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?
> >
> > joshua houk
> > kd7pos
>
> Do you have a source for this story?

And on what amateur band was the claimed morse
message being sent?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5673. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:00:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C78737F.232ABEC9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35231

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> That's what I did in 1963. I met the requirements. Hams today meet the
> >> requirements.
>
> > So maybe the requirements are inadequate.
>
> The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level
> requirments of 1963. The requirements today to obtain all amateur priveleges
> require the studying of a lot more than a 16-page study guide. If you are
> claiming Amateur Radio is in the tubes because of the requirements, you are
> claiming that it has been broken for almost 40 years. That is quite a bit to
> expect people to believe, considering the evidence of the continuous growth and
> evolution of Amateur Radio.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

When yourpremise is wrong, your argument can't be any more accurate.
. Your premise is wrong.

5674. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:03:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C78743D.BF13F120@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35233

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >
> >> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >>
> >> >Short memory, Ed? What goes around comes back around, ya know.
> >> >Dish it out and you'd better be ready to take it.
> >>
> >> Well, at least you admit what your real agenda is.
> >
> > I see that your assumer is working well.
>
> Okay, then by your above quip, can I assume that you are telling us that your
> intent is not to dish it out and watch others take it?
>
> Just what can one infer from what you say, Dick?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you consider self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and others never dished it out they would have nothing to take.

5675. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:03:43 UTC
From: "Dimmy's Lap Dog, Roger" <Dullard@BigMarie.com>
Message-ID: <a59s53dvo0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35232
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Zoran Brlecic" <WA7AA@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:3C786F20.455C62F0@attbi.com...
> Jim Higgins wrote:
>
> > >The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
> > >historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted
for
> > >DXCC....this remark from the eQSL Webmaster found at this
> > >
> > >URL: http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
> > >"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are mailed. AG or
> > >not" (Webmaster)
> > >15-Feb-2002
> >
> > Can you point to anything on the ARRL website supporting this? I
> > can't find word one, even in Members Only areas.
> >
> > Conflicting rumors say ARRL is placing added requirements on
> > eQSLs that basically can't be met, possibly making the eQSL
> > statement either untrue or grossly incomplete. My take on things
> > is that eQSL is not telling the whole story involving all
> > requirements.
> >
> > Also, and I feel stupid asking, but is there more to this
> > Webmaster comment than this one line? I went to eQSL and can't
> > find anything but this one sound bite. I think that's most
> > unusual given how important this is to eQSL and DXCCers in
> > general.
>
> What's the difference? Ain't nothin' "historical" about this announcement.
> What the ARRL (may have) said is that they will accept the (e)QSLs that
are
> ***mailed***. I fail to see the difference between a mailed QSL that had
been
> verified and printed by a QSL manager and a mailed eQSL that had been
> verified and printed by the eQSL service.
>
>
> 73 .... Zoran WA7AA
>
Who cares? What is the ARRL anyway? A place to throw away your income?

5676. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:16:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C78774A.2648D19B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35234

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I've seen people set down, go down the sheet checking one after the next and
> > turn it in within 15 minutes, with not a mark on the scratch
> > sheet. Not problem worked, not a formula written down and make a good passing
> > score. I can only conclude they had done the memory
> > thing till they could instantly
> > pick out the matching answer to any question on whatever exam they prepared
> > for.
>
> I took about ten minutes for my Extra exam and made no marks on the
> scratch sheet. Do you think I didn't know the material, Dick?

That's entirely possible. It's also possible you didn't take a test when I was a VE. I can believe that one could take a test today that required no calculations and no marks on a scratch sheet.

5677. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:18:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7877B0.8B0CF205@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35235

Dave Heil wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > > In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > says...
> > >
> > > > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
> > reliable
> > > > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> > > > reliability is a moot point.
> > >
> > > Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
> > >
> > > joshua houk
> > > kd7pos
> >
> > I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I don't
> > think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
>
> Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
> like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
> there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
> s t r e t c h.

Not for her it isn't.

5678. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:27:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7879CA.B0EBCA90@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35236

Jim Kelley wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
> ever
> > paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> > seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> As far as you know.

Which isn't very far. Mebbie out the door.

5679. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:30:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C787AA1.C6F467F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35238

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
> > ever
> > > paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> > > seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > As far as you know.
>
> What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.

That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, in fact it usually
goes much
slower than you seem to realize. You gotta spend time watching it go to get the
picture. My much - quoted PSK31/CWID experience was on a band that had gone out
many hours earilier, and was for practical purposes, dead. Except for those
dozen or so tiny signals....

> When the atmospheric effect can vary
> by 120dB, 15dB of advantage can soon disappear.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5680. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:31:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a59u39efs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35239

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >>What gives the Congress the right to
> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
> >
> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto with
state
> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
>
> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.

OK to a point.

> The government passed the
> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods

No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves
contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract
that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.

>... I am saying that
> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
> oversteps the authority of the government.

It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
stipulation.

> They can say you can have
> antennas 6 feet long and no higher then 12 feet at your home, but they can
> not disallow the reception of any type of legal transmission. In case you
> are not aware the Supreme court says that broadcasts are free speech and
the
> government can not prevent the reception of those broadcasts.

So if I want to put a 100 foot tower up to recieve SW broadcasts, are
you suggesting the town I live in must allow that?

> No CC&R has a rule that the reception of a broadcasts is against the
rules
> in the USA. The government opened the door for antennas, but overstepped

> it's authority on what radio transmissions you can receive on that
antenna.
> Using your logic if I have a home entertainment center and use that TV
> antenna for FM Stereo reception also I am violating the CC&R.

The CC&R almost always prohibits ANY antenna...the FCC preemption
was created for only very specific exceptions. So far that hasn't
been overturned. In the case you bring up (FM Stereo), let's
be
serious...no one in the neighborhood would likly push the issue
because FM Stereo recievers usually don't lead to neighborhood
RFI issues which almost always are the precipitating incident(s)
which get the nieghbor(s) on the CC&R enforcement warpath.

> You are wrong
> to think the government or neighborhood association has such authority. I
> will concede that radio transmissions may not be covered, but reception is
a
> different story.

As before, your stawman doesn't help your ham radio use in any case.

> I'm talking to a stubborn person.

More that folks around this newssgroup have had considerable
experience(s) with CC&R applicability, past case law, etc. Don't
kill the messenger just because the message isn't something you
don't agree with. For now, your legal logic has NOT been
the rule of the day in the various cases Phil K and others have
knowledge of or participated in. If you have others, please
share them.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5681. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:38:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a59ubn$32u$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35240

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222071343.13180.00000139@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >The number of front page
> >extremist cases are, apparently, relatively small.
>
> Relatively small, but also relatively painful for the unlucky ham who gets
> wrapped up in them.

But also usually because of a lack of judgement first
on the ham's part in not knowing about CC&Rs to
begin with.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5682. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:40:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a59ugakqs1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35241

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C76930A.9C070C49@uci.edu...
>
>
> Keith wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > >What won't hold up in court? Your claim that you can't be legally
> > >prevented from using a TVRO antenna to transmit based on PRB-1 and the
> > >TVRO law? I think we'd all appreciate it greatly if you could actually
> > >make that happen. Get off the dime and cut the drivel.
>
> > No, what the congress is saying that I can't use that antenna to receive
> > transmissions on 90.3 MHz. What I listen to with that antenna is not
the
> > governments business. They only have the right to say CC&R's can not
prevent
> > antennas to for the reception of radio signals and they can set up
> > regulations for the placement or size of that antenna, but they can't
say if
> > you listen to FM Stereo on that antenna it is illegal. Think about
privacy
> > rights for God's sake!
> > Let's pretend that Joe Smith uses his TV antenna for FM Stereo also,
the
> > association finds out and goes to court. What will the judge rule? Think
> > about it! You are not a criminal for listening to NPR on your antenna in
> > your home. This thinking and portion of the law is absurd and can not be
> > supported by the law.
> > The Congress can allow antennas in CC&R neighborhoods for the reception
of
> > radio transmissions, but they can not say if you listen to Radio Moscow
on
> > it you are a criminal.
>
> You HAD been talking about using the antenna for ham radio. Now you're
> talking about listening to radio broadcasts. Broadcast reception is
> what the legislation provides for, so that really isn't even an issue.
> But I do understand why you've switched topics.

And, as Phil already pointed out...the case is CIVIL...no CRIMINAL
aspect involved at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5683. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 05:45:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a59uu7mmn1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35242

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020222070840.13180.00000137@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com
>
> >What
> >you are defending is the intrusion of the government into my home.
>
> He is not defending that law, he is explaining what that law is.
>
> > As long as that antenna is within the bonds of the law then I can do
with
> >it as I please as far as reception or transmission of radio signals.
>
> Yes, and that law clearly says that if the antenna is used for any purpose
> other than OTARD, it is not pre-empted.
>
> > You can have a phone, but you can't call Nevada on it and if you do the
> >courts will come after you.
>
> No, you can have a phone, but you can't put 100 watts of RF onto the
phone
> wire. :-)

And, additionally, the courts won't do anything.
If the FCC preemption doesn't apply, the courts (nor
anyone else in the local government) will do anything
with regard to enforcement of CC&Rs. The initiation of any
action will be a civil filing by a neighbor and/or the
homeowners' association to enforce the contract you
signed which included the CC&Rs.

> >The ARRL will sit around defending this law with Phil
> >leading the charge.
>
> > Good Lord, Why do I support the ARRL at all?
>
> Because ARRL is not defending this law at all. They have expended
considerable
> resources with the FCC trying to change it and now that they have been
told to
> take it to Congress, they are taking it to Congress.
>
> Why would you take a clear explanation of a law that Phil says he doesn't
like
> as "defending" it?

Call it "kill the messenger" (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5684. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:11:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a0jo$57e$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35243

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a55j0l02osp@enews3.newsguy.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >> As long as that antenna is within the bonds of the law then I can do
with
> >>it as I please as far as reception or transmission of radio signals. It
is
> >>not the place of the government to make it illegal for the lawful use in
> >>regards to radio signals.
> >
> >The govt. isn't doing that. You did it when you signed the paper to buy
the
> >place
> >with anti-antenna restrictions.
>
> Guess what there are no antenna restrictions allowed by CC&R's.

Are YOU saying: CC&Rs that prohibit antennas don't exist?

or are you saying that CC&Rs that prohibit antennas are ALL
unenforceable?

If the latter, please help us all by pointing to the case law that
supports your claim. The rest of us here are unfamiliar with
ANY case law that supports that viewpoint.

> The
> government is just trying to say what kind of transmission I can receive
on
> that receiver using that antenna.

The government hasn't said that at all. The government (FCC) has
only said that they (FCC) have preempted certain antennas for certain
specific uses. You can make all the statements you want...BUT
your claims are NOT supported by case law at all.

> The government has overstepped it's
> authority. What are we going to do about it?

Would you be happier if the FCC did NOT pre-empt
the CC&Rs at all? That was the case for many years
and the courts still upheld CC&R restrictions.

> Show me the CC&R that states the reception of shortwave, AM/FM radio or
> NOAA weather broadcasts is prohibited?

They prohibit antennas. CC&Rs don't have to be service specific.
Your strawman application of the federal pre-emption tocover all
recieve applications is, while factually incorrect, would NOT likly
ever be challenged (practically speaking) IF the only uses of
the antenna in question were for recieve of other broadcast and/or
short wave signals. Where the issue goes far astray involves
TRANSMISSION of amateur signals. THAT is when the neighborhood
"enforcers" would probably get on your case and they'd have
prior court rulings on their side. That's the current situation.

> Most TV transmissions are analog
> radio transmissions and the law or CC&R can not make a distinction. The
> government can only allow the antenna and regulate it's size, but no one
can
> tell you what kind of radio transmission you can receive with that
antenna.
> TV is a radio transmission, just because you can see a picture with that
> transmission doesn't mean it is something else. The government can preempt
> the CC&R for antennas and regulate the size and placement, but it can not
> say you can't use it for receiving legal transmission of any type.

Trust me...neither the neighbors nor the home owners association will
even care IF the only use is RECIEVE. That's just the practical
aspects. The issues of primary concern here are NOT recieve only use, but
rather the ability to erect and use ham antennas...or to simply be able
to operate as a ham.

> The law or a suit by a CC&R association won't hold up in court if someone
> uses their TV antenna for TV and receiving Radio Moscow. Maybe the courts
> won't allow transmitters I will concede that point,

That's THE point. The neighbors won't give a hoot if you recieve channel
5, 55 or Radio Moscow.

> but using it to receive
> a radio transmission is not a violation of a CC&R or the law because the
TV
> is a radio receiver just like that SW or FM Stereo. Now if the CC&R
> prohibits the use of radio receivers then I guess the CC&R will hold up if
I
> attach my radio receiver to it? No, it wouldn't because radio receivers
are
> legal and the Supreme court says so.

This is the ham radio policy issues newsgroup. So far no one has
even identified a case involving prohibition of
RECEIVE via the TV antenna. I agree with Phil K that in
such a case, the FCC won't backup the preemption, BUT
I also believe the type of "mis-use" on a recieve only basis will
never result in any efforts to enforce the CC&R to begin with.

> The law is wrong in trying to limit the reception of a radio transmission
> to so called TV transmissions with an antenna. It oversteps the authority

of
> the government and the authority of a CC&R. The courts have held that
> reception of broadcasts is a free speech issue. Hmm, isn't that TV a radio
> receiver or am I just imagining things?
> Like I said you can't see the forest because of all the trees, but hey
you
> can stay here and say it is legal for the government to regulate what you
> attach to that antenna or you can join the fight to overthrow the
reception
> of TV only portion of this law. The ARRL wants special legislation for
hams
> only and I don't think it will ever happen that way, there isn't enough
> support in Congress.
> Screw the FCC, this law needs to be challenged in the courts. The law has
> already overruled CC&R's about the placement of antennas, the only problem
> with this law is that it is being used to prevent the reception of other
> legal radio transmissions, reception of radio transmissions are free
speech.

PLEASE cite even one case where RECEPTION ONLY was
the issue. The issue of reception ONLY just hasn't raised any "test case"
for you to rely on.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5685. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:16:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a0jsjpp1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35244

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a55fmc01lcj@enews4.newsguy.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >I am sure that there are a number of hams who would like to avoid the
costs of
> >"just letting the courts decide." I don't know about you, but in the
cases
> >where I have seen a ham end up in court, one way or the other, it was a
losing
> >proposition.
>
> Stop looking at this as a ham radio problem. This is a privacy and free
> speech issue. The government has overridden CC&R regulations for antennas
> and set up the criteria for what is allowed as far as height and length,
but
> it can not say you are prohibited from using that antenna to receive
> FM broadcasts or shortwave or NOAA weather broadcasts. It is not the
> governments place to say you can only use an antenna to receive a certain
> type of transmission. If this was true they could allow radio
broadcasters,
> but disallow radios to receive those transmission. What I do in the
privacy
> of my home with that antenna is not the governments or neighborhood
> associations business. As long as it meets the physical requirements the
use
> for any kind of reception of a radio transmission is a private matter.
> Yes, the government can regulate transmitters and my argument that radio
> transmissions be allowed with these antennas *might* not be allowed by the
> court, but does the government have the right to tell me what signals I
can
> receive in my home with that legal antenna in a CC&R neighborhood?
> Free speech and the constitution that says my home is my castle is what
> comes into play here. The government has opened the door, I'm just saying
> the restriction on receiving other type of transmissions on that antenna
in
> a CC&R neighborhood overreaches the governments authority.

Has anyone been brought to court because they had aTV antenna and were
using it for Stero FM reception, or reception of any other signal
beside TV? I am unaware of any such "enforcement effort."

YMMV.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5686. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:22:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a0u7gof1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35245

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a54q4h01ote@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > One principle that I learned was never to go forward with
> > a case when the law is against you and you have no grounds to
> > get the court to change it.
>
> I see so the law is against private property rights and if I use my legal
> antenna to listen to 90.3 MHz I am a criminal. Gee, Phil so much for
privacy
> rights in the home.

Keith...PLEASE...once and for all...drop the CRIMINAL
reference. It does NOT apply!!!!

> The government can overrule CC&R's for the use of antennas at the home
for
> reception of radio transmissions, but they can't come along and throw me
in
> jail for listening to Radio Moscow on that same antenna.

The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
have to worry about going to jail.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5687. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:29:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a1bb$bp7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35246

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220552280.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210539220.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
> >> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
> >> >> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only
if
> >they
> >> >> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate
in
> >> >> any way are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
> >> >
> >> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
> >>
> >> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
> >> between the two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.
> >
> >There always is a clear distinction between the two.
> >
> >CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
> >private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
> >vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
> >are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
> >notices from zoning, etc.)
>
> That "governmental" action is still a civil matter. No difference.

Wrong! In the one case, THE government is the
plaintiff and is directly taking the action to enforce
the ordinance in question. In the CC&R cases, the
government is ONLY providing the venue (the court)
where the issue is adjudicated beween the two
civil parties.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5688. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:34:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a1l7mhs1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35247

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220547400.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 22 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >
> >>You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if
they
> >>provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in
any
> >>way
> >>are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
> >
> >Absolutely incorrect. CC&Rs relating to amateur antennas are not
pre-empted by
> >anything from the feds.
>
> Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those
INVOLUNTARILY
> entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
> inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).

I'll let Phil add any of the legal details, but everything
I know about regarding such transfers of property
do NOT, in any way, invalidate the CC&Rs. That's
no different than the bank mortgage still being
in effect as an outstanding lien against the property
that needed to be paid for title to pas to the "new
owner" who inherited the property.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5689. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:45:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a29r$f7t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35248

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:3C7663B7.7080809@ieee.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> >>At 14 years of age in the 8th grade, virtually all of my "learning" was
> >>rote memorization. The only thing I had trouble memorizing were those
> >>darned schematics. I had absolutely no idea what all those squiggly
> >>lines meant.
> >
> > I suspect you are stretching it a bit here, Cecil. Did you really not
know
> > that a resistor schematic represented a resistor? I can believe that you
may
> > not have understood how they all worked together as a circuit, but I do
expect
> > that you had some understanding of what you were looking at.
>
> I knew what a resistor was and that it obeyed ohm's law but I had
> absolutely no idea what a resistor did or why it was placed where
> it was in a circuit. It was a very large conceptual leap to realize
> why a cathode resistor was really needed in a single supply amplifier.
> I didn't learn that until college.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Yes, same experience I had at 16 when I did the General theory test
(1958 or so). I memorized 14 diagrams from the licnese manual (5 were
on the test).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5690. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 06:52:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a2v0tqk1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35249

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C785BA0.B23C2016@adelphia.net...
> I've had the chance to look at some of the evidence provided, and I'm
> now pretty convinced that a person who passes the exam for a particular
> class is qualified to operate within their privileges.
>
> I'm also pretty convinced that not only are the tests not "dumbed
> down", but If I were to make a suggestion, it would be that holders of
> licenses issued older than say 10 years should have to retake the tests
> to maintain their license.

WHY?

<SNIP>

> My final thoughts are that I am now having a lot of fun, experimenting
> with the new computer based modes, some initial contesting activities,
> and having fun doing public service with my local club. I've also worked
> a little bit at recruiting new hams into the fold. I homebrew a fair
> amount of my own equipment also. The studying I've had to do has
> prepared me pretty well for all that.

Great...and having said that...just why would YOU want to be
retested again in 10 years?

> I suspect my upbeat attitude may be seen by some as distinctly out of
> place. Too bad about that! ;^)

Welcome. Happy to see you and your upbeat attitude.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5691. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 07:16:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5a448$1fa$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35250

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a59onp02laf@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > I am passionately in favor of complete pre-emption with regard to
> > all antennas of any type and use. but this law doesn't provide it,
> > and the FCC was very clear recently about their refusal to exert
> > such pre-emption absent clear directions from The Congress.
>
> I have an antenna for TV reception only with the TV preemption and I
have
> it hooked up to my TV, stereo & Shortwave Radio , what are you going to do
> about it as a association lawyer?

Your recieve only case is never going to see the light of
day because the association and the neighbors don't care
at that point since the extra-use isn't detectable at all
and provides nothing to "trigger" enforcement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5692. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 08:23:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020224032353.09757.00000114@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 35102

In article <3C6F0425.BFE5398F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You and Cecilia are what is bizzarre. OF COURSE cw has merits.
>
>Does CW have enough merits to survive without forced testing? _____
>It's a simple yes/no question.

Cecil:

Yes, it's a simple question -- and since nobody's ever been "forced"
to take a code test, it's also an illogical question.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5693. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 08:23:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020224032353.09757.00000115@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 35103

In article <3C6F06D9.EB537F03@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Bill Sohl wrote:
>> They just can't accept the concept of voluntary.
>
>They vant everyvun to be forced to volunteer.

Cecil:

The Russkies aren't "forcing" anyone to become a ham. If you
want to be a ham, you take the code test. I'm sure they also
require a road test for a driver's license. Nobody ever said the
Russians wern't logical.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5694. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 08:23:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020224032354.09757.00000116@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 35101

In article <3c75c985_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Dick, you have *initiated* more insults that anyone else on this
>newsgroup.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Maybe I just ignored Dick most of the time...but I think Larry is the record
>holder on insults...
>
>Kim W5TIT

This is from the person who insults all amateurs, especially YL's,
every time she gives her callsign! Must be a dougle standard.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5695. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 08:23:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020224032354.09757.00000117@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 35104

In article <20020222065228.13180.00000132@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>> And the Dick and Larry show gets to insult people either way!
>
>>Whom? Those who insult first. What goes around comes back around. As always
>>you conveniently "forget" the first half.
>
>When did I ever tell you to go soak your head, Dick?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Don't look now, but it seems like you just did! So much for your reputation for being "subtle."

Need a towel, Dick?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5696. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 08:42:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020224034201.09757.00000118@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 35105

In article <3c7716ca$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Axeually, I have a lot of sympathy for lazy knuckle-draggers. From
>> a strictly ham radio perspective, I used to be one myself. However,
>> I was able to overcome those tendencies, and attain 20 WPM
>> and Extra class with relative ease, once I got started. At that time,
>> the only thing keeping me out of ham radio was my own lack of
>> willingness to learn a useful communications skill. It "filtered" me
>> out. Had I not had to earn my privileges under the set of testing
>> requirements in place at the time, it is not very likely that I would
>> have done a fraction as much on-the-air as I have, nor would I have
>> had a fraction as much fun. I really feel sorry for future hams who
>> will never know the satisfaction of being "Real Hams" because they
>> simply won't learn Morse code in the absence of a meaningful
>> license testing requirement to do so.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>heh heh heh...look at it this way: At least Larry found something he was
>actually good at...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I'm good at a lot of things, but I'm not good at anything I haven't
tried. That's the beauty of the code testing requirement -- it got
me (and a lot of other people) to try something they may have
thought they couldn't do. I didn't get there by someone "selling"
me on the Morse code. The only thing I was "sold" on was the
thought of unrestricted HF phone privileges. The code testing
requirement to get there is the thing that made me realize that
CW was a useful and fun mode. I never would have learned this
in the absence of a code testing requirement, and neither will
the vast majority of future radio amateurs.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5697. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 10:42:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224054203.17463.00000342@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35106

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>When did I ever tell you to go soak your head, Dick?

>Don't look now, but it seems like you just did! So much for your
>reputation for being "subtle."

This might explain some of the way you see the world, Larry. Thinking that a question is the same as a statement is pretty bizarre.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5698. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 10:51:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224055147.17463.00000343@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35107

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>Bill Sohl wrote:

>>Your recieve only case is never going to see the light of
>>day because the association and the neighbors don't care
>>at that point since the extra-use isn't detectable at all
>>and provides nothing to "trigger" enforcement.

> Not according to Phil Kane. Now what if I also use that antenna for TV &
>CB, can the association prevent me from doing so?

Phil Kane never discussed whether your neighbors are going to bother to enforce the CC&R against antennas.

Bill was trying to explain to you the difference in meaning between "will enforce," "might enforce" and "can enforce."

Of course your neighbors or association "can" enforce violations against CC&Rs. They "might" do so, but Bill has said that it is unlikely that they "will" do so.

This, too, is starting to resemble the "what was said/what was heard" series from the funny papers.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5699. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 10:54:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224055413.17463.00000344@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35108

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>> From the ARRL Web-zine...
>>
>
>> handling all phases of radio support; start area, length of the course, and
>> finish line," said Paul Topolski, W1SEX.
>
> I suspect that in this group, Mr Topolski's Callsign will be the major
>subject of commentary. Wouldn't you agree, Kim? 8^)

Larry has placed himself in charge of the crusade against such callsigns. He has insisted that he is not facincated with Kim, so I am sure he will share the letters he has sent to the callsign holder, telling him/her how he or she is ruining ham radio. If he has carped on W1SEX as often as he has carped on Kim, I will believe him when he says this is not personal fascination with Kim that is behind all the hoopolah.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5700. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 10:56:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224055623.17463.00000345@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35109

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>I would have to agree with Ed that a person would have to be an idiot
>savant to memorize the huge amount of questions in the question pool
>just so they could pass the 50 questions that are asked. They would have
>to be "extra" special to then have somehow memorized the exact answer,
>because the ABCD answers are not in the same position as in the study
>guide.

I should have pointed out, though, that one of the test elements DOES require
rote memorization.

>I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
>wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
>get the correct answer.

You couldn't have done that, because Dick claims it doesn't happen. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5701. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:08:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224060852.17463.00000346@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35110

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> You are the one claiming that the antenna can only be used for TV
> reception, not me.

Phil is not making that claim. He is telling you that the FCC pre-empts antennas used only for the purposes defined in the OTARD rules and that they do not pre-empt antennas also used for other purposes.

If your statement is that Phil is claiming that the pre-emption applies only to antennas used as outlined in the rules, it is not Phil making that claim, it is the FCC.

What was said... what was heard...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5702. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:11:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224061116.17463.00000347@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35111

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you
>consider
>self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and others
>never dished it out they would have nothing to take.

Your honor, she made me beat her...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5703. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:12:31 UTC
From: cbjunkie@cb.org.au
Message-ID: <24549151.00010ebf.076@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" says...
>
>hello ole capt. peckers:
>
>> I wonder if after all of this is done
>> and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
>> or whatever the heck he calls it will still
>> retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
>> status...? Methinks not.
>
>i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have someone
>take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there are so
>many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the wrong
>way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought that
>equipment.
>
>phil :)

This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own hands type.
I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham Radio have a
15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people like him
getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.

5704. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:16:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224061630.17463.00000348@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35112

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> The only entity that prohibits how I use the antenna is the US
>government after the preemption.

This is incorrect. What prohibits the antenna is the CC&R. The US government pre-empts that CC&R if the antenna is used only for the purposes of the pre-emption.

>The government states I can not listen to
>90.3 MHz on it, but I can receive at 88.6 MHz on it.

What regulation? Can you cite anything to back this claim?

>The neighborhood
>association has no such rule.

How odd. The neighborhood association is the one that has the CC&R, the US governement pre-empts it if it is an OTARD antenna, and you think that this is all the US governement.

> The government can say we preempt CC&R's, but it can not tell me what to do
>with that antenna once that antenna is at the home as far as reception of
>transmissions and maybe transmissions of radio signals.

Tell us when you file the court case. I would love to follow it to see how it ends up.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5705. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:19:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224061934.17463.00000349@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35113

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> Everybody in a CC&R neighborhood already has an
>exemption for TV only antennas, why not simply expand that exemption.

ARRL asked the FCC to do so for amateur antennas. They said no. I think it unlikely that the FCC would say yes to an extension of what the ARRL asked for to include other antennas, too. The Commission was pretty clear that they are very reluctant to pre-empt CC&Rs and will only do so in cases where they are required to do so by Congress.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5706. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:20:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224062045.17463.00000350@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35114

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.

>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that.

No, it truly is the argument used as the reason to keep the code tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5707. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:21:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224062140.17463.00000351@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35115

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
>>that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.

>Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.

And I imagine that some of the time, it has the opposite effect. None of us
know for certain which is which.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5708. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 11:23:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224062342.17467.00000312@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35116

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>>The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
>>have to worry about going to jail.
>
> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to detach a
>shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then I
>can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.

Only if your neighbors or assocation take the matter to civil court, obtain an injunction and you do not follow that injunction. It is still a civil matter.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5709. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 13:56:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C78F118.8F104088@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35118

Keith wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> >You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
> >decade or two.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> What am I so thick about, Dave?
>
> --
> Best Regards,
>
> Keith

Thanks for helping to make my point, Keith. Several others have wasted much time in attempting to enlighten you on the difference between government regs and private contracts you enter into. So far, you've ignored very good information and have continued howling at the moon.

As Hans Brakob would say: Why let facts get in the way of a perfectly good rant?

Dave K8MN

5710. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:32:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c78f992_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35119

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020223053509.03609.00000189@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> >reliability is a moot point.
>
> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yes, Ed ... but the argument is bogus and we both know it,
because much more reliable (better weak signal, fading,
and QRM performance) modes are readily available to hams
who are willing to accept (and learn a bit about) something new.

I would admit that those modes require some "hardware assist"
and therefore are often rejected by those who have an emotional
hang-up about manual skills, "minimialist radio" or who simply
don't understand the reality that with today's technology, a radio
build with VLSI ICs can be (for all practical purposes) just as reliable
as a simple CW rig.

The other argument ("I'll whip up a CW rig from the remains of a
trashed TV set in an emergency.") is, of course equally ridiculous.

The REAL argument behind MOST pro-coders' desire to retain
Morse test requirements is a desire to have the government
mandate that everyone MUST learn Morse, in hopes that a few
will decide they like it, so that the procoders don't have to expend
any effort recruiting new Morse users themselves.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR

Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5711. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:38:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c78fcd6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35121

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e1de60fc4e2e98989693@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c7839c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e12ea7d2001cc6989692@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > Before the 2000 restructuring, there were approximately 289,000
amateurs
> > > with Extra, Advanced, or General licenses. That's a couple hundred of
> > > thousand of people the understand CW.
> >
> > You aren't seriously under the impression that because there are that
many
> > of those license classes, that there are that many who routinely use CW,
are
> > you? I am a Tech+ and I never use CW.
>
> And if you read my statement again, you'll see that I never mentioned
> Tech+. And if you read my statement yet *again*, I simply said that they
> "understand" CW, not "use" CW.
>

I got what you said, Joshua. I probably understood CW the first maybe month
or two after I got my license, with a gradual loss of knowing it any more
after that. Today, 6-7 years later I think, I couldn't recognize a thing,
I'm sure. I doubt I am the only licensed person as such.

>
> The General Class and above licensees before April 2000 demonstrated an
> ability to copy 13wpm and above.
>

That doesn't mean they can do it now at all. My dad was Chief Petty Officer
in the Navy at his retirement. He was a radio officer and used CW routinely
for nearly all of his 20 years in the Navy. He retired about 40 years ago.
He studied for about a year to pass his 5wpm CW.

>
> They showed that they were functionally
> literate in morse, and that learning really doesn't fade much over time,
> even if they predominantly or only use voice or digital modes other than
> CW. If an emergency communication in morse was received by them, I'm
> quite confident that they'd be able to deal with it effectively.
>

And, I am not because I think you're wrong about CW knowledge retention.

> >
> > I didn't say not to have backups, Joshua, I said I don't share in the
> > opinion that CW is all that reliable--because I believe that phone is
the
> > mode of choice among most operators.
>
> So what? Voice isn't my mode of choice, yet people could definitely rely
> on me to communicate with them via SSB/FM if they needed me to.
>

Oh for goodness sake, Joshua. It takes no learning to operate voice on
SSB/FM!!!

>
> 300,000+ functionally CW-literate amateurs (and again, the number
> increases when you account for foreign hams) isn't enough for you?
>

Nope, for reasons stated above.

> > > I'm a bit baffled to you're comment that people need to *like* CW in
> > > order to rely on it. Do you know someone that would pass over a
*** ---
> > > *** when scanning the bands because they don't like the mode?
> >
> > One need not know CW to know SOS.
>
> Again, reread what I said. I used the word "like", not "know".
>

Again, I state that even if someone does not *LIKE* CW, it takes no liking
(or knowledge of CW) to know SOS. Most people off the street know CW SOS,
the recent SOS pad commercials enhanced that even further.

> But, addressing your divergence, the operator would be up the proverbial
> creek if you recognized the ... --- ... yet didn't understand .--. .-.. .
> .- ... . -. -.. .- ... ... - .- -. -.-. . - --- (...
> ..- -.-. .... .- -. -.. ... ..- -.-. .... .- .-.. --- -.-. .- -
> .. --- -.), neh?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

I recognize the SOS, yet didn't understand the rest and don't care to look
it up on a chart.

Several of you are thinking that my statements about the reality of relying
on CW as a mode are statements against CW. They are not. But then, you're
all prone to digging those holes for yourselves so you have my good wishes.

Kim W5TIT

5712. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:40:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c78fb8f$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35120

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C76E99F.AD9B8840@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
> > >condition.
> > >So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
> >
> > Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered
are too
> > lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will
help
> > them see that clothes washing is a good thing.
>
> Ah, yes. And washing clothing is so difficult task no one will learn
> to do it unless there is a test to pass which results in a permit issued.
>

And I'll bet that Dick would just LOVE to see several grades of
clothes-washing permits, based on a demonstration of how fast
your could wash a given amount of clothes to a prescribed degree
of cleanliness.

Of course, this would have to be done on an old-fashioned
washboard in a wooden tub ... no washing machine
assistance allowed, because " 'REAL' clothes washers do it
manually and shun the use of washing machines."

I'll bet thatDick would even go for a special "Extra Class" permit
for those who would forego the washboard and tub and do their
washing on the rocks in a stream ("like in the good old days") :-)

Carl - wa6vse

5713. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:43:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c78fe19$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35122

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> > message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> > disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW
message
> > sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
> >
> > I doubt it.
>
> Of course you would doubt it.
>
> And, needless to say, you would be wrong.
>
> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> beneath the iron and concrete.
>
> Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up and
> ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall to
> try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

I'm not embarrassed at all, Joshua and I think your story of their having
using CW to be found is nothing more than an urban legend. So, you're
coming from the angle of only victims using CW for emergencies!!!!???? Then
I'd rely far less on CW.

And, I'll broaden my invitation. If you are so put off by my example of the
WTC disaster--the WORST--then you find any disaster you'd like where a net
was up and operational using CW to relay messages out of the disaster area.
I am *NOT* talking about H&W, etc. I am talking about where CW was the only
method available because of power failure, downed antennas, etc., etc. Now,
if you're going to come back at me with your desperate "are you embarrassed
enough" crap, then you can shove your defending CW as the mode of
reliability up your proverbial place where the sun don't shine. Urban
legends indeed. I suppose that is equivalent to the gents in the submarine
who were supposedly tapping out CW on the hull...uh huh, yeah, right.

Kim W5TIT

5714. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:46:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c78fea1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35124

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a59l1l0a8t@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > And, needless to say, you would be wrong.
> >
> > The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> > later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > beneath the iron and concrete.
> >
> > Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up and
> > ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall
to
> > try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?
> >
> > joshua houk
> > kd7pos
>
> Do you have a source for this story?
>
>

Krell, I seriously doubt this amounts to any more than an urban legend.
Somehow there are always the glorified stories of how CW saved the day...

Kim W5TIT

5715. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:54:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c78fed7_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35123

Having read NO responses ... the Alaska Emergency frequency
at 5.1675 MHz.

Picky, picky, picky :-)

Carl - wa6vse

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216184734.13798.00000470@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.
>
> Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
authorized
> under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>

5716. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 14:58:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c78ffcc_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35125

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.grnmc10.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On 16 Feb 2002 23:47:34 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> >>CW is allowed on EVERY frequency in the HF bands.
> >
> >Actually, this is not quite true. Does anyone know the HF frequency
> >authorized under Part 97 on which a ham may not operate CW?
>
> Section 97.401(d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may
> transmit emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 MHz for
> emergency communications. The channel must be shared with
> stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The
> transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.
>
> Sucker punch......

Yes, Phil ... (now, after having answered Ed, reading replies) I
knew Ed had me on that one on a technicallity the minute I saw
his question.

However, I'm sure that, despite his inability to resist having
some fun with me, that Ed knew I was referring to the "normal"
HF ham bands :-)

Carl - wa6vse

5717. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:01:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790245_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35129

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C785BA0.B23C2016@adelphia.net...
> I've had the chance to look at some of the evidence provided, and I'm
> now pretty convinced that a person who passes the exam for a particular
> class is qualified to operate within their privileges.
>
> I'm also pretty convinced that not only are the tests not "dumbed
> down", but If I were to make a suggestion, it would be that holders of
> licenses issued older than say 10 years should have to retake the tests
> to maintain their license.
>

I would disagree, Mike. I think your inference, and correct me if I am wrong, would be that longer-licensed hams may have passed their tests, but couldn't pass today's tests due to advanced technologies, frequency changes, etc. I would tend to agree with the idea that a longer-licensed ham probably could not pass today's exam, but I don't think it's necessary--strictly from an administrative viewpoint. If a longer-licensed ham hasn't been paying attention to band/frequency changes, that's their problem. And, in most cases, hams just aren't going to experiment with a new technology without having the support and encouragement of others who've been doing it. At least I don't think someone would.

>
> I would have to agree with Ed that a person would have to be an idiot
> savant to memorize the huge amount of questions in the question pool
> just so they could pass the 50 questions that are asked.
>

I am not an idiot savant, but I did just that.

>
> They would have
> to be "extra" special to then have somehow memorized the exact answer,
> because the ABCD answers are not in the same position as in the study
> guide.
>

Hell, I don't know what you'd call it: photographic memory, whatever. It doesn't matter what causes it, but if you study all the test questions with only the right answers and have never even seen the wrong answers, you are going to remember the right answer more often than not. I bet there's even some kind of mathematical perfectness to it where, sure you're going to miss some, but not enough to fail.

>
> I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
> wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
> get the correct answer. I learned a lot when I was using the pool. It
> took several days to go through the pool and it's over 1000 questions.
> Anyone who tried to learn the answers via rote memorization would have
> to do more much work than simply learning the subject matter at hand. It
> took days to get through the thing.
>

Hmmmm, don't know about the Extra pool--simply because I imagine there's loads of numbers. I don't seem to be able to remember numbers well at all. I supposed I *had* to pass some of the frequency questions on the test, because I think each segment has a minimum number of questions that do have to be answered correctly. But, I can tell you that I simply glazed over those questions because remembering numbers--especially ranges of numbers--is a whole 'nuther ballgame.

I must put a disclaimer in here, though. I *think* when I did the memorizing before, there weren't that many questions in the pool for Novice and Tech. I hear that the number of questions in the pools now are huge. I plan on upgrading to General (no further--as I said, remembering number stuff, for me, is just way more than I want to do--but I haven't taken a serious round with the new pool yet. I also don't know anyone who's got the pool ready with only the right answers. What I'll do is get the question pool printed and mark out all the wrong answers, go back and study the question with the right answer. Do I learn from this? I think one would *have* to learn something. However, I don't think I learn much that way at all. I am just taking advantage of a system that exists... I'll learn what I need to later.

>
> The pool was a great help and learning tool. I then used an on-line
> test to check out my new knowledge.
>
> My final thoughts are that I am now having a lot of fun, experimenting
> with the new computer based modes, some initial contesting activities,
> and having fun doing public service with my local club. I've also worked
> a little bit at recruiting new hams into the fold. I homebrew a fair
> amount of my own equipment also. The studying I've had to do has
> prepared me pretty well for all that.
>

And, there is the perfect example of why it's not all that important to focus on the tests. If you know enough to operate within the rules and laws, and you are that active a ham, all the rest will come.

>
> I suspect my upbeat attitude may be seen by some as distinctly out of
> place. Too bad about that! ;^)
>
> - Mike -
>

Never! Your upbeat attitude is great!

Kim W5TIT

5718. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:03:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7902a3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35130

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C785D3E.C998356A@adelphia.net...
> "Ronnie D." wrote:
> >
> > From the ARRL Web-zine...
> >
>
> > handling all phases of radio support; start area, length of the course,
and
> > finish line," said Paul Topolski, W1SEX.
>
> I suspect that in this group, Mr Topolski's Callsign will be the major
> subject of commentary. Wouldn't you agree, Kim? 8^)
>
> - Mike -

heh heh heh...well, I wonder, Mike. "Mr." is a man. I bet the detractors
from my callsign here in this newsgroup are probably the type that think,
"well, it's OK (different) for a man..." ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

5719. Re: Petition to Repeal or change TV Only Antenna Laws

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:06:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790374_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35131

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a59o310frh@enews2.newsguy.com...
> JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>
> >For what it is worth, my wallet is a heck of a lot smaller than any
> >association's or the government's. We live by the golden rule; he who
has
> >the gold, rules. Such fighting is probably best left to the political
> >process. The ARRL is likely to do a lot more for us than any of us can
do
> >for ourselves.
>
> The ARRL is doing it in the wrong way, they are just trying to get
another
> bill to say Ham Radio antennas only, just like there is a TV antenna only
> law. I disagree with this tactic and logic. Why not have a modification of
> the law to preempt CC&R's that say you can have a antenna that is no
higher
> then 12 feet high, a certain length and height and nothing else.
> If there is a ham only bill then there will have to be a shortwave, AM/FM
> and other radio bills. Everybody in a CC&R neighborhood already has an
> exemption for TV only antennas, why not simply expand that exemption. You
> can have one antenna of a certain height and size. I don't think ham
towers
> or dipoles should be allowed. A one size fits all antenna and you can do
> with it as you see fit.
> We will spend the next 3 years trying to get special legislation for ham
> radio only and everyone will fight it. I say that we simply expand the
> current law with out any changes. One antenna and do with it as you
please,
> but do not have any other antennas. You can tune up the antenna
> with a antenna tuner and use it on the ham bands.
>
>

And you are welcome to send that to your Congressman, the FCC and whomever
else you want, Keith. I personally don't want the ARRL spending my money on
all other radio services.

Kim W5TIT

5720. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:09:13 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <320i7usr358gujfv94jqc9hesbmd83ftlg@4ax.com>
Source record: 35128

Steve do you suppose that you might find time to grow up soon?

Perhaps you could form a new group "alt.hate.len.carl.myself" and
post there. That way kids investigating amateur radio would not
have to wade through crap like this and become disenchanted.

Why don't you take this to email and spare the rest of us the
embarrassment of being the same species as you.

On 24 Feb 2002 03:12:17 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/22/2002 11:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20020223003519.26927.00000033@mb-ma.aol.com>
>
>>For one shift as part of one of four operating teams, ABSOLUTELY,
>>but only at ADA, not at WAR. Please try to read carefully before
>>apoplexy clouds the big badass ex-marine's vision.
>
> Ohhhhhh! >>> NOW<<< it's a "TEAM"....
>
> Of course that's NOT what you said, Lennie...and that's already an
>archived fact in Google.
>
>>Me and a few hundred others all working together. Everyone's
>>abilities and cooperation was required. Lose one part and the
>>whole circuit goes down.
>
> Sorry, Your Foolishness....That's NOT what you said! backpeddle as much
>as you'd care to, your dirty underwear is now fully exposed!
>
>>I did not claim "1.25 million messages." I claimed an approximation
>>of 1.32 million based on known statistics of 1955 and clarified in
>>sufficient detail.
>
> "1.25"..."1.32"....Matters not...It's NOT what YOU said! =) (>>>laughing
>it off as Lennie thinks he's "clarifying" this to his satisfaction!<<<)
>
>>No misdirection, just IGNORANCE of a claimed military veteran
>>based on his never being part of any branch's signal operations
>>and not demonstrating knowledge or familiarity with any military
>>radio operations or equipment other than some avionics black
>>boxes.
>

> Lennie, whatever I did in the Armed Forces is absolutely irrelevent when it
>comes to being able to see through your veil of foolishness. Stevie Wonder and
>Ray Charles could see through your BS!
>
>>To repeat, military message transmission in a signals unit is
>>NOT done by some solo operator in front of a single radio.
>
> Then when you mean "we" or "team", may I suggest that YOU keep YOUR
>fingers off of the " I " key?
>
>> It is
>>the cooperative, coordinated effort and skills of ALL in the unit.
>
> "Well golly, gee whillikers, Mr Wilson!" Lennie finally says something I
>can agree with and even admire! TOO BAD he finally said it after having got
>his short pipe caught in his zipper and now he's trying to cover his tracks!
>
>>No lies. It is not surprising that a great deal of ignorance of the
>>rest of the world of radio exists among radio amateurs...the
>>publications seldom carry such information and too many amateurs
>>are loathe to attempt understanding the radio professionals.
>
> Oh I have the GREATEST admiration and respect for "radio
>professionals"...It's YOU, and liars LIKE you I loathe.
>
>>The bigbadass ex-marine has demonstrated NO knowledge
>>whatsoever of military radio skills, knowledge, or familiarity and has
>>attempted to bluff his way in knowledge several times.
>
> And if I quote and plagarize the works and sources of others like YOU do,
>I will be "knowledgeable"? That's a reputation I don't need......YOU keep it,
>Lennie! Fit's you like a GLOVE!!
>
>>Those of us
>>who have actually worked in communications know and recognize him
>>for the bluffing fake he is.
>
> Your last "exposure" to "communications" was in 1955. Unfortunately for
>YOU, your frame of reference is grossly deficient.
>
> But you keep on, Lennie. We're getting a good laugh from it!
>
>>"Steve and the Boys" ought to relax, go out in the streets, look for
>>old people to beat up and laugh at their agony. So far the "boys"
>>haven't done so with me. Mosquito bites are not agony but are
>>rather irritating. "The Boys" are mosquitoes.
>
> "The Boys" are just about every licensed Amateur Radio operator....That
>YOU...Lennie the Licenseless, consider them "mosquitoes", is not unexpected.
>Your "true colors" are showing through.

5721. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:09:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224100944.21763.00000050@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 35127

In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Joshua Houk wrote:
>> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
>> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
>> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
>> beneath the iron and concrete.
>
>One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.

Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
people.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5722. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:09:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224100945.21763.00000052@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 35126

In article <20020224062045.17463.00000350@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
>>> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
>
>>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that.
>
>No, it truly is the argument used as the reason to keep the code tests.

Actually, it is AN argument used by SOME as A reason to keep the code tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5723. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:11:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790495$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35132

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2069376441b29989695@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
>
> > I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> > message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> > disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW
message
> > sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
> >
> > I doubt it.
>
> "Ismael Quinones, a traffic enforcement agent in a scooter at a stoplight
> at Cortlandt and Church streets, reached for his radio. "Traffic 191, we
> just had an explosion at One World Trade Center by a jet," he told his
> dispatcher and left his car to order civilians to leave the area. "They
> hadn't heard about it yet," said Quinones, 39. "People were hanging out
> the window, sending morse code [by flicking the blinds]."
>
> http://www.newsday.com/ny-nyresc232380685sep23.story
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

That is not morse code, that is flicking blinds in desperation to get
noticed so that someone will know there's someone on that floor. That some
media person translates anything like that, flicking the blinds, banging on
the pipes, etc., as Morse Code is their mistake. I doubt someone was
literally doing anything more than flicking the blinds...the only way to
"wave a flag" at that point. And, no, flag waving should not be translated
to mean that someone would be using signaling.

Kim W5TIT

5724. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:14:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790559_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35134

Is the statement "my work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue" anything like "I did not have sex with that woman?" :o

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3C786DA3.497369BA@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C77C6B3.3E656666@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>
> > >> In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > >><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua
> > >> >Houk
> > >> >> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > >> >> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > >> >> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> > >> >> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
> > >
> > >Cecil is a ham. You aren't.
> >
> > Like me, Cecil Moore is a thinking human being. You aren't.
>
> How pathetic you are.
>
> > Like me, Cecil Moore is a retired professional in radio-electronics
> > of long experience in industry. Dave Heil worked for government.
>
> ...and the point of this is? You aren't Cecil. You aren't me. You
> aren't a ham.
>

> > >> I don't portray myself as Heil does,
> > >> giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
> > >> as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from
> > >> an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
> > >> wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.
> > >
> > >There was no snow job. It wasn't my idea. I did not describe it as
> > >"wonderful".
> >
> > The exact words were more like a "neat idea" and the claim was
> > as a "personal innovation." it was intended to prove some kind of
> > point on the superiority of CW over teleprinter. It did not prove
> > anything except that snow jobs can grow in hot weather.
>
> Post it or stuff it. There was no claim that it is something I
> originated. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not at issue.
>
> > >I used a system which was in place. That you don't
> > >understand the reasons for its use make it no less true and no less
> > >effective.
> >
> > The first excuse/rationalization was that "the circuit needed to
> > be synchronized." That was a technically false statement since
> > teleprinters are all designed to be self-synchronizing to the
> > remote transmitter.
>
> I don't know what sort of crypto devices you used on asynchonous
> circuits back in the dark ages, Len. You write now as you wrote then,
> from an uninformed point of view. My work in Guina-Bissau is not an
> issue.
>
> > Heil later "amended" that to mean "synchronizing schedules and
> > frequencies" which is not yet understandable in commercial-
> > government practice. If a teleprinter terminal is working at all,
> > a full set of "schedules" and other data can be transmitted to
> > both ends of a circuit, identical in content at each end.
> >
> > Had the excuse/rationale been given that a teleprinter was "down"
> > (not working), then use of CW would be perfectly understandable
> > and acceptible. That was NOT given.
>
> We had no teleprinter down and I've never offered an "excuse". Morse
> was used for openings, closings, QSYs and crypto set. For more than
> this you have no need to know and no clearance. My work in Guina-Bissau
> is not at issue.
>
> > >You didn't understand it then. You don't understand it now. The
> > >discussion back then was government use of morse. It was then used.
> > >That you don't accept that is of not much consequence.
> >

> > Incorrect. Heil made the initial remark claiming some personally-
> > conceived innovation, not on "government use of morse" but of
> > trying to prove a point of morse modes over teleprinter.
>
> Show us the statement I made, Len or clam up. This is simply another of
> your attempts at diversion. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue.
>
> > A much later excuse/rationale claimed that such switchover in
> > modes was some kind of State Department "radio doctrine" or
> > "procedure" to use morse modes as an order-wire on a teleprinter
> > circuit. That defies understanding considering that teleprinters
> > over radio had already been in use throughout the US government
> > and military for over 30 years prior to the 1980s. USN and other
> > military procedures on teleprinter circuits are given in a 1967
> > USN text used by all branches. Existing for 15 years prior to this
> > alleged innovation, it explains "synchronization" and also "order-
> > wires."
>
> That you don't understand it does not negate its reality or its value.
> Instead of saying that something "defies understanding", why not just
> admit that YOU don't understand it?
>
> My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue. By the way, I didn't work for
> the Navy or any other branch of the U.S. military in Africa.
>
> > >You've gotten more than this part twisted, Leonardo. I'm not
attempting
> > >to constantly post my past exploits.
> >
> > Again, incorrect. Heil has done so in the past.
>
> All anyone needs to do is research your past posts and research mine.
> They are there for all to see and they'd reveal you to be a fabricator
> as well as a non-radio amateur.
>
> > >I am a ham. You aren't.
> >
> > Heil is a radio amateur. I am a radio professional.
>
> You aren't a radio anything. The past is past. You eat up the present
> with your posts here. Ham radio can only be in the future for you.
>
> > >You're an SWL with attitude.
> >
> > My attitude as a BCL, SWL, TVW and as a radio professional is
> > that I enjoy all of it. Wouldn't do it if there was no enjoyment.
>
> Bully for you. Continue your enjoyment as listener, viewer and sidewalk
> superintendent.
>

> > I might enjoy amateur radio as well, but certain attitudinally-
> > oriented rank-status-privilege-by-mode-and-tenure "superiors"
> > insist that I must only enjoy what they personally enjoy.
>
> Piffle! If you are holding back for those reasons, I'm afraid you'll be
> doomed to being forever an onlooker.
>
> > >You've made no attempt to actually become a ham.
> >
> > Incorrect. I've never carried it as far an amateur radio license
> > examination.
>
> So you rocketed to the fore only to skip taking the exam through which
> you'd actually have become a ham.
>
> > >You simply haunt a ham radio newsgroup on the internet.
>
> > Incorrect again, a false assumption.
>
> It's the only conclusion which can be made about you given the
> information available.
>
> > >You won't become a newcomer until you enter amateur radio. I'm not
> > >discussing vehicles or Zambonis. I'm discussing Leonard H. Anderson,
> > >non-ham, newcomer-to-be (maybe).
> >
> > Heil is not "discussing" but venting frustration on an individual
> > he has not been able to best on a newsgroup.
>
> Len you don't even realize when you've been bested. Ask around.
>
> > >You've misread my statement much as you've misread others. This one
was
> > >simply an observation.
> >
> > Not at all. Heil exhibits an extreme need to win all "discussions"
> > including methods of deprecating and denigrating others who do
> > not share his viewpoints. Standard Operating Procedure. :-)
>
> What does "Anderson" do? Could it be that he attributes to others the
> characteristics he himself possesses?
>
> >
> > >> Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that
> > >> tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did
> > >> they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.
> > >
> > >Another Nazi reference, Len? In which statement did I mention CW?
> >
> > "Uber" (over) and "alles" (all) and "bund" are all German words.

> > Not all Germans are/were NAZIs. "Heil" as a surname is
> > Germanic and means a salute or honor as a German word.
> > Is Heil a NAZI?!?
>
> The word "Heil" has several meanings. I'm not German but American.
> Perhaps you noticed that I don't have a DL, DK or DJ callsign. I don't
> speak or read German. I do know that "gesundheit" is a German word.
> You didn't use it. In which statement did I mention CW?
>
> > >Does this mean you already have an ARRL tee-shirt?
> >
> > No.
> >
> > >I work DX, contest, handle traffic and rag-chew using a number of
modes,
> > >Len. Which modes do you use when you frequent the ham bands?
> >
> > I have no authorization to be a control operator of an amateur
> > radio station. I do not "frequent the ham bands" (presuming Heil
> > means only those bands below 30 MHz). Why would Heil imply
> > that I break the law?!?
>
> You assume too much. I said "ham bands". Do you frequent ham bands
> above 30 MHz?
>
> > >I even
> > >have 2m FM QSOs with those who have never passed a code test. After
> > >all, THEY are hams.
> >
> > We had ham last night (Thursday) for supper. Quite good.
> > Tasted just like ham. ;-)
>
> That is simply sophomoric.
>
> > I have semi-regular communications on UHF above the amateur
> > 70 cm band, moved from above the amateur 2m band. NONE of
> > the communicators need or needed code testing. After all, WE
> > are professionals, carrying on business. :-)
>
> This is an amateur radio newsgroup, Len. I asked you about the ham
> bands. We don't carry on commercial business.
>
> > I am well aware of the elitist attitude of some that NO ONE can
> > possibly discuss ANYTHING involving amateur radio until they
> > are authorized by a government amateur license. That includes
> > petitioning my government for a redress of grievances, a right
> > supposedly granted by the US Constitution.
>
> I feel your pain, Len. All of those lengthy posts here; all of that
> hard work prepping your anti-code testing diatribe for the Commission

> and STILL no one takes you seriously!
>
> > I'm also postitive that Heil will be upset (to some degree) by this
> > response and will continue with his regular routine of insisting on
> > conformist attitudes and demanding that others enjoy what he
> > enjoys whether they like it or not. He is not correctable even if
> > wrong. Matters not. :-)
>
> Naw, Len. By this time I realize that you've reached true geezerhood
> and that you'll never actually attempt entry into amateur radio. You
> exist here simply to stir up crap. To my knowledge, that is your only
> purpose in showing up.
>
> Dave K8MN

5725. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:20:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7904A6.61DF894C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35133

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you consider
> self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and others
> never dished it out they would have nothing to take.

You've got to be kidding, Dick. 95% of the time you initiate the conflict.
Someone expresses his/her honest opinion and you call them dirty names.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5726. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:22:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35139

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C786FF8.1EB13F51@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> > message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> > disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW
message
> > sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
> >
> > I doubt it.
>
> It matters no whether there was or not, Kim. What I said was:
>
> "Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you
> don't like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion
> that there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's
> some s t r e t c h."
>
> Go debate your "what ifs" with someone else.
>
> Dave K8MN

There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no farther than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in recent disasters. I draw that conclusion based on stories I've read and hear about. My offer was to see if I am wrong; and the only way to do that is to have *real* examples of where CW has been used in a net condition during an emergency or disaster--other than for H&W, because it *IS* my opinion that CW is probably used more often in trafficking. However, on a second note, it is also my opinion that it is probably used less today than ever before, and will be used less and less as time goes on.

We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW themselves. Why would we?

There is no "what if" Dave, there was an invitation you apparently cannot meet. I see I made my point. Glad you were able to understand.

Kim W5TIT

5727. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:24:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7905AC.DBF7A3E6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35135

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
>
> That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...

Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5728. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:25:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7907c1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35140

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7877B0.8B0CF205@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.16e0bcb6f1783093989690@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > > says...
> > > >
> > > > > Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
> > > reliable
> > > > > mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it,
its
> > > > > reliability is a moot point.
> > > >
> > > > Well, lucky for us that more than a few people understand it, neh?
> > > >
> > > > joshua houk
> > > > kd7pos
> > >
> > > I don't have the same comfort or smugness in your opinion, Joshua. I
don't
> > > think there are enough who use/understand/like CW to rely it on it.
> >
> > Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
> > like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
> > there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
> > s t r e t c h.
>
> Not for her it isn't.
>

So, you can't meet the inviation either, Little Dick?

Kim W5TIT
```

5729. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:25:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C790602.6FDD019C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35137

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Yes, it's a simple question -- and since nobody's ever been "forced"
> to take a code test, it's also an illogical question.

All HF hams were required by circumstances (forced) to take a code
test, Larry. Otherwise, they wouldn't be HF hams, would they?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5730. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:27:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7906a7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35136

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable on
Amateur
> Radio history and generally comes out on top on any discussion of same.
>
> I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action is to
accept
> defeat gracefully. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Having been in Mexico City all of the past week, as a member
of the US Delegation to the CITEL PCC III regional radio regulatory
conference, I'm afraid I've been VERY selectively reading the over
1000 new messages in this group today and don't know how or on
what subject Jim "got me."

However, if he did in fact, I will follow your advice :-)

WRT to the CITEL conference ...

Just because I *have* to see the reaction from the Dick and some
of the other PCTAs, I simply *can't* resist reporting that the FCC
asked me to present the Draft US Proposal on WRC-03 Agenda
Item 1.7.1 ... the revision of S25 of the ITU Radio Regs :-)

This proposal, originally drafted by the ARRL, with some modifications
agreed by NCI and others in IWG-6, and approved by the WAC, FCC,
NTIA, and State Dept., supports the suppression (elimination) of S25.5,
the international Morse test requirement :-)

It will be VERY interesting to see what Dick and some of the
others spew on THIS :-)

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages

ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5731. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:28:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7906BB.661CFF51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35138

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Joshua Houk wrote:
> >> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> >> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> >> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> >> beneath the iron and concrete.
> >>
> >One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
>
> Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> people.

From inside the collapsed World Trade Center? What a strange thing to say.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5732. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:29:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7908cf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35141

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020224034201.09757.00000118@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c7716ca$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes: ADDENDUM: AXEUALLY, Kim did not
write the following, Larry Roll just doesn't know how to requote a message.
Larry Roll wrote:
>
> >> Axeually, I have a lot of sympathy for lazy knuckle-draggers. From
> >> a strictly ham radio perspective, I used to be one myself. However,
> >> I was able to overcome those tendencies, and attain 20 WPM
> >> and Extra class with relative ease, once I got started. At that time,
> >> the only thing keeping me out of ham radio was my own lack of
> >> willingness to learn a useful communications skill. It "filtered" me
> >> out. Had I not had to earn my privileges under the set of testing
> >> requirements in place at the time, it is not very likely that I would
> >> have done a fraction as much on-the-air as I have, nor would I have
> >> had a fraction as much fun. I really feel sorry for future hams who
> >> will never know the satisfaction of being "Real Hams" because they
> >> simply won't learn Morse code in the absence of a meaningful
> >> license testing requirement to do so.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>

THEN Kim wrote:

> >
> >heh heh heh...look at it this way: At least Larry found something he was
> >actually good at...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>

THEN Larry wrote:

>
> Kim:
>
> I'm good at a lot of things, but I'm not good at anything I haven't
> tried. That's the beauty of the code testing requirement -- it got
> me (and a lot of other people) to try something they may have
> thought they couldn't do. I didn't get there by someone "selling"
> me on the Morse code. The only thing I was "sold" on was the
> thought of unrestricted HF phone privileges. The code testing
> requirement to get there is the thing that made me realize that

> CW was a useful and fun mode. I never would have learned this
> in the absence of a code testing requirement, and neither will
> the vast majority of future radio amateurs.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, now Kim is writing: Like I said, Larry, at least being good at CW gives you *something* to be good at.

Kim W5TIT

5733. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:30:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c79090e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35142

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224054203.17463.00000342@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>When did I ever tell you to go soak your head, Dick?
>
> >Don't look now, but it seems like you just did! So much for your
> >reputation for being "subtle."
>
> This might explain some of the way you see the world, Larry. Thinking
that a
> question is the same as a statement is pretty bizarre.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

ROFLMAO!!!!

5734. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:34:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7909e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35143

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224061116.17463.00000347@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you
> >consider
> >self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and
others
> >never dished it out they would have nothing to take.
>
> Your honor, she made me beat her...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Sad thing is, the personality strikes (no pun intended) me as one who would
"hit her."

Kim W5TIT

5735. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:42:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790bf0$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35147

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224100944.21763.00000050@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Joshua Houk wrote:
> >> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> >> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> >> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> >> beneath the iron and concrete.
> >
> >One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
>
> Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> people.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Y'all are cracking me up. First, there's the urban legend about window blinds being "flicked." Preposterous. Anyone know how far back from that building one would have to be just to be able to *SEE* the window area, let alone see clear enough to see "flicking" blinds? Let's just leave alone the fact that obscurity was probably at a *MAXIMUM* due to smoke, dust, and debris clouds. GOOD GRIEF. Second, there's the urban legend story about the FDNY personnel. Anyone know how *IMPOSSIBLE* it would have been to hear such tapping--Hell, I'd daresay even BANGING--in such an environment???!!! Give me an everliving break.

Kim W5TIT

5736. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:44:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790c3c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35148

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224100945.21763.00000052@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <20020224062045.17463.00000350@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> >>> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
> >
> >>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that.
> >
> >No, it truly is the argument used as the reason to keep the code tests.
>
> Actually, it is AN argument used by SOME as A reason to keep the code
tests.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

And, IMHO, SOME people are quite wrong.

Kim W5TIT

5737. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:47:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790d11_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35150

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c7906a7_1@news7.fast.net...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> > Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable on
> Amateur
> > Radio history and generally comes out on top on any discussion of same.
> >
> > I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action is to
> accept
> > defeat gracefully. :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed,
>
> Having been in Mexico City all of the past week, as a member
> of the US Delegation to the CITEL PCC III regional radio regulatory
> conference, I'm afraid I've been VERY selectively reading the over
> 1000 new messages in this group today and don't know how or on
> what subject Jim "got me."
>
> However, if he did in fact, I will follow your advice :-)
>
> WRT to the CITEL conference ...
>
> Just because I *have* to see the reaction from the Dick and some
> of the other PCTAs, I simply *can't* resist reporting that the FCC
> asked me to present the Draft US Proposal on WRC-03 Agenda
> Item 1.7.1 ... the revision of S25 of the ITU Radio Regs :-)
>
> This proposal, originally drafted by the ARRL, with some modifications
> agreed by NCI and others in IWG-6, and approved by the WAC, FCC,
> NTIA, and State Dept., supports the suppression (elimination) of S25.5,
> the international Morse test requirement :-)
>
> It will be VERY interesting to see what Dick and some of the
> others spew on THIS :-)

>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
> <mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
> ONLY, please]
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> --
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, TAPR
> Member, ARRL
> --
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>

Spew is about all it will be...

Kim W5TIT

5738. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:48:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c790b7f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35144

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020220182027.18934.00002168@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> > Well, hear hear! One post he's the 50 year expert who has it ALL
> >> >under his complete control, and the next he's an offended newcomer!
> >> >Ain't it sensational, how he does it? Troll, troll, troll!!!
>
> >> Calling him a troll is an insult. You just proved his point for him.
>
> > And you just proved mine.
>
> Which point did I prove, Dick? That Cecil is a 50-year ham who has it all
> under control, that he is an offended newcomer, that he is sensational or
that
> he is a troll?
>
> In what way does my saying that by insulting him you have proved Cecil's
point
> that all you do is insult prospective CW ops prove any of the above?
>
> Help me out, here, Dick; I am trying to take your words at face value.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed,

Perhaps the difficulty is rooted in your (IMHO, overly generous)
assumption that Dick's words HAVE value :-)

Carl - wa6vse

5739. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:49:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c790d7e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35251

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C790BE3.E31E7B42@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you
> > >consider
> > >self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and
others
> > >never dished it out they would have nothing to take.
> >
> > Your honor, she made me beat her...
> >
>
> Pretty lame, Ed, and not just a little insulting. There is no "she"
involved. Just
>
> a few assholes like Cecil, and you're showing a lot of signs yourself.
>

Hey, Ed...at least he's not reading a book-a-weekend to come to the
conclusion that he has...

Kim W5TIT

5740. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:49:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c790be8$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35146

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020219220826.06176.00000814@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Interesting. Wonder what exactly I did to have
> >earned being insulted by Dick?
>
> And I? Perhaps I was too "vanilla," whatever that is supposed to mean?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Maybe it's another "pigment" reference from Dick???

Carl - wa6vse

5741. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:50:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C790BE3.E31E7B42@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35145

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you
> >consider
> >self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and others
> >never dished it out they would have nothing to take.
>
> Your honor, she made me beat her...
>

Pretty lame, Ed, and not just a little insulting. There is no "she" involved. Just

a few assholes like Cecil, and you're showing a lot of signs yourself.

5742. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 15:58:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C790DAA.B4C272E6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35149

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020223053509.03609.00000189@mb-df.aol.com...
> > From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >
> > >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> > >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> > >reliability is a moot point.
> >
> > That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Yes, Ed ... but the argument is bogus and we both know it,
> because much more reliable (better weak signal, fading,
> and QRM performance) modes are readily available to hams
> who are willing to accept (and learn a bit about) something new.

Ah, yes, they will always be as readily available as radiotelegraphy, and
will be present, ready to serve each and every emergency.

What is bogus is *you*. And we both know it.

How's the SSB DXCC going? Been on PSK31 yet? MFSK? HELL?CLOVER?
Get back to us after you spend some time on AMATEUR RADIO digital.

5743. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:07:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C790FF1.8277C25@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35252

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You say that I have an agenda that includes "dishing it out". If you consider
> > self defense an agenda you consider everything an agends. If Cecil and others
> > never dished it out they would have nothing to take.
>
> You've got to be kidding, Dick. 95% of the time you initiate the conflict.
> Someone expresses his/her honest opinion and you call them dirty names.
> -

Well it's my HONEST OPINION that you're a lying sack. Unless, of course,
you consider your and Stevenson's tripe as only "honest opinion". In that case you
must consider my answers as only my honest opinion.
My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of your "honest
opinions".

5744. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:09:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C791034.E4C56BA9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35254

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Pretty lame, Ed, and not just a little insulting. There is no "she" involved. Just
> a few assholes like Cecil, and you're showing a lot of signs yourself.

So, in a reply to Ed, you are self-defending yourself from something I
didn't do by calling me names?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5745. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:12:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C791113.F8627980@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35253

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> > > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
> >
> > That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...
>
> Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
> consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
> sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
> opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?

You're ignorance is showing again, Genius. When a radio op is in the
process of passing urgent communications and the band dies so that
SSB can't do the job, and CW still can, the time remaining to pass the traffic
on CW is almost always far more than enough, before the band totally tanks-
if indeed it happens on that particular occasion that it actually goes completely
dead so that CWwon't get through, either. It certainly isn't "fleeting".
Sometimes it doesn't go that dead at all.

5746. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:16:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7911E4.746108C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35255

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Joshua Houk wrote:
> > >> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> > >> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > >> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > >> beneath the iron and concrete.
> > >
> > >One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
> >
> > Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> > people.
>
> From inside the collapsed World Trade Center? What a strange thing to say.

????? Collapsed buildings give out all sorts of creaks, groans and "tap" sounds.

Actually it isn't stange at all that you would not know that.

5747. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:17:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C79122B.B6859F5C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35256

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I've seen people set down, go down the sheet checking one after the next and
> > > turn it in within 15 minutes, with not a mark on the scratch
> > > sheet. Not problem worked, not a formula written down and make a good passing
> > > score. I can only conclude they had done the memory
> > > thing till they could instantly
> > > pick out the matching answer to any question on whatever exam they prepared
> > > for.
> >
> > I took about ten minutes for my Extra exam and made no marks on the
> > scratch sheet. Do you think I didn't know the material, Dick?
>
> That's entirely possible. It's also possible you didn't take a test when I was
> a VE. I can believe that one could take a test today that required no calculations
> and no marks on a scratch sheet.

I also scored 100%. So do you think I rote-memorized the correct answers?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5748. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:19:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C79129A.FAEB6EA9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35257

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When yourpremise is wrong, your argument can't be any more accurate.
> Your premise is wrong.

So says the resident logic expert. :-) Ed and I are speaking from
personal experience, Dick. You weren't there. How can you possibly
know what Ed and I did to pass the general/conditional exam?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5749. Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:42:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c79184f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35258

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c71c429_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16db53ac9cf705ad989685@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> > noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?
> >
> > joshua houk
> > kd7pos
>
> Publicly? Do I think they're stupid?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Actually, the ARRL *routinely* notes comments made by others
in FCC rulemaking proceedings by filing reply comments. And
they often solicit their membership to file comments or reply
comments on issues of importance ... this is fine and well,
and neither I nor NCI have a problem with it ... however it seems
that Josh would deny NCI the same rights of participating in
the due process of FCC proceedings or the right of free speech
of informing its membership items of particular interest.

Case in point where the ARRL is doing EXACTLY what
Josh (somewhat incorrectly) accuses NCI of doing (with
the implication that it's "a bad thing") ... the current
proceeding where the ARRL opposed changes in Part 15
rules requested by an outfitcalled SAVI ...

The ARRL commented publicly (both in the record of the
proceeding, and in QST, bulletins, on the web site, etc.) ...
in this case SPECIFICALLY asking members to make
their views opposing SAVI's requested rules changes
known (somewhat different than simply informing the
membership in a summary fashion as to the tone and
contents of someone's comments - without asking them
to take any specific action, as NCI did in the case of Mr.
Tynan's comments).

Nothing wrong with that ... when ARRL does it (which,
as I said, they do routinely when it suits their purpose) ...
however, if NCI even MENTIONS someone's comments
(without making any specific request to the membership
to file opposing comments), then, THAT is, of course,

"a bad thing" (according to Josh ...)

Baloney ... the paragraph quoted by Josh simply reported
the facts surrounding Mr. Tynan's comments to the membership.
NCI filed its own reply comments in response to Mr. Tynan's
comments (which is, of course, our right whether Josh agrees
or not ...)

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5750. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 16:43:39 UTC
From: Glen Houghton <houghtonglen@hotmail.nospame.com>
Message-ID: <JL8e8.23$J6.15305@ralph.vnet.net>
Source record: 35259

What is the waiting period to re-test if you fail the tech exam? Can you
take it again on the spot or do you have to wait a period of time?

Thanks

Glen
"> The cost is $10 per session, It's the same $10 if you take one element,
all
> 4 of them or anything in between. I do not know if it is always done this
> way, but at the session I attended, the code test was given first. Whether
> or not you pass this element, you can then sit for the Tech written test.
If
> you pass that, you can take the General written and if you pass that you
can
> take the Extra.
>

5751. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:22:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5b7lv$ht2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35260

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020224032354.09757.00000116@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c75c985_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Dick, you have *initiated* more insults that anyone else on this
> >newsgroup.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Maybe I just ignored Dick most of the time...but I think Larry is the
record
> >holder on insults...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> This is from the person who insults all amateurs, especially YL's,
> every time she gives her callsign! Must be a dougle standard.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Actually, of late...I'd say Dick has exceeded Larry...certainly
in terms of variability. Larry is, to say the least, pretty
consistent with his "knuckle dragging..." comments.

ROTFLMAO,

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5752. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:28:52 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2c1fd2a727df8989697@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35261

In article <3c78fcd6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e1de60fc4e2e98989693@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > And if you read my statement again, you'll see that I never mentioned
> > Tech+. And if you read my statement yet *again*, I simply said that they
> > "understand" CW, not "use" CW.
>
> I got what you said, Joshua. I probably understood CW the first maybe month
> or two after I got my license, with a gradual loss of knowing it any more
> after that. Today, 6-7 years later I think, I couldn't recognize a thing,
> I'm sure. I doubt I am the only licensed person as such.

And if you would reread my statement for the third time (how many times
will it take, Kim?), you will see that I did *not* include Tech+ folks in
the folks who are functionally literate in CW. No doubt more than a few
are, and no doubt there are those who, like yourself, are illiterate.

> > Again, reread what I said. I used the word "like", not "know".
>
> Again, I state that even if someone does not *LIKE* CW, it takes no liking
> (or knowledge of CW) to know SOS. Most people off the street know CW SOS,
> the recent SOS pad commercials enhanced that even further.
>
> > But, addressing your divergence, the operator would be up the proverbial
> > creek if you recognized the ... --- ... yet didn't understand .--. .-.. .
> > .- ... . -. -.. .- ... ... - .- -. -.-. . - --- (...
> > ..- -.-. .... .- -. -.. ... ..- -.-. .... .- .-.. --- -.-. .- -
> > .. --- -.), neh?
>
> I recognize the SOS, yet didn't understand the rest and don't care to look
> it up on a chart.

Thanks Kim - it saves so much typing when you prove my points for me!

joshua houk
kd7pos

5753. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:29:52 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2bfde37d136b0989696@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35262

In article <3c79184f_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net engages in historical revisionism by saying...

> Actually, the ARRL *routinely* notes comments made by others
> in FCC rulemaking proceedings by filing reply comments. And
> they often solicit their membership to file comments or reply
> comments on issues of importance ... this is fine and well,
> and neither I nor NCI have a problem with it ... however it seems
> that Josh would deny NCI the same rights of participating in
> the due process of FCC proceedings or the right of free speech
> of informing its membership items of particular interest.

Please provide one instance of an ARRL press release or news release saying that a person or an organization has posted a comment (or, even bettter, a "reply comment", such as NCI did) on a proposed rulemaking.

> Case in point where the ARRL is doing EXACTLY what
> Josh (somewhat incorrectly) accuses NCI of doing (with
> the implication that it's "a bad thing") ... the current
> proceeding where the ARRL opposed changes in Part 15
> rules requested by an outfitcalled SAVI ...

The ARRL is amking a comment on a petition for rulemaking, not a reply comment on somebody else's comment on a proposed rulemaking. Therein the difference. I'm surprised that someone as prolific a public commentmaker as yourself doesn't know the difference.

Oh wait... this is NCI we're talking about...

> Nothing wrong with that ... when ARRL does it (which,
> as I said, they do routinely when it suits their purpose) ...
> however, if NCI even MENTIONS someone's comments
> (without making any specific request to the membership
> to file opposing comments), then, THAT is, of course,
> "a bad thing" (according to Josh ...)

You do understand the difference between a "Petition" and a "Reply Comment", right Carl? When has the ARRL publicly noted a "Reply Comment", or even a "Comment"?

> Baloney ... the paragraph quoted by Josh simply reported
> the facts surrounding Mr. Tynan's comments to the membership.
> NCI filed its own reply comments in response to Mr. Tynan's
> comments (which is, of course, our right whether Josh agrees
> or not ...)

More revisionism - I already *stated* that it was your right to file a reply comment. If you're going to insinuate that I think otherwise, don't do it in public - it's just another embarrassment on your part.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5754. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:32:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5b8dk$o3r$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35264

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a5abn00jj3@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >>... I am saying that
> >> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
> >> oversteps the authority of the government.
> >
> >It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
> >stipulation.
>
> The government passed the law and it says:
>
> Q: What are "fixed wireless signals"?
>
> A: "Fixed wireless signals" are any commercial non-broadcast
communications
> signals transmitted via wireless technology to and/or from a fixed
customer
> location. Examples include wireless signals used to provide telephone
> service or high-speed Internet access to a fixed location. This definition
> does not include, among other things, AM/FM radio, amateur ("HAM") radio,
> Citizens Band ("CB") radio, and Digital Audio Radio Services ("DARS")
> signals.

And this comes from "what law" that you disagree with?....and
just how does it relate to your arguments regarding CC&Rs?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5755. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:36:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5b8dl$o3r$2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35263

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a5afpp02srv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
> >have to worry about going to jail.
>
> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to detach a
> shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then I
> can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.

You have stretched your case far beyond reality in almost any
situation. Just how many times has anyone been found
in contempt.

Additionally, I don't know (Phil K query follows) if
being jailed for contempt of cout qualifies as a criminal
charge/finding?

Regardless, your constant referencing to criminal
is at the extreme end of the spectrum regardless of
what you want others to believe.

No cigar.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5756. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:38:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c79280c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35266

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C791113.F8627980@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of
opportunity
> > > > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
> > >
> > > That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...
> >
> > Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
> > consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
> > sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
> > opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?
>
> You're ignorance is showing again, Genius. When a radio op is in the
> process of passing urgent communications and the band dies so that
> SSB can't do the job, and CW still can, the time remaining to pass the
traffic
> on CW is almost always far more than enough, before the band totally
tanks-
> if indeed it happens on that particular occasion that it actually goes
completely
> dead so that CWwon't get through, either. It certainly isn't "fleeting".
> Sometimes it doesn't go that dead at all.
>

Can ya give me just one--that's all I'm asking for, just one--example of CW
communication during a disaster or emergency in these days? I'll even make
it easy for you, does the Hurricane Net use CW communication for
anything--other than H&W? I have always heard of CW being this great tool
for emergencies, but never have heard of an example of it. I *know* that
there is a CW traffic net; but most traffic these days is contrived for the
benefit of having a net (net messages back and forth, etc.).

Kim W5TIT

5757. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:42:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c79299f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35267

I took that Josh was asking for an example of the ARRL "slamming" someone
for a comment. I don't think they would do that--they'd be stupid if they
did. And, as to noting comments, I don't think they name the person do
they, when they note that "the membership" feels a certain way? Isn't it
more a general reference to "comments that they've received/heard etc.?

Kim W5TIT

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c79184f_2@news7.fast.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c71c429_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16db53ac9cf705ad989685@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Can you come up with one instance where the ARRL publicly
> > > noted a *comment* made by someone in response to an proposed FCC rule?
> > >
> > > joshua houk
> > > kd7pos
> >
> > Publicly? Do I think they're stupid?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Actually, the ARRL *routinely* notes comments made by others
> in FCC rulemaking proceedings by filing reply comments. And
> they often solicit their membership to file comments or reply
> comments on issues of importance ... this is fine and well,
> and neither I nor NCI have a problem with it ... however it seems
> that Josh would deny NCI the same rights of participating in
> the due process of FCC proceedings or the right of free speech
> of informing its membership items of particular interest.
>
> Case in point where the ARRL is doing EXACTLY what
> Josh (somewhat incorrectly) accuses NCI of doing (with
> the implication that it's "a bad thing") ... the current
> proceeding where the ARRL opposed changes in Part 15
> rules requested by an outfitcalled SAVI ...
>
> The ARRL commented publicly (both in the record of the
> proceeding, and in QST, bulletins, on the web site, etc.) ...
> in this case SPECIFICALLY asking members to make
> their views opposing SAVI's requested rules changes

> known (somewhat different than simply informing the
> membership in a summary fashion as to the tone and
> contents of someone's comments - without asking them
> to take any specific action, as NCI did in the case of Mr.
> Tynan's comments).
>
> Nothing wrong with that ... when ARRL does it (which,
> as I said, they do routinely when it suits their purpose) ...
> however, if NCI even MENTIONS someone's comments
> (without making any specific request to the membership
> to file opposing comments), then, THAT is, of course,
> "a bad thing" (according to Josh ...)
>
> Baloney ... the paragraph quoted by Josh simply reported
> the facts surrounding Mr. Tynan's comments to the membership.
> NCI filed its own reply comments in response to Mr. Tynan's
> comments (which is, of course, our right whether Josh agrees
> or not ...)
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
> <mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
> ONLY, please]
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> ----------
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, TAPR
> Member, ARRL
> ----------
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>
>
>

5758. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:49:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c797f6a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35483

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2c1fd2a727df8989697@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c78fcd6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e1de60fc4e2e98989693@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > And if you read my statement again, you'll see that I never mentioned
> > > Tech+. And if you read my statement yet *again*, I simply said that
they
> > > "understand" CW, not "use" CW.
> >
> > I got what you said, Joshua. I probably understood CW the first maybe
month
> > or two after I got my license, with a gradual loss of knowing it any
more
> > after that. Today, 6-7 years later I think, I couldn't recognize a
thing,
> > I'm sure. I doubt I am the only licensed person as such.
>
> And if you would reread my statement for the third time (how many times
> will it take, Kim?), you will see that I did *not* include Tech+ folks in
> the folks who are functionally literate in CW. No doubt more than a few
> are, and no doubt there are those who, like yourself, are illiterate.
>

I don't care if you included, or didn't, Tech+. My statement stands for
even General and Extra class hams. In fact, I *KNOW* Extra class hams who
haven't used CW in years if ever and have told me they couldn't do it now.

As to illiteracy, you really place way too much importance on a mode in ham
radio if you relate it to illiteracy for one not to know it. You should be
embarrassed to use illiteracy as a value judgement against someone--there
are many extremely intelligent people who cannot read.

> > >
> > > Again, reread what I said. I used the word "like", not "know".
> >
> > Again, I state that even if someone does not *LIKE* CW, it takes no
liking
> > (or knowledge of CW) to know SOS. Most people off the street know CW
SOS,
> > the recent SOS pad commercials enhanced that even further.
> >
> > > But, addressing your divergence, the operator would be up the

proverbial
> > > creek if you recognized the ... --- ... yet didn't understand .--.
.-.. .
> > > .- ... . -. -.. .- ... ... - .- -. -.-. . - ---
(...
> > > ..- -.-. .... .- -. -.. ... ..- -.-. .... .- .-.. --- -.-.
.- -
> > > .. --- -.), neh?
> >
> > I recognize the SOS, yet didn't understand the rest and don't care to
look
> > it up on a chart.
>
> Thanks Kim - it saves so much typing when you prove my points for me!
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

I think your anger is directed because you know I am making a valid point.
I will accept your anger and sit here smiling.

Kim W5TIT

5759. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 17:49:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5b9durus1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35265

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a5abr80jnu@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Your recieve only case is never going to see the light of
> >day because the association and the neighbors don't care
> >at that point since the extra-use isn't detectable at all
> >and provides nothing to "trigger" enforcement.
>
>
> Not according to Phil Kane.

Phil was addressing the probability of discovery
wherein the other use was TRANSMISSION. Your NEW
hypothetical (new of the last 2/3 days) has focused on
RECIEVE only. I won't claim to speak for Phil,
but I'd bet he'd not likly expect the association or
any of the neighbors to be able to "detect" any
"extended receive" functionality. No detection, then means
no case for the association or a neighbor to pursue.

> Now what if I also use that antenna for TV &
> CB, can the association prevent me from doing so?

If they know about it...yes they can. Would they know
about it at all...it depends. If CB use involved
TRANSMISSION, then there's a possibility of detection.
IF CB use involved RECEIVE only, detection and
subsequent court action would probably never
happen. Such recieve only situations are nothing but
academic discussions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5760. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:06:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5badkrcp1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35268

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2bfde37d136b0989696@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c79184f_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net engages
> in historical revisionism by saying...
>
> > Actually, the ARRL *routinely* notes comments made by others
> > in FCC rulemaking proceedings by filing reply comments. And
> > they often solicit their membership to file comments or reply
> > comments on issues of importance ... this is fine and well,
> > and neither I nor NCI have a problem with it ... however it seems
> > that Josh would deny NCI the same rights of participating in
> > the due process of FCC proceedings or the right of free speech
> > of informing its membership items of particular interest.
>
> Please provide one instance of an ARRL press release or news release
> saying that a person or an organization has posted a comment (or, even
> bettter, a "reply comment", such as NCI did) on a proposed rulemaking.

Such has often been included in QST reports. Maybe later today
I'll look a few up. More to the issue, might anyone at ARRL
even claim to have never reported on such matters.

> > Case in point where the ARRL is doing EXACTLY what
> > Josh (somewhat incorrectly) accuses NCI of doing (with
> > the implication that it's "a bad thing") ... the current
> > proceeding where the ARRL opposed changes in Part 15
> > rules requested by an outfitcalled SAVI ...
>
> The ARRL is amking a comment on a petition for rulemaking, not a reply
> comment on somebody else's comment on a proposed rulemaking. Therein the
> difference. I'm surprised that someone as prolific a public commentmaker
> as yourself doesn't know the difference.

I'm surprised you think ARRL has never reported on reply
comments.

> Oh wait... this is NCI we're talking about...
>
> > Nothing wrong with that ... when ARRL does it (which,
> > as I said, they do routinely when it suits their purpose) ...
> > however, if NCI even MENTIONS someone's comments
> > (without making any specific request to the membership
> > to file opposing comments), then, THAT is, of course,
> > "a bad thing" (according to Josh ...)
>

> You do understand the difference between a "Petition" and a "Reply
> Comment", right Carl? When has the ARRL publicly noted a "Reply Comment",
> or even a "Comment"?
>
> > Baloney ... the paragraph quoted by Josh simply reported
> > the facts surrounding Mr. Tynan's comments to the membership.
> > NCI filed its own reply comments in response to Mr. Tynan's
> > comments (which is, of course, our right whether Josh agrees
> > or not ...)
>
> More revisionism - I already *stated* that it was your right to file a
> reply comment. If you're going to insinuate that I think otherwise, don't
> do it in public - it's just another embarrassment on your part.

Josh,

Your original trip down this path claimed that the
reporting by NCI of another person's comments
was done to generate harassment against the
opposing commentor.

The embarrasment, if any, belongs to you in that
you don't believe that ARRL and or hundreds of other entities don't
report on comments filed by opposing parties in their repective
organization's journals (e.g. NTIA, ARRL, etc.). Such reporting
is common, normal and done for comments filed both
as original comments and/or reply comments.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5761. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:10:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5badg$r1s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35269

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c79299f_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> I took that Josh was asking for an example of the ARRL "slamming" someone
> for a comment.

NCI didn't "slam" anyone either. The posting of the individual's
actual text is all that was done.

> I don't think they would do that--they'd be stupid if they
> did.

What if they did? What is stupid about attacking the
comments of an opposition party?

> And, as to noting comments, I don't think they name the person do
> they, when they note that "the membership" feels a certain way? Isn't it
> more a general reference to "comments that they've received/heard etc.?

I'll have to look at some past QSTs. Even if so, the reporting of
an individual's comments by name is nothing more than
that...(i.e. reporting)...as in Journalism 101.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5762. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:14:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c792e1e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35270

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2bfde37d136b0989696@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c79184f_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net engages
> in historical revisionism by saying...

No "historical revisionism" ... just the facts.

Since Josh can't or won't read anything contrary to his agenda
without putting "spin" on it, I won't bother to reply to his nonsense
any more after this post.

> > Actually, the ARRL *routinely* notes comments made by others
> > in FCC rulemaking proceedings by filing reply comments. And
> > they often solicit their membership to file comments or reply
> > comments on issues of importance ... this is fine and well,
> > and neither I nor NCI have a problem with it ... however it seems
> > that Josh would deny NCI the same rights of participating in
> > the due process of FCC proceedings or the right of free speech
> > of informing its membership items of particular interest.
>
> Please provide one instance of an ARRL press release or news release
> saying that a person or an organization has posted a comment (or, even
> bettter, a "reply comment", such as NCI did) on a proposed rulemaking.
>
> > Case in point where the ARRL is doing EXACTLY what
> > Josh (somewhat incorrectly) accuses NCI of doing (with
> > the implication that it's "a bad thing") ... the current
> > proceeding where the ARRL opposed changes in Part 15
> > rules requested by an outfitcalled SAVI ...
>
> The ARRL is amking a comment on a petition for rulemaking, not a reply
> comment on somebody else's comment on a proposed rulemaking. Therein the
> difference. I'm surprised that someone as prolific a public commentmaker
> as yourself doesn't know the difference.

Yes, I know the difference ... and the ARRL *does* make
reply comments on the comments of others when it suits
their purposes ... and ususally those items are mentioned
in ARRL news ...

To assert that this is false is a blatant falsehood on YOUR part.

> Oh wait... this is NCI we're talking about...

Careful, your *real* agenda (trying ... without much
success ... to discredit NCI) is showing ...

> > Nothing wrong with that ... when ARRL does it (which,
> > as I said, they do routinely when it suits their purpose) ...
> > however, if NCI even MENTIONS someone's comments
> > (without making any specific request to the membership
> > to file opposing comments), then, THAT is, of course,
> > "a bad thing" (according to Josh ...)
>
> You do understand the difference between a "Petition" and a "Reply
> Comment", right Carl? When has the ARRL publicly noted a "Reply Comment",
> or even a "Comment"?

Asked and answered before ...

> > Baloney ... the paragraph quoted by Josh simply reported
> > the facts surrounding Mr. Tynan's comments to the membership.
> > NCI filed its own reply comments in response to Mr. Tynan's
> > comments (which is, of course, our right whether Josh agrees
> > or not ...)
>
> More revisionism - I already *stated* that it was your right to file a
> reply comment. If you're going to insinuate that I think otherwise, don't
> do it in public - it's just another embarrassment on your part.

I didn't "insinuate" that you said we didn't have a right to file
comments ... I only *stated* that we had the right to do so, whether
you agreed (with our comments) or not. Apparently you misunderstood
what I was saying.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5763. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:29:43 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2d03ba1c3ba5a989698@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35271

In article <a5badg$r1s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...

> NCI didn't "slam" anyone either. The posting of the individual's
> actual text is all that was done.

A typical lie from the board of NCI.

Is this "[t]he posting of the individual's actual text"?:

"William A. Tynan, W3XO, Files Scathing "Reply Comments" in RM-9673. Bill Tynan, W3XO, a well-known VHF DXer, former QST columnist, and former President of AMSAT NA, was involved in the filing of and is apparently an ardent supporter of the CSVHFS' Petition for Rulemaking. A number of major organizations have filed comments in opposition to the CSVHFS' Petition, including the ARRL, the Texas VHF FM Society, the 220 Spectrum Management Association of Southern California, and NCI. In his "Reply Comments" W3XO systematically attacks all of these comments in opposition to his desired outcome in the Proceeding, questioning both the motives and the integrity of the organizations in question. He also insinuates that new operators are at the root of the (alleged) "problem" which the Petition "seeks to remedy,"..."

joshua houk
kd7pos

5764. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:32:05 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2d0c785088f8c989699@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35272

In article <3c792e1e_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> Since Josh can't or won't read anything contrary to his agenda
> without putting "spin" on it, I won't bother to reply to his nonsense
> any more after this post.

See above reply to Mr. Sohl - looks like you can't help but put your
own spin on writing contrary to your agenda.

Pot. Kettle. Black.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5765. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:44:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C793484.53BD9358@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35274

Dick Carroll wrote:
> My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of your "honest
> opinions".

Did you ever notice that my honest opinion rarely contains dirty words
and your honest opinion almost always contains dirty words? Does that
tell you anything?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5766. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:44:31 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e2d39b98e9a5798969a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35273

In article <3c790495$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e2069376441b29989695@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > "Ismael Quinones, a traffic enforcement agent in a scooter at a stoplight
> > at Cortlandt and Church streets, reached for his radio. "Traffic 191, we
> > just had an explosion at One World Trade Center by a jet," he told his
> > dispatcher and left his car to order civilians to leave the area. "They
> > hadn't heard about it yet," said Quinones, 39. "People were hanging out
> > the window, sending morse code [by flicking the blinds]."
> >
> > http://www.newsday.com/ny-nyresc232380685sep23.story
>
> That is not morse code, that is flicking blinds in desperation to get
> noticed so that someone will know there's someone on that floor. That some
> media person translates anything like that, flicking the blinds, banging on
> the pipes, etc., as Morse Code is their mistake.

Well, it wasn't the media who said it was morse code, it was Mr.
Quinones.

> I doubt someone was literally doing anything more than flicking the blinds...
> the only way to "wave a flag" at that point. And, no, flag waving should
> not be translated to mean that someone would be using signaling.

Nah - I'd wager that if someone just saw a signal without intelligence
(just on and off with no particular timing to it), they'd say they were
signaling. If they saw a pattern to it, they'd say it was morse code.

Ignore the first story, however - I have serious doubts as to the
credibility of the report I read. Oy vey - I need to check these things
more carefully! Stupid, stupid me...

And I seriously do apologize for the righteous indignation towards you
eariler. I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't
fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
Well, *that* certainly didn't work out. Many apologies, for whatever it's
worth.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5767. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:48:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C793566.4C2EAE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35275

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> > > > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
> > >
> > > That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...
> >
> > Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
> > consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
> > sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
> > opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?
>
> You're ignorance is showing again, Genius. When a radio op is in the
> process of passing urgent communications and the band dies so that
> SSB can't do the job, and CW still can, the time remaining to pass the traffic
> on CW is almost always far more than enough, before the band totally tanks-
> if indeed it happens on that particular occasion that it actually goes completely
> dead so that CWwon't get through, either. It certainly isn't "fleeting".

What you have described is a fleeting, transitory period of time, Dick. Why
don't you ever crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself? Nothing
I said contradicts your above statement. Nothing you said contradicts what
I said. In fact, your description is one of the dictionary definitions of
"fleeting".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5768. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:51:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C793627.2EEDEC4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35276

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> > > people.
> >
> > From inside the collapsed World Trade Center? What a strange thing to say.
>
> ????? Collapsed buildings give out all sorts of creaks, groans and "tap" sounds.

Dick, I was talking about people who can tell the difference between human tapping
and nonhuman tapping. I'm sorry you are not one of those people. When you hear
a woodpecker, do you automatically assume someone is sending an 'SOS'? ROTFL
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5769. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 18:55:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C793733.AD32A2F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35277

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
> >wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
> >get the correct answer.
>
> You couldn't have done that, because Dick claims it doesn't happen. :-)

Heck, Ed, I did worse than Dick claims. I memorized the answers on the
Extra exam years before I ever saw the questions. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5770. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 19:02:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7938E2.69B60CCF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35278

Joshua Houk wrote:
> Please provide one instance of an ARRL press release or news release
> saying that a person or an organization has posted a comment (or, even
> bettter, a "reply comment", such as NCI did) on a proposed rulemaking.

They cover such in the ARRL (emailed) newsletter. Do you subscribe?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5771. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 19:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224142438.26726.00000039@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 35279

In article <3c7906a7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable on
>Amateur
>> Radio history and generally comes out on top on any discussion of same.
>>
>> I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action is to
>accept
>> defeat gracefully. :-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Ed,
>
>Having been in Mexico City all of the past week, as a member
>of the US Delegation to the CITEL PCC III regional radio regulatory
>conference, I'm afraid I've been VERY selectively reading the over
>1000 new messages in this group today and don't know how or on
>what subject Jim "got me."
>
>However, if he did in fact, I will follow your advice :-)
>
Carl, Ed, and group:

Here's my reply to Carl's earlier post. This is driectly from google.

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE:

In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...

>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
>> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
>> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
>> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.

>> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response something
>> like "So the FCC at some time in the past created band segments by
> mode
>> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."
>
>Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
>be 10 wpm ...

Hold it right there. Tell the WHOLE story.

The code test speed for US licenses (except the old Extra) was 10 wpm from
1919 to 1936.

>at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
>the speed to 12.5 wpm ...

That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the WRITTEN exam
so that it required more radio knowledge in order to pass.

> SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
>hams "because the bands were too crowded."

Incorrect.

The concerns were:

1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
2) many newcomers were getting on the air with insufficient skill AND TECHNICAL
KNOWLEDGE for the conditions of the day
3) the explosive growth (the number of US hams TRIPLED from 1929's ~16,000 in
less than 5 years)
4) high turnover (as many as 40% of hams not renewing, at a time when the
license term was 3 years
5) increasing numbers of TECHNICAL violations (out of band, harmonics, hum,
chirps, etc.) wreaking havoc on other services and threatening the reputation
of the ARS.

Many of these
violations were the result of inexperienceand a "don't care" attitude.

The solution proposed by the ARRL leadership and accepted by the FCC was a
slight rise in the code test speed AND new written tests. Funny how the written
test changes are forgotten.

>(at the time, the
>total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
>so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)

Incorrect again. Carl, do you know what the amateur bands were in 1936? Do you
know how they were used? Do you know what the typical amateur station equipment

was like in those days? Or how many hours/week a typical amateur was on the air?

The argument was NOT "absurd" once all the FACTS are known.

>The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
>for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...

Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2. Then 5 wpm was added.

>Was this decision made "for good reason" ???

They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?

>Given that it's been proven that our bands can support FAR more hams
>than the small fraction of today's population, then licensed,
>the underlying argument of "overcrowding" was invalid, therefore
>the decision to increase the code test speed to artificially limit
>the population was flawed.

Incorrect. It all depends on the methods used and how much a typical ham operates. These things change over time.

Do some math using realistic-for-1936 and show us what ya got.

>Note that this goes back MANY years and does not reflect
>in any way on the current FCC's ability to make rational
>public policy decisions.

In toehr words, if you agree with them, the decisions are rational, but if you don't, they are irrational.

73 de Jim, N2EY

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Them's the historic facts, Carl.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5772. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 19:29:16 UTC
From: John Miles <jmiles@pop.removethistomailme.net>
Message-ID: <3C794018.3D1A@pop.removethistomailme.net>
Source record: 35280
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

```
Charles Johnston wrote:
>
> The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
> historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted

Unless you guys are building your own eQSL servers from chips and
solder, there are better groups for this spam than r.r.a.h...

-- jm

-------------------------------------------------------
http://www.qsl.net/ke5fx
Note: My E-mail address has been altered to avoid spam
-------------------------------------------------------
```

5773. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:02:30 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5bla2egu6@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35282
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<cbjunkie@cb.org.au> wrote in message
news:24549151.00010ebf.076@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" says...
> >
> >hello ole capt. peckers:
> >
> >> I wonder if after all of this is done
> >> and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
> >> or whatever the heck he calls it will still
> >> retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
> >> status...? Methinks not.
> >
> >i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have someone
> >take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there are
so
> >many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the
wrong
> >way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought
that
> >equipment.
> >
> >phil :)
>
>
> This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own hands
type.
> I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham Radio
have a
> 15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people
like him
> getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.

Llllardasssss Llllloyd N0VFP who's been qrming on HF with only a
technician license will get a letter soon, too.

5774. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:07:02 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C7955F6.F900BD1F@attbi.com>
Source record: 35281
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Dimmy's Lap Dog, Roger" wrote:

> Who cares? What is the ARRL anyway? A place to throw away your income?

Right... Don't join. When they come to take away your frequencies, your operating privileges and eventually your entire hobby, just lock yourself with a couple of buddies in a shack in Montana and make an armed stand-off against the feds.

A typical CB mentality if I've ever seen one.

5775. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:07:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5bki102v5q@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<cbjunkie@cb.org.au> wrote in message
news:24549151.00010ebf.076@drn.newsguy.com...

> This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own hands
type.
> I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham Radio
have a
> 15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people
like him
> getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.

I doubt that. With so many internet radio stations, it's easier to set up a broadcast on live365.com or some other web radio venue rather than use shortwave in the amatuer bands. Internet broadcasts have more of a chance being heard since more people have computers and net access than have shortwave receivers.

5776. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:11:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5bkpm02vqi@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35287

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org...
> Joshua Houk wrote:
> > The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> > later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > beneath the iron and concrete.
>
> One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.

If the story is true, that's probably what *really* happened - slightly
embellished to prove how important morse code is.

5777. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:23:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5blef03147@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35292

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C790DAA.B4C272E6@worldnet.att.net...
> > Yes, Ed ... but the argument is bogus and we both know it,
> > because much more reliable (better weak signal, fading,
> > and QRM performance) modes are readily available to hams
> > who are willing to accept (and learn a bit about) something new.
>
> Ah, yes, they will always be as readily available as radiotelegraphy, and
> will be present, ready to serve each and every emergency.
>
> What is bogus is *you*. And we both know it.
>
> How's the SSB DXCC going? Been on PSK31 yet? MFSK? HELL?CLOVER?
> Get back to us after you spend some time on AMATEUR RADIO digital.

Interesting that you have no counter-point to Carl's statement, so you have
to shoot off on something completely irrelevant.

5778. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:23:43 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5bnug$l1f$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35297
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Zoran Brlecic" <WA7AA@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:3C7955F6.F900BD1F@attbi.com...
> "Dimmy's Lap Dog, Roger" wrote:
>
> > Who cares? What is the ARRL anyway? A place to throw away your income?
>
> Right... Don't join. When they come to take away your frequencies, your
> operating privileges and eventually your entire hobby, just lock yourself
with a
> couple of buddies in a shack in Montana and make an armed stand-off
against the
> feds.
>
> A typical CB mentality if I've ever seen one.

He couldn't afford the $39, it would cut into his crack-cocaine money.

5779. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:28:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224162827.01358.00000081@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 35283

In article <3c783af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you don't
>> like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion that
>> there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's some
>> s t r e t c h.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
>message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
>disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW message
>sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
>
>I doubt it.

According to lore on this newsgroup, a reporter (who curiously
understands morse codes as used with window shade blinker
systems) has given the "facts." Another reporter on another
story reporting someone who "had ridden down a collapsing
Trade Center building and survived" had his story discounted.
I'm not going to touch the "last photograph from on top of the
WTC" that has circulated on the Internet...

According to another working journalist who does not know any
morse codes, the window blinker was formerly the radio operator
on the Motor Vessel Oak and was trying to contact a ham on
a Grassy Knoll near the WTC. Someone took his picture while
riding down with the collapsing building but both were arrested
by the FCC police who were quick on the scene via black
helicopters. The camera and film was confiscated by the NSA.
Both are being held at a secret location formerly used by the
Vice President. No one in the US government confirms this
information so it must be assumend that a great conspiracy
is keeping everyone from knowing the Real Truth.

5780. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:28:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224162828.01358.00000082@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 35284

In article <3c7906a7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable on
>Amateur
>> Radio history and generally comes out on top on any discussion of same.
>>
>> I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action is to
>accept
>> defeat gracefully. :-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Ed,
>
>Having been in Mexico City all of the past week, as a member
>of the US Delegation to the CITEL PCC III regional radio regulatory
>conference, I'm afraid I've been VERY selectively reading the over
>1000 new messages in this group today and don't know how or on
>what subject Jim "got me."
>
>However, if he did in fact, I will follow your advice :-)
>
>WRT to the CITEL conference ...
>
>Just because I *have* to see the reaction from the Dick and some
>of the other PCTAs, I simply *can't* resist reporting that the FCC
>asked me to present the Draft US Proposal on WRC-03 Agenda
>Item 1.7.1 ... the revision of S25 of the ITU Radio Regs :-)
>
>This proposal, originally drafted by the ARRL, with some modifications
>agreed by NCI and others in IWG-6, and approved by the WAC, FCC,
>NTIA, and State Dept., supports the suppression (elimination) of S25.5,
>the international Morse test requirement :-)
>
>It will be VERY interesting to see what Dick and some of the

>others spew on THIS :-)

The full story as of the end of November, 2001, may be found on the FCC website as DA 01-2764, (shortened title) WAC Preliminary Views and Draft Proposals. That seems to be incomplete since its 15 pages do not include all the agenda items for WRC-03. It does begin with Informal Working Group 6 decisions on agenda item 1.7 (three) in that S25.1 through S25.6 are all re-worded. S25.5 has a complete rewrite over the existing form and simply omits any mention of morse codings; it does not "eliminate" or "suppress" the need for morse code testing, it just doesn't mention it. See pages 3 and 4 for the new wording.

According to DA 01-2764, credit is given to the IARU and no one else for the revisions on all of S25 (page 2).

Neither is there any indication in that document that these Preliminary Views and Draft have been "approved" by either NTIA or State Department. No doubt there are other documents which contain "more firm" stands on WRC agenda items 1.7.1 through 1.7.3. Those could be misfiled, not-yet-on-listings-due-to-terrible-workloads-preventing-prompt-handling, or just unfinished and NOT IN PUBLIC ACCESS YET.

Note: Corrections on statements in this message will never ever be rejected. They may be ignored, however, and that will offer a moral victory for someone because no one can prove rejection. :-)

5781. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:28:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224162830.01358.00000083@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 35285

In article <3c790559_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Is the statement "my work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue" anything like "I
>did not have sex with that woman?" :o
>
>Kim W5TIT

Leaving aside definitions of "is," let's define Guinea-Bisseau and "work."

Guinea-Bisseau (or Bissau) is a small middle-Africa-general-location
country of 1.3 million whose chief exports are cashews and peanuts.
[see any almanac for details]

It is stretching incredulity to attempt picturing this tiny former colony
as being "important" in world affairs or even general African affairs,
trade, religion of any kind. It doesn't seem to have attracted press
attention to any level higher than "filler" items over the last three-
plus decades. It is definitely not a "hotbed of intrigue and mystery,"
even in fictional works. It doesn't appear to have any strategic
military value for air bases or ports to any other nation except
maybe its immediate neighbors.

"Work." Department of State communications was dragged kicking
and screaming into modern methods when the Cold War began
(acknowledged to start about 1948). State had been using standard-
issue non-updated code books until 1943 while the military had much
more secure rolling-code machine encryption in 1938 (never any
evidence that it had been compromised although German crypto
training regularly broke State book codes as class exercises). We
can skip over the details on methods-machinery with only a mention
of the USS Pueblo's capture almost intact by North Korea (mass
replacement of crypto equipment throughout government right after),
espionage by USN Chief Warrant Officer Walker and his family
spy ring that provided the USSR with full details, including tech
manual photographs and key lists, of the replacement crypto
systems. A second mass replacement of crypto equipment for the
US government, this time costing billions but aided by great leaps
in Information Theory yielding new methods in cryptography.

Communications work is important. In an age where the start of
nuclear holocaust may be only 20 minutes away (first detection of
an incoming ICBM), government needs quick, secure
communications. However, the "work" is often over-exaggerated
and self-glorified or even romanticized in descriptions to lay people.
Government communications is procedural for many reasons and

those involved must ALWAYS be aware and vigilant against violations of "sensitive" communications. In the main, it is simply routine, "following the book." Security should not have any questions regarding its existance at any level whether from a CIA station chief at the US Embassy in Moscow down to a Petty Officer 3rd radio tech on the supply ship "USS Bilgewater."

However, the word "code" has many meanings and appears strange and mysterious to lay people, has many colorings of mystery, secret things, even arcane magic. It is wonderful fertilizer for works of fiction, enabling quite a few authors to grow acres of print, accumulating silos of money. Who can refute them? The real details are supposed to be "secret" and cannot be revealed on some imagined charge of treason! Not quite so in the real communications world.

The existance and wide variety of voice scramblers available in the US government was shown to the public during the Iran-Contra investigations. Their technical details are rather well known within the electronics industry. The basic technology is equally applied to digitized telephony that many use every day without realizing their call is digitized. It is transparent to the user. Civilian businesses have been using commercial voice scramblers for at least two decades. Security lies in the method-algorithm of encryption-decryption, not the ordinary electronic details. The method is sufficiently complex that decryption cannot be accomplished within a reasonable time.

I've mentioned the US military's SINCGARS manpack to vehicular standard small-unit land-forces radio now in its 13th year of operational use. Not only does it have compatible COMSEC (Communications Security) methods for voice or data but it is also a frequency-hopper. The main manufacturer is General Dynamics Fort Lauderdale division. That division has a website and lists the technical details of the radio family. The subcontractor for the ICs containing the encryption-decryption circuitry is Nova Engineering who also has a website. Any SINCGARS could be fully reverse-engineered, even down to the complete details of the ICs, yet all those man-years of work would NOT enable an unfriendly to decode and use such communications in the field. The method involves the entire system of use, everything from the "hop set" (part of which is the "key list" of older crypto equipment) through the algorithm. The SYSTEM is so robust that intercepted information cannot be used in any reasonable time.

The long-time morsemen keep implying that morse code is somehow in the "importance" or "vital nature" area as cryptographic code. Nonsense. Rubbish. They are not related except for having the same letters in English. That one insists that morse codes were "standard procedure" in

State Department communications defies known procedure
on radio circuits established throughout the US government
in the 1940s...order-wires and "synchronization" (of times
and frequencies) used the same mode as for regular traffic
on that mode. Anything else is snow-jobbery to an audience
who has little information on either old or new radio procedures
outside of amateur radio.

I'm sure some snow machine operators are able to avalanche
the unfamiliar. To those who've done it and know the systems
they are simply stuffing snow shoes into their big mouths.

5782. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:30:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5blsa0g4@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35293

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020224032354.09757.00000116@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c75c985_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Dick, you have *initiated* more insults that anyone else on this
> >newsgroup.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Maybe I just ignored Dick most of the time...but I think Larry is the
record
> >holder on insults...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> This is from the person who insults all amateurs, especially YL's,
> every time she gives her callsign! Must be a dougle standard.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You've stated that you feel amateurs *should* be insulted by Kim's callsign.
Don't presume to think that every amateur *is* insulted. Who are you to say
what is insulting and what isn't for someone else?

5783. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:36:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35289

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224142438.26726.00000039@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3c7906a7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020216185135.13798.00000471@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>
> >> >In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >>
> >> Carl, just a word to the wise here -- Jim is quite knowledgeable
> >> on Amateur Radio history and generally comes out on top on
> >> any discussion of same.
> >>
> >> I think he gotcha' on this one, and the wisest course of action
> >> is to accept defeat gracefully. :-)
> >>
> >> 73,
> >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >Ed,
> >
> >Having been in Mexico City all of the past week, as a member
> >of the US Delegation to the CITEL PCC III regional radio regulatory
> >conference, I'm afraid I've been VERY selectively reading the over
> >1000 new messages in this group today and don't know how or on
> >what subject Jim "got me."
> >
> >However, if he did in fact, I will follow your advice :-)
> >
> Carl, Ed, and group:
>
> Here's my reply to Carl's earlier post. This is driectly from
>google.

Jim,

I certainly trust you to accurately recount your previous
post.

OK ... I'll respond ...

> In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...
>
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
> >> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
> >> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
> >> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>
> >> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response
> >> something like "So the FCC at some time in the past
> >> created band segments by mode
> >> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."
> >
> >Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
> >be 10 wpm ...
>
> Hold it right there. Tell the WHOLE story.

OK ... no problem ... nothing to hide here.

> The code test speed for US licenses (except the old Extra) was 10
> wpm from 1919 to 1936.

No argument so far ...

> >at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
> >the speed to 12.5 wpm ...
>
> That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the
> WRITTEN exam so that it required more radio knowledge in
> order to pass.

The letter refers to "A slight stiffening of the basic examination,"
then *discounts* the written exams as a means to the end of
limiting the number of hams. Clearly, from the letter, which
was published in an ARRL publication, as indicated, the
emphasis was on code as a filter to keep people out of ham
radio.

> > SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
> >hams "because the bands were too crowded."
>
> Incorrect.

NOT INCORRECT ... read on ...

Here are quotes from an article posted on the NCI website.
The specific URL to read the entire article is:

http://www.nocode.org/articles/filter.html

Begin quote from above-referenced article
****
In Clinton B. DeSoto's classic book, Two Hundred Meters and Down, The Story of Amateur Radio (Published by the American Radio Relay League in 1936) is the following passage on page 179. DeSoto was a highly placed ARRL official at the time his book was written and published, so we assume it represents League thinking.

"The growth of amateur radio and the total number of amateurs will doubtless be controlled in the future. The present condition of the amateur bands, while not intolerable, approaches saturation. ... [The number of amateurs at the time was 46,000] DeSoto goes on:

"Obviously no competent person can be denied the right to become an amateur. The only justifiable restrictive procedure is to raise the standards of competency. This has already been done to the point where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's license than it was ten years ago. Increasing the code speed equirement is one step in this direction. ..."

DeSoto goes on to say that additional restrictions are not needed since "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained relatively constant during the past two years. A slight stiffening of the basic examination, together with the increased code-speed requirement, would accomplish the desired result."

At the 1936 annual ARRL Board Meeting held in West Hartford, CT) the Board "...voted to ask [the] FCC to raise the code speed requirement on license exams to 12.5 wpm..
[From Official Broadcast 671, May 10, 1936]

A letter was then sent by Mr. K. B. Warner, ARRL General Manager, to the FCC requesting a code speed increase from 10 to 12 words per minute. Here are some quotes from Warner's letter:

"It has become desirable to raise the general standard of qualification for an amateur operator license. Observations show that too many licensed amateurs do not possess the qualifications presupposed by the regulations. Considering that the written part of the examination may be mastered with relative ease, the chief opportunity for a better selective process resides with the code examination. ..." [That is pretty clear!]

"A general raising of the standards could help to confine the obviously limited facilities of amateur radio to those who have at least nominal aptitude for the same. It seems indicated that this situation could be best treated by an increase in the code speed. Consequently the League now requests the Commission to increase the code speed required in the amateur examination

from ten words per minute to twelve and one-half words per minute."
****

It's clear from the above that the ARRL, at the time, wanted to
"control the population" and that the bands, with ~46k amateurs
were "approaching saturation."

The referenced letter also states that "the chief opportunity for
a better selective process resides with the code examination."

The final paragraph above ALSO indicates QUITE CLEARLY
that the increase in code speed which the ARRL requested was
TO CONTROL THE NUMBER OF AMATEURS.

>
> The concerns were:
>
> 1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded

I find that hard to swallow with well more than an order of
magnitude fewer hams than today ... also, even if it
were true, which I don't buy, a better solution than
"controlling the population" would have been to encourage
folks to spread out a bit by using the other bands, which
you insinuate were not "so crowded."

And what about the "superior spectral efficency of CW,"
which was the predominant mode at the time?

> 2) many newcomers were getting on the air with insufficient
> skill AND TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE for the conditions of
> the day

Sorry, but there is no indication in the letter requesting that
the code speed be increased to control the population that
the ARRL sought "better written tests" ... only that they asked
that the code speed be increased to keep people out.
(There was a vague mention of "a slight stiffening of
the basic examination," but in the end, the ARRL doesn't
specifically request a tougher written test, nor does the FCC
appear to respond with such action ... only an increase in
code speed ... see the entire article ...)

> 3) the explosive growth (the number of US hams TRIPLED
> from 1929's ~16,000 in less than 5 years)

Still, the indications are that there were ~ 46k hams .. FAR
fewer than the 600k+ of today ... and at that time, I would
suspect that far more hams were using CW ... which is,
according to its proponents, "extremely spectrally efficient,"
so, even given that receiver selectivity was not as good in
those days as today, I find the argument unconvincing.
(I don't believe that receivers were more than 10x worse

than today, and there must have been FAR fewer hams,
as a percentage using any form of voice.)

> 4) high turnover (as many as 40% of hams not renewing, at
> a time when the license term was 3 years

Neither is this mentioned in the record to which I referred ...
and if so many hams were dropping out, why the concern
that the bands would become "saturated?"

> 5) increasing numbers of TECHNICAL violations (out of
> band, harmonics, hum, chirps, etc.) wreaking havoc on
> other services and threatening the reputation of the ARS.

I see no direct mention of this in the ARRL's letter to the FCC,
either ... if it was, indeed, such big problem, why didn't the
ARRL mention it? Why did they *discount* improvements
in the written tests and focus ONLY on increasing code speed?
(And why only in reference to "controlling the population?")

> Many of these violations were the result of inexperience
> and a "don't care" attitude.

Lacking supporting evidence (which I'm open to consider),
I can only suspect that this assertion is your opinion or
conjecture.

> The solution proposed by the ARRL leadership and accepted
> by the FCC was a slight rise in the code test speed AND new
> written tests. Funny how the written test changes are forgotten.

"The written test changes" were not "forgotten" ... they were not
mentioned in the ARRL's request. In fact, the written tests were
specifically discounted in the letter as a solution to the "problem,"
and instead ONLY an increase in code speed was requested.
(And again, only in the context of "controlling the population.")

> >(at the time, the
> >total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
> >so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)
>
> Incorrect again. Carl, do you know what the amateur bands were in
>1936? Do you know how they were used? Do you know what the
> typical amateur station equipment was like in those days? Or how
>many hours/week a typical amateur was on the air?

I wasn't born at the time ... were you? (If you are that much older
than me, were you licensed and on the air at the time?) However,
I recognized above that while receivers weren't as good as they
are today, there were also more than an order of magnitude less
hams than today and voice operation was not the norm, with most
operators using CW.

> The argument was NOT "absurd" once all the FACTS are known.

I still think the argument was absurd. It's not the first time you
and I have disagreed ...

> >The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
> >for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...
>
> Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2.
> Then 5 wpm was added.

Yes, for a novice license, good for 1 year, non-renewable.
"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
(Some "welcome"!!!)

> >Was this decision made "for good reason" ???
>
> They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are
> you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?

Yes, I think so ... if you read the entire article, you'll find out
that the FCC Chief Engineer at the time sounded a LOT like
Larry or Dick "If you can't do 25-30 wpm, you're not much of
an operator." In fact, he states the view in his reply that "An
operator whose top speed is not more than 12 words per
minute would be classed as a poor operator."
(Sounds a LOT like Larry or Dick ...)

> Them's the historic facts, Carl.

Sorry ... but the letter from the ARRL to the FCC and the
FCC's response don't seem to support your assertions ...

I respectfully decline to concede, absent some more
compelling evidence that your assertions are not little
more than conjecture.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHlc8Ze+N6+q84HiEQIDfQCg5FWhi+TjK93mYf0Za1yYA2scEZQAoOoC
UNUriFujNAhOveGfbx7qAWkj
=gixL
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5784. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:40:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C795DCF.1A0737D9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35290

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org...
> > Joshua Houk wrote:
> > > The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> > > later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > > tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > > beneath the iron and concrete.
> >
> > One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
>
> If the story is true, that's probably what *really* happened - slightly
> embellished to prove how important morse code is.

I don't think I could read Morse telegraph code which is what tapping
would have to be. I wonder how many hams can read Morse telegraph clicks?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5785. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:41:11 UTC
From: Loose Connection <YoMomma@anon.com>
Message-ID: <a5bmiqhjm0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35288
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a5bla2egu6@dosa.alt.net...
>
> <cbjunkie@cb.org.au> wrote in message
> news:24549151.00010ebf.076@drn.newsguy.com...
> > In article <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" says...
> > >
> > >hello ole capt. peckers:
> > >
> > >> I wonder if after all of this is done
> > >> and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
> > >> or whatever the heck he calls it will still
> > >> retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
> > >> status...? Methinks not.
> > >
> > >i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have
someone
> > >take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there are
> so
> > >many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the
> wrong
> > >way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought
> that
> > >equipment.
> > >
> > >phil :)
> >
> >
> > This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own
hands
> type.
> > I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham Radio
> have a
> > 15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people
> like him
> > getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.
>
> Llllardasssss Llllloyd N0VFP who's been qrming on HF with only a
> technician license will get a letter soon, too.

Like the ones you got Wiseman?

--
I've learned that the greater a person's sense
of guilt, the greater his or her need to cast blame on others.

5786. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:45:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C795F07.7FD751D1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35291

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I simply *can't* resist reporting that the FCC

> asked me to present the Draft US Proposal on WRC-03 Agenda
> Item 1.7.1 ... the revision of S25 of the ITU Radio Regs :-)
>

That should come as a surprise, or what? If you bother to check
back you'll find that I've said for years that our spectrum WILL be
removed from our allocations as it is needed for commercial enterprises.
So who better to lead that assault than a licensed ham who is too dense
to understand what he is being used to do? One that has no use for hams
other than those who feels exactly as he does. One who insists his
experience at cordless telephone design trumps everthing else in
AMATEUR RADIO.

The scenario couldn't have come out better for the benefit of commercial
frequency grabbers if Reed Hundt had written it himself. In fact, it shouldn't

be too much of a surprise to find that he did.

Hey, once the ARS is converted to a majority of CBers and cordless fone
jocks, the rest is a piece of cake.

5787. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:54:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C796145.D92C4C13@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35294

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of your "honest
> > opinions".
>
> Did you ever notice that my honest opinion rarely contains dirty words
> and your honest opinion almost always contains dirty words? Does that
> tell you anything?
>

Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long time ago.

5788. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 21:56:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c79625f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35295

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2d03ba1c3ba5a989698@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a5badg$r1s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > NCI didn't "slam" anyone either. The posting of the individual's
> > actual text is all that was done.
>
> A typical lie from the board of NCI.
>
> Is this "[t]he posting of the individual's actual text"?:
>
> "William A. Tynan, W3XO, Files Scathing "Reply Comments" in RM-9673.
> Bill Tynan, W3XO, a well-known VHF DXer, former QST columnist, and
> former President of AMSAT NA, was involved in the filing of and is
> apparently an ardent supporter of the CSVHFS' Petition for
Rulemaking.
> A number of major organizations have filed comments in opposition
to
> the CSVHFS' Petition, including the ARRL, the Texas VHF FM Society,
> the 220 Spectrum Management Association of Southern California, and
> NCI. In his "Reply Comments" W3XO systematically attacks all of
these
> comments in opposition to his desired outcome in the Proceeding,
> questioning both the motives and the integrity of the organizations
in
> question. He also insinuates that new operators are at the root of
the
> (alleged) "problem" which the Petition "seeks to remedy,"..."

No, that is the "lead" to the posting of the actual text of
Mr. Tynan's comments ... they WERE"scathing," he DID
"systematically attack" all of the opposing comments, and
he DID "question both the motives and the integrity of the
organizations in question."

THAT was a PURELY FACTUAL "lead" or "pointer" to
the link to the actual, unabridged text of Mr. Tynan's Reply
Comments. I wrote it and I stand by it.

The "Articles" page on NCI's website always has some sort
of "lead," pointing to a link to the full text, unless the bit of news

is so brief (1 or 2 short paragraphs) that is makes sense to just
place it on the main "Articles" page ...

Obviously, you seem to have a problem with factual reporting
of news ... at least when the news (or the reporter) are not to
your liking in terms of fitting your agenda.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHlhjJe+N6+q84HiEQJV8wCfeDwofKC6YC8Vfbyjfp7AjIHev9IAoK81
Yt4rOPzGlhsfrdDkI9Z3D0WH
=m1Kg
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5789. Re: Software - Text to CW ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:01:14 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c7962b4@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 35296
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello Pete,
Yes I sure do! Morse Tutor Gold will do that and a lot more. While learning CW myself I tried several freeware - and - commercial CW software tutor programs. Morse Tutor Gold is the Cadillac of all of them IMHO. Here is the link to their homepage and from there you can order.

GGTE Amateur Radio Software
http://www.ggte.com/

It is also available through HRO outlets and the ARRL organization....good luck. Morse Tutor Gold took me well past 20wpm with great ease and flexibility in lesson structure....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

5790. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:17:07 UTC
From: "Mark S. Holden" <mark@bmas.org>
Message-ID: <3C796663.ADE3C17C@bmas.org>
Source record: 35299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

KC8JBO wrote:
>

> Llllardasssss Llllloyd N0VFP who's been qrming on HF with only a
> technician license will get a letter soon, too.

Roger:

Do you ever post anything besides qrm on the news groups?

I can't speak for the other news groups, but Lloyd has been generally
well behaved for several weeks in rrs.

Perhaps you could learn something from him.

5791. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:18:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7966DA.743D98F0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35298

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> > > > people.
> > >
> > > From inside the collapsed World Trade Center? What a strange thing to say.
> >
> > ????? Collapsed buildings give out all sorts of creaks, groans and "tap" sounds.
>
> Dick, I was talking about people who can tell the difference between human tapping
> and nonhuman tapping. I'm sorry you are not one of those people. When you hear
> a woodpecker, do you automatically assume someone is sending an 'SOS'? ROTFL
> -

Oh, we know, You're a master of changing meanings in mid thread. We see it
from you all the time. Meanwhile you insist I dot every i and cross every t.
Whatta horses ass.

5792. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:19:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224171956.11767.00000281@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35300

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>The ARRL is amking a comment on a petition for rulemaking, not a reply
>comment on somebody else's comment on a proposed rulemaking.

It would be very unlikely that ARRL would file Comments without also filing Reply Comments. The very purpose of Reply Comments is to reply to the comments filed by others. ARRL routinely does so, and in doing so, most often discusses the Comments filed by others and why ARRL believes them to be wrong.

When the restructuring proposal was on the plate, ARRL filed extensive Reply Comments. Included in those Reply Comments was considerable verbiage about both NCI's and Carl Stevenson's Comments.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/01/21/3/

Note that although ARRL disagreed with Carl, there are no major hard feelings involved on either side. The system is a matter of due process and the system is more important than the outcome in any individual case.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5793. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:24:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224172416.11767.00000282@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35451

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>They cover such in the ARRL (emailed) newsletter. Do you subscribe?

Virtually all of the ARRL Letter is also included on the news crawl on the arrl.org web site. That is where I found the story that ARRL posted about its Reply Comments wrt restructuring.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5794. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:26:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224172640.11767.00000283@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35452

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Perhaps the difficulty is rooted in your (IMHO, overly generous)
>assumption that Dick's words HAVE value :-)

Of course some of Dick's words have value. Unfortunately, that value is often lost.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5795. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:33:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224173343.11767.00000284@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35453

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long time
>ago.

Cecil, it is another one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5796. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:34:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35454

Joshua Houk wrote:

I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't

> fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
> Well, *that* certainly didn't work out.

Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat. Happens here all the time. Meanwhile they're too lazy to just meet the qualifications
and go all the way even to persuading the bureaucrat in the FCC who runs ham radio rule making into doing exactly what they want. Hey, he isn't about to get them down on him, just to save basic radio communications.

5797. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:40:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224174024.11767.00000285@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35455

And no one should memorize how to wash clothes. The technique should be developed from first principles each time. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 2/24/02 9:40 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c78fb8f$1_1@news7.fast.net>
>
>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C76E99F.AD9B8840@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>>
>> W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> >
>> > >Absolute fact: I am trying to sell a Maytag clothes washer in very good
>> > >condition.
>> > >So far no takers. Guess they are too reliable.
>> >
>> > Either that or new people who entered the human race since you entered
>are too
>> > lazy to wash their clothes unless there is a government test that will
>help
>> > them see that clothes washing is a good thing.
>>
>> Ah, yes. And washing clothing is so difficult task no one will learn
>> to do it unless there is a test to pass which results in a permit issued.
>>
>
>And I'll bet that Dick would just LOVE to see several grades of
>clothes-washing permits, based on a demonstration of how fast
>your could wash a given amount of clothes to a prescribed degree
>of cleanliness.
>
>Of course, this would have to be done on an old-fashioned
>washboard in a wooden tub ... no washing machine
>assistance allowed, because " 'REAL' clothes washers do it
>manually and shun the use of washing machines."
>
>I'll bet thatDick would even go for a special "Extra Class" permit
>for those who would forego the washboard and tub and do their

>washing on the rocks in a stream ("like in the good old days") :-)
>
>Carl - wa6vse
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

5798. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:42:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35456

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> > > > > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
> > > >
> > > > That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...
> > >
> > > Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
> > > consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
> > > sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
> > > opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?
> >
> > You're ignorance is showing again, Genius. When a radio op is in the
> > process of passing urgent communications and the band dies so that
> > SSB can't do the job, and CW still can, the time remaining to pass the traffic
> > on CW is almost always far more than enough, before the band totally tanks-
> > if indeed it happens on that particular occasion that it actually goes completely
> > dead so that CWwon't get through, either. It certainly isn't "fleeting".
>
> What you have described is a fleeting, transitory period of time, Dick. Why
> don't you ever crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself? Nothing
> I said contradicts your above statement. Nothing you said contradicts what
> I said. In fact, your description is one of the dictionary definitions of
> "fleeting".
>

Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters. If it isn't Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not applied) logic.

I can't seem to get it through to him. When a communicator is trying to get a message passed, and SSB tanks but CW is still going strong he couldn't care less what Webster has to say about obscure word definitions. Especailly when they are chosen by a Trollmeister.

5799. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:48:03 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242237400.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35457

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
>news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
>> W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >>What gives the Congress the right to
>> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
>> >
>> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto with
>state
>> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
>>
>> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.
>
>OK to a point.
>
>> The government passed the
>> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods
>
>No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves ...

Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for television and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza dish" satellite antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as the cite, but I could be wrong), which specifically indicated that it overrode any CC&R's which would otherwise be in conflict.

>contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
>restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
>elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract
>that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
>in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
>Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
>interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.
>
>>... I am saying that
>> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
>> oversteps the authority of the government.
>
>It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
>stipulation.

And the government can always [indirectly] change what elements are necessary for a valid contract:

- The parties must have the authority to enter into it, and
- The contract must be legally enforcible.

With a law that specifically sets aside CC&R contracts with regard to certain actions, that cancels the enforcibility requirement; i.e. the HOA for the area cannot sue the individual homeowner when he followed a state law that OVERRODE the CC&R's agreement. The individual has a valid defense that cannot be defeated. The HOA must first challenge the law and win.

>> They can say you can have
>> antennas 6 feet long and no higher then 12 feet at your home, but they can
>> not disallow the reception of any type of legal transmission. In case you
>> are not aware the Supreme court says that broadcasts are free speech and
>the
>> government can not prevent the reception of those broadcasts.
>
>So if I want to put a 100 foot tower up to recieve SW broadcasts, are
>you suggesting the town I live in must allow that?
>
>> No CC&R has a rule that the reception of a broadcasts is against the
>rules
>> in the USA. The government opened the door for antennas, but overstepped
>> it's authority on what radio transmissions you can receive on that
>antenna.
>> Using your logic if I have a home entertainment center and use that TV
>> antenna for FM Stereo reception also I am violating the CC&R.
>
>The CC&R almost always prohibits ANY antenna...the FCC preemption
>was created for only very specific exceptions. So far that hasn't
>been overturned. In the case you bring up (FM Stereo), let's be
>serious...no one in the neighborhood would likly push the issue
>because FM Stereo recievers usually don't lead to neighborhood
>RFI issues which almost always are the precipitating incident(s)
>which get the nieghbor(s) on the CC&R enforcement warpath.
>
>> You are wrong
>> to think the government or neighborhood association has such authority. I
>> will concede that radio transmissions may not be covered, but reception is
>> a different story.
>
>As before, your stawman doesn't help your ham radio use in any case.
>
>> I'm talking to a stubborn person.
>
>More that folks around this newssgroup have had considerable
>experience(s) with CC&R applicability, past case law, etc. Don't
>kill the messenger just because the message isn't something you
>don't agree with. For now, your legal logic has NOT been
>the rule of the day in the various cases Phil K and others have
>knowledge of or participated in. If you have others, please
>share them.

5800. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:52:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242250180.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35458

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220552280.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202210539220.18661-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >> On Wed, 20 Feb 2002, Jim Kelley wrote:
>> >> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> >> >> You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only
>if
>> >they
>> >> >> provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate
>in
>> >> >> any way are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>> >> >
>> >> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
>> >>
>> >> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
>> >> between the two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.
>> >
>> >There always is a clear distinction between the two.
>> >
>> >CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
>> >private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
>> >vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
>> >are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
>> >notices from zoning, etc.)
>>
>> That "governmental" action is still a civil matter. No difference.
>
>Wrong! In the one case, THE government is the
>plaintiff and is directly taking the action to enforce
>the ordinance in question. In the CC&R cases, the
>government is ONLY providing the venue (the court)
>where the issue is adjudicated beween the two
>civil parties.

Still no difference. It is still a civil matter. The fact that in one case,
the government is a party and in the other, it is not, does not elevate the one
involving the government to be some other sort of matter, such as criminal, nor
does it invoke Constitutional protections.

5801. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:52:49 UTC
From: xpyttl <xpyttl_nospam@earthling.net>
Message-ID: <u7irmv2qkse585@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35459
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Zoran Brlecic" <WA7AA@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:3C7955F6.F900BD1F@attbi.com...

> Right... Don't join. When they come to take away your frequencies

This month's Scientific American had an article on using power lines for LAN connections. When I saw that they had broken the 4-20MHz spectrum up into 84 wideband channels it really raised my eyebrows. Sounded like a great opportunity to QRM almost all the HF bands. And are we really going to get on our neighbors case because their computer is keeping us off 40 though 15?

But then I read a little further. They blocked out the ham bands from their frequency plan. Seems they knew the League would be all over them like a cheap suit. Looks like they learned a lesson from the RFID crowd. Not clear who is going to win that one yet, but the League has kept them from wrecking 440 for several years now.

..

5802. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:52:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C796ECB.7E6C15C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35460

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of your "honest
> > > opinions".
> >
> > Did you ever notice that my honest opinion rarely contains dirty words
> > and your honest opinion almost always contains dirty words? Does that
> > tell you anything?
>
> Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long time ago.

Got news for you, Dick. After a plethora of dirty words, nobody listens to you anymore, even if you are right. Try out your approach on a street corner. If you called me a horse's ass on 40m CW, do you think the FCC would mind?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5803. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:55:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C796F46.2CE0BEA9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35464

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long time
> >ago.
>
> Cecil, it is another one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" things.

If Dick is himself on CW, he may be the first person in
history to get a NAL while using CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5804. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:57:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5br7c$73u$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35463

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2d03ba1c3ba5a989698@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a5badg$r1s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > NCI didn't "slam" anyone either. The posting of the individual's
> > actual text is all that was done.
>
> A typical lie from the board of NCI.
>
> Is this "[t]he posting of the individual's actual text"?:
>
> "William A. Tynan, W3XO, Files Scathing "Reply Comments" in RM-9673. Bill
> Tynan, W3XO, a well-known VHF DXer, former QST columnist, and former
> President of AMSAT NA, was involved in the filing of and is apparently an
> ardent supporter of the CSVHFS' Petition for Rulemaking. A number of
> major organizations have filed comments in opposition to the CSVHFS'
> Petition, including the ARRL, the Texas VHF FM Society, the 220 Spectrum
> Management Association of Southern California, and NCI. In his "Reply
> Comments" W3XO systematically attacks all of these comments in opposition
> to his desired outcome in the Proceeding, questioning both the motives
> and the integrity of the organizations in question. He also insinuates
> that new operators are at the root of the (alleged) "problem" which the
> Petition "seeks to remedy,"..."

Josh,

If you consider that a "slam" then I'd avoid reading any newspapers
on any day of the week.

As to including more than the actual text, so be it.
That was incomplete research on my part based on your prior
comments. Never-the-less...shame on me. Regardless...
if you still think there's something unethical, unfair, or whatever
as to NCI stating what we did...then get out of the kitchen
if you can't stand the heat.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5805. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:57:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C796FD9.A4E66DEE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35461

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> Is the statement "my work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue" anything like "I
> did not have sex with that woman?" :o
>
> Kim W5TIT

What a peculiar thing to write. I'm not a former president or former elected official, have not been involved in a sexual scandal in my office or otherwise and there were no women involved in the scenario at all. Other than those few minor details, you probably have it 100% correct, Tugboat.

Dave K8MN

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C786DA3.497369BA@earthlink.net...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3C77C6B3.3E656666@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >>
> > > >> In article <3C766B2C.AB7849FA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > > ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > >> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >Len Over and over and over and over 21 wrote:
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> In article <MPG.16deaf05e47f1df098968a@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
> Joshua
> > > >> >Houk
> > > >> >> <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> >In article <3C750307.80C2C480@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> says...
> > > >> >> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > >> He doesn't have a handle on Cecil's five decades of amateur radio
> > > >> experience, either. In fact, he doesn't seem to have a handle.
> > > >
> > > >Cecil is a ham. You aren't.
> > >

> > > Like me, Cecil Moore is a thinking human being. You aren't.
> >
> > How pathetic you are.
> >
> > > Like me, Cecil Moore is a retired professional in radio-electronics
> > > of long experience in industry. Dave Heil worked for government.
> >
> > ...and the point of this is? You aren't Cecil. You aren't me. You
> > aren't a ham.
> >
> > > >> I don't portray myself as Heil does,
> > > >> giving everyone a snow-job on his "wonderful idea" of using CW
> > > >> as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit for State Department from
> > > >> an Embassy (!!!) in Guinea-Bissau. Rather NON-amateur,
> > > >> wasn't that? Of course it was. Of course it was also a snow-job.
> > > > >
> > > >There was no snow job. It wasn't my idea. I did not describe it as
> > > >"wonderful".
> > >
> > > The exact words were more like a "neat idea" and the claim was
> > > as a "personal innovation." it was intended to prove some kind of
> > > point on the superiority of CW over teleprinter. It did not prove
> > > anything except that snow jobs can grow in hot weather.
> >
> > Post it or stuff it. There was no claim that it is something I
> > originated. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not at issue.
> >
> > > >I used a system which was in place. That you don't
> > > >understand the reasons for its use make it no less true and no less
> > > >effective.
> > >
> > > The first excuse/rationalization was that "the circuit needed to
> > > be synchronized." That was a technically false statement since
> > > teleprinters are all designed to be self-synchronizing to the
> > > remote transmitter.
> >
> > I don't know what sort of crypto devices you used on asynchonous
> > circuits back in the dark ages, Len. You write now as you wrote then,
> > from an uninformed point of view. My work in Guina-Bissau is not an
> > issue.
> >
> > > Heil later "amended" that to mean "synchronizing schedules and
> > > frequencies" which is not yet understandable in commercial-
> > > government practice. If a teleprinter terminal is working at all,
> > > a full set of "schedules" and other data can be transmitted to
> > > both ends of a circuit, identical in content at each end.
> > >
> > > Had the excuse/rationale been given that a teleprinter was "down"
> > > (not working), then use of CW would be perfectly understandable
> > > and acceptible. That was NOT given.

> >
> > We had no teleprinter down and I've never offered an "excuse". Morse
> > was used for openings, closings, QSYs and crypto set. For more than
> > this you have no need to know and no clearance. My work in Guina-Bissau
> > is not at issue.
> >
> > > >You didn't understand it then. You don't understand it now. The
> > > >discussion back then was government use of morse. It was then used.
> > > >That you don't accept that is of not much consequence.
> > >
> > > Incorrect. Heil made the initial remark claiming some personally-
> > > conceived innovation, not on "government use of morse" but of
> > > trying to prove a point of morse modes over teleprinter.
> >
> > Show us the statement I made, Len or clam up. This is simply another of
> > your attempts at diversion. My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue.
> >
> > > A much later excuse/rationale claimed that such switchover in
> > > modes was some kind of State Department "radio doctrine" or
> > > "procedure" to use morse modes as an order-wire on a teleprinter
> > > circuit. That defies understanding considering that teleprinters
> > > over radio had already been in use throughout the US government
> > > and military for over 30 years prior to the 1980s. USN and other
> > > military procedures on teleprinter circuits are given in a 1967
> > > USN text used by all branches. Existing for 15 years prior to this
> > > alleged innovation, it explains "synchronization" and also "order-
> > > wires."
> >
> > That you don't understand it does not negate its reality or its value.
> > Instead of saying that something "defies understanding", why not just
> > admit that YOU don't understand it?
> >
> > My work in Guinea-Bissau is not an issue. By the way, I didn't work for
> > the Navy or any other branch of the U.S. military in Africa.
> >
> > > >You've gotten more than this part twisted, Leonardo. I'm not
> attempting
> > > >to constantly post my past exploits.
> > >
> > > Again, incorrect. Heil has done so in the past.
> >
> > All anyone needs to do is research your past posts and research mine.
> > They are there for all to see and they'd reveal you to be a fabricator
> > as well as a non-radio amateur.
> >
> > > >I am a ham. You aren't.
> > >
> > > Heil is a radio amateur. I am a radio professional.
> >
> > You aren't a radio anything. The past is past. You eat up the present

> > with your posts here. Ham radio can only be in the future for you.
> >
> > > >You're an SWL with attitude.
> > >
> > > My attitude as a BCL, SWL, TVW and as a radio professional is
> > > that I enjoy all of it. Wouldn't do it if there was no enjoyment.
> >
> > Bully for you. Continue your enjoyment as listener, viewer and sidewalk
> > superintendent.
> >
> > > I might enjoy amateur radio as well, but certain attitudinally-
> > > oriented rank-status-privilege-by-mode-and-tenure "superiors"
> > > insist that I must only enjoy what they personally enjoy.
> >
> > Piffle! If you are holding back for those reasons, I'm afraid you'll be
> > doomed to being forever an onlooker.
> >
> > > >You've made no attempt to actually become a ham.
> > >
> > > Incorrect. I've never carried it as far an amateur radio license
> > > examination.
> >
> > So you rocketed to the fore only to skip taking the exam through which
> > you'd actually have become a ham.
> >
> > > >You simply haunt a ham radio newsgroup on the internet.
> >
> > > Incorrect again, a false assumption.
> >
> > It's the only conclusion which can be made about you given the
> > information available.
> >
> > > >You won't become a newcomer until you enter amateur radio. I'm not
> > > >discussing vehicles or Zambonis. I'm discussing Leonard H. Anderson,
> > > >non-ham, newcomer-to-be (maybe).
> > >
> > > Heil is not "discussing" but venting frustration on an individual
> > > he has not been able to best on a newsgroup.
> >
> > Len you don't even realize when you've been bested. Ask around.
> >
> > > >You've misread my statement much as you've misread others. This one
> was
> > > >simply an observation.
> > >
> > > Not at all. Heil exhibits an extreme need to win all "discussions"
> > > including methods of deprecating and denigrating others who do
> > > not share his viewpoints. Standard Operating Procedure. :-)
> >
> > What does "Anderson" do? Could it be that he attributes to others the

> > characteristics he himself possesses?
> >
> > >
> > > >> Heil has made all kinds of statements of the OBLIVIOUS with that
> > > >> tired old CW-uber-alles speechmaking. Jay-suss, big Dave, did
> > > >> they toss you out of the Bund meeting again? Poor guy.
> > > >
> > > >Another Nazi reference, Len? In which statement did I mention CW?
> > >
> > > "Uber" (over) and "alles" (all) and "bund" are all German words.
> > > Not all Germans are/were NAZIs. "Heil" as a surname is
> > > Germanic and means a salute or honor as a German word.
> > > Is Heil a NAZI?!?
> >
> > The word "Heil" has several meanings. I'm not German but American.
> > Perhaps you noticed that I don't have a DL, DK or DJ callsign. I don't
> > speak or read German. I do know that "gesundheit" is a German word.
> > You didn't use it. In which statement did I mention CW?
> >
> > > >Does this mean you already have an ARRL tee-shirt?
> > >
> > > No.
> > >
> > > >I work DX, contest, handle traffic and rag-chew using a number of
> modes,
> > > >Len. Which modes do you use when you frequent the ham bands?
> > >
> > > I have no authorization to be a control operator of an amateur
> > > radio station. I do not "frequent the ham bands" (presuming Heil
> > > means only those bands below 30 MHz). Why would Heil imply
> > > that I break the law?!?
> >
> > You assume too much. I said "ham bands". Do you frequent ham bands
> > above 30 MHz?
> >
> > > >I even
> > > >have 2m FM QSOs with those who have never passed a code test. After
> > > >all, THEY are hams.
> > >
> > > We had ham last night (Thursday) for supper. Quite good.
> > > Tasted just like ham. ;-)
> >
> > That is simply sophomoric.
> >
> > > I have semi-regular communications on UHF above the amateur
> > > 70 cm band, moved from above the amateur 2m band. NONE of
> > > the communicators need or needed code testing. After all, WE
> > > are professionals, carrying on business. :-)
> >
> > This is an amateur radio newsgroup, Len. I asked you about the ham

> > bands. We don't carry on commercial business.
> >
> > > I am well aware of the elitist attitude of some that NO ONE can
> > > possibly discuss ANYTHING involving amateur radio until they
> > > are authorized by a government amateur license. That includes
> > > petitioning my government for a redress of grievances, a right
> > > supposedly granted by the US Constitution.
> >
> > I feel your pain, Len. All of those lengthy posts here; all of that
> > hard work prepping your anti-code testing diatribe for the Commission
> > and STILL no one takes you seriously!
> >
> > > I'm also postitive that Heil will be upset (to some degree) by this
> > > response and will continue with his regular routine of insisting on
> > > conformist attitudes and demanding that others enjoy what he
> > > enjoys whether they like it or not. He is not correctable even if
> > > wrong. Matters not. :-)
> >
> > Naw, Len. By this time I realize that you've reached true geezerhood
> > and that you'll never actually attempt entry into amateur radio. You
> > exist here simply to stir up crap. To my knowledge, that is your only
> > purpose in showing up.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

5806. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:58:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242253070.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35462

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220547400.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On 22 Feb 2002, W1RFI wrote:
>> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>> >
>> >>You're forgetting about PRB-1. Remember that CC&R's are valid only if
>they
>> >>provide for a reasonable accomodation. Those which don't accomodate in
>any
>> >>way
>> >>are blatently invalid and trumped by the FCC's ruling.
>> >
>> >Absolutely incorrect. CC&Rs relating to amateur antennas are not
>pre-empted by
>> >anything from the feds.
>>
>> Perhaps CC&R's voluntarily entered into aren't, but NOT those
>INVOLUNTARILY
>> entered into (i.e. properties acquired by other than purchase - such as
>> inherited [some cases; not all], tax sales, foreclosure sales, etc....).
>
>I'll let Phil add any of the legal details, but everything
>I know about regarding such transfers of property
>do NOT, in any way, invalidate the CC&Rs. That's
>no different than the bank mortgage still being
>in effect as an outstanding lien against the property
>that needed to be paid for title to pas to the "new
>owner" who inherited the property.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Well, what you know is apparently deficient. It might work your way over in NJ, but we're discussing California law and CC&R's (clear by the title of this thread). Involuntary conversions do not carry the CC&R's with them here. If they did, people could easily be denied loans on the grounds that banks don't like the CC&R's (and for no other reason), on the risk that the bank could end up with the property upon foreclosure. I certainly don't practice banking law, but such an action may even violate federal "fair credit" laws; I'd have to check.

5807. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 22:59:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C797063.162B76D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35467

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What you have described is a fleeting, transitory period of time, Dick. Why
> > don't you ever crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself? Nothing
> > I said contradicts your above statement. Nothing you said contradicts what
> > I said. In fact, your description is one of the dictionary definitions of
> > "fleeting".
>
> Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters. If it isn't
> Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not applied) logic.
>
> I can't seem to get it through to him. When a communicator is trying to get a message
> passed, and SSB tanks but CW is still going strong he couldn't care less what Webster
> has to say about obscure word definitions. Especailly when they are
> chosen by a Trollmeister.

The argument is not over whether CW sometimes gets through after SSB fails, Dick.
The argument is over the definition of, "fleeting", an on that count your ignorance
outshines a supernova. I was on 17m awhile ago and CW faded until the signal
was unintelligible. Of course, with your 150dB ears, that never happens to you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5808. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:00:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242259430.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35465

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Keith wrote:
>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
>>have to worry about going to jail.
>
> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to detach a
>shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then I
>can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.

Yes, but you would be jailed for the CONTEMPT issue, not for the detachment issue. You're associating the action with the wrong cause.

5809. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:02:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242301360.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35466

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
>news:a5afpp02srv@enews3.newsguy.com...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> >The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
>> >have to worry about going to jail.
>>
>> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to detach a
>> shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then I
>> can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.
>
>You have stretched your case far beyond reality in almost any
>situation. Just how many times has anyone been found
>in contempt.
>
>Additionally, I don't know (Phil K query follows) if
>being jailed for contempt of cout qualifies as a criminal
>charge/finding?

As a charge: No. Why? There's no trial.
A finding is a necessary step before the imprisonment, and technically, any event where the result includes incarceration is a criminal matter by definition.

>Regardless, your constant referencing to criminal
>is at the extreme end of the spectrum regardless of
>what you want others to believe.

5810. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:03:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C797155.4E8C313@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35469

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The scenario couldn't have come out better for the benefit of commercial
> frequency grabbers if Reed Hundt had written it himself. In fact, it shouldn't
> be too much of a surprise to find that he did.

Huhhhhhh? Dick, you've completely lost it. What on earth could dropping the
Morse code requirement have to do with losing ham frequencies???? The frequencies
that hams are most likely to lose are the ones where nocode techs are allowed to
reside.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5811. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:04:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C79717E.50F0E368@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35471

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Perhaps the difficulty is rooted in your (IMHO, overly generous)
> >assumption that Dick's words HAVE value :-)
>
> Of course some of Dick's words have value. Unfortunately, that value is often
> lost.

Sad but true! He doesn't spend them wisely.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5812. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:05:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7971C8.836A73F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35472

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Oh, we know, You're a master of changing meanings in mid thread. We see it
> from you all the time. Meanwhile you insist I dot every i and cross every t.
> Whatta horses ass.

Well, Dick, you just did dot every i and cross every t. That wasn't so hard,
was it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5813. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:07:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C79720C.3299E7F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35468

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C786FF8.1EB13F51@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > I'll tell ya what, Dave. I invite you, or anyone else, to provide the
> > > message that was relayed via CW out of the most serious and devastating
> > > disaster I can think of recently here in the US. Was there one CW
> message
> > > sent to request help, relay site information, etc.? One?
> > >
> > > I doubt it.
> >
> > It matters no whether there was or not, Kim. What I said was:
> >
> > "Because you don't know morse well enough to use it and because you
> > don't like CW enough to be a regular user, you've drawn the conclusion
> > that there aren't enough folks using it for it to be reliable. That's
> > some s t r e t c h."
> >
> > Go debate your "what ifs" with someone else.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no farther
> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in recent
> disasters.

That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
little if anything about its use.

> I draw that conclusion based on stories I've read and hear
> about.

Right. You don't know anything about it and must rely on stories.

> My offer was to see if I am wrong; and the only way to do that is to
> have *real* examples of where CW has been used in a net condition during an
> emergency or disaster--other than for H&W, because it *IS* my opinion that
> CW is probably used more often in trafficking. However, on a second note,
> it is also my opinion that it is probably used less today than ever before,
> and will be used less and less as time goes on.

>
> We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
> agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW
> themselves. Why would we?

Because we use it and have it as one more tool available to us. Because
at HF the mode is second in popularity of use only to SSB.
>
> There is no "what if" Dave, there was an invitation you apparently cannot
> meet. I see I made my point. Glad you were able to understand.

No, you've failed to make your point. You seem to believe that if CW is
not used in one disaster or emergency situation, it will never be used.

Roll on the floor laughing some more of your ample bottom off over your
own simple notions.

Dave K8MN

5814. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:07:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C797224.B31A20D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35473

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> Happens here all the time.

Oh NO! The paranoids are after Dick again! And of course, he is blameless.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5815. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:08:29 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242303430.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35470

Depends on the policy of the testing group.

In my group, we have sufficient multiple versions of each test that we allow up to three attempts in any one session for any one element, time permitting (since we have to vacate the premises by a certain time). However, each retest requires the payment of another test fee. If a candidate only missed a test by 1-3 questions, we encourage at least one retest. At least half of them pass on the retest (so it seems - I'd have to go through our records to verify this).

Other groups sometimes don't have sufficient resources to give retests at the same session.

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Glen Houghton wrote:
>What is the waiting period to re-test if you fail the tech exam? Can you
>take it again on the spot or do you have to wait a period of time?
>
>Thanks
>
>Glen
>"> The cost is $10 per session, It's the same $10 if you take one element, all
>> 4 of them or anything in between. I do not know if it is always done this
>> way, but at the session I attended, the code test was given first. Whether
>> or not you pass this element, you can then sit for the Tech written test. If
>> you pass that, you can take the General written and if you pass that you can
>> take the Extra.

5816. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:13:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5bsv6$355$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35475

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net...
> Joshua Houk wrote:
> I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't
>
> > fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
> > Well, *that* certainly didn't work out.
>
> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help
asnwering one
> or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
goat.

No one needs to worm their way into making "you" the goat Dick,
your words...once again...as stated above do it all too well
without anyone helping.

> Happens here all the time. Meanwhile they're too lazy to just meet the
> qualifications

Another false claim. I've been a coded ham since before the 5wpm
min/max change. So has Cecil and many others.

> and go all the way even to persuading the bureaucrat in the FCC who runs
ham radio
> rule making into doing exactly what they want.

Let's see...there's one school of believers that say the FCC made
up their mind years ago and NCI had ZERO impact on the
changes...then you now give us (NCI) an outstanding
comment of support as to our (NCI) ability to persuade the
powers that be in the FCC.

>Hey, he isn't about to get them
> down on him, just to save basic radio communications.

What an unsubstantiated pile of garbage. Not a shred
of evidence or documentation to back up your half
backed assertion. No cigar...and I'd avoid public debate
if I were Dick.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>

5817. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:18:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5bsv7$355$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35477

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242237400.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> >news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> >> W1RFI wrote:
> >>
> >> >>What gives the Congress the right to
> >> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
> >> >
> >> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto with
> >state
> >> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
> >>
> >> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.
> >
> >OK to a point.
> >
> >> The government passed the
> >> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods
> >
> >No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves ...
>
> Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
television
> and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza dish" satellite
> antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as the cite, but I could
be
> wrong), which specifically indicated that it overrode any CC&R's which
would
> otherwise be in conflict.

BUT that ONLY covers the satellite/TV reception antenna. No
such luck from any state and/or FCC on that front so far.

> >contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
> >restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
> >elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract
> >that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
> >in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
> >Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
> >interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.
> >
> >>... I am saying that
> >> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only

> >> oversteps the authority of the government.
> >
> >It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
> >stipulation.
>
> And the government can always [indirectly] change what elements are
necessary
> for a valid contract:

True...BUT that hasn't happened at all for ham antennas
relative to CC&Rs.

> - The parties must have the authority to enter into it, and
> - The contract must be legally enforcible.
>
> With a law that specifically sets aside CC&R contracts with regard to
certain
> actions, that cancels the enforcibility requirement; i.e. the HOA for the
area
> cannot sue the individual homeowner when he followed a state law that
OVERRODE
> the CC&R's agreement. The individual has a valid defense that cannot be
> defeated. The HOA must first challenge the law and win.

Agree completely...BUT no such set aside exists for ham antennas...that
IS the point.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5818. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:21:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5bsv8$355$3@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35476

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242301360.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> >news:a5afpp02srv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> >> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >> >The issue is CONTRACT law, NOT criminal law...you really don't
> >> >have to worry about going to jail.
> >>
> >> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to
detach a
> >> shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then
I
> >> can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.
> >>
> >You have stretched your case far beyond reality in almost any
> >situation. Just how many times has anyone been found
> >in contempt.
> >
> >Additionally, I don't know (Phil K query follows) if
> >being jailed for contempt of cout qualifies as a criminal
> >charge/finding?
>
> As a charge: No. Why? There's no trial.
> A finding is a necessary step before the imprisonment, and technically,
any
> event where the result includes incarceration is a criminal matter by
> definition.

I don't believe that is true...Phil K...can you verify or clear
that up. My belief is based on the many attornies that
have been jailed for contempt yet they don't lose their
license to practice.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5819. Re: Software - Text to CW ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:27:17 UTC
From: peter@strg-alt-entf.org
Message-ID: <a5bssl$6478a$1@ID-31.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 35474
Cross-posted to: news.admin.net-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[x] Crosspost and follow up to news.admin.net-abuse.usenet

Your provider has been notified about your constant abuse of usenet.
Constantly crossposting as default behaviour of your news-client is
unacceptable behaviour by usenet standards. This is clearly stated in your
provider's terms of use, which can be read here:

http://www.bnb-lp.com/terms_of_service.html

Explicitly the following two paragraphs should make things rather clear to
you:

"Sending a message to many different off-topic newsgroups (Cross Posting),
is particularly unacceptable and will be treated as inappropriate posting
which may result in account suspension or cancellation.. You agree to abide
by BnB's policies concerning use of BnB's Internet Services. BnB reserves
the right to suspend access to service for your account(s) upon an
indication of disallowed use."

and

"You agree to pay a fine of $500 for flagrant disregard of allowable use
policies including sending unsolicited commercial email, spam, or via
posting commercial messages to Usenet discussion groups whose charter does
not explicitly allow advertisements. You also agree to reimburse BnB for any
costs involved in dealing with such incidents. BnB staff time will be billed
at $ 50.00 per hour. It is at BnB's sole discretion what constitutes such
flagrant disregard of allowable use."

A formal complaint has already been filed with abuse@bnb-lp.com.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Yes, it works!

5820. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:27:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5bt17vdl1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35478

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242250180.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220552280.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> >> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
> >> >>
> >> >> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
> >> >> between the two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.
> >> >
> >> >There always is a clear distinction between the two.
> >> >
> >> >CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
> >> >private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
> >> >vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
> >> >are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
> >> >notices from zoning, etc.)
> >>
> >> That "governmental" action is still a civil matter. No difference.
> >
> >Wrong! In the one case, THE government is the
> >plaintiff and is directly taking the action to enforce
> >the ordinance in question. In the CC&R cases, the
> >government is ONLY providing the venue (the court)
> >where the issue is adjudicated beween the two
> >civil parties.
>
> Still no difference. It is still a civil matter. The fact that in one
case,
> the government is a party and in the other, it is not, does not elevate
the one
> involving the government to be some other sort of matter, such as
criminal, nor
> does it invoke Constitutional protections.

On that I agree. The difference that one comes up against is
that in CC&Rs, the government does NOT make the
charge (filing), nor does it make any arguments for or
against. In an ordinance violation, the governemnt,
as plaintiff, does the filing (notice of violation) and can muster
the resources of the government in "pressing the case against
the violator.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5821. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:38:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C797962.DFABF1D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35479

Dave Heil wrote:
> ... and there were no women involved in the scenario at all.

You realize that leaves the door open for men to have been involved. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5822. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:41:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C797A28.A696797@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35480

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Another false claim. I've been a coded ham since before the 5wpm
> min/max change. So has Cecil and many others.

Actually, I had all amateur privileges when Dick was still messing
his diapers. Too bad he was nine years old at the time. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5823. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:56:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224185655.26465.00000388@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35481

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/2002 3:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020224162828.01358.00000082@mb-de.aol.com>

>S25.5 has
>a complete rewrite over the existing form and simply omits any
>mention of morse codings; it does not "eliminate" or "suppress"
>the need for morse code testing, it just doesn't mention it.

Gee-zis Freakin' Key-ryst! You aren't going to be happy unless there's a
public hanging of one of Samuel F. B. Morse's decenfants, are you?

Damn...what a PUTZ.

K4YZ

5824. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-24 23:59:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c797f76_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35482

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C795F07.7FD751D1@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > I simply *can't* resist reporting that the FCC
> > asked me to present the Draft US Proposal on WRC-03 Agenda
> > Item 1.7.1 ... the revision of S25 of the ITU Radio Regs :-)
> >

I knew that I could count on Dick to spew immediately on
receipt of this tidbit of news ... :-)

> That should come as a surprise, or what? If you bother
> to check back you'll find that I've said for years that our
> spectrum WILL be removed from our allocations as it is
> needed for commercial enterprises.

Yes, Dick, the elimination of Morse test requirements from
the ITU Radio Regulations is an international conspiracy
designed to take away our spectrum (not!)... the sad part
is that you can't comprehend how TOTALLY RIDICULOUS
you sound when you infer that.

What WILL cost us spectrum, in the long run, if it's not
changed, is STAGNATION caused by the "It must always
and forevermore be just like it's always been." attitude that
folks like you exude because you believe that passing your
amateur test was such a great accomplishment and everyone
else is "dumbed down."

> So who better to lead that assault than a licensed ham who
> is too dense to understand what he is being used to do?

Gratuitous insult noted ... but I'm not leading an assault on
our spectrum ... I'm trying to defend it by promoting modernization,
despite the best efforts of old foggies like you to keep ham radio
in the past and, thereby, make it less attractive to newcomers in
today's technically advanced world.

> One that has no use for hams other than those who feels
> exactly as he does.

I don't feel that way at all ... unlike you, I respect the right of
choice of modes of other hams and don't try to force my
mode of choice down everyone else's throats by unnecessary
regulatory requirements.

Yes, I have expressed disdain for certain attitudes ... like the
"stomp 'em into the dust with rude, crude, brute force" attitude
I see/hear in so many contests. But, it's the ATTITUDES and
BEHAVIORS that I find objectionable, not that someone finds
the activity fun or interesting.

> One who insists his experience at cordless telephone design
> trumps everthing else in AMATEUR RADIO.

Dick ... I've simply stated that there is inexpensive consumer
electronics technology out there that is ages more advanced
than most of what is used in ham radio. Yes, I'm proud to be
able to be creative enough to invent such stuff ... and I'm proud
of my patents. I only wish that more hams could grasp the
utility and benefits of more advanced technology and embrace
it, rather than shunning it and insisting that it's "irrelevant to
ham radio" like you do all the time.

> Hey, once the ARS is converted to a majority of CBers and
> cordless fone jocks, the rest is a piece of cake.

Wow! You've actually managed to attempt two insults in
one sentence. Too bad that neither of them applies to
me. I'm not a CBer and I'm not a "cordless fone jock" ...
I'm an RF designer and systems engineer who happens
to work in standards and regulatory matters now.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHl+cZe+N6+q84HiEQJVAACgvnwnmKozZUUhzY07T1CB2cxOfFAAmwSV
Px/xIeBiXpZy3XKE92ITNkJv
=C6S0
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5825. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:03:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c798146_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35484

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5badg$r1s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c79299f_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I took that Josh was asking for an example of the ARRL "slamming"
someone
> > for a comment.
>
> NCI didn't "slam" anyone either. The posting of the individual's
> actual text is all that was done.
>

Well, I didn't mean to imply that, Bill. What I meant by my comment was simply that Joshua seems to think NCI did and I thought he was approaching the ARRL angle from that perspective.

> >
> > I don't think they would do that--they'd be stupid if they
> > did.
>
> What if they did? What is stupid about attacking the
> comments of an opposition party?
>

It would seem to me that if the ARRL openly "attacked" someone for making comments to the FCC, that it would neither be good business, nor would it be in any way productive. However, I've just never seen them "name names" in their public comments (the little I've read of the ARRL Letter, for example). I may very well be mistaken. I don't look to the ARRL, or NCI for that matter, as the type of entity that would emulate a reporting agency, where all's fair in love and war.

> >
> > And, as to noting comments, I don't think they name the person do
> > they, when they note that "the membership" feels a certain way? Isn't
it
> > more a general reference to "comments that they've received/heard etc.?
>
> I'll have to look at some past QSTs. Even if so, the reporting of
> an individual's comments by name is nothing more than
> that...(i.e. reporting)...as in Journalism 101.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

>

It would be interesting to note. *Did* NCI criticize (that's as far as I would go with it) someone? I don't think it's wrong at all for the ARRL or NCI to offer criticism--but not act as we do in this newsgroup. :)

Kim W5TIT

5826. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:09:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c79829a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35485

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e2d39b98e9a5798969a@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c790495$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e2069376441b29989695@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > "Ismael Quinones, a traffic enforcement agent in a scooter at a
stoplight
> > > at Cortlandt and Church streets, reached for his radio. "Traffic 191,
we
> > > just had an explosion at One World Trade Center by a jet," he told his
> > > dispatcher and left his car to order civilians to leave the area.
"They
> > > hadn't heard about it yet," said Quinones, 39. "People were hanging
out
> > > the window, sending morse code [by flicking the blinds]."
> > >
> > > http://www.newsday.com/ny-nyresc232380685sep23.story
> >
> > That is not morse code, that is flicking blinds in desperation to get
> > noticed so that someone will know there's someone on that floor. That
some
> > media person translates anything like that, flicking the blinds, banging
on
> > the pipes, etc., as Morse Code is their mistake.
>
> Well, it wasn't the media who said it was morse code, it was Mr.
> Quinones.
>
> > I doubt someone was literally doing anything more than flicking the
blinds...
> > the only way to "wave a flag" at that point. And, no, flag waving
should
> > not be translated to mean that someone would be using signaling.
>
> Nah - I'd wager that if someone just saw a signal without intelligence
> (just on and off with no particular timing to it), they'd say they were
> signaling. If they saw a pattern to it, they'd say it was morse code.
>
> Ignore the first story, however - I have serious doubts as to the
> credibility of the report I read. Oy vey - I need to check these things
> more carefully! Stupid, stupid me...
>

> And I seriously do apologize for the righteous indignation towards you
> eariler. I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't
> fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
> Well, *that* certainly didn't work out. Many apologies, for whatever it's
> worth.
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

It's certainly worth a lot, Joshua. My comments about CW--especially in emergency and disaster situations--are simply an observation that I believe other modes are most often used. If I am wrong, I offer anyone to submit some kind of evidence.

CW is grand, it's a great tradition for those who enjoy it and I don't think in any way that it should fade away from the bands. I don't support it being tested for a license--and that always stirs contempt. I don't even mind the contempt. But, the greatest defense offered always boils down to emergency communication. That doesn't cut the mustard, as I think it's false.

I also apologize for any aggressiveness I may have used--and I think I did. This medium (text on the internet) is the roughest form of communication we have. None of us are very good at it yet. You remind me if I act like an idiot, and I'll remind you... ;)

Kim W5TIT

5827. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:10:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7982d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35486

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C793627.2EEDEC4D@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides
trapped
> > > > people.
> > >
> > > From inside the collapsed World Trade Center? What a strange thing to
say.
> >
> > ????? Collapsed buildings give out all sorts of creaks, groans and "tap"
sounds.
>
> Dick, I was talking about people who can tell the difference between human
tapping
> and nonhuman tapping. I'm sorry you are not one of those people. When you
hear
> a woodpecker, do you automatically assume someone is sending an 'SOS'?
ROTFL
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

How much ya wanna bet? ;)

Kim W5TIT

5828. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:20:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c79852a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35489

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't
>
> > fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
> > Well, *that* certainly didn't work out.
>
> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help
asnwering one
> or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
goat.
> Happens here all the time. Meanwhile they're too lazy to just meet the
> qualifications
> and go all the way even to persuading the bureaucrat in the FCC who runs
ham radio
> rule making into doing exactly what they want. Hey, he isn't about to get
them
> down on him, just to save basic radio communications.
>

Who's done that, Dick (wormed their way into making someone a goat)? I've
never seen that at all. I think Joshua is several notches above your way of
thinking, and several notches above your class...

Kim W5TIT

5829. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:22:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35490

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters. If
it isn't
> Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
applied) logic.
>

Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was that wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in a weekend? What was the title...?

Kim W5TIT

5830. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:24:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224192409.03629.00000352@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35487

>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 2/24/2002 9:09 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <320i7usr358gujfv94jqc9hesbmd83ftlg@4ax.com>

>Steve do you suppose that you might find time to grow up soon?

Hi Gerald. You and your other Los Alamos buddies out of secrets to sell to the Red Chinese, or just taking a break due to the current spate of patriotism?

>Why don't you take this to email and spare the rest of us the
>embarrassment of being the same species as you.

I could say the same of you, Gerry. You felt compelled to get your "dings" in in a public forum.

By the way...I don't remember seein a whole lot of posts of ANY meaningful content in any significant number of threads.

You just like to pop in and be rude? If so, you're doing a fine job.

By the way, just how many "kids" find thier way to Amateur Radio via RRAP?

I tried several websearches for "Amateur" radio, "Ham" radio, "SWL", "radio hobby", "CB" and several other permeations, and NONE of them made ANY link to this forum.

Of the three Amateur Radio clubs I belong to, NO ONE knows of this forum. Certainly none of the Amateurs under 18 know about it.

If you LIKE being made the target of such bile and filth the likes of which His Lyingness has spewed, be my guest.

Otherwise, AMF

Steve

5831. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:24:43 UTC
From: Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3C79844B.6A0A10AD@yahoo.com>
Source record: 35488
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

So without the ARRL what other organization can I job that will do anything for HAM radio?????????????

5832. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:26:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7986bf_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35491

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C79720C.3299E7F1@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > There is no "what if" Dave, there was an invitation you apparently
cannot
> > meet. I see I made my point. Glad you were able to understand.
>
> No, you've failed to make your point. You seem to believe that if CW is
> not used in one disaster or emergency situation, it will never be used.
>
> Roll on the floor laughing some more of your ample bottom off over your
> own simple notions.
>
> Dave K8MN

I take it you can't come up with some valid proof of a situation where CW
was used. You could just say you aren't sure of any. But, your defiance
speaks volumes... You had the perfect opportunity to prove me wrong, and
you can't do it.

Kim W5TIT

5833. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:37:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202250025400.25647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35492

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242237400.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
>> >news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
>> >> W1RFI wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >>What gives the Congress the right to
>> >> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
>> >> >
>> >> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto with
>> >state
>> >> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
>> >>
>> >> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.
>> >
>> >OK to a point.
>> >
>> >> The government passed the
>> >> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods
>> >
>> >No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves ...
>>
>> Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
>television
>> and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza dish" satellite
>> antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as the cite, but I could
>be
>> wrong), which specifically indicated that it overrode any CC&R's which
>would
>> otherwise be in conflict.
>
>BUT that ONLY covers the satellite/TV reception antenna. No
>such luck from any state and/or FCC on that front so far.

True, but all I had to demonstrate is one example that countered you BLANKET statement in order to prove it false. You said that no law exists allowing antennas in deed-restricted neighborhoods. I showed that there is a law that allows a specific type antenna in such a neighborhood. Although it doesn't allow ANY antenna, it still voids your statement.

>> >contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
>> >restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
>> >elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract

>> >that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
>> >in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
>> >Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
>> >interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.
>> >
>> >>... I am saying that
>> >> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
>> >> oversteps the authority of the government.
>> >
>> >It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
>> >stipulation.
>>
>> And the government can always [indirectly] change what elements are
>necessary
>> for a valid contract:
>
>True...BUT that hasn't happened at all for ham antennas
>relative to CC&Rs.
>
>> - The parties must have the authority to enter into it, and
>> - The contract must be legally enforcible.
>>
>> With a law that specifically sets aside CC&R contracts with regard to
>certain
>> actions, that cancels the enforcibility requirement; i.e. the HOA for the
>area
>> cannot sue the individual homeowner when he followed a state law that
>OVERRODE
>> the CC&R's agreement. The individual has a valid defense that cannot be
>> defeated. The HOA must first challenge the law and win.
>
>Agree completely...BUT no such set aside exists for ham antennas...that
>IS the point.

I agree that no statute exists. Federal regulations are not statutes, but the government's explanation and extension of them.

However, a state cannot take away what the federal government specifically grants (10th amendment corrolary), and don't amateur licenses have a section labelled "station privileges?" (Hint, hint.....) :-)

[Granted, there is no current definition of an amateur radio station being a FIXED location, but if there were, it's possible that a very subtile change in the regulations could wipe out CC&R's. In any event, CC&R's usually do not prevent in amy way mobile or portable operation, so put your 1KW HF rig/amp in the car and operate it from there while at home. It's even got a built-in chair!]

5834. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:39:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202250038180.25647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35493

```
On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242250180.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202220552280.20015-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >> On Thu, 21 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >> >> >PRB-1 doesn't address CC&R's. It addresses local ordinances.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> You may find that in some states, there is little to no distinction
>> >> >> between the two - especially when a neighbor wants enforcement.
>> >> >
>> >> >There always is a clear distinction between the two.
>> >> >
>> >> >CC&Rs are only enforceable as a civil matter between two
>> >> >private parties (e.g. association vs homeowner, or neighbor
>> >> >vs. homeowner.) while state/county/city/local ordinances
>> >> >are enforcable by governmental action (i.e. violation
>> >> >notices from zoning, etc.)
>> >>
>> >> That "governmental" action is still a civil matter. No difference.
>> >
>> >Wrong! In the one case, THE government is the
>> >plaintiff and is directly taking the action to enforce
>> >the ordinance in question. In the CC&R cases, the
>> >government is ONLY providing the venue (the court)
>> >where the issue is adjudicated beween the two
>> >civil parties.
>>
>> Still no difference. It is still a civil matter. The fact that in one
>case,
>> the government is a party and in the other, it is not, does not elevate
>the one
>> involving the government to be some other sort of matter, such as
>criminal, nor
>> does it invoke Constitutional protections.
>
>On that I agree. The difference that one comes up against is
>that in CC&Rs, the government does NOT make the
>charge (filing), nor does it make any arguments for or
>against. In an ordinance violation, the governemnt,
>as plaintiff, does the filing (notice of violation) and can muster
>the resources of the government in "pressing the case against
>the violator.
```

But both are civil cases. A change in party does not change the type of case.

5835. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:52:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5c1p10154p@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35494

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters.
If
> it isn't
> > Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
> applied) logic.
> >
>
> Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was that
> wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in a
> weekend? What was the title...?
>
> Kim W5TIT

I currently reading "Why I'm Not a Muslim" by Ibn Warraq. Well documented
and interesting stuff.

5836. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 00:57:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5c20a015h5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35495

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C796145.D92C4C13@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of
your "honest
> > > opinions".
> >
> > Did you ever notice that my honest opinion rarely contains dirty words
> > and your honest opinion almost always contains dirty words? Does that
> > tell you anything?
> >
>
> Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long
time ago.

When did you ever "coddle" the likes of Cecil? Must have been back in the
days of Fidonet, because you've never done it on this newsgroup.

5837. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 01:00:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5c25q015q5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35497

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020224032353.09757.00000115@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3C6F06D9.EB537F03@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> They just can't accept the concept of voluntary.
> >
> >They vant everyvun to be forced to volunteer.
>
> Cecil:
>
> The Russkies aren't "forcing" anyone to become a ham. If you
> want to be a ham, you take the code test. I'm sure they also
> require a road test for a driver's license. Nobody ever said the
> Russians wern't logical.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Same as it is here.

5838. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 01:20:32 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C799147.BBB0B3FF@attbi.com>
Source record: 35496
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Ronald Oberloh wrote:

> So without the ARRL what other organization can I job that will do anything for HAM
> radio??
??
??
??
??/
>
> I really want to know.....

That's my point!!!

5839. Re: Call Sign as your Dot.com name $11.95

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 01:30:02 UTC
From: News Editor <news@ez-domainnameregistration.com>
Message-ID: <u7j4vj5c9p2b9e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35498
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You're correct Charles... if you need domain forwarding, our fee is more than you might pay at others... but then you don't get our outstanding, personalized support. And, you forgot to mention that our registration fee of $11.95 is $4.05 cheaper than the other company... if you don't need forwarding, why pay more?
www.Ez-DomainNameRegistration.com

> Hello News Editor,
> I have used domain forwarding for years and it is very useful. However
> I pay only $16 / year for the domain registration, the email forwarding,
> URL forwarding, full-frame forwarding, toll-free tech support, domain
> parking, and full-featured DNS....all found at.....
> http://www.buydomains.com/
>
> Your price (from your site) is $23. IMHO if smart people shop around
> for these kinds of services they won't be contacting you.....your
> competition has already got you whipped but good.....
>
> --
>
> 73 / DX
>
> Charles T Johnston
> Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> charles@ab7sl.com
>
> AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> Official W9INN Antennas Page
> www.ab7sl.com
>
>
>
>

5840. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 01:56:32 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e338f18fa6543b98969b@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35499

In article <3c798146_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net says...

> However, I've just never seen them "name names" in
> their public comments (the little I've read of the ARRL Letter, for
> example.

Unfortunately for me, they have. Just checked it out.

Cripes!

There seems to be a small difference in that from what I've seen it doesn't look like the ARRL ever (hold on!) published a news release that someone had made a Reply Comment without the ARRL noting that it made a Reply Comment in reply. From the way the NCI page is set up, it looks like they possibly did, but either later or concurrently posted a news item about their Reply Comment to the Reply Comment.

In other words, I'm making a lot of brouhaha over nothing.

Yeah, I didn't like the tone of the news release, but I think what I initially took as browbeating and the targeting of someone is a whole lot more innocuous than that.

joshua houk
kd7pos

5841. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 02:28:55 UTC
From: ValleyArts1@webtv.net
Message-ID: <16337-3C79A167-130@storefull-118.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Source record: 35500

Thanks to all who responded. I very much appreciate getting the
information I needed. Again thanks.

5842. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 03:10:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224221056.19003.00000087@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 35301

In article <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> Here's my reply to Carl's earlier post. This is driectly from
>>google.

Actually, it's "directly" from google....
>
>Jim,
>
>I certainly trust you to accurately recount your previous
>post.

Thanks!
>
>OK ... I'll respond ...
>
>> In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>> >news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>
>> >> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
>> >> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
>> >> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
>> >> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>>
>> >> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response
>> >> something like "So the FCC at some time in the past
>> >> created band segments by mode
>> >> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."
>> >
>> >Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
>> >be 10 wpm ...
>>
>> Hold it right there. Tell the WHOLE story.
>
>OK ... no problem ... nothing to hide here.

Uh huh...
>
>> The code test speed for US licenses (except the old Extra) was 10

>> wpm from 1919 to 1936.
>
>No argument so far ...
>
>> >at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
>> >the speed to 12.5 wpm ...
>>
>> That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the
>> WRITTEN exam so that it required more radio knowledge in
>> order to pass.
>
>The letter refers to "A slight stiffening of the basic examination,"
>then *discounts* the written exams as a means to the end of
>limiting the number of hams. Clearly, from the letter, which
>was published in an ARRL publication, as indicated, the
>emphasis was on code as a filter to keep people out of ham
>radio.

The letter and the "200 Meters and Down" story are simply summaries of
the situation. The written tests WERE made tougher.
>
>> > SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
>> >hams "because the bands were too crowded."
>>
>> Incorrect.
>
>NOT INCORRECT ... read on ...

No, it's incorrect. The idea was to slow down the growth. Imagine having
too many newcomers as a problem!

>Here are quotes from an article posted on the NCI website.
>The specific URL to read the entire article is:
>
>http://www.nocode.org/articles/filter.html
>
>Begin quote from above-referenced article

Do you have any other source material? Say, the QSTs of the era?
Interviews with hams who were on the air at the time?

>*********
>In Clinton B. DeSoto’s classic book, Two Hundred Meters and Down,
>The Story of Amateur Radio (Published by the American Radio Relay
>League in 1936) is the following passage on page 179. DeSoto was
>a highly placed ARRL official at the time his book was written and
>published, so we assume it represents League thinking.
>
>"The growth of amateur radio and the total number of amateurs will
>doubtless be controlled in the future. The present condition of the
>amateur bands, while not intolerable, approaches saturation. ...
>[The number of amateurs at the time was 46,000]

Which was approaching saturation given the typical techniques of the day,
and the band allocations of that time. Seems incredible today, but that
was the case back then.

> DeSoto goes on:
>
>"Obviously no competent person can be denied the right to become
>an amateur.

Which means the total number cannot be controlled, and this was realized by
DeSoto,
ARRL leadership and the FCC back then.

>The only justifiable restrictive procedure is to raise the
>standards of competency. This has already been done to the point
>where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>license than it was ten years ago. Increasing the code speed
>equirement is one step in this direction. ..."
>
>DeSoto goes on to say that additional restrictions are not needed
>since "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
>relatively constant during the past two years. A slight stiffening of
>the basic examination, together with the increased code-speed
>requirement, would accomplish the desired result."
>
>At the 1936 annual ARRL Board Meeting held in West Hartford, CT)
>the Board "...voted to ask [the] FCC to raise the code speed
>requirement on license exams to 12.5 wpm..
>[From Official Broadcast 671, May 10, 1936]
>
>A letter was then sent by Mr. K. B. Warner, ARRL General Manager, to
>the FCC requesting a code speed increase from 10 to 12 words per
>minute. Here are some quotes from Warner's letter:
>
>"It has become desirable to raise the general standard of
>qualification for an amateur operator license. Observations show
>that too many licensed amateurs do not possess the qualifications
>presupposed by the regulations. Considering that the written part
>of the examination may be mastered with relative ease, the chief
>opportunity for a better selective process resides with the code
>examination. ..." [That is pretty clear!]

Yep, it's pretty clear:

"Observations show that too many licensed amateurs do not possess
the qualifications presupposed by the regulations."
>
>"A general raising of the standards could help to confine the
>obviously limited facilities of amateur radio to those who have
>at least nominal aptitude for the same. It seems indicated that
>this situation could be best treated by an increase in the code
>speed. Consequently the League now requests the Commission
>to increase the code speed required in the amateur examination

>from ten words per minute to twelve and one-half words per minute."
>*********
>
>It's clear from the above that the ARRL, at the time, wanted to
>"control the population" and that the bands, with ~46k amateurs
>were "approaching saturation."

The problem was that getting a license was so easy that huge
numbers of newcomers were raising havoc - on the bands
and with other services.
>
>The referenced letter also states that "the chief opportunity for
>a better selective process resides with the code examination."
>
>The final paragraph above ALSO indicates QUITE CLEARLY
>that the increase in code speed which the ARRL requested was
>TO CONTROL THE NUMBER OF AMATEURS.

And the earlier parts clearly show that no qualified person could be
denied a license, and that too many of the hams of the day
lacked the necessary qualifications.
>
>> The concerns were:
>>
>> 1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
>
>I find that hard to swallow with well more than an order of
>magnitude fewer hams than today ...

Yet it is true. In 1936, US hams had 160, 80, 40, 20, 10 meters
on HF/MF, plus 5, 2-1/2 and 1-1/4 meters. (In fact, hams could
use almost all of the "ultrahighs" back then).

But most hams clustered on 40, 80 and 160. Many hams used
only one band because of equipment and antenna limitations.

Although a few hams were using SSB, (W6DEI and others, as
early as 1931), almost all amateurs on voice used AM.

Using typical amateur equipment and methods of the mid 1930s,
how many QSOs do you think those bands could support?

>also, even if it
>were true, which I don't buy, a better solution than
>"controlling the population" would have been to encourage
>folks to spread out a bit by using the other bands, which
>you insinuate were not "so crowded."

The ARRL DID encourage the use of 10 meters, 5 meters
and up. As early as 1928 there were lots of articles on
getting on the "ultrahighs" - particularly after mobile
operation was authorized there. But the results obtained were
a far cry from what could be done with the same expenditure and

complexity of equipment on the HF bands.

In those days all hams had access to all amateur frequencies, too.
Getting on 75 or 20 meter voice required a Class A license, which
took another written exam but required the same code as Class B
or C.
>
>And what about the "superior spectral efficency of CW,"
>which was the predominant mode at the time?

Exploiting that superiority requires stable transmitters and stable,
selective receivers. While crystal control and single-signal
receivers did exist, they were beyond the reach of most hams.
End result was that most hams of the day used receivers that
were horribly unselective. Typically, one heard a 10 kHz chunk of the
band, at minimum.

Most operation in those days was what we would call "split" today -
two stations in a QSO would transmit on different frequencies. This
doubled the spectrum usage.

Of course superior techniques greatly increased the "carrying
capacity" of the bands. But such techniques were only beginning
to show up in the shacks of Depression-era hams. After WW2,
it was an entirely different story.
>
>> 2) many newcomers were getting on the air with insufficient
>> skill AND TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE for the conditions of
>> the day
>
>Sorry, but there is no indication in the letter requesting that
>the code speed be increased to control the population that
>the ARRL sought "better written tests" ... only that they asked
>that the code speed be increased to keep people out.
>(There was a vague mention of "a slight stiffening of
>the basic examination," but in the end, the ARRL doesn't
>specifically request a tougher written test, nor does the FCC
>appear to respond with such action ... only an increase in
>code speed ... see the entire article ...)

The ARRL wasn't going to remind the FCC of the problems of
technical violations by amateurs. Read the publications of the
day, and talk to the hams who were there. Bum notes, harmonics,
drift, chirps, clicks, overmodulation, and instability were big
problems that gave the ARS a "black eye".
>
>> 3) the explosive growth (the number of US hams TRIPLED
>> from 1929's ~16,000 in less than 5 years)
>
>Still, the indications are that there were ~ 46k hams .. FAR
>fewer than the 600k+ of today ...

Of those 600K hams of today, how many are active on HF? How
many hours/day do they operate? How many bands do they have
to choose from?

> and at that time, I would
>suspect that far more hams were using CW ...

True, but many were also using 'phone. Some of the signals
were gawdawful, produced by things like loop modulated oscillators
that FM'ed as much as they AM'd.

> which is,
>according to its proponents, "extremely spectrally efficient,"

It is - IF it's used properly.

>so, even given that receiver selectivity was not as good in
>those days as today, I find the argument unconvincing.
>(I don't believe that receivers were more than 10x worse
>than today, and there must have been FAR fewer hams,
>as a percentage using any form of voice.)

A typical CW receiver today, suitable for casual use, has a
passband of perhaps 500 Hz. Serious CW ops usually have provision
for at least 250 Hz passband filtering. Filter shape factors of 2:1 are
typical. Blocking dynamic range of more than 130 dB is common.

Back in the 1930s, a typical amateur receiver had a passband of 10
kHz - 20 to 40 times that of a modern receiver. Shape factors of
10:1 were common, and dynamic range was all over the place. Some
receivers were pretty good while others were awful in this regard.
There was also the split-frequency situation. End result was that
the spectral efficiency of CW was not realized in most situations,
and the bands were "very crowded" if one used the equipment
commonly used at the time.

Proof of this is simple: Advanced hams were using SSB and
single-signal crystal filter receivers by the mid 1930s. This progress
was driven by the crowding of the bands.

>> 4) high turnover (as many as 40% of hams not renewing, at
>> a time when the license term was 3 years
>
>Neither is this mentioned in the record to which I referred ...
>and if so many hams were dropping out, why the concern
>that the bands would become "saturated?"

The turnover was indeed a reality. Part of the problem was frustration,
but the Depression was the major force. The main point is that the
ARS of the thirties was taking in huge numbers of newcomers who
weren't renewing. They were being rapidly replaced by even more
newcomers.
>
>> 5) increasing numbers of TECHNICAL violations (out of

>> band, harmonics, hum, chirps, etc.) wreaking havoc on
>> other services and threatening the reputation of the ARS.
>
>I see no direct mention of this in the ARRL's letter to the FCC,
>either ... if it was, indeed, such big problem, why didn't the
>ARRL mention it?

The FCC knew all about it. It would not be smart to point out
these things to the FCC in writing.

>Why did they *discount* improvements
>in the written tests and focus ONLY on increasing code speed?
>(And why only in reference to "controlling the population?")
>
Controlling - not limiting. BIG difference.

>> Many of these violations were the result of inexperience
>> and a "don't care" attitude.
>
>Lacking supporting evidence (which I'm open to consider),
>I can only suspect that this assertion is your opinion or
>conjecture.

It's based on reading the literature of the day, and interviews with
hams who were licensed at the time.
>
>> The solution proposed by the ARRL leadership and accepted
>> by the FCC was a slight rise in the code test speed AND new
>> written tests. Funny how the written test changes are forgotten.
>
>"The written test changes" were not "forgotten" ... they were not
>mentioned in the ARRL's request.

They were mentioned elsewhere. Are they mentioned on NCI's
website?

>In fact, the written tests were
>specifically discounted in the letter as a solution to the "problem,"
>and instead ONLY an increase in code speed was requested.

Because the written tests had already been upgraded.

>(And again, only in the context of "controlling the population.")
>
>> >(at the time, the
>> >total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
>> >so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)
>>
>> Incorrect again. Carl, do you know what the amateur bands were in
>>1936? Do you know how they were used? Do you know what the
>> typical amateur station equipment was like in those days? Or how
>>many hours/week a typical amateur was on the air?
>

>I wasn't born at the time ... were you? (If you are that much older
>than me, were you licensed and on the air at the time?)

I didn't come along until years later - but so what? Must one have
been alive during the Civil War to be knowledgeable about it, and
the factors that influenced the people of the time?

> However,
>I recognized above that while receivers weren't as good as they
>are today, there were also more than an order of magnitude less
>hams than today and voice operation was not the norm, with most
>operators using CW.

And they had fewer bands and much less stability and selectivity. End
result was apparent overcrowding.
>
>> The argument was NOT "absurd" once all the FACTS are known.
>
>I still think the argument was absurd.

Then give some numbers. Like how many simultaneous QSOs could
be had on 40 meters at night using 1936 equipment and methods.

> It's not the first time you
>and I have disagreed ...
>
HAW! That's a GOOD one!! ;-)

>> >The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
>> >for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...
>>
>> Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2.
>> Then 5 wpm was added.
>
>Yes, for a novice license, good for 1 year, non-renewable.
>"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
>(Some "welcome"!!!)

The same 1951 restructuring that gave us the Novice also gave us the
Technician - which had a 5 wpm code test!

Have you forgotten about the Tech license?

Its purpose, btw, was to encourage the use of the "ultrahighs". It was
suggested
in various fashions in the late '30s, and formally proposed as a "Class D"
license after WW2.

Your statement:

"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio." (Some "welcome"!!!)

indicates a hatred of the code itself and a big gap in your knowledge of the
history of US amateur radio licensing. Remember, we're talking about

history here, not the way things are today.
>
>> >Was this decision made "for good reason" ???
>>
>> They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are
>> you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?
>
>Yes, I think so ... if you read the entire article, you'll find out
>that the FCC Chief Engineer at the time sounded a LOT like
>Larry or Dick "If you can't do 25-30 wpm, you're not much of
>an operator."

For 1936, was he not correct? At that time, Morse/CW was THE
major mode of both the military and commercial services. Yes, there
was some voice and some RTTY, but only a small amount compared
to Morse/CW.

>In fact, he states the view in his reply that "An
>operator whose top speed is not more than 12 words per
>minute would be classed as a poor operator."
>(Sounds a LOT like Larry or Dick ...)

Why is that not correct - for 1936?

One of the justifications for the very existence of the ARS back in those days
was as a training ground for radio operators, and a ready reserve for military
and commercial needs. Of course the military and commercial services don't
need many Morse/CW operators today, but back in 1936 it was a VERY
different story! Hams who could not begin to approach commercial or
military standards of skill weakened this justification.

This idea is explained in DeSoto's book. Have you read the whole thing?

Recall that early in WW1, there was a severe shortage of radio operators. About
4000 US hams (a very large percentage of the US amateur radio population of
1917) served Uncle Sam in WW1. With the rise of communism and fascism in
Europe, the possibility of another war could not be ignored. Having a large
contingent of skilled and technically knowledgeable hams helped justify the
continued existence of the ARS.
>
>> Them's the historic facts, Carl.
>
>Sorry ... but the letter from the ARRL to the FCC and the
>FCC's response don't seem to support your assertions ...

If you look at them without an understanding of the technology, methods
and concerns of the times, I would tend to agree with you.
>
>I respectfully decline to concede, absent some more
>compelling evidence that your assertions are not little
>more than conjecture.

See above. I would respectfully suggest that your conclusions are conjecture based mostly on lack of historical background of the time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5843. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 03:15:09 UTC
From: Walt <walt@REMOVETHISpobox.com>
Message-ID: <21bj7uslmoilufuesnrguuvi4kus1tg0kp@4ax.com>
Source record: 35302
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 24 Feb 2002 03:12:31 -0800, cbjunkie@cb.org.au wrote:

>Why doesn't Ham Radio have a
>15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule.

Read the rules. Broadcasting is not allowed.

5844. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 03:49:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020224224913.27846.00000050@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 35303

In article <3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>> Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters. If
>it isn't
>> Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
>applied) logic.
>>
>
>Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was that
>wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in a
>weekend? What was the title...?

I think he keeps it right next to an older book on earthquakes
which he once used to tell everyone he "knows all about
earthquakes (in Missouri)" and "what they are like." :-)

5845. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:24:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C79BC7F.F6F2E852@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35304

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> > Happens here all the time.
>
> Oh NO! The paranoids are after Dick again! And of course, he is blameless.
> -

And then, as you can see, they accuse you of paranoia to deflect their nonsense.

5846. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:24:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5cedgno1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35305

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202250025400.25647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242237400.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> >"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> >> >> W1RFI wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >>What gives the Congress the right to
> >> >> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto
with
> >> >state
> >> >> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
> >> >>
> >> >> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.
> >> >
> >> >OK to a point.
> >> >
> >> >> The government passed the
> >> >> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods
> >> >
> >> >No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves ...
> >>
> >> Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
> >television
> >> and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza dish"
satellite
> >> antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as the cite, but I
could
> >be
> >> wrong), which specifically indicated that it overrode any CC&R's which
> >would
> >> otherwise be in conflict.
> >
> >BUT that ONLY covers the satellite/TV reception antenna. No
> >such luck from any state and/or FCC on that front so far.
>
> True, but all I had to demonstrate is one example that countered you
BLANKET
> statement in order to prove it false. You said that no law exists

allowing
> antennas in deed-restricted neighborhoods. I showed that there is a law
that
> allows a specific type antenna in such a neighborhood. Although it
doesn't
> allow ANY antenna, it still voids your statement.

So back to the main event...there are NO laws that override CC&Rs
for HAM antennas.

> >> >contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
> >> >restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
> >> >elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract
> >> >that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
> >> >in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
> >> >Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
> >> >interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.
> >> >
> >> >>... I am saying that
> >> >> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
> >> >> oversteps the authority of the government.
> >> >
> >> >It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
> >> >stipulation.
> >>
> >> And the government can always [indirectly] change what elements are
> >necessary
> >> for a valid contract:
> >
> >True...BUT that hasn't happened at all for ham antennas
> >relative to CC&Rs.
> >
> >> - The parties must have the authority to enter into it, and
> >> - The contract must be legally enforcible.
> >>
> >> With a law that specifically sets aside CC&R contracts with regard to
> >certain
> >> actions, that cancels the enforcibility requirement; i.e. the HOA for
the
> >area
> >> cannot sue the individual homeowner when he followed a state law that
> >OVERRODE
> >> the CC&R's agreement. The individual has a valid defense that cannot
be
> >> defeated. The HOA must first challenge the law and win.
> >
> >Agree completely...BUT no such set aside exists for ham antennas...that
> >IS the point.
>
> I agree that no statute exists. Federal regulations are not statutes, but
the

> government's explanation and extension of them.

Petty...regardless of what the feds call them, none exist that gives hams
the chance/opportunity to override CC&Rs for ham antennas.

> However, a state cannot take away what the federal government specifically
> grants (10th amendment corrolary), and don't amateur licenses have a
section
> labelled "station privileges?" (Hint, hint.....) :-)

Hint, hint...not laughing. So why hasn't that defense found favor
in ANY state court. Phil K has pointed out that the argument you
suggest (vis-a-vis station privileges from the feds) hasn't found
favor anywhere.

> [Granted, there is no current definition of an amateur radio station being
a
> FIXED location, but if there were, it's possible that a very subtile
change in
> the regulations could wipe out CC&R's.

Go for it then. I'd be more than happy to see you win...but
I won't hold any expectations as to that outcome.

> In any event, CC&R's usually do not
> prevent in amy way mobile or portable operation, so put your 1KW HF
rig/amp in
> the car and operate it from there while at home. It's even got a built-in
> chair!]

Or run a coax from the car to your ham shack :-) and use the
mobile antenna.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5847. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:29:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C79BDC3.78F8353D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35306

If for nothing else Bill, it might keep some of the Hams from Grousing.
I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.

- Mike -

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3C785BA0.B23C2016@adelphia.net...
> > I've had the chance to look at some of the evidence provided, and I'm
> > now pretty convinced that a person who passes the exam for a particular
> > class is qualified to operate within their privileges.
> >
> > I'm also pretty convinced that not only are the tests not "dumbed
> > down", but If I were to make a suggestion, it would be that holders of
> > licenses issued older than say 10 years should have to retake the tests
> > to maintain their license.
>
> WHY?

>
> > My final thoughts are that I am now having a lot of fun, experimenting
> > with the new computer based modes, some initial contesting activities,
> > and having fun doing public service with my local club. I've also worked
> > a little bit at recruiting new hams into the fold. I homebrew a fair
> > amount of my own equipment also. The studying I've had to do has
> > prepared me pretty well for all that.
>
> Great...and having said that...just why would YOU want to be
> retested again in 10 years?
>
> > I suspect my upbeat attitude may be seen by some as distinctly out of
> > place. Too bad about that! ;^)
>
> Welcome. Happy to see you and your upbeat attitude.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

5848. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:33:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5cevc$pu4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35307

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C79BDC3.78F8353D@adelphia.net...
> If for nothing else Bill, it might keep some of the Hams from Grousing.
> I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
> without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.
>
> - Mike -

OK, I understand your logic. Frankly, however, I have better
things to do with my time than to have to "requalify" every
so often.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C785BA0.B23C2016@adelphia.net...
> > > I've had the chance to look at some of the evidence provided, and I'm
> > > now pretty convinced that a person who passes the exam for a
particular
> > > class is qualified to operate within their privileges.
> > >
> > > I'm also pretty convinced that not only are the tests not "dumbed
> > > down", but If I were to make a suggestion, it would be that holders of
> > > licenses issued older than say 10 years should have to retake the
tests
> > > to maintain their license.
> >
> > WHY?
>
> >
> > > My final thoughts are that I am now having a lot of fun, experimenting
> > > with the new computer based modes, some initial contesting activities,
> > > and having fun doing public service with my local club. I've also
worked
> > > a little bit at recruiting new hams into the fold. I homebrew a fair
> > > amount of my own equipment also. The studying I've had to do has
> > > prepared me pretty well for all that.
> >
> > Great...and having said that...just why would YOU want to be
> > retested again in 10 years?
> >
> > > I suspect my upbeat attitude may be seen by some as distinctly out of

> > > place. Too bad about that! ;^)
> >
> > Welcome. Happy to see you and your upbeat attitude.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

5849. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:40:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C79C044.93D8957@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35308

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >I would have to agree with Ed that a person would have to be an idiot
> >savant to memorize the huge amount of questions in the question pool
> >just so they could pass the 50 questions that are asked. They would have
> >to be "extra" special to then have somehow memorized the exact answer,
> >because the ABCD answers are not in the same position as in the study
> >guide.
>
> I should have pointed out, though, that one of the test elements DOES require
> rote memorization.

That one made me smile! And it was the absolute hardest part of the
whole process for me. Failed the CW the first time I took it too.

> >I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
> >wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
> >get the correct answer.
>
> You couldn't have done that, because Dick claims it doesn't happen. :-)

It's actually quite clever. Have a person study a thousand or so
questions to prepare for a 50 question selection. A person actually
learns quite a bit.

The way I see it, it isn't a whole lot different than a reference book
that has all the answers "in there somewhere".

- Mike -

5850. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 04:53:28 UTC
From: Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3C79C348.21DBEC0D@yahoo.com>
Source record: 35309
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

No you were running the ARRL down.....

Zoran Brlecic wrote:

> Ronald Oberloh wrote:
>
> > So without the ARRL what other organization can I job that will do anything for HAM
> > radio???
??
??
??
??/
> >
> > I really want to know.....
>
> That's my point!!!
!!!
> !!!
!!!
!!!
!!!
!!!
!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

5851. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 05:04:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C79C60C.A7076E7C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35310

Krell wrote:

> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters.
> If
> > it isn't
> > > Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
> > applied) logic.
> > >
> >
> > Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was that
> > wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in a
> > weekend? What was the title...?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I currently reading "Why I'm Not a Muslim" by Ibn Warraq. Well documented
> and interesting stuff.

I don't open TITS' posts (who wants to waste the time to read reams of
airhead twaddle?) but she just as well know the answer to her question. It was
the Koran.

Of course there's lots of later writings that analyze Islam, particularly
large radical
sects who have vowed harm to the West, but hey, don't upset her little world
with
anything unpleasant. She's all fun.

5852. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 05:05:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C79C636.55DB80C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35311

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C796145.D92C4C13@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > My honest opinion is that you're a hopeless horses ass because of
> your "honest
> > > > opinions".
> > >
> > > Did you ever notice that my honest opinion rarely contains dirty words
> > > and your honest opinion almost always contains dirty words? Does that
> > > tell you anything?
> > >
> >
> > Sure. You're the horses ass. I stopped coddling the likes of you a long
> time ago.
>
> When did you ever "coddle" the likes of Cecil? Must have been back in the
> days of Fidonet, because you've never done it on this newsgroup.

So you've been reading here forever, right?

5853. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:00:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2bpc0.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35312

On Sat, 23 Feb 2002 20:03:07 -0800, Keith wrote:

> I have an antenna for TV reception only with the TV preemption and I have
>it hooked up to my TV, stereo & Shortwave Radio , what are you going to do
>about it as a association lawyer?

If the Association is out to get you, an Association lawyer will
send you what amounts to a "cease and desist" order to remove that
antenna because it does not comply wuth the terms of the CC&Rs and
thr Association's Rules.

Now the ball is in your court to tell the Association that their
order is pre-empted. Unless you attempt to bluff them by lying
about what the FCC Rules pre-empt (which their lawyer can check very
easily) you can try to get an FCC Declaratory Ruling of pre-emotion.

Do you think that the FCC will issue one for your mixed-use antenna
or are you going to lie to the FCC about your stated use of the
antenna?

If the Association knows about, or legally should know about, your
antenna and does not send you a "cease and desist" order, you are
home free until some aggrieved member/owner sues both you and the
Association for enforcement of the CC&Rs and the Association rules,
and the circus starts all over again.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5854. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2c421.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35313

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 12:49:09 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> Now what if I also use that antenna for TV &
>> CB, can the association prevent me from doing so?
>
>If they know about it...yes they can. Would they know
>about it at all...it depends. If CB use involved
>TRANSMISSION, then there's a possibility of detection.
>IF CB use involved RECEIVE only, detection and
>subsequent court action would probably never
>happen. Such recieve only situations are nothing but
>academic discussions.

Until Keith shoots his mouth off to the Association about what he is doing like he does here and someone on the Board decides to look into how they can get him to stop - I served on a Board that had such a memeber once - and finds out just what the pre-emption will and will not cover.

Smart people never cross an Association board when the law AND the facts are in the Board's favor.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5855. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2cbz2.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35314

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 04:51:59 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
>decade or two.

Nah, he's just ignoring the facts because they go against his
perception of how things should be, and if he bangs on that
tea-kettle long enough, he thinks that they will come true.

Operation Magic Wand......

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5856. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2emq3.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35315

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 01:34:34 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>I'll let Phil add any of the legal details, but everything
>I know about regarding such transfers of property
>do NOT, in any way, invalidate the CC&Rs. That's
>no different than the bank mortgage still being
>in effect as an outstanding lien against the property
>that needed to be paid for title to pas to the "new
>owner" who inherited the property.

In California at the present time, property passsed to a new owner by any means includes all easements. CC&Rs, and applicable Association membership subject to rules.

At one time, lien sales/auctions passed property "free and clear" of all "encumbrances" but over time, the law changed to apply only to liens and other financial "encumbrances", not to the above. That's why bidders/devisees have to do due diligence and the lienholder will enter a bid equal to its interest (remaining trust-deed balance, for instance) in the property to protect itself.

I have enough problems with California's "pretzel" of laws - I am not qualified to speak to other state's real estate law.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5857. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2fki4.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35316

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 02:36:25 -0800, Keith wrote:

> If I live in a CC&R/deed restricted neighborhood and I refuse to detach a
>shortwave or FM Stereo radio to the antenna I use for TV reception then I
>can be found in contempt of court and imprisoned.

Rarely happens that way (I do know several judges who wish that it
did more often, and that stupidity and knotheadedness were
criminal offenses).

What does happen in the extreme (they reslly want to "get" you) or
when safety is at issue is that the Association applies to the court
for a Writ of Enforcement to enable it to hire a contractor to enter
your property (which you agreed to in the CC&Rs) and abate the
non-compliance/ They may also ask (and pay for) for law-enforcement
standby protection for the contractor. Start 'rasslin' with the
sheriff and THEN you go to jail for assault.

That's the extreme, and would not be invoked in most instances (but
COULD BE).

What they most probably would do is to assess a monetary penalty
for non-compliance (again, as you agreed to in the CC&Rs), something
like $500 or $1000 per day for each day that the "violation" exists.
This penalty, if unpaid within a specific time, gets filed as a lien
against your property. When the lien gets large enough, the
Association forecloses, and your property is sold at auction to
satisfy the lien. Most probably the holder of your first deed of
trust (there are no mortgages in California) will bid in for its
outstanding balance and get the property once it's up for auction.

All over a stupid TV antenna.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5858. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2gin5.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35317

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 18:21:00 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>I don't believe that is true...Phil K...can you verify or clear
>that up. My belief is based on the many attornies that
>have been jailed for contempt yet they don't lose their
>license to practice.

The following is California practice......

There are two kinds of contempt - civil and criminal. Both are triggered by egregious challenges to the judge's authority.

Civil comtempt, usually imposed for past misconduct, such as mouthing off at the judge, has only monetary penalties, but criminal contempt, usually imposed for continuing to disobey a court order after one or more warnings, can result in monetary penalties and/or imprisonment. The latter is imposed until such time as the defendant decides to comply with the court order. The catch phrase is "the keys to the cell are in your hands". Jail terms over 6 months require a jury trial, in which the only issues are whether the order was lawfully issued and if the defendant is able to comply with the order or not. Jailed defendants share the same luxurious quarters as the failure-to-pay-child-sypport folks.

(Too many) lawyers get slammed for comtempt, but unless the situation involves a violation of the Lawyer's Rules of Practice (the ABA Canons are not part of California law) or egregious character qualification issues, no action is taken against their license to practice.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5859. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:01:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2gw66.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35318

On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 22:48:03 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
>television and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza
>dish" satellite antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as
>the cite, but I could be wrong), which specifically indicated that it
>overrode any CC&R's which would otherwise be in conflict.

Civil Code Sec. 1376. Close enough.

It only applied to satellite dishes in Planned Unit Developments.
(condo apartments, townhouses, and individual residences that
constituted a PUD tract) and did not cover TV antennas or any
antennas in any other type of development or neighborhood.

At the time it was a great advance.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5860. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 06:02:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs2hwi7.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35319

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 00:37:57 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>However, a state cannot take away what the federal government specifically
>grants (10th amendment corrolary), and don't amateur licenses have a section
>labelled "station privileges?" (Hint, hint.....) :-)

Hint, hint....read _Howard v City of Burlingame_ where the Ninth Circuit basically said that holding an amateur radio license does not carry any First ASmendment "free speech" protection as against any governmental (Federal, state, or local) action, that holding such a license does not give the licensee any right to erect any antenna of his choice as against the reasonable regulation of the local government, amd that holding such a license does not invoke any superior rights as against legitimate local governmnetal actions.

This was never appealed (IIRC "Uncle Vern" died shortly after the ruling) nor overruled in any other Circuit or by the SCOTUS, and is cited quite often in Federal and FCC proceedings so it remains prevailing law.

Of course if "Uncle Vern" wouldn't have put up that 65 foot tower after the City denied him a permit for a 51 foot tower, this would never have happened, and on my home turf.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5861. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 07:19:56 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C79E599.1E19896C@attbi.com>
Source record: 35320
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Ronald Oberloh wrote:

> No you were running the ARRL down.....
>
> Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>
> > Ronald Oberloh wrote:
> >
> > > So without the ARRL what other organization can I job that will do anything for HAM
> > > radio???
??
??
??
??/
> > >
> > > I really want to know.....
> >
> > That's my point!!
!!
> > !!
!

5862. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 07:49:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C79ECA1.6FF7B81E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 35321

>
> What they most probably would do is to assess a monetary penalty
> for non-compliance (again, as you agreed to in the CC&Rs), something
> like $500 or $1000 per day for each day that the "violation" exists.
> This penalty, if unpaid within a specific time, gets filed as a lien
> against your property. When the lien gets large enough, the
> Association forecloses, and your property is sold at auction to
> satisfy the lien. Most probably the holder of your first deed of
> trust (there are no mortgages in California) will bid in for its
> outstanding balance and get the property once it's up for auction.

At which point the old owner trashes the joint.....

Ever notice that landlords never seem to notice added phone jacks
or changed electrical outlets, but freak out over stupid stuff
like a dirty toilet?

5863. Re: Call Sign as your Dot.com name $11.95

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 09:31:04 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u7k12sg2a9pbe9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35322
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I register many domains of my own, all at a cheaper cost of $8.95 or less
per year.
And I use www.godaddy.com for mine, which is less than what you charge.
BTW, why is this crossposted to so many groups anyway?
I don't do business with spammers, and I class you there.

"News Editor" <news@ez-domainnameregistration.com> wrote in message
news:u7j4vj5c9p2b9e@corp.supernews.com...
> You're correct Charles... if you need domain forwarding, our fee is more
than
> you might pay at others... but then you don't get our outstanding,
personalized
> support. And, you forgot to mention that our registration fee of $11.95
is
> $4.05 cheaper than the other company... if you don't need forwarding, why
pay
> more?
> www.Ez-DomainNameRegistration.com
>
> > Hello News Editor,
> > I have used domain forwarding for years and it is very useful. However
> > I pay only $16 / year for the domain registration, the email forwarding,
> > URL forwarding, full-frame forwarding, toll-free tech support, domain
> > parking, and full-featured DNS....all found at.....
> > http://www.buydomains.com/
> >
> > Your price (from your site) is $23. IMHO if smart people shop around
> > for these kinds of services they won't be contacting you.....your
> > competition has already got you whipped but good.....
> >
> > --
> >
> > 73 / DX
> >
> > Charles T Johnston
> > Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> > charles@ab7sl.com
> >
> > AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> > Official W9INN Antennas Page
> > www.ab7sl.com
> >
> >

> >
> >
>
>

5864. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 10:31:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Gnoe8.13370$lm1.891280@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35323

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C79C044.93D8957@adelphia.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >
> > >I would have to agree with Ed that a person would have to be an idiot
> > >savant to memorize the huge amount of questions in the question pool
> > >just so they could pass the 50 questions that are asked. They would
have
> > >to be "extra" special to then have somehow memorized the exact
answer,
> > >because the ABCD answers are not in the same position as in the study
> > >guide.
> >
> > I should have pointed out, though, that one of the test elements DOES
require
> > rote memorization.
>
> That one made me smile! And it was the absolute hardest part of the
> whole process for me. Failed the CW the first time I took it too.
>
> > >I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
> > >wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
> > >get the correct answer.
> >
> > You couldn't have done that, because Dick claims it doesn't happen.
:-)
>
> It's actually quite clever. Have a person study a thousand or so
> questions to prepare for a 50 question selection. A person actually
> learns quite a bit.
>
> The way I see it, it isn't a whole lot different than a reference book
> that has all the answers "in there somewhere".
>
> - Mike -

Like most things it comes to the 3 E's, Engineering, Education, and
Enforcement, just like traffic safety. How good the locals or the FCC are
at what they do I will leave to you.

5865. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 10:49:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mFoe8.13384$lm1.891589@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35324

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gs2cbz2.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 04:51:59 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
> >decade or two.
>
> Nah, he's just ignoring the facts because they go against his
> perception of how things should be, and if he bangs on that
> tea-kettle long enough, he thinks that they will come true.
>
> Operation Magic Wand......
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

If he holds his breath and stomps his foot, will it help?? :-)

Time to send out for Mr. Smee, Captain Hook, and Rufus T. Firefly.

5866. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:13:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225061349.11751.00000476@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35325

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
>without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.

They know what the tests are and because they feel they can pass them easily after decades of hamming, they think they are trivial tests compared to the "hard" ones they took before they had decades of experience.

When I studied the 4 page Novice study guide and passed the test at 13, I thought I had done something pretty special. Sure glad we didn't have internet around in those days so some cussing old timer couldn't tell me how lazy I had been.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5867. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:14:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225061449.11751.00000477@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35326

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>OK, I understand your logic. Frankly, however, I have better
>things to do with my time than to have to "requalify" every
>so often.

I think that after nearly a century of ham radio, the need for periodic
retesting has not been demonstrated.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5868. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:22:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225062241.11751.00000478@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35327

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>When did you ever "coddle" the likes of Cecil? Must have been back in the
>days of Fidonet, because you've never done it on this newsgroup.

He used to be a nice guy, but everyone made him be unkind and profane.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5869. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:26:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225062604.11751.00000479@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35328

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Joshua Houk wrote:

>>I promised myself when I started posting here that I wouldn't
>> fall in that particular usenet trap of being insulting, obnoxious, etc.
>> Well, *that* certainly didn't work out.

> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
>insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering
>one or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
goat.

You *say* that you only insult people while defending yourself. There were a lot of insults in the above post. What did Joshua say to you that you felt you had to defend yourself by cussing about other people?

Is this another one of those "Do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Happens here all the time. Meanwhile they're too lazy to just meet the
>qualifications
>and go all the way even to persuading the bureaucrat in the FCC who runs ham
>radio
>rule making into doing exactly what they want. Hey, he isn't about to get
>them
>down on him, just to save basic radio communications.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

5870. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:27:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225062759.11751.00000480@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35329

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no
>farther
>> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
>> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in recent
>> disasters.

>That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
>CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
>little if anything about its use.

Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead of
calling her conclusion "juvenile."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5871. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:29:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225062919.11751.00000481@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35330

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick Carroll wrote:

>> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
>> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering
>one
>> or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
>goat.
>> Happens here all the time.

>Oh NO! The paranoids are after Dick again! And of course, he is blameless.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Not only blameless, but the others made him act that way. And then, of all
things, they expected that *he* should be accountable for his actions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5872. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:33:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063312.11751.00000482@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35331

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Dick, I was talking about people who can tell the difference between human
>tapping
>> and nonhuman tapping. I'm sorry you are not one of those people. When you
>hear
>> a woodpecker, do you automatically assume someone is sending an 'SOS'?
>ROTFL

> Oh, we know, You're a master of changing meanings in mid thread. We see it
>from you all the time. Meanwhile you insist I dot every i and cross every t.
>Whatta horses ass.

You had to "defend yourself" again because Cecil commented that he believes
that humans can tell the difference between human and non-human tapping?

This "defend yourself" justification for your public profanity is wearing
pretty thin if you consider what Cecil said "an attack." Do you really need
that much "coddling?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>
>

5873. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:38:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063826.20570.00000049@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35335

In article <3C79BDC3.78F8353D@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
>without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.
>
Not me!

All anyone has to do is surf over to one of the sites that lets you take
a practice test online. The ones I use grade the test for you, so it's
easy to see how you're doing.

I've never had a bit of a problem with any of the current tests. Retest? HA!
I say, BRING 'EM ON!!!!! I'll take 'em and pass 'em easily, with NO prep
at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5874. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:38:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35333

In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
>agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW
>themselves. Why would we?
>
Because it works!

Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate communications
facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there would be
no
need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better in this
regard,
though). Why should we copy what they do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5875. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:38:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063828.20570.00000052@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35332

In article <20020224062140.17463.00000351@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
>>>that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.
>
>>Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.
>
>And I imagine that some of the time, it has the opposite effect.

Sure. We see their writings here.

>None of us
>know for certain which is which.

I know for certain that in my case.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5876. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:38:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35336

In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020223161019.20570.00000036@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
>> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >I think your deliberately misunderstanding, Jim.
>> >>
>> >> No, Kim, I'm trying to understand what you wrote. That's all I have to
>> >> go on. Your philosophy seems to be that people should not rely on
>> >> that which is reliable but rather on that which is fixable.
>> >>
>> >> >As usual...
>> >>
>> >> Seems to me that when someone doesn't understand and agree with
>> >> your posts, you put the blame on them, rather than consider that
>> >> perhaps what you said wasn't clear, or perhaps isn't entirely logical
>or
>> >> based on fact.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
>> >mode.
>>
>> Yep. May be.
>>
>> > But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
>> >reliability is a moot point.
>> >
>> True - but there are lots us who do use it and like it. More than some
>folks
>> here on rrap want to admit.
>>
>> Your opinion of the reliability of CW/Morse is understandable, given your

>> lack of experience with the mode and the amateur bands where it is most
>> commonly used. That's not meant as a criticism, Kim, just a simple
>statement
>> of fact.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>And, not meant as a criticism, just simple statement: it seems you are still
>discussing the reliability of the mode...in spite of its popularity of use
>among amateurs in emergency situations.

Popularity and reliability are two different things.

>Not just my personal feelings about
>the mode, but my experience since being a ham of listening to hams discuss
>disaster situations, watching discussions in other venues on disaster
>communication, etc., tells me that CW is little used/relied upon in most
>disaster situations.

It's not a primary mode, no. But it IS used, like it or not.

Many disasters don't involve HF, either.

> In fact, other than simple traffic handling routines,
>I know of no instance where CW has been used in an emergency.

"Simple traffic handling routines"?
>
>Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
>message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's worst.

whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?

I'm NOT minimizing the tragedy or impact of 9/11, or the losses suffered in
NYC, Washington or Pennsylvania on that day. But on what grounds do you
call the WTC disaster the WORST in USA history?

>I don't think you'll find one.

I don't have access to any of those messages. But I can pretty much guarantee
that any which were relayed on NTS went at least part of the way on CW.

Did any emergency messages go by HF? If you can't provide one, will you say
that HF is not preferred in emergencies?

> I am not saying anything against the mode,
>its users, etc.

Maybe not in this post.

>I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
>preferred mode in an emergency.

Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is different.
Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff KT4ST is

involved in.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5877. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:38:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063829.20570.00000053@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35334

In article <3C7906BB.661CFF51@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Joshua Houk wrote:
>> >> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
>> >> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
>> >> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
>> >> beneath the iron and concrete.
>> >
>> >One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
>>
>> Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
>> people.
>
>From inside the collapsed World Trade Center?

Sure. And the rescue people made all kinds of noises, too. The key point (pun intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from those noises.

73 de Jim, N2EY

What a strange thing to say.
>--

5878. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 11:39:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225063916.11751.00000483@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35337

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>Ever notice that landlords never seem to notice added phone jacks
>or changed electrical outlets, but freak out over stupid stuff
>like a dirty toilet?

No, that has never happened to me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5879. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:08:31 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5dfcs$l4e$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"LAAAAARDASSSSSSSSS Connection" <YoMomma@anon.com> wrote in message
news:a5bmiq$hjm$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a5bla2$egu$6@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > <cbjunkie@cb.org.au> wrote in message
> > news:24549151.00010ebf.076@drn.newsguy.com...
> > > In article <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" says...
> > > >
> > > >hello ole capt. peckers:
> > > >
> > > >> I wonder if after all of this is done
> > > >> and he's off the air for good, if is IARN
> > > >> or whatever the heck he calls it will still
> > > >> retain it's alleged 501-C3 tax exempt
> > > >> status...? Methinks not.
> > > >
> > > >i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have
> someone
> > > >take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there
are
> > so
> > > >many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the
> > wrong
> > > >way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought
> > that
> > > >equipment.
> > > >
> > > >phil :)
> > >
> > >
> > > This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own
> hands
> > type.
> > > I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham
Radio
> > have a
> > > 15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people
> > like him
> > > getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.
> >
> > Llllardasssss Lllllloyd N0VFP who's been qrming on HF with only a
```

> > technician license will get a letter soon, too.
>
> Like the ones you got Wiseman?

How about the ones YOU are going to get? Bwhahahahahahahahaha!!!!

5880. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:21:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5dfd4$l4e$8@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Mark S. Holden" <mark@bmas.org> wrote in message
news:3C796663.ADE3C17C@bmas.org...
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
>
> > Llllardasssss Lllllloyd N0VFP who's been qrming on HF with only a
> > technician license will get a letter soon, too.
>
> Roger:
>
> Do you ever post anything besides qrm on the news groups?

Follow your own advice, Mark. And if you don't like what I post, use a killfile. To answer your question, perhaps you need to look closer in the archives. If I'm attacked, I attack back.

> I can't speak for the other news groups, but Lloyd has been generally
> well behaved for several weeks in rrs.

Wrong again, Mark, he's been posting crap anonymously of course, and the same old cut and pastes. You need to do more research before you spout off.

> Perhaps you could learn something from him.

What, how to be a neo-nazi? Llllllardasssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd has nothing I would EVER want to know.

5881. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:23:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225072333.21826.00000083@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 35338

In article <mFoe8.13384$Im1.891589@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.gs2cbz2.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 04:51:59 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> >You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
>> >decade or two.
>>
>> Nah, he's just ignoring the facts because they go against his
>> perception of how things should be, and if he bangs on that
>> tea-kettle long enough, he thinks that they will come true.
>>
>> Operation Magic Wand......
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>
>
>If he holds his breath and stomps his foot, will it help?? :-)
>
>Time to send out for Mr. Smee, Captain Hook, and Rufus T. Firefly.
>
HAW!!! Also the firm of Dewey, Cheetham and Howe.

btw, the new sequel "Return to Neverland" is actually quite good.

The receive-only scenario does indeed have some interesting possibilities.
For example, suppose Our Hero puts up a "TV" antenna in apparent
violation of restrictions. HOA or whatever the Gladys Kravitz folks call
themselves
try to make him take it down, but he cites FCC preemption. HOA folks are
NOT happy, but can't do anything. They look up the rules, though...

Then Our Hero mouths off about using it for FM, SW, or whatever else -
reception only. HOA folks jump on the violation and make Our Hero take
down the TV antenna. AND they go after him for costs.

Now what does this have to do with ham radio? It weakens our collective
position.
The really insidious thing about all this anti-antenna stuff is that, over
time, people
start to think that houses with no antennas are the norm, and that antennas of
any kind are "eyesores" and unnecessary. The person who wants to put up an

antenna - any antenna, for any purpose - is more and more classified as a weirdo who is "hurting property values" and "doesn't support community aesthetics" and such nonsense.

Around here there are neighborhoods where almost every house has an antenna of some kind. Usually they are old TV antennas that have been unused for years (you can see the ragged bit of Twin-Lead waving in the wind). A few of them are still in use, there are a few TVRO pizza dishes, the occasional scanner vertical, and once in a while a ham dipole or some such. The ham antenna is "invisible" to almost everyone because they're used to seeing things on people's
roofs.

But go a fraction of a mile and there are neighborhoods with NO antennas of any kind. Try putting up anyhting there, and it WILL be noticed.

73 de Jim, N2EY
few

5882. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:30:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35339

Len Over 21 devoted a large chunk of his enormous amount of free time
and uttered:

> Leaving aside definitions of "is," let's define Guinea-Bisseau and "work."
>
> Guinea-Bisseau (or Bissau) is a small middle-Africa-general-location
> country of 1.3 million whose chief exports are cashews and peanuts.
> [see any almanac for details]
>
> It is stretching incredulity to attempt picturing this tiny former colony
> as being "important" in world affairs or even general African affairs,
> trade, religion of any kind. It doesn't seem to have attracted press
> attention to any level higher than "filler" items over the last three-
> plus decades. It is definitely not a "hotbed of intrigue and mystery,"
> even in fictional works. It doesn't appear to have any strategic
> military value for air bases or ports to any other nation except
> maybe its immediate neighbors.

This is another of your "because I don't know anything about it, it
can't have happened" pieces of stupidity. The Soviet Union maintained
quite a large presence in Guinea-Bissau back in the '80s. The Cubans
had an even larger presence. Cuban troops returning from Angola and
troops preparing to go there flew Aeroflot from Bissau. There was a
summit of the five Lusophone African nations while I was in the country.
The very first group of Peace Corps volunteers began their service and
USAID had an active program in the country. Aside from those items
unknown to you, each embassy does ongoing political and economic
reporting and offers consular services to traveling Americans. Most have
activity including USIA programs and libraries. Military assistance and
training is another program the U.S. supports. Because no one sent
Leonardo Heathcliffe Anderson a letter, those things can't have taken
place. I know of your deep love for amateur radio, Len. It might
interest you to know that, for most of my two year tour in
Guinea-Bissau, I was the only ham in the country. I made over 75,000
QSOs on CW, SSB and RTTY on 10 through 6 meters.

> "Work." Department of State communications was dragged kicking
> and screaming into modern methods when the Cold War began
> (acknowledged to start about 1948). State had been using standard-
> issue non-updated code books until 1943 while the military had much
> more secure rolling-code machine encryption in 1938 (never any
> evidence that it had been compromised although German crypto
> training regularly broke State book codes as class exercises). We
> can skip over the details on methods-machinery with only a mention
> of the USS Pueblo's capture almost intact by North Korea (mass

> replacement of crypto equipment throughout government right after),
> espionage by USN Chief Warrant Officer Walker and his family
> spy ring that provided the USSR with full details, including tech
> manual photographs and key lists, of the replacement crypto
> systems. A second mass replacement of crypto equipment for the
> US government, this time costing billions but aided by great leaps
> in Information Theory yielding new methods in cryptography.

It is always nice to receive a history lesson from someone on the
outside whether the subject is my work (which this isn't supposed to be
about) or amateur radio which this doesn't touch on at all though this
is an amateur radio newsgroup. Did you have anything on amateur radio
you'd like to say?

> Communications work is important. In an age where the start of
> nuclear holocaust may be only 20 minutes away (first detection of
> an incoming ICBM), government needs quick, secure
> communications. However, the "work" is often over-exaggerated
> and self-glorified or even romanticized in descriptions to lay people.

Communication work doesn't have to be "important" at all. We in
Guinea-Bissau had no responsibilities to warn anyone of a nuclear
holocaust. You must have been thinking of my 2nd AF commo days, Len.
We did do some work with NASA though. Do you know anything about that
or did it not happen because you were unaware?

We already knew of the self-glorification and romanticizing. We've seen
your earlier and frequent descriptions of your Army service.

> However, the word "code" has many meanings and appears
> strange and mysterious to lay people, has many colorings of
> mystery, secret things, even arcane magic. It is wonderful
> fertilizer for works of fiction, enabling quite a few authors to
> grow acres of print, accumulating silos of money. Who can
> refute them? The real details are supposed to be "secret"
> and cannot be revealed on some imagined charge of treason!
> Not quite so in the real communications world.

Much of the material I transmitted and received was and is classified.
Much of the methodology and technology used is classified. I signed
forms indicating that I understood this and that I'd not reveal
classified information under penalty of law. That it bothers some
wizened, embittered geezer in California is pretty insignificant.
It hasn't effected my ham radio activity at all.

(much irrelevant historical blather snipped in the interest of everyone)

> The long-time morsemen keep implying that morse code is
> somehow in the "importance" or "vital nature" area as
> cryptographic code. Nonsense. Rubbish. They are not
> related except for having the same letters in English. That
> one insists that morse codes were "standard procedure" in
> State Department communications defies known procedure

> on radio circuits established throughout the US government
> in the 1940s...order-wires and "synchronization" (of times
> and frequencies) used the same mode as for regular traffic
> on that mode. Anything else is snow-jobbery to an audience
> who has little information on either old or new radio procedures
> outside of amateur radio.

More of your "it can't have been since I never heard it"?
State had very few HF (AFRECONE) primary posts in the 80s and early 90s.
Almost all were in Africa in countries where the infrastructure did not
support leased line communications. CW was used for openings, closings,
QSYs and to agree upon crypto sets for use. It happened. It took
place. It was used daily. Don't let it eat you. Get over it. Go on
with your life. Take up a hobby--maybe ham radio. By the way, did you
have something related to ham radio or are you going off on another
non-linear rant?

> I'm sure some snow machine operators are able to avalanche
> the unfamiliar. To those who've done it and know the systems
> they are simply stuffing snow shoes into their big mouths.

What will we do about the stupid? You've been ignorant before. You've
been enlightened yet you continue to rail as if you can't accept
reality. That would have to make you stupid since you are attempting to
argue something you know nothing about with someone who was there, has
done it, has the T-shirt and the souvenirs. You'd have to be a moron to
attempt that. That would be as goofy as a non-ham telling hams how it
should be.

Dave K8MN

5883. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:33:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A2EEF.807183F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35340

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > ... and there were no women involved in the scenario at all.
>
> You realize that leaves the door open for men to have been involved. :-)

Of course there were men involved. Did you bother to read everything?

Dave K8MN

5884. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:37:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A300A.14F5899C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35341

N2EY wrote:
> The key point (pun
> intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from
> those noises.

So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio Morse
and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
virtually useless in that situation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5885. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:40:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A30D7.DAD9F50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35342

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> >> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering
> >> one or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
> >> goat. Happens here all the time.
>
> >Oh NO! The paranoids are after Dick again! And of course, he is blameless.
>
> Not only blameless, but the others made him act that way. And then, of all
> things, they expected that *he* should be accountable for his actions.

You mean, you mean, the same people who cause him to act that way also
want him to be accountable for the very actions they caused. For shame.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5886. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:44:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A31A4.BC75CD55@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35343

N2EY wrote:
> I don't have access to any of those messages. But I can pretty much guarantee
> that any which were relayed on NTS went at least part of the way on CW.

What does -. ... - mean?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5887. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 12:50:54 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AC48F98D76D7C797.71DC5A3F09A2C700.80FB64197E954028@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 35344

On 23 Feb 2002 00:05:03 GMT, kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) wrote:

>Nope. $10, no matter how many elements you take at that particular session. If
>you fail an element, you will have to fork over another $10 to retest though.

$10 is the maximum per session. Some groups will charge less. Either
way, it's not a bad deal.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

5888. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 13:31:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a3ee8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35346

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
> >agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW
> >themselves. Why would we?
> >
> Because it works!
>
> Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate communications
> facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there would
be
> no
> need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better in this
> regard,
> though). Why should we copy what they do?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5889. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 13:37:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202250537.1ba413c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35345

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...

> Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> Happens here all the time.

The trick is not to get sucked in.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5890. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:21:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6Mre8.15946$ZL5.2338155590@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35350

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
weren't
> > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
argument)
> > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
>
> You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> year-and-a-half now. Please update your database.

Agreed, I recall you saying something about a tar-paper shack. Home Depot
has a great video about plastic siding if you ever get over that way.

> I've never commented
> on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only stated
> that YOU don't know much about DXing.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, I really didn't need to know a whole lot about DX when I got started.
Like you , I was the DX. And being the DX, I worked a lot of DX. So sorry.

Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6 daily, like
he was in KP4-land. You just need a few more years on the noisy side of the
pileup, and you'll lose your snobbishness. Well, maybe you won't.

That is all.

Brian N0iMD

5891. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:21:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7Mre8.15947$NL5.2338143271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35349

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c783dd9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
> weren't
> > > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
> argument)
> > > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
> >
> > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database. I've never commented
> > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only stated
> > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yeah, Brian ;) Didn't you know that you tread on a sacred circle?
> Sheesh...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, perhaps I should wash Dave's feet or kiss his ring. If I don't adore him I'm crap. Oh well.

DXing wasn't about being known or famous or on 25,000 hamshack walls. It was just pure fun. I guess that make me unknowledgeable about it.

When Jim, KH2D, Joe, N3EMA/KH2, and I would have a local roundtable going, there was always a european or a hundred wanting a signal report. No greenstamps required. Buro was fine. WMPY kept me supplied with beautiful cards. So sorry.

73, Brian

5892. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:31:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35402

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >We provide communication service to our public service and
regulatory
> >agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not
use CW
> >themselves. Why would we?
> >
> Because it works!

Jim,

The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
preparedness is totally bogus.

Having been active in emergency communications (ARES/RACES)
for virtually all of the 25 years I've been licensed, including a time
as
a Section Emergency Coordinator, I can assure you that the emergency
management agency "clients" that we serve have NO use for a cadre
of CW operators. They want tactical voice on VHF/UHF (and HF-SSB
when wider area coverage is needed) and data communications ... NOT
the ARRL/NTS style "radiograms" sent by Morse.

As someone stated, the nets that exist to pass such radiograms
exist, not because someone really needs that sort of capability,
but because "it's always been that way" and the nets have come
to create most of the traffic solely for the purpose of justifying
their
own continuation.

> Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate
communications
> facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there
would be
> no need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better
in this
> regard, though). Why should we copy what they do?

Nobody is suggesting that we copy their limitations or shortcomings.

However, there is also no point, and it is actually counter to our image of being a useful resource, to attempt to insist that they use our square pegs (CW) when they have round holes that need filling. The way to show our utility is to give them the round pegs that they want and need.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHpKhZe+N6+q84HiEQJItgCfeU15/aTxp1PBsA8xOHa3LcuPz+UAn0El
aZ2GSFpUhYBr6hkV4FJoFkZW
=2Jj0
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5893. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:32:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bWre8.15951$iT5.2338621511@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35401

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a59tn2$2t4$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:a59l1l0a8t@enews2.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e1e7b46a0bf579989694@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > > And, needless to say, you would be wrong.
> > >
> > > The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly,
one
> > > later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> > > tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> > > beneath the iron and concrete.
> > >
> > > Sorry - I don't know the message. Do you really want to call them up
and
> > > ask them what it was, or are you embarrassed enough by having the gall
> to
> > > try to use the WTC attack as a justification for your smugness?
> > >
> > > joshua houk
> > > kd7pos
> >
> > Do you have a source for this story?
>
> And on what amateur band was the claimed morse
> message being sent?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, lets have the gall to broaden the scope of his claim and include the
non-amateur frequencies as well. After all, we're a training ground for the
other services...

Brian

5894. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:40:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a4f40_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35403

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:

[snip]

> >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> >preferred mode in an emergency.
>
> Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
different.
> Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff
KT4ST is
> involved in.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Another point ... in the vast majority of (the few) cases where CW
is used for emergency communications (including H&W traffic),
it is because the operator CHOOSES to use that mode as a
matter of personal preference, NOT because it is NECESSARY
or because it is the ONLY mode available or that would work.

Operator choice based on preference is fine ... however, it is
not legitimate to infer from this that the use of CW is ESSENTIAL
in any way to emergency communications.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHpM1Ze+N6+q84HiEQJlrgCdFBSRXMLFZzP9vSpY3I9FUEEChgEAoP5U
N8OOMUcbitM9jpmYojonDjfK
=yo7l
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5895. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 14:57:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ehse8.15957$O86.2339739841@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a59312aim1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
> bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> >
> > "Steven - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:a4f1t8pdu1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > In article <3c6ae327@news.bnb-lp.com>, ctj92@cableone.net says...
> > > > Hello John,
> > > > The real-low-down-skinny is that eQSL confirmations are now
accepted
> > > > at the ARRL - DXCC desk provided the eQSL web site "mail-a-card"
service
> > > > is used. Basically this way eQSL becomes a sort of qsl manager by
> > > > verifying logs from both parties of a qso and then mailing out the
card.
> > > > This has never before been done and thus it is a '" news-item "
for
> > > > all DXers that prefer the economy, speed, ease, and fun of
electronic
> > > > qsl'ing. Statements to this affect are plastered all over the eQSL
> > > > website including a copy of the email from Bill Moore at the DXCCC
desk
> > > > verifying that eQSL cards handled in this manner would be valid for
> > > > DXCC.
> > >
> > > However, if the sender of the QSL card objects to having Eqsls act as
a
> > > "qsl manager", they can notify the Eqsl and the DXCC desk
> > > and then the cards will not be accepted for DXCC credit.
> >
> > Steve, what is the motivation for this? Couldn't the DXer simply
refrain
> > from sending his logs to Eqsl?
>
> The whole premise was a paper-less qsl medium. The major problem being
> that people who participated in the DXCC program could not submit eqsls
> for DXCC credit or clicks as some call them. And yes, the DX'er can
> refrain, but when this was announced it was a sudden done deal and a
> few, not all of the DX'ers felt that they should have had a say as to
> whether or not Eqsl would represent them.

I'm sorry Steve, I'm not up on the agreement. So Eqsl changed the rules in the middle of the game. Certainly the Dxers otta have a say.

> > And once the DXer does submit his/her log to Eqsl, did the DXer not work the
> > DX because the confirmation came from this manager and not that manager?
> > I'm inclined to think that the issue is money related.
>
> It isn't a matter of the confirmation per say, I contact you, you reply,
> we're both in the log..confirmed. I download my logs, or visa versa and
> we pick them up from the Eqsl site. It's become a matter that now,
> again for participation in the DXCC, WAZ and several other programs, if
> your contact is in Eqsl's, you have to pay to A $1 have them print out
> the card, mail it to you, then you have to turn around and submit it to
> whatever program your are participating in. So yes, it is a money
> issue.

Seems like a fair deal, though. If you're going direct, postage to many countries is easily a dollar, then you include an addressed envelope and a couple of green stamps. And I'm sure the DXpeditions really don't want a stack of 40,000 cards. Using Eqsl avoids them having to get your card in order to return a card, and is a lot easier on the planet. Now if Eqsl could get away from having to mail out a piece of paper, and just post a record in an electronic database.

> > Just to avoid all the hand wringing that this appears to be causing, I'm
> > satisfied with whatever I've recorded in my log book. I'd rather have
> > pictures of my kids on the wall anyway. All my real awards are in the top
> > drawer of my dresser, and my kids will get to throw them out someday, same
> > as any paper I put on the wall.
>
> Ands as Carl had said, he doesn't either, but there are lots of people,
> myself included that do.

More power to them. I used to send out cards to the buro at the end of the week or month, depending on how busy I was. Then I would get these direct cards that I had already sent out a buro card, so...I would send a direct back.

With EQSL, if everyone posted their logs it could be a simple matter to match records and get instant verification. They could track all awards for you and generate an e-mail when you needed to send your$10 or whatever to the ARRL.

> > > I have noticed a number of people requesting that their logs be
> > > "returned" as they do not want Eqsl acting in this capacity. The prime
> > > reason given is that the logs were sent with the understanding that no
> > > money was needed (other than a donation. Now Eqsl wants to charge for a
> > > contact (which is fine, I guess). but they "object" to having Eqsl
> > > represent itself as a qsl manager for them without 1st asking.

> >
> > What else would Eqsl be doing if not acting as a qsl manager? You send
them
> > your logs and... they're not supposed to recover their costs?
>
> According to the various programs, there must be an understanding that
> the QSL manager is representing the particular DX station. There are
> several instances right now where the are bogus QSL managers for a
> number of pirate stations. My understanding from discussion with Wayne
> Mills and Bill Moore is that you can't arbitrarily declare yourself the
> QSL manager without specific permission form the DX station. Up and
> till recent Eqsl was a clearinghouse for qsl confirmations. Now
> recently, they have gone into the business of selling cards if you wish
> to participate in these various programs.

Hmm, I really have no interest in bogus managers for bogus stations. But
Eqsl needs to honor their original agreements.

> > Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you
meant
> > to say charging for a "confirmation."
>
> Correct, my error. The contact has already been made. If you want a
> "valid" confirmation that can be submitted for DXCC or WAS or WAZ, you
> have to pay.

I guess its a valid assumption that we "pay for the contact" but we need to
retrain our senses to comply with the rules.

> > At least thats what a KF2 is supposed
> > to be saying in America, given Part 97 as it exists.... unless we "just
> > ignore" the rules.
>
>
> Yep, Part 97 specifically states you can't accept money for a contact,
> but then again, as you correctly point out, this is not a contact, it's
> a confirmation of the contact already made. I'm aware of several DX
> stations that actually required a cash contribution above and beyond the
> normal SASE or IRC, before they would release a card, one formerly being
> on Roatan Island and the other being on Reunion Island. But then their
> foreign stations and Part 97 does not apply. The point is, it seems to
> go against the very principles that Eqsl has been trying to develop. A
> paper-less qsl format that requires virtually no $$$ except for a
> voluntary donation to the upkeep of the site. Yet, now they are
> printing cards for cash. You can't have one that you can use for these
> programs unless you pay. In this case, are you paying for the contact
> or paying for the confirmation? The contact has already been made, as
> proven by the downloaded card. The confirmation is another story and is
> not covered anywhere by Part 97.
>
> It all boils down to the principle. If you want to play, you are being

> forced to pay. Illegal, no, just a tad strange that they'd set the bar
> and when more and more people complain they lower it themselves.
>
> I doubt, at least for the time being that you are going to see any of
> the big DX operations use Eqsls. Again, for one thing, the card won't
> count for any clicks, as Jim calls them. For another, there is the
> voluntary donations that some people make with their cards to help
> offset/recover some of the costs. What I've seen is the basic DX stuff,
> essentially from contests, etc. I doubt you'll see the TI9M or the H40T
> downloading their logs to eqsls. LOTW maybe, but for the time being not
> Eqsls
>
> But as you said previously, if you aren't participating in these
> programs, what difference does it make if they print cards or not, the
> point is moot. The confirmations are their in the computer and the
> archives.
>
>
> Up until your last sentence Brian, it was nice to have a rational
> conversation with you for a change. You just can't let a good thing go
> by without going true to form. Too bad.
>
> Have a good weekend

Sorry for my jerky comment. You've provided a very straight forward explanation of the Eqsl situation. Thank you.

Brian

5896. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 15:34:18 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e3f8a07c291b9a98969c@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35405

In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> preparedness is totally bogus.

Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.

> As someone stated, the nets that exist to pass such radiograms
> exist, not because someone really needs that sort of capability,
> but because "it's always been that way" and the nets have come
> to create most of the traffic solely for the purpose of justifying
> their own continuation.

Ah... so next up is No Traffic International?

joshua houk
kd7pos

5897. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 15:53:52 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a5dmmq$16q$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <ehse8.15957$O86.2339739841@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>,
bpburke@prodigy.net says...
>
> "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:a59312aim1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> > In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
> > bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> > >

> Seems like a fair deal, though. If you're going direct, postage to many
> countries is easily a dollar, then you include an addressed envelope and a
> couple of green stamps. And I'm sure the DXpeditions really don't want a
> stack of 40,000 cards. Using Eqsl avoids them having to get your card in
> order to return a card, and is a lot easier on the planet. Now if Eqsl
> could get away from having to mail out a piece of paper, and just post a
> record in an electronic database.

I think that's the hardest part of this whole thing. How do handle the
busted calls, reversed letters, miscopied callsigns? In CW (I am not
starting this up here) my call can be misconstrued as KF2D if I send it
quickly. How would an electronic database handle matching that up or an
even better problem..not everyones computer clock is set the same. How
can you confirm a contact by computer, for record keeping, if the times
are different.

Right now you are EQSL for the QSL card and the ARRL LOTW for submitting
(soon hopefully) cards to the various programs. Who knows if the 2 can
come to a mutual agreement. Only time will tell.

>
> With EQSL, if everyone posted their logs it could be a simple matter to
> match records and get instant verification. They could track all awards for
> you and generate an e-mail when you needed to send your$10 or whatever to
> the ARRL.

I think eventually it may come to that.

> > According to the various programs, there must be an understanding that
> > the QSL manager is representing the particular DX station. There are
> > several instances right now where the are bogus QSL managers for a
> > number of pirate stations. My understanding from discussion with Wayne
> > Mills and Bill Moore is that you can't arbitrarily declare yourself the
> > QSL manager without specific permission form the DX station. Up and
> > till recent Eqsl was a clearinghouse for qsl confirmations. Now
> > recently, they have gone into the business of selling cards if you wish

> > to participate in these various programs.
>
> Hmm, I really have no interest in bogus managers for bogus stations. But
> Eqsl needs to honor their original agreements.

I think that's what created the uproar to begin with, the move from the stated course.

>
> > > Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think you
> meant
> > > to say charging for a "confirmation."
> >
> > Correct, my error. The contact has already been made. If you want a
> > "valid" confirmation that can be submitted for DXCC or WAS or WAZ, you
> > have to pay.
>
> I guess its a valid assumption that we "pay for the contact" but we need to
> retrain our senses to comply with the rules.

This is were we disagree as to the nature of the "paying for the contact" The FCC sez you can not charge for making the contact. I and Riley look at this as you (for example sake) are running a DX op in P5..everyone needs this, so you set up a website where those wanting a contact have to deposit $$$ before you'll acknowledge me on the air.

That certainly violates the rule. I think voluntarily, and the FCC agrees on this, that my putting a couple $$$ or extra IRCs to help cover the costs is perfectly acceptable. If I include nothing more than a SASE, including those using the postage of the return country, in the large majority of cases, I get my card. I see website advertising the DXoperation soliciting donations, but nothing that ever states they are mandatory, that would be illegal as far as US based ops are concerned.

All boils down that there are still way too many questions and not enough answers. Once that happens this will become another remember when story.

BTW, did you know Jim, KH2D became a mainlander several months ago. Here's still living on an island surrounded by H2O, but it's part of the state of Fla. I remember you knew him when you were stationed there on Guam way back.

Have a good week

73, Steve

5898. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:05:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A60CC.FD33037D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35407

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Dick, I was talking about people who can tell the difference between human
> >tapping
> >> and nonhuman tapping. I'm sorry you are not one of those people. When you
> >hear
> >> a woodpecker, do you automatically assume someone is sending an 'SOS'?
> >ROTFL
>
> > Oh, we know, You're a master of changing meanings in mid thread. We see it
> >from you all the time. Meanwhile you insist I dot every i and cross every t.
> >Whatta horses ass.
>
> You had to "defend yourself" again because Cecil commented that he believes
> that humans can tell the difference between human and non-human tapping?
>
> This "defend yourself" justification for your public profanity is wearing
> pretty thin if you consider what Cecil said "an attack." Do you really need
> that much "coddling?"
>

Thanks for proving that what I said is true, Ed. You *DO* automatically
side with Cecil regardless. Or you're just as witless as he. Do not either of
you read the news? There have been many cases of sounds coming from
within a destroyed building that rescuers could not determine whether or
not were being made by humans. Is that reason enough for everyone to
learn Morse code? Of course not. It sure is reason enough for Cecil to
act like a horses ass and for you to jump to his defense.

5899. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:08:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A619A.79B5C07D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35408

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C7906BB.661CFF51@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C786999.9F6A0A49@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >Joshua Houk wrote:
> >> >> The only survivors found in the rubble - six FDNY personnel (sadly, one
> >> >> later died due to his severe injuries) - were found because they were
> >> >> tapping out morse code to make people aware that there were buried
> >> >> beneath the iron and concrete.
> >> >
> >> >One wonders why simple tapping was not sufficient.
> >>
> >> Simple tapping could originate from any number of sources besides trapped
> >> people.
> >
> >From inside the collapsed World Trade Center?
>
> Sure. And the rescue people made all kinds of noises, too. The key point (pun
> intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from
> those noises.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> What a strange thing to say.
>

Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to support him.

5900. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:11:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a64cf_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35410

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020224221056.19003.00000087@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> >> >at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
> >> >the speed to 12.5 wpm ...
> >>
> >> That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the
> >> WRITTEN exam so that it required more radio knowledge in
> >> order to pass.
> >
> >The letter refers to "A slight stiffening of the basic
examination,"
> >then *discounts* the written exams as a means to the end of
> >limiting the number of hams. Clearly, from the letter, which
> >was published in an ARRL publication, as indicated, the
> >emphasis was on code as a filter to keep people out of ham
> >radio.
>
> The letter and the "200 Meters and Down" story are simply summaries
of
> the situation. The written tests WERE made tougher.

Perhaps marginally so, but that is NOT what the ARRL
asked for from the FCC, according to the account published
by the ARRL itself

> >> > SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
> >> >hams "because the bands were too crowded."
> >>
> >> Incorrect.
> >
> >NOT INCORRECT ... read on ...
>
> No, it's incorrect. The idea was to slow down the growth. Imagine
having
> too many newcomers as a problem!

SORRY ... the letter SPECIFICALLY states (read the quotes
again) that:
1) "the total number of amateurs will doubtless be controlled
```

in the future" [this is population control, not growth control]
2) "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
relatively constant during the past two years." [this indicates
no problem with growth, but with a desire to control the TOTAL
size of the population ... sort of "So 'our' (those of us who
are
currently amongst the 'haves') bands aren't more crowded
than we'd like, we want to keep newcomers out."]
>
> >Here are quotes from an article posted on the NCI website.
> >The specific URL to read the entire article is:
> >
> >http://www.nocode.org/articles/filter.html
> >
> >Begin quote from above-referenced article
>
> Do you have any other source material? Say, the QSTs of the era?
> Interviews with hams who were on the air at the time?

I am trusting that the ARRL published an accurate account
of their request to, and the response from, the FCC. Note
also in the entire article on the NCI website, at the end, the fact
that the article was researched by a professional archivist,
not by me ...

> >*********
> >In Clinton B. DeSoto's classic book, Two Hundred Meters and Down,
> >The Story of Amateur Radio (Published by the American Radio Relay
> >League in 1936) is the following passage on page 179. DeSoto was
> >a highly placed ARRL official at the time his book was written and
> >published, so we assume it represents League thinking.
> >
> >"The growth of amateur radio and the total number of amateurs will
> >doubtless be controlled in the future. The present condition of the
> >amateur bands, while not intolerable, approaches saturation. ...
> >[The number of amateurs at the time was 46,000]
>
> Which was approaching saturation given the typical techniques of the
day,
> and the band allocations of that time. Seems incredible today, but
that
> was the case back then.

So you say ... I'm more inclined to think it was more a
case of the "haves" vs. the "have-nots" ... the same sort
of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."

>
> > DeSoto goes on:

> >
> >"Obviously no competent person can be denied the right
>> to become an amateur.
>
> Which means the total number cannot be controlled, and
> this was realized by DeSoto, ARRL leadership and the
> FCC back then.

That's not what the letter says or contemplates ... the objective
is CLEARLY to limit the total population of hams by using
faster Morse requirements as a "filter." The letter also CLEARLY
states that the standards of competency had been raised "to
the point where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur
operator's license than it was ten years ago." [This in itself
raises questions about the assertion that newcomers' qualifications
were truly lacking ... and points to a purely "control the population
for the benefit of the incumbents and to hell with everyone else"
sort of attitude ... sorry ... I've seen the "not in my sandbox"
attitude towards newcomers to ham radio too many times over
the past 25 years to be so naive as to not be suspicious of
the motives in this case ...]

> >The only justifiable restrictive procedure is to raise the
> >standards of competency. This has already been done to the point
> >where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur
operator's
> >license than it was ten years ago. Increasing the code speed
> >equirement is one step in this direction. ..."
> >
> >DeSoto goes on to say that additional restrictions are not needed
> >since "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
> >relatively constant during the past two years. A slight stiffening
of
> >the basic examination, together with the increased code-speed
> >requirement, would accomplish the desired result."
> >
> >At the 1936 annual ARRL Board Meeting held in West Hartford, CT)
> >the Board "...voted to ask [the] FCC to raise the code speed
> >requirement on license exams to 12.5 wpm..
> >[From Official Broadcast 671, May 10, 1936]
> >
> >A letter was then sent by Mr. K. B. Warner, ARRL General Manager,
to
> >the FCC requesting a code speed increase from 10 to 12 words per
> >minute. Here are some quotes from Warner's letter:
> >
> >"It has become desirable to raise the general standard of
> >qualification for an amateur operator license. Observations show
> >that too many licensed amateurs do not possess the qualifications
> >presupposed by the regulations. Considering that the written part
> >of the examination may be mastered with relative ease, the chief

> >opportunity for a better selective process resides with the code
> >examination. ..." [That is pretty clear!]
>
> Yep, it's pretty clear:

Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
license than it was ten years ago." So, again, it seems that the
"haves"
simply wanted to keep the "have-nots" out of "their (the haves')
sandbox."

> "Observations show that too many licensed amateurs do not possess
> the qualifications presupposed by the regulations."

Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
license than it was ten years ago." Smells pretty rotten to me. I
think
Mssrs. DeSoto and Warner "spoke with forked tongue" as they used
to say in the cowboys and indians movies ...

> >"A general raising of the standards could help to confine the
> >obviously limited facilities of amateur radio to those who have
> >at least nominal aptitude for the same. It seems indicated that
> >this situation could be best treated by an increase in the code
> >speed. Consequently the League now requests the Commission
> >to increase the code speed required in the amateur examination
> >from ten words per minute to twelve and one-half words per minute."
> >*********
> >
> >It's clear from the above that the ARRL, at the time, wanted to
> >"control the population" and that the bands, with ~46k amateurs
> >were "approaching saturation."
>
> The problem was that getting a license was so easy that huge
> numbers of newcomers were raising havoc - on the bands
> and with other services.

Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
license than it was ten years ago." And "The total number of licensed
amateur operators has remained relatively constant during the past two
years." Sorry ... still having difficulty being naive enough to buy
that
this was a "benevolant move for the benefit of all."

> >The referenced letter also states that "the chief opportunity for
> >a better selective process resides with the code examination."
> >
> >The final paragraph above ALSO indicates QUITE CLEARLY
> >that the increase in code speed which the ARRL requested was
> >TO CONTROL THE NUMBER OF AMATEURS.
>
> And the earlier parts clearly show that no qualified person could be

> denied a license, and that too many of the hams of the day
> lacked the necessary qualifications.

In the view of the (self-appointed) "elite" ... who admitted that it
was
"many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
license than it was ten years ago."

> >> The concerns were:
> >>
> >> 1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
> >
> >I find that hard to swallow with well more than an order of
> >magnitude fewer hams than today ...
>
> Yet it is true. In 1936, US hams had 160, 80, 40, 20, 10 meters
> on HF/MF, plus 5, 2-1/2 and 1-1/4 meters. (In fact, hams could
> use almost all of the "ultrahighs" back then).
>
> But most hams clustered on 40, 80 and 160. Many hams used
> only one band because of equipment and antenna limitations.
>
> Although a few hams were using SSB, (W6DEI and others, as
> early as 1931), almost all amateurs on voice used AM.
>
> Using typical amateur equipment and methods of the mid 1930s,
> how many QSOs do you think those bands could support?

Typical response of the "haves" ... instead of accepting some
inevitable congestion and embracing new technology to solve
the "problem," take the approach of keeping out the "have-nots"
(newcomers) and remaining largely stagnant, while acting in the
role of the (self-proclaimed) elite ...

> >also, even if it
> >were true, which I don't buy, a better solution than
> >"controlling the population" would have been to encourage
> >folks to spread out a bit by using the other bands, which
> >you insinuate were not "so crowded."
>
> The ARRL DID encourage the use of 10 meters, 5 meters
> and up. As early as 1928 there were lots of articles on
> getting on the "ultrahighs" - particularly after mobile
> operation was authorized there. But the results obtained were
> a far cry from what could be done with the same expenditure and
> complexity of equipment on the HF bands.

There's no such thing as a free lunch ... we hams are
SUPPOSED to experiment and develop better methods
("advance the radio art"), not sit around and bitch and
whine that things are "too crowded" and "we need to keep
newcomers out" ... we should be working to use our

spectrum more efficiently so that ALL qualified applicants
can be accomodated ... not generating artificial limits,
barriers, and elitist attitudes.

[snipped some lengthly detail, not to avoid the issue,
but only for brevity, trying to cut to "the meat" of the issue]

> Back in the 1930s, a typical amateur receiver had a passband of 10
> kHz - 20 to 40 times that of a modern receiver. Shape factors of
> 10:1 were common, and dynamic range was all over the place. Some
> receivers were pretty good while others were awful in this regard.
> There was also the split-frequency situation. End result was that
> the spectral efficiency of CW was not realized in most situations,
> and the bands were "very crowded" if one used the equipment
> commonly used at the time.
>
> Proof of this is simple: Advanced hams were using SSB and
> single-signal crystal filter receivers by the mid 1930s. This
progress
> was driven by the crowding of the bands.

Fine ... so the "average" ham should have been adopting
this technology in response to "crowding" rather than
bitching an whining and doing noting to resolve it. Limiting
the population as an alternative to actually fixing the problem
is a crappy, self-serving, elitist "solution," IMHO.

> >Why did they *discount* improvements
> >in the written tests and focus ONLY on increasing code speed?
> >(And why only in reference to "controlling the population?")
> >
> Controlling - not limiting. BIG difference.

Actually controlling the total number of amateurs certainly
implies that establishing some limit was the idea ...

> >> >The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
> >> >for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...
> >>
> >> Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2.
> >> Then 5 wpm was added.
> >
> >Yes, for a novice license, good for 1 year, non-renewable.
> >"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
> >(Some "welcome"!!!)
>
> The same 1951 restructuring that gave us the Novice also gave us the

> Technician - which had a 5 wpm code test!
>
> Have you forgotten about the Tech license?

No ... the meat of the issue is, and always has been,
access to the HF bands.

> Your statement:
>
> "Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
>Some "welcome"!!!)
>
> indicates a hatred of the code itself

It does NOT indicate a hatred of the code itself ... it
indicates disgust with the way in which self-appointed
elitists, whose elitism was based in many cases purely
on code prowess, used the code for decades as a tool
to systematically keep otherwise perfectly qualified
people out of ham radio.

> >> >Was this decision made "for good reason" ???
> >>
> >> They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are
> >> you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?
> >
> >Yes, I think so ... if you read the entire article, you'll find out
> >that the FCC Chief Engineer at the time sounded a LOT like
> >Larry or Dick "If you can't do 25-30 wpm, you're not much of
> >an operator."
>
> For 1936, was he not correct? At that time, Morse/CW was THE
> major mode of both the military and commercial services. Yes, there
> was some voice and some RTTY, but only a small amount compared
> to Morse/CW.
>
> >In fact, he states the view in his reply that "An
> >operator whose top speed is not more than 12 words per
> >minute would be classed as a poor operator."
> >(Sounds a LOT like Larry or Dick ...)
>
> Why is that not correct - for 1936?

Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
has ALWAYS been BS.

> >I respectfully decline to concede, absent some more
> >compelling evidence that your assertions are not little
> >more than conjecture.
>
> See above. I would respectfully suggest that your conclusions are
> conjecture based mostly on lack of historical background of the
time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

As I said ... we disagree ... let's agree to disagree. I don't have the time to compose such lenthy posts when there is little prospect that we will persuade each other to change our views, so why bother? You've said your views and I've said mine ... why don't we leave it up to others to decide whose views they buy and whose they don't? I can live with that ... freedom of opinion.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHpiC5e+N6+q84HiEQKofwCg27gk31/GVft7g25uh8Dw0RTafagAnRm8
Y9Q/V0nTyrJrNkZWOGQvwusQ
=d7dq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5901. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:17:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A63BE.13A52B06@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35409

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > The key point (pun
> > intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from
> > those noises.
>
> So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
> you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio Morse
> and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
> would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
> virtually useless in that situation.
>

That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.

5902. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:21:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a6766_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35412

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e338f18fa6543b98969b@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c798146_2@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
>
> > However, I've just never seen them "name names" in
> > their public comments (the little I've read of the ARRL Letter, for
> > example.
>
> Unfortunately for me, they have. Just checked it out.
>
> Cripes!
>
> There seems to be a small difference in that from what I've seen it
> doesn't look like the ARRL ever (hold on!) published a news release that
> someone had made a Reply Comment without the ARRL noting that it made a
> Reply Comment in reply. From the way the NCI page is set up, it looks
> like they possibly did, but either later or concurrently posted a news
> item about their Reply Comment to the Reply Comment.
>
> In other words, I'm making a lot of brouhaha over nothing.

Josh ...

That was my impression from the start .. perhaps a bit too
eager to find fault, simply on the basis that you don't agree
with NCI's fundamental agenda?

> Yeah, I didn't like the tone of the news release, but I think what I
> initially took as browbeating and the targeting of someone is a whole lot
> more innocuous than that.

Exactly ...

> joshua houk
> kd7pos

See, NCI is not "the evil empire" ... just an organization that
understands, and pursues its rights under, the regulatory process
and tries to keep its members informed of what's going on.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]

<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5903. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:31:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A66FD.569A0D73@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35411

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> . the same sort
> of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
> PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
> to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."

Are you *never* going to grow up and join the adult world? Evidently
not,
you've demonstrated the same juvenile attitude for at least the past 25
years.
That we can accept, but to deny that radiotelegraphy is BASIC radio
communications is inexcusable for a supposed professional. It is even used

by professionals to do some high tech things.

5904. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:34:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a6a86_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35413

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225061349.11751.00000476@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
> >without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.
>
> They know what the tests are and because they feel they can pass
them easily
> after decades of hamming, they think they are trivial tests compared
to the
> "hard" ones they took before they had decades of experience.

Yet, Ed ... I truly wonder how many hams who have been
licensed for 20+ years could actually walk in and pass
those "easy, dumbed-down" tests of today without some
considerable practice and study ... unfortunately, for the
ARS, I'd be willing to bet that the the percentage would
be disappointingly ... even disturbingly ... low.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHpnqJe+N6+q84HiEQLDTACgl8EbMkSLDZAWZxrccCNGHdlc1hsAniGp
1/VzqDlvu8z5Ne/V1qnbSge4
=uJ+x
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5905. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:47:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7A6A9B.AF2E0390@uci.edu>
Source record: 35424

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I have never implied that SSB gets through when CW doesn't, Jim.
> >
> > Saying that "CW gets through when SSB doesn't" is a false statement
> > implies that when SSB doesn't get through, CW doesn't either. That's
> > the misleading thing you're saying.
>
> You sure need a lesson in logic, Jim, more than can be done in a newsgroup.

Thanks for your opinion. I'll take it under advisement. You could use
a lesson in common sense, OM.

> Nope, I'm a died-in-the-wool Texan. You, OTOH, obviously deserve a
call from
> the land of fruits and nuts.

I already have a 6 call, if that's what you mean. Given the two
locations, Texas and California, I'm thankful to be here.

5906. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:52:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6BB9.96B94575@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35414

Dick Carroll wrote:
> ... to deny that radiotelegraphy is BASIC radio
> communications is inexcusable for a supposed professional. It is even used
> by professionals to do some high tech things.

Uhhhhhhh Dick, BASIC is a programming language. And nobody has denied
that radiotelegraphy is basic radio communications. In fact, it is so
extremely basic that we don't need to test for it anymore.

I've never had a memory keyer before and I hated sending a 12 character
QTH twice each QSO. The memory keyer on my new IC-756pro solves the problem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5907. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:54:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6C3D.5D4BA460@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35415

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Thanks for proving that what I said is true, Ed. You *DO* automatically
> side with Cecil regardless.

That's a lie, Dick. Ed said I was wrong about the basic logic behind,
"CW gets through when SSB doesn't."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5908. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:54:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7A6C54.92A2CD96@uci.edu>
Source record: 35425

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C76C529.D809C673@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> What is N2EY's experience on CW or SSB above UHF?
> > >
> > >Tell us about yours, Len (he said reluctantly).
>
> Why?

The same question occurred to me when you demanded to know about N2EY's experience.

5909. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:56:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35417

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > The key point (pun
> > > intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from
> > > those noises.
> >
> > So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
> > you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio Morse
> > and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
> > would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
> > virtually useless in that situation.
>
> That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.

Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5910. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 16:59:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A6D6A.A5C50B51@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35416

N2EY wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> > Happens here all the time.
>
> The trick is not to get sucked in.

Yep, it's tempting to just let the Texas Blowhard have his way with rrap
but that wouldn't be right, either.

5911. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:01:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6DF4.BB639A38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35420

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > What a strange thing to say.
>
> Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to support him.

I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5912. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:02:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A6E44.F945F46@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35418

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> preparedness is totally bogus.

So hams preparing themselves to use the most basic radiocommunications mode
is bogus. We see where you're coming from. You're one of the people who would rather have no communications at all rather than "use that old stuff".
That is exactly what I heard an administrator say once when all the computer
comms were out of service and we HAD no communications.

Welcome to the 21st century, where either it's high tech or it doesn't exist.

5913. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:02:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6E33.353E2CDE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35421

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> > Happens here all the time.
>
> The trick is not to get sucked in.

Dick usually swallows it hook, line, and sinker. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5914. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:04:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A6EA8.E38EA78D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35422

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
>
> > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > preparedness is totally bogus.
>
> Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.

The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW. That's why I have a
spare HF rig stored in a metal footlocker.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5915. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:04:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A6EC2.25F37A50@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35419

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>NCI is not "the evil empire"

That wouldn't keep it from being the "ignorant impire".

5916. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:06:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7A6F00.A11253F9@uci.edu>
Source record: 35426

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You said that omitting boundaries invalidates that statement. Remember?
> > Try to keep up.
>
> The statement, "CW gets through when SSB doesn't", is the ***ONLY***
> statement so far that doesn't contain boundary conditions. What appears
> to be the problem is that you don't recognize boundary conditions when
> they are staring you in the face.

Only a totally naieve person would think that it is an unbounded case.

> No, you did *NOT* unbound my statement. That is your error.

> I don't like being jerked around by someone who doesn't fathom
> what is contained in his own statements.

That's what you'd like to think. Makes you feel better about you, I guess. :-) I suspect it wouldn't come up so often were that not the case.

5917. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:11:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7A703F.8DAA53C6@uci.edu>
Source record: 35428

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c75c94c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > I don't know about y'all, but it seems to me that every Field Day I've
> > ever
> > > paid attention, when the bands die, the bands die...for all modes. I've
> > > seen voice go first, but CW will even fade fairly quick as well...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > As far as you know.

> What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of opportunity
> where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.

Reminds me of the locker room scene in the movie The Right Stuff, when
Deke Slayton was explaining what Gus "Bubba" Grissom was saying.

No, Cecil. She didn't say that. I would have noticed.

5918. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:12:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7A7060.5898B68B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35423

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > preparedness is totally bogus.
>
> So hams preparing themselves to use the most basic radiocommunications
> mode is bogus.

You guys obviously have a difference of opinion, like Ford Vs Chevy.
What's wrong with allowing both of your guys to prepare for emergencies
in the way you each choose to prepare? What is wrong with live and let
live? Nobody wants to take your CW preparedness away from you, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5919. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:12:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7A7089.5D220634@uci.edu>
Source record: 35429

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> What are you saying, Jim? Are you thinking that there are no CW operators
> at Field Days?

You aren't really THAT clueless, are you?

5920. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 17:45:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7a7b2b_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35427

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e3f8a07c291b9a98969c@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net
says...
>
> > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > preparedness is totally bogus.
>
> Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.

Try using (whatever) after a large EMP event.
The issue is whether physical devices will be
"fried" ... not whether a mode will work or not.
(And let's not get into the "cobble something
together in the field from scrap parts" argument.)

Actually, there was something published (I believe
by the ARRL) some years back that indicated that
most ham gear, with reasonable precautions, would
do surprisingly well in the event of an EMP.

> > As someone stated, the nets that exist to pass such radiograms
> > exist, not because someone really needs that sort of capability,
> > but because "it's always been that way" and the nets have come
> > to create most of the traffic solely for the purpose of justifying
> > their own continuation.
>
> Ah... so next up is No Traffic International?

No ... let's not be ridicuous ... if people enjoy the exercise
of passing traffic via the NTS, who am I to try to suggest
that they stop? The only point I was making is that NTS
type "radiograms" are not what emergency management
folks need or want and that the NTS creates a lot of
message traffic simply to jusify its continued existence.
(again, if people enjoy the activity, that's fine by me, but
let's not distort reality to the degree of asserting that it is
an essential function any more, when it's pretty much
devolved into a recreational activity ...)

Carl - wa6vse

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHp4G5e+N6+q84HiEQKGVACfXVSyYoMVu+qE7ZcjhAVliTibV+sAn1gN
rox+ubP+iTr44gFA8woLocev
=QJMm
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5921. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 18:04:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202251004.3b274ee7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35430

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7a4f40_1@news7.fast.net>...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
>
> [snip]
>
> > >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> > >preferred mode in an emergency.
> >
> > Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
> different.
> > Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff
> KT4ST is
> > involved in.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Another point ... in the vast majority of (the few) cases where CW
> *is* used for emergency communications (including H&W traffic),
> it is because the operator CHOOSES to use that mode as a
> matter of personal preference, NOT because it is NECESSARY
> or because it is the ONLY mode available or that would work.

In the cases I cited, the operators used CW because SSB WOULD NOT GET
THROUGH. Other modes were NOT available, or would not get through.

Let me repaeat that in case it's not clear: In the cases I cited, CW
was used because SSB simply couldn't do the job, and other modes were
not available.

Carl, let's see you cite the "vast majority of cases" where other
available modes would not work.

> Operator choice based on preference is fine ... however, it is
> not legitimate to infer from this that the use of CW is ESSENTIAL
> in any way to emergency communications.

I'm not saying that any mode is essential. Personally, I find it
amazing that digital modes (voice, image and data) are not more used
by hams in emergency work.

But the categorical denial that CW/Morse plays any role in emergency comms by hams is simply false.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5922. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 18:04:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0202251004.20cf1686@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35431

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7a4f40_1@news7.fast.net>...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
>
> [snip]
>
> > >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> > >preferred mode in an emergency.
> >
> > Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
> different.
> > Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff
> KT4ST is
> > involved in.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Another point ... in the vast majority of (the few) cases where CW
> *is* used for emergency communications (including H&W traffic),
> it is because the operator CHOOSES to use that mode as a
> matter of personal preference, NOT because it is NECESSARY
> or because it is the ONLY mode available or that would work.

In the cases I cited, the operators used CW because SSB WOULD NOT GET
THROUGH. Other modes were NOT available, or would not get through.

Let me repaeat that in case it's not clear: In the cases I cited, CW
was used because SSB simply couldn't do the job, and other modes were
not available.

Carl, let's see you cite the "vast majority of cases" where other
available modes would not work.

> Operator choice based on preference is fine ... however, it is
> not legitimate to infer from this that the use of CW is ESSENTIAL
> in any way to emergency communications.

I'm not saying that any mode is essential. Personally, I find it
amazing that digital modes (voice, image and data) are not more used
by hams in emergency work.

But the categorical denial that CW/Morse plays any role in emergency comms by hams is simply false.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5923. ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 18:15:36 UTC
From: Daniel Hicks <w8mmq-nospam@email.com>
Message-ID: <3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
Source record: 35432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What do you think?

Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice your opinions.

No License? No Radio!
http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/

Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
http://www.eham.net/survey/
(You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)

This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take the time to review it, and consider taking part.

73 de,
Dan, W8MMQ

5924. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 18:31:52 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35433
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
of a license before sale? Give me a break!

I bought my Swan 500C as incentive to get my Novice ticket. BEFORE
I had any HAM license at all. I got the Swan, listened to my friends, and
practiced listening to code. Finally got my ticket.

I bought my Kenwood TR-2400 as incentive to get my Tech license.
BEFORE I had privileges on 2M. Listening to 2M gave me the bug to
get off my butt and over to Dallas to take the test for upgrade.

My Alinco DR-590 dual-bander for my car was a birthday gift from
my wife, who DIDN'T have a ticket. You're little Gestapo tactics would
rule out anyone buying a radio as a gift.

I had decided (but actually didn't buy it) to get a K2 as my incentive to
get back into CW and upgrade. Opps, should I not be allowed to buy
a radio out of class?

Little people with little minds making a big agenda to control anyone
they can, any way they can. And when they can't build themselves up,
they try to put anyone else into a lower class. Hey, it's all relative.

This kind of 'attitude' makes me be ashamed to be associated with some
HAMs. The 'little' people who just have to be controlling of anyone they
can, and make a big thing out of nothing... I had a boss one time like
that. Managed by putting the people under him under his thumb. Didn't
last long...

Mike

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>
> No License? No Radio!
> http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
>

> Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> http://www.eham.net/survey/
> (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
>
> This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
the
> time to review it, and consider taking part.
>
> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ

5925. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 18:31:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225133157.10663.00000086@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35434

In article <20020224221056.19003.00000087@mb-bd.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
>>> Here's my reply to Carl's earlier post. This is driectly from
>>>google.
>
>Actually, it's "directly" from google....
>>
>>Jim,
>>
>>I certainly trust you to accurately recount your previous
>>post.
>
>Thanks!
>>
>>OK ... I'll respond ...
>>
>>> In article <3c6e7faf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>>
>>> >"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>>> >news:3C6FB8F3.D5572023@worldnet.att.net...
>>>
>>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>>
>>> >> > In the vast majority of the world, there ARE not
>>> >> > govt. mandated sub-band restrictions on mode usage ...
>>> >> > this does not seem to have caused any perceivable problem
>>> >> > requiring regulatory action by those other administrations.
>>>
>>> >> That's a fact, one which should elicit a mental response
>>> >> something like "So the FCC at some time in the past
>>> >> created band segments by mode
>>> >> for US hams, obviously for some good reason."
>>> >
>>> >Not necessarily ... as an example, the CW test speed used to
>>> >be 10 wpm ...
>>>
>>> Hold it right there. Tell the WHOLE story.
>>
>>OK ... no problem ... nothing to hide here.

>
>Uh huh...
>>
>>> The code test speed for US licenses (except the old Extra) was 10
>>> wpm from 1919 to 1936.
>>
>>No argument so far ...
>>
>>> >at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
>>> >the speed to 12.5 wpm ...
>>>
>>> That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the
>>> WRITTEN exam so that it required more radio knowledge in
>>> order to pass.
>>
>>The letter refers to "A slight stiffening of the basic examination,"
>>then *discounts* the written exams as a means to the end of
>>limiting the number of hams. Clearly, from the letter, which
>>was published in an ARRL publication, as indicated, the
>>emphasis was on code as a filter to keep people out of ham
>>radio.
>
>The letter and the "200 Meters and Down" story are simply summaries of
>the situation. The written tests WERE made tougher.
>>
>>> > SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
>>> >hams "because the bands were too crowded."
>>>
>>> Incorrect.
>>
>>NOT INCORRECT ... read on ...
>
>No, it's incorrect. The idea was to slow down the growth. Imagine having
>too many newcomers as a problem!
>
>>Here are quotes from an article posted on the NCI website.
>>The specific URL to read the entire article is:
>>
>>http://www.nocode.org/articles/filter.html
>>
>>Begin quote from above-referenced article
>
>Do you have any other source material? Say, the QSTs of the era?
>Interviews with hams who were on the air at the time?
>
>>*********
>>In Clinton B. DeSoto’s classic book, Two Hundred Meters and Down,
>>The Story of Amateur Radio (Published by the American Radio Relay
>>League in 1936) is the following passage on page 179. DeSoto was
>>a highly placed ARRL official at the time his book was written and

>>published, so we assume it represents League thinking.
>>
>>"The growth of amateur radio and the total number of amateurs will
>>doubtless be controlled in the future. The present condition of the
>>amateur bands, while not intolerable, approaches saturation. ...
>>[The number of amateurs at the time was 46,000]
>
>Which was approaching saturation given the typical techniques of the day,
>and the band allocations of that time. Seems incredible today, but that
>was the case back then.
>
>> DeSoto goes on:
>>
>>"Obviously no competent person can be denied the right to become
>>an amateur.
>
>Which means the total number cannot be controlled, and this was realized by
>DeSoto,
>ARRL leadership and the FCC back then.
>
>>The only justifiable restrictive procedure is to raise the
>>standards of competency. This has already been done to the point
>>where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>>license than it was ten years ago. Increasing the code speed
>>equirement is one step in this direction. ..."
>>
>>DeSoto goes on to say that additional restrictions are not needed
>>since "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
>>relatively constant during the past two years. A slight stiffening of
>>the basic examination, together with the increased code-speed
>>requirement, would accomplish the desired result."
>>
>>At the 1936 annual ARRL Board Meeting held in West Hartford, CT)
>>the Board "...voted to ask [the] FCC to raise the code speed
>>requirement on license exams to 12.5 wpm..
>>[From Official Broadcast 671, May 10, 1936]
>>
>>A letter was then sent by Mr. K. B. Warner, ARRL General Manager, to
>>the FCC requesting a code speed increase from 10 to 12 words per
>>minute. Here are some quotes from Warner's letter:
>>
>>"It has become desirable to raise the general standard of
>>qualification for an amateur operator license. Observations show
>>that too many licensed amateurs do not possess the qualifications
>>presupposed by the regulations. Considering that the written part
>>of the examination may be mastered with relative ease, the chief
>>opportunity for a better selective process resides with the code
>>examination. ..." [That is pretty clear!]
>
>Yep, it's pretty clear:

>
>"Observations show that too many licensed amateurs do not possess
>the qualifications presupposed by the regulations."
>>
>>"A general raising of the standards could help to confine the
>>obviously limited facilities of amateur radio to those who have
>>at least nominal aptitude for the same. It seems indicated that
>>this situation could be best treated by an increase in the code
>>speed. Consequently the League now requests the Commission
>>to increase the code speed required in the amateur examination
>>from ten words per minute to twelve and one-half words per minute."
>>*********
>>
>>It's clear from the above that the ARRL, at the time, wanted to
>>"control the population" and that the bands, with ~46k amateurs
>>were "approaching saturation."
>
>The problem was that getting a license was so easy that huge
>numbers of newcomers were raising havoc - on the bands
>and with other services.
>>
>>The referenced letter also states that "the chief opportunity for
>>a better selective process resides with the code examination."
>>
>>The final paragraph above ALSO indicates QUITE CLEARLY
>>that the increase in code speed which the ARRL requested was
>>TO CONTROL THE NUMBER OF AMATEURS.
>
>And the earlier parts clearly show that no qualified person could be
>denied a license, and that too many of the hams of the day
>lacked the necessary qualifications.
>>
>>> The concerns were:
>>>
>>> 1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
>>
>>I find that hard to swallow with well more than an order of
>>magnitude fewer hams than today ...
>
>Yet it is true. In 1936, US hams had 160, 80, 40, 20, 10 meters
>on HF/MF, plus 5, 2-1/2 and 1-1/4 meters. (In fact, hams could
>use almost all of the "ultrahighs" back then).
>
>But most hams clustered on 40, 80 and 160. Many hams used
>only one band because of equipment and antenna limitations.
>
>Although a few hams were using SSB, (W6DEI and others, as
>early as 1931), almost all amateurs on voice used AM.
>
>Using typical amateur equipment and methods of the mid 1930s,

> how many QSOs do you think those bands could support?
>
>>also, even if it
>>were true, which I don't buy, a better solution than
>>"controlling the population" would have been to encourage
>>folks to spread out a bit by using the other bands, which
>>you insinuate were not "so crowded."
>
>The ARRL DID encourage the use of 10 meters, 5 meters
>and up. As early as 1928 there were lots of articles on
>getting on the "ultrahighs" - particularly after mobile
>operation was authorized there. But the results obtained were
>a far cry from what could be done with the same expenditure and
>complexity of equipment on the HF bands.
>
>In those days all hams had access to all amateur frequencies, too.
>Getting on 75 or 20 meter voice required a Class A license, which
>took another written exam but required the same code as Class B
>or C.
>>
>>And what about the "superior spectral efficency of CW,"
>>which was the predominant mode at the time?
>
>Exploiting that superiority requires stable transmitters and stable,
>selective receivers. While crystal control and single-signal
>receivers did exist, they were beyond the reach of most hams.
>End result was that most hams of the day used receivers that
>were horribly unselective. Typically, one heard a 10 kHz chunk of the
>band, at minimum.
>
>Most operation in those days was what we would call "split" today -
>two stations in a QSO would transmit on different frequencies. This
>doubled the spectrum usage.
>
>Of course superior techniques greatly increased the "carrying
>capacity" of the bands. But such techniques were only beginning
>to show up in the shacks of Depression-era hams. After WW2,
>it was an entirely different story.
>>
>>> 2) many newcomers were getting on the air with insufficient
>>> skill AND TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE for the conditions of
>>> the day
>>
>>Sorry, but there is no indication in the letter requesting that
>>the code speed be increased to control the population that
>>the ARRL sought "better written tests" ... only that they asked
>>that the code speed be increased to keep people out.
>>(There was a vague mention of "a slight stiffening of
>>the basic examination," but in the end, the ARRL doesn't
>>specifically request a tougher written test, nor does the FCC

>>appear to respond with such action ... only an increase in
>>code speed ... see the entire article ...)
>
>The ARRL wasn't going to remind the FCC of the problems of
>technical violations by amateurs. Read the publications of the
>day, and talk to the hams who were there. Bum notes, harmonics,
>drift, chirps, clicks, overmodulation, and instability were big
>problems that gave the ARS a "black eye".
>>
>>> 3) the explosive growth (the number of US hams TRIPLED
>>> from 1929's ~16,000 in less than 5 years)
>>
>>Still, the indications are that there were ~ 46k hams .. FAR
>>fewer than the 600k+ of today ...
>
>Of those 600K hams of today, how many are active on HF? How
>many hours/day do they operate? How many bands do they have
>to choose from?
>
>> and at that time, I would
>>suspect that far more hams were using CW ...
>
>True, but many were also using 'phone. Some of the signals
>were gawdawful, produced by things like loop modulated oscillators
>that FM'ed as much as they AM'd.
>
>> which is,
>>according to its proponents, "extremely spectrally efficient,"
>
>It is - IF it's used properly.
>
>>so, even given that receiver selectivity was not as good in
>>those days as today, I find the argument unconvincing.
>>(I don't believe that receivers were more than 10x worse
>>than today, and there must have been FAR fewer hams,
>>as a percentage using any form of voice.)
>
>A typical CW receiver today, suitable for casual use, has a
>passband of perhaps 500 Hz. Serious CW ops usually have provision
>for at least 250 Hz passband filtering. Filter shape factors of 2:1 are
>typical. Blocking dynamic range of more than 130 dB is common.
>
>Back in the 1930s, a typical amateur receiver had a passband of 10
>kHz - 20 to 40 times that of a modern receiver. Shape factors of
>10:1 were common, and dynamic range was all over the place. Some
>receivers were pretty good while others were awful in this regard.
>There was also the split-frequency situation. End result was that
>the spectral efficiency of CW was not realized in most situations,
>and the bands were "very crowded" if one used the equipment
>commonly used at the time.

>
>Proof of this is simple: Advanced hams were using SSB and
>single-signal crystal filter receivers by the mid 1930s. This progress
>was driven by the crowding of the bands.
>
>>> 4) high turnover (as many as 40% of hams not renewing, at
>>> a time when the license term was 3 years
>>
>>Neither is this mentioned in the record to which I referred ...
>>and if so many hams were dropping out, why the concern
>>that the bands would become "saturated?"
>
>The turnover was indeed a reality. Part of the problem was frustration,
>but the Depression was the major force. The main point is that the
>ARS of the thirties was taking in huge numbers of newcomers who
>weren't renewing. They were being rapidly replaced by even more
>newcomers.
>>
>>> 5) increasing numbers of TECHNICAL violations (out of
>>> band, harmonics, hum, chirps, etc.) wreaking havoc on
>>> other services and threatening the reputation of the ARS.
>>
>>I see no direct mention of this in the ARRL's letter to the FCC,
>>either ... if it was, indeed, such big problem, why didn't the
>>ARRL mention it?
>
>The FCC knew all about it. It would not be smart to point out
>these things to the FCC in writing.
>
>>Why did they *discount* improvements
>>in the written tests and focus ONLY on increasing code speed?
>>(And why only in reference to "controlling the population?")
>>
>Controlling - not limiting. BIG difference.
>
>>> Many of these violations were the result of inexperience
>>> and a "don't care" attitude.
>>
>>Lacking supporting evidence (which I'm open to consider),
>>I can only suspect that this assertion is your opinion or
>>conjecture.
>
>It's based on reading the literature of the day, and interviews with
>hams who were licensed at the time.
>>
>>> The solution proposed by the ARRL leadership and accepted
>>> by the FCC was a slight rise in the code test speed AND new
>>> written tests. Funny how the written test changes are forgotten.
>>
>>"The written test changes" were not "forgotten" ... they were not

>>mentioned in the ARRL's request.
>
>They were mentioned elsewhere. Are they mentioned on NCI's
>website?
>
>>In fact, the written tests were
>>specifically discounted in the letter as a solution to the "problem,"
>>and instead ONLY an increase in code speed was requested.
>
>Because the written tests had already been upgraded.
>
>>(And again, only in the context of "controlling the population.")
>>
>>> >(at the time, the
>>> >total number of hams was a SMALL fraction of those now licensed,
>>> >so the argument was, on its face, absurd ...)
>>>
>>> Incorrect again. Carl, do you know what the amateur bands were in
>>>1936? Do you know how they were used? Do you know what the
>>> typical amateur station equipment was like in those days? Or how
>>>many hours/week a typical amateur was on the air?
>>
>>I wasn't born at the time ... were you? (If you are that much older
>>than me, were you licensed and on the air at the time?)
>
>I didn't come along until years later - but so what? Must one have
>been alive during the Civil War to be knowledgeable about it, and
>the factors that influenced the people of the time?
>
>> However,
>>I recognized above that while receivers weren't as good as they
>>are today, there were also more than an order of magnitude less
>>hams than today and voice operation was not the norm, with most
>>operators using CW.
>
>And they had fewer bands and much less stability and selectivity. End
>result was apparent overcrowding.
>>
>>> The argument was NOT "absurd" once all the FACTS are known.
>>
>>I still think the argument was absurd.
>
>Then give some numbers. Like how many simultaneous QSOs could
>be had on 40 meters at night using 1936 equipment and methods.
>
>> It's not the first time you
>>and I have disagreed ...
>>
>HAW! That's a GOOD one!! ;-)
>

>>> >The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
>>> >for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...
>>>
>>> Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2.
>>> Then 5 wpm was added.
>>
>>Yes, for a novice license, good for 1 year, non-renewable.
>>"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
>>(Some "welcome"!!!)
>
>The same 1951 restructuring that gave us the Novice also gave us the
>Technician - which had a 5 wpm code test!
>
>Have you forgotten about the Tech license?
>
>Its purpose, btw, was to encourage the use of the "ultrahighs". It was
>suggested
>in various fashions in the late '30s, and formally proposed as a "Class D"
>license after WW2.
>
>Your statement:
>
>"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio." (Some
>"welcome"!!!)
>
>indicates a hatred of the code itself and a big gap in your knowledge of the
>history of US amateur radio licensing. Remember, we're talking about
>history here, not the way things are today.
>>
>>> >Was this decision made "for good reason" ???
>>>
>>> They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are
>>> you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?
>>
>>Yes, I think so ... if you read the entire article, you'll find out
>>that the FCC Chief Engineer at the time sounded a LOT like
>>Larry or Dick "If you can't do 25-30 wpm, you're not much of
>>an operator."
>
>For 1936, was he not correct? At that time, Morse/CW was THE
>major mode of both the military and commercial services. Yes, there
>was some voice and some RTTY, but only a small amount compared
>to Morse/CW.
>
>>In fact, he states the view in his reply that "An
>>operator whose top speed is not more than 12 words per
>>minute would be classed as a poor operator."
>>(Sounds a LOT like Larry or Dick ...)
>
>Why is that not correct - for 1936?

>
>One of the justifications for the very existence of the ARS back in those
>days
>was as a training ground for radio operators, and a ready reserve for
>military
>and commercial needs. Of course the military and commercial services don't
>need many Morse/CW operators today, but back in 1936 it was a VERY
>different story! Hams who could not begin to approach commercial or
>military standards of skill weakened this justification.
>
>This idea is explained in DeSoto's book. Have you read the whole thing?
>
>Recall that early in WW1, there was a severe shortage of radio operators.
>About
>4000 US hams (a very large percentage of the US amateur radio population of
>1917) served Uncle Sam in WW1. With the rise of communism and fascism in
>Europe, the possibility of another war could not be ignored. Having a large
>contingent of skilled and technically knowledgeable hams helped justify the
>continued existence of the ARS.
>>
>>> Them's the historic facts, Carl.
>>
>>Sorry ... but the letter from the ARRL to the FCC and the
>>FCC's response don't seem to support your assertions ...
>
>If you look at them without an understanding of the technology, methods
>and concerns of the times, I would tend to agree with you.
>>
>>I respectfully decline to concede, absent some more
>>compelling evidence that your assertions are not little
>>more than conjecture.
>
>See above. I would respectfully suggest that your conclusions are
>conjecture based mostly on lack of historical background of the time.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

5926. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:06:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A8B2B.6D602E13@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35435

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > The key point (pun
> > > > intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly different from
> > > > those noises.
> > >
> > > So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
> > > you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio Morse
> > > and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
> > > would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
> > > virtually useless in that situation.
> >
> > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
>
> Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?

How do you suppose Morse got it with the telegraph sounder?

The point is, if someone trapped could strike three quick taps, three with
longer spacing, and then three more quick ones, wouldn't anyone who
could read Morse code instantly recognize that as SOS, instead of some
part of the building just settling?

5927. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:12:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A8CA4.FCE9CF1B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35436

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > What a strange thing to say.
> >
> > Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to support him.
>
> I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> decode it, including most amateur radio operators.

Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?

The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is indeed
a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?
If prisoners of war can invent a tap code to
use to keep in touch with each other surely hams can learn 5wpm Morse code.
If they don't want to use it they can consider it a public service. New hams aren't

really selfish, are they? That's what your attitude projects, that they are too
selfcentered
to do such a minor thing as learn the basic radiocommunications mode.

5928. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:13:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A8CFF.15C39B0E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35437

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...
> >
> > > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> > > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help asnwering one
> > > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the goat.
> > > Happens here all the time.
> >
> > The trick is not to get sucked in.
>
> Dick usually swallows it hook, line, and sinker. :-)

And spits it right back in your face.

And you don't realize what you just admitted to. Troll, troll, troll.

5929. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:15:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35438

CAM wrote:

> Joshua Houk wrote:
> >
> > In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> >
> > > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > > preparedness is totally bogus.
> >
> > Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.
>
> The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.

BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.

5930. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:20:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <T7we8.7884$FE4.482483@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35439

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7A6DF4.BB639A38@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > What a strange thing to say.
> >
> > Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to
support him.
>
> I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil, there are any number of people on this and other groups who can use
both clacker (American, Continental, railroad, etc) Morse and
International Morse on both clackers and beepers. I will grant you that
it will take a bit of OJT but it should not take too long to figure out
that di-dit di-dit is an L. At first it will be di-di-dit dit di-dit a
lot but it will work.

Simply a wetware mode in a distinctly wetware situation. The only solid
state stuff in the vicinity is the concrete burying the victim. To
continue this exercise would be stupid but it is a great place to start
until the neat hardware arrives.

Dick NBK

5931. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:43:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5e40c01osv@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.

What makes you think that this is a growing problem?

5932. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:50:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5e4cf01p9d@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35443

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org...
> > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
>
> Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and pans were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything else beyond that would be extremely difficult.

5933. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:55:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225145552.17584.00000502@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35440

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 12:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225133157.10663.00000086@mb-fp.aol.com>

39,000 bytes of repost without comment deleted.

I suppose there was a reason for that, other than you were too stupid to
just provide a link to it?

Steve

5934. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 19:58:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225145847.17584.00000503@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 35441

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: "Mike Yetsko" joe@user.com
>Date: 2/25/2002 12:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com>

>Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
>your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
>of a license before sale? Give me a break!

The man was asking others for thier opinion, not stating a case.

Seems there's some growing up to do, but I think the problem is yours,
Mike.

Steve, K4YZ

5935. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:02:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5e53f01q6a@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35444

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C79C636.55DB80C7@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > When did you ever "coddle" the likes of Cecil? Must have been back in
the
> > days of Fidonet, because you've never done it on this newsgroup.
>
> So you've been reading here forever, right?

No. It only seems that way.

5936. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:26:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252026170.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35445

```
On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202250025400.25647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0202242237400.25473-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >> >"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:a55jqi02qg5@enews3.newsguy.com...
>> >> >> W1RFI wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>What gives the Congress the right to
>> >> >> >>tell me how to use my private property in a legal manner?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >The US Consitution has empowered Congress to enact laws. Ditto
>with
>> >> >state
>> >> >> >constitutions for state lawmakers.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> And the Supreme court says the home is my castle.
>> >> >
>> >> >OK to a point.
>> >> >
>> >> >> The government passed the
>> >> >> law allowing antennas in deed restricted neighborhoods
>> >> >
>> >> >No such law exists. The applicable situation (CC&Rs) involves ...
>> >>
>> >> Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
>> >television
>> >> and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza dish"
>satellite
>> >> antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as the cite, but I
>could
>> >be
>> >> wrong), which specifically indicated that it overrode any CC&R's which
>> >would
>> >> otherwise be in conflict.
>> >
>> >BUT that ONLY covers the satellite/TV reception antenna. No
>> >such luck from any state and/or FCC on that front so far.
>>
>> True, but all I had to demonstrate is one example that countered you
>BLANKET
```

>> statement in order to prove it false. You said that no law exists
>allowing
>> antennas in deed-restricted neighborhoods. I showed that there is a law
>that
>> allows a specific type antenna in such a neighborhood. Although it
>doesn't
>> allow ANY antenna, it still voids your statement.
>
>So back to the main event...there are NO laws that override CC&Rs
>for HAM antennas.
>
>> >> >contracts between private indivdiuals/entities. The antenna CC&R
>> >> >restricytions are not law on their own, but simply cntract
>> >> >elements to which both parties agreed as part of the contract
>> >> >that resulted in the transference of the land. Now I am as much
>> >> >in favor of getting preemption for amateur antennas as you are...but
>> >> >Phil, Ed and several others have been right on as to the current
>> >> >interpretations and application of PRB-1 vs CC&Rs.
>> >> >
>> >> >>... I am saying that
>> >> >> restricting that use of an antenna to receive TV transmissions only
>> >> >> oversteps the authority of the government.
>> >> >
>> >> >It isn't a government restriction, it is a mutually agreed to contract
>> >> >stipulation.
>> >>
>> >> And the government can always [indirectly] change what elements are
>> >necessary
>> >> for a valid contract:
>> >
>> >True...BUT that hasn't happened at all for ham antennas
>> >relative to CC&Rs.
>> >
>> >> - The parties must have the authority to enter into it, and
>> >> - The contract must be legally enforcible.
>> >>
>> >> With a law that specifically sets aside CC&R contracts with regard to
>> >certain
>> >> actions, that cancels the enforcibility requirement; i.e. the HOA for
>the
>> >area
>> >> cannot sue the individual homeowner when he followed a state law that
>> >OVERRODE
>> >> the CC&R's agreement. The individual has a valid defense that cannot
>be
>> >> defeated. The HOA must first challenge the law and win.
>> >
>> >Agree completely...BUT no such set aside exists for ham antennas...that
>> >IS the point.
>>

>> I agree that no statute exists. Federal regulations are not statutes, but
>the
>> government's explanation and extension of them.
>
>Petty...regardless of what the feds call them, none exist that gives hams
>the chance/opportunity to override CC&Rs for ham antennas.
>
>> However, a state cannot take away what the federal government specifically
>> grants (10th amendment corrolary), and don't amateur licenses have a
>section
>> labelled "station privileges?" (Hint, hint.....) :-)
>
>Hint, hint...not laughing. So why hasn't that defense found favor
>in ANY state court. Phil K has pointed out that the argument you
>suggest (vis-a-vis station privileges from the feds) hasn't found
>favor anywhere.
>
>> [Granted, there is no current definition of an amateur radio station being
>a
>> FIXED location, but if there were, it's possible that a very subtile
>change in
>> the regulations could wipe out CC&R's.
>
>Go for it then. I'd be more than happy to see you win...but
>I won't hold any expectations as to that outcome.

Go for what? I've already defeated my CC&R's and didn't even have to go to
court to do so.

>> In any event, CC&R's usually do not
>> prevent in amy way mobile or portable operation, so put your 1KW HF
>rig/amp in
>> the car and operate it from there while at home. It's even got a built-in
>> chair!]
>
>Or run a coax from the car to your ham shack :-) and use the
>mobile antenna.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

5937. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:29:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252029350.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35447

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 22:48:03 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>Actually, it does. Before the FCC enacted their own preemption for
>>television and satellite, in 1995 California enacted its own "pizza
>>dish" satellite antenna law (civil code 1356 seems to ring a bell as
>>the cite, but I could be wrong), which specifically indicated that it
>>overrode any CC&R's which would otherwise be in conflict.
>
> Civil Code Sec. 1376. Close enough.
>
> It only applied to satellite dishes in Planned Unit Developments.
> (condo apartments, townhouses, and individual residences that
> constituted a PUD tract) and did not cover TV antennas or any
> antennas in any other type of development or neighborhood.
>
> At the time it was a great advance.

...And although limited, it did provide a chance for a "foothold....."

5938. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:33:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252030570.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35448

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 00:37:57 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>However, a state cannot take away what the federal government specifically
>>grants (10th amendment corrolary), and don't amateur licenses have a section
>>labelled "station privileges?" (Hint, hint.....) :-)
>
> Hint, hint....read _Howard v City of Burlingame_ where the Ninth
> Circuit basically said that holding an amateur radio license does
> not carry any First ASmendment "free speech" protection as against
> any governmental (Federal, state, or local) action, that holding
> such a license does not give the licensee any right to erect any
> antenna of his choice as against the reasonable regulation of the
> local government, amd that holding such a license does not invoke
> any superior rights as against legitimate local governmnetal
> actions.
>
> This was never appealed (IIRC "Uncle Vern" died shortly after the
> ruling) nor overruled in any other Circuit or by the SCOTUS, and is
> cited quite often in Federal and FCC proceedings so it remains
> prevailing law.
>
> Of course if "Uncle Vern" wouldn't have put up that 65 foot tower
> after the City denied him a permit for a 51 foot tower, this would
> never have happened, and on my home turf.....

Sounds like another misargued case. There's NO First Amendment issue here.
The issue should have been the grant of the "station license" and the 10th
Amendment (the state has no rights to regulate [in conflict] something that the
federal government has specifically reserved to itself). The appeal was moot
since he died.... Oh well.

5939. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:34:11 UTC
From: Daniel Hicks <w8mmq-nospam@email.com>
Message-ID: <3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
Source record: 35449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.

Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios illegally and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.

By the way, next time you send a post, why not try using your real email address. Your pathetic attempt to hide your identity only discredits your argument.

Dan W8MMQ

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com...
> Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
> your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
> of a license before sale? Give me a break!
>
> I bought my Swan 500C as incentive to get my Novice ticket. BEFORE
> I had any HAM license at all. I got the Swan, listened to my friends, and
> practiced listening to code. Finally got my ticket.
>
> I bought my Kenwood TR-2400 as incentive to get my Tech license.
> BEFORE I had privileges on 2M. Listening to 2M gave me the bug to
> get off my butt and over to Dallas to take the test for upgrade.
>
> My Alinco DR-590 dual-bander for my car was a birthday gift from
> my wife, who DIDN'T have a ticket. You're little Gestapo tactics would
> rule out anyone buying a radio as a gift.
>
> I had decided (but actually didn't buy it) to get a K2 as my incentive to
> get back into CW and upgrade. Opps, should I not be allowed to buy
> a radio out of class?
>
> Little people with little minds making a big agenda to control anyone
> they can, any way they can. And when they can't build themselves up,
> they try to put anyone else into a lower class. Hey, it's all relative.
>
> This kind of 'attitude' makes me be ashamed to be associated with some
> HAMs. The 'little' people who just have to be controlling of anyone they
> can, and make a big thing out of nothing... I had a boss one time like
> that. Managed by putting the people under him under his thumb. Didn't
> last long...
>

> Mike
>
> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > What do you think?
> >
> > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
> amateur
> > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is
a
> > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> > your opinions.
> >
> > No License? No Radio!
> > http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
> >
> > Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> > http://www.eham.net/survey/
> > (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
> >
> > This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
> the
> > time to review it, and consider taking part.
> >
> > 73 de,
> > Dan, W8MMQ
>
>
>
>

5940. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:35:52 UTC
From: Afew <.....@mhsi.comNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <b18l7u4ose3tsgvssugb1mtmranmiq4tbc@4ax.com>
Source record: 35450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 13:15:36 -0500, "Daniel Hicks"
<w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote:

>
>What do you think?
Hey Hicks, do us all a favor and get a life. By the way, since you're
only a Technician you can't speak for the sale of HF equipment.

5941. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:41:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252034280.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35352

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 01:34:34 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>>I'll let Phil add any of the legal details, but everything
>>I know about regarding such transfers of property
>>do NOT, in any way, invalidate the CC&Rs. That's
>>no different than the bank mortgage still being
>>in effect as an outstanding lien against the property
>>that needed to be paid for title to pas to the "new
>>owner" who inherited the property.
>
> In California at the present time, property passsed to a new owner
> by any means includes all easements. CC&Rs, and applicable
> Association membership subject to rules.
>
> At one time, lien sales/auctions passed property "free and
> clear" of all "encumbrances" but over time, the law changed to
> apply only to liens and other financial "encumbrances", not to the
> above. That's why bidders/devisees have to do due diligence
> and the lienholder will enter a bid equal to its interest
> (remaining trust-deed balance, for instance) in the property to
> protect itself.
>...

I was unaware that ALL of these "loopholes" have since been closed. We got to get that reversed....

Aside: Speaking of "pretzels," you should see the mess that California creates for income taxes when they fail to [timely] pass their "conforming bills" after each federal tax law change. I'm at the point where if they pass these late (i.e. after returns have been filed), retroactively, and the change is not beneficial to the taxpayer, too bad - no amended return (for it was correct when filed). I really liked the Roth IRA conversion spread for 1998: Congress permitted an election for NOT taking the spread, but California, through March 15, 1999, had not - the spread was mandatory. That by itself was a headache.

5942. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:43:25 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u7l8mf933vt184@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Now, wait a minute... He may be a jerk, but if he wants to limit the
sale of equipment to himself, I'm all for it!

Mike

"Afew" <.....@mhsi.comNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:b18l7u4ose3tsgvssugb1mtmranmiq4tbc@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 13:15:36 -0500, "Daniel Hicks"
> <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >What do you think?
> Hey Hicks, do us all a favor and get a life. By the way, since you're
> only a Technician you can't speak for the sale of HF equipment.

5943. Re: Test Session Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:44:06 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252042530.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35353

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>On 23 Feb 2002 00:05:03 GMT, kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) wrote:
>
>>Nope. $10, no matter how many elements you take at that particular session. If
>>you fail an element, you will have to fork over another $10 to retest though.
>
>$10 is the maximum per session. Some groups will charge less. Either
>way, it's not a bad deal.

Wrong. FCC regulations, effective April 15, 2000, have NO MAXIMUM for VE
session fees.

$10.00 is simply what the ARRL determined was necessary for them to cover all
their costs (as one of the largest VEC's). However, it's not a cap.

5944. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:48:06 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0202252045060.27049-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 35355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002, Daniel Hicks wrote:
>What do you think?
>
>Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur
>radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
>growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
>your opinions.

1) A retailer is not the police (including the FCC).

2) Such an action may preclude surprise gifts for amateurs from their
unlicensed family, relatives, or friends.

3) Even if purchased by a licensed amateur, there's no guarentee that he
didn't actually buy it on behalf of an unlicensed individual or for immediate
resale to one.

They should mention that a license is required and perhaps "push their book"
and the local test session if they find the purchaser is unlicensed and the
item is not a gift for someone who is.

5945. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 20:50:24 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u7l8u8t9dv6e12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, are YOU that stupid? It's pretty easy to find out who I am.
I mean, I DO post with my real name. If you want my email
address, it's easy enough to find. The 'joe@user.com' is just what
HP leaves in the envelope when you buy their machines and don't
change the default. In fact, in all the years I've been on the internet,
(and the old usenet demand thing before that) you're the first person
that's ever even voiced the idea that I was trying to hide my identity.

Or do you think it's ok for you to doctor yours with 'nospam' and
that's the only acceptable way of doing things?

Like I said, small minds want to control all they can...

You discredit yourself, I don't need to do anything more..

My argument and assessment of you and your idea still stands.

Mike

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
>
> Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your
> mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
illegally
> and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> By the way, next time you send a post, why not try using your real email
> address. Your pathetic attempt to hide your identity only discredits your
> argument.
>
> Dan W8MMQ
>
> "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> news:u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
> > your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
> > of a license before sale? Give me a break!
> >
> > I bought my Swan 500C as incentive to get my Novice ticket. BEFORE
> > I had any HAM license at all. I got the Swan, listened to my friends,
and
> > practiced listening to code. Finally got my ticket.

> >
> > I bought my Kenwood TR-2400 as incentive to get my Tech license.
> > BEFORE I had privileges on 2M. Listening to 2M gave me the bug to
> > get off my butt and over to Dallas to take the test for upgrade.
> >
> > My Alinco DR-590 dual-bander for my car was a birthday gift from
> > my wife, who DIDN'T have a ticket. You're little Gestapo tactics would
> > rule out anyone buying a radio as a gift.
> >
> > I had decided (but actually didn't buy it) to get a K2 as my incentive
to
> > get back into CW and upgrade. Opps, should I not be allowed to buy
> > a radio out of class?
> >
> > Little people with little minds making a big agenda to control anyone
> > they can, any way they can. And when they can't build themselves up,
> > they try to put anyone else into a lower class. Hey, it's all relative.
> >
> > This kind of 'attitude' makes me be ashamed to be associated with some
> > HAMs. The 'little' people who just have to be controlling of anyone
they
> > can, and make a big thing out of nothing... I had a boss one time like
> > that. Managed by putting the people under him under his thumb. Didn't
> > last long...
> >
> > Mike
> >
> > "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> > >
> > > What do you think?
> > >
> > > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
> > amateur
> > > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This
is
> a
> > > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to
voice
> > > your opinions.
> > >
> > > No License? No Radio!
> > > http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
> > >
> > > Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> > > http://www.eham.net/survey/
> > > (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
> > >
> > > This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please
take

> > the
> > > time to review it, and consider taking part.
> > >
> > > 73 de,
> > > Dan, W8MMQ
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5946. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:10:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35357

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no
> >farther
> >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
> >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in recent
> >> disasters.
>
> >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> >little if anything about its use.
>
> Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead of
> calling her conclusion "juvenile."

To what end, Ed? It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in emergencies. Kim seems to think that the only emergencies that take place will be on the same order of the WTC bombing. She believes that because she is ignorant of the use of the mode, everyone is. If you want to play games with Kim, YOU fill in the blanks. I'm still of the opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of information.

Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the subject at hand.

Dave K8MN

5947. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:26:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AAC0C.B0C4E3EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35358

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
> weren't
> > > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
> argument)
> > > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
> >
> > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database.
>
> Agreed, I recall you saying something about a tar-paper shack. Home Depot
> has a great video about plastic siding if you ever get over that way.

These new fangled notions are slow to catch on in these parts. The
nearest Home Depot is about 45 miles away. I used the money I saved on
antennas.

> > I've never commented
> > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only stated
> > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, I really didn't need to know a whole lot about DX when I got started.
> Like you , I was the DX. And being the DX, I worked a lot of DX. So sorry.

I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
wasting electricity. You didn't address my reply to your statement of
my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets. I maintain that I only
commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license class.

> Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6 daily, like
> he was in KP4-land.

I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't handle".
I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it or
not.

> You just need a few more years on the noisy side of the
> pileup, and you'll lose your snobbishness. Well, maybe you won't.

Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever operated overseas on the ham bands. What you call snobbishness, others would call experience.

I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m the other day and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks. Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX side of the Omni VI +.

Dave K8MN

5948. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:38:31 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7AAED7.FE65A184@psu.edu>
Source record: 35360

I suspect you might be right. Though I bet some here might take umbrage
at the number on the back of my Hockey Jersey. People can take a wild
guess at what that might be.

- Mike -

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3C785D3E.C998356A@adelphia.net...
> > "Ronnie D." wrote:
> > >
> > > From the ARRL Web-zine...
> > >
> >
> > > handling all phases of radio support; start area, length of the course,
> and
> > > finish line," said Paul Topolski, W1SEX.
> >
> > I suspect that in this group, Mr Topolski's Callsign will be the major
> > subject of commentary. Wouldn't you agree, Kim? 8^)
> >
> > - Mike -
>
> heh heh heh...well, I wonder, Mike. "Mr." is a man. I bet the detractors
> from my callsign here in this newsgroup are probably the type that think,
> "well, it's OK (different) for a man..." ROFLMAO...
>
> Kim W5TIT

5949. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:40:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202251340.46c6efd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35359

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7a6a86_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020225061349.11751.00000476@mb-cq.aol.com...
> > From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >
> > >I think a lot of hams complain about how the tests are dumbed down
> > >without real knowledge of what the tests exactly are at the moment.

Curious, because the current tests are publicly available for all to see.
> >
> > They know what the tests are and because they feel they can pass
> them easily
> > after decades of hamming, they think they are trivial tests compared
> to the
> > "hard" ones they took before they had decades of experience.

Sure. And some of us think the test METHOD is the problem, more than
the content.
>
> Yet, Ed ... I truly wonder how many hams who have been
> licensed for 20+ years could actually walk in and pass
> those "easy, dumbed-down" tests of today without some
> considerable practice and study ...

I can. Been that way since I was first licensed. Code and written.

> unfortunately, for the
> ARS, I'd be willing to bet that the the percentage would
> be disappointingly ... even disturbingly ... low.

Pure conjecture on your part ;-)

I know for a fact, Carl, that you could not pass the tests I took
for General, Advanced and Extra.

But I can pass the tests you took for Extra.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5950. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:42:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bdye8.13027$wa3.1692565666@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steve Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a5dmmq$16q$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> In article <ehse8.15957$O86.2339739841@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>,
> bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> >
> > "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:a59312aim1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > In article <NiTd8.33897$nn7.965504020@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
> > > bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> > > >
>
> > Seems like a fair deal, though. If you're going direct, postage to many
> > countries is easily a dollar, then you include an addressed envelope and
a
> > couple of green stamps. And I'm sure the DXpeditions really don't want
a
> > stack of 40,000 cards. Using Eqsl avoids them having to get your card
in
> > order to return a card, and is a lot easier on the planet. Now if Eqsl
> > could get away from having to mail out a piece of paper, and just post a
> > record in an electronic database.
>
> I think that's the hardest part of this whole thing. How do handle the
> busted calls, reversed letters, miscopied callsigns? In CW (I am not
> starting this up here) my call can be misconstrued as KF2D if I send it
> quickly. How would an electronic database handle matching that up or an
> even better problem..not everyones computer clock is set the same. How
> can you confirm a contact by computer, for record keeping, if the times
> are different.

Of course that contact is not valid reguardless of the method of QSL. If
the other station sends back KF2D, and they were supposed to send KF2, you
should correct it on the spot, before you hear QRZ.

> Right now you are EQSL for the QSL card and the ARRL LOTW for submitting
> (soon hopefully) cards to the various programs. Who knows if the 2 can
> come to a mutual agreement. Only time will tell.
>
> > With EQSL, if everyone posted their logs it could be a simple matter to
> > match records and get instant verification. They could track all awards
for
> > you and generate an e-mail when you needed to send your$10 or whatever
to
> > the ARRL.

>
> I think eventually it may come to that.
>
> > > According to the various programs, there must be an understanding that
> > > the QSL manager is representing the particular DX station. There are
> > > several instances right now where the are bogus QSL managers for a
> > > number of pirate stations. My understanding from discussion with
Wayne
> > > Mills and Bill Moore is that you can't arbitrarily declare yourself
the
> > > QSL manager without specific permission form the DX station. Up and
> > > till recent Eqsl was a clearinghouse for qsl confirmations. Now
> > > recently, they have gone into the business of selling cards if you
wish
> > > to participate in these various programs.
> >
> > Hmm, I really have no interest in bogus managers for bogus stations.
But
> > Eqsl needs to honor their original agreements.
>
> I think that's what created the uproar to begin with, the move from the
> stated course.
>
> > > > Charging for a contact isn't fine, no guessing required. I think
you
> > meant
> > > > to say charging for a "confirmation."
> > >
> > > Correct, my error. The contact has already been made. If you want a
> > > "valid" confirmation that can be submitted for DXCC or WAS or WAZ, you
> > > have to pay.
> >
> > I guess its a valid assumption that we "pay for the contact" but we need
to
> > retrain our senses to comply with the rules.
>
> This is were we disagree as to the nature of the "paying for the
> contact" The FCC sez you can not charge for making the contact. I and
> Riley look at this as you (for example sake) are running a DX op in
> P5..everyone needs this, so you set up a website where those wanting a
> contact have to deposit $$$ before you'll acknowledge me on the air.
>
> That certainly violates the rule. I think voluntarily, and the FCC
> agrees on this, that my putting a couple $$$ or extra IRCs to help cover
> the costs is perfectly acceptable. If I include nothing more than a
> SASE, including those using the postage of the return country, in the
> large majority of cases, I get my card. I see website advertising the
> DXoperation soliciting donations, but nothing that ever states they are
> mandatory, that would be illegal as far as US based ops are concerned.
>

> All boils down that there are still way too many questions and not
> enough answers. Once that happens this will become another remember
> when story.

Yep. Well, the first big step appears to have been taken. Now its the
details.

> BTW, did you know Jim, KH2D became a mainlander several months ago.
> Here's still living on an island surrounded by H2O, but it's part of the
> state of Fla. I remember you knew him when you were stationed there on
> Guam way back.

I hadn't heard. Makes me wonder who'se running the KH2 buro.

There's good gov't contract work in Florida. I was headed toward Melbourne
area when I changed direction to Ohio. I'd still rather be in Florida,
thunderstorm discharges and all.

73, Brian

5951. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:50:14 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7AB196.6FD11F95@psu.edu>
Source record: 35362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, I don't think that a retail outlet can *not* sell radios to anyone who will pay for them. I don't think it is illegal to own one without a license.

Now, it is definitely illegal to transmit without a license.

Many hams routinely stage "fox hunts". This sounds like a really great opportunity to have one. If the miscreant is jamming the repeater, have a fox hunt, and track 'em down. Sounds like fun to me. Gather your evidence, hand it over to the authorities, and let 'em rip.

- Mike -

Daniel Hicks wrote:
>
> Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
>
> Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your
> mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios illegally
> and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> By the way, next time you send a post, why not try using your real email
> address. Your pathetic attempt to hide your identity only discredits your
> argument.

5952. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:51:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB1DA.3486734D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35363

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The statement, "CW gets through when SSB doesn't", is the ***ONLY***
> > statement so far that doesn't contain boundary conditions. What appears
> > to be the problem is that you don't recognize boundary conditions when
> > they are staring you in the face.
>
> Only a totally naieve person would think that it is an unbounded case.

Only a person totally ignorant of logic would think it is a bounded case.
Draw the symbolic logic diagram. You will find it is unbounded. A circle
can represent when SSB gets through. Everything outside that circle is
when SSB doesn't get through and is unbounded. If "when SSB doesn't
get through" is unbounded then "CW gets through" is also unbounded,
by definition.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5953. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 21:58:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB384.2363998C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35364

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
>
> How do you suppose Morse got it with the telegraph sounder?

Hopefully, you are aware that a telegraph sounder is NOT International Morse
and that most hams could not read Morse code sent over a telegraph sounder.

> The point is, if someone trapped could strike three quick taps, three with
> longer spacing, and then three more quick ones, wouldn't anyone who
> could read Morse code instantly recognize that as SOS, instead of some
> part of the building just settling?

Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
'S E E E S' and move on. You cannot be serious. Would someone involved
in a rescue attempt ignore the tapping because it wasn't Morse code?
You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5954. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:00:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB3E3.77A0984C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35365

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org...
> > > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
> > >
> > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and pans
> > were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
> > recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything else
> > beyond that would be extremely difficult.

So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
Agenda just a little too far?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5955. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:05:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB533.3B3A1CC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35366

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
>
> Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?
>
> The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is indeed
> a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?

So if I forget to tap out an 'SOS', you just move on and let me die?
Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test Agenda just a mite
too far? What if I'm one of the 99.97% of the population who doesn't
know Morse code? Do I deserve to die because I don't know Morse code?
Does your wife know Morse code, Dick? Would you let her die because
she didn't tap out 'SOS'? Good Grief!!!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5956. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:12:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB6CE.F988F003@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35367

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
>
> Cecil, there are any number of people on this and other groups who can use
> both clacker (American, Continental, railroad, etc) Morse and
> International Morse on both clackers and beepers. I will grant you that
> it will take a bit of OJT but it should not take too long to figure out
> that di-dit di-dit is an L. At first it will be di-di-dit dit di-dit a
> lot but it will work.

Egads, Dick, what are the chances of the trapped person and the rescuer
both being able to use railroad code? You PCTA folk are so far out that
I don't know where you get your oxygen. Probably 0.01% of the population
knows railroad code. For any two random people to know it would be 0.00001%.
I think I now understand what Kim is saying. If the chances of Morse code
saving the day is 0.00001%, why bother?

By taking this completely irrational stand, Morse code is disgraced. With
supporters like that, Morse code doesn't need any enemies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5957. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:14:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB754.4F1A0283@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35368

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick usually swallows it hook, line, and sinker. :-)
>
> And spits it right back in your face.

You wish.

> And you don't realize what you just admitted to. Troll, troll, troll.

Of course, I keep fishing as long as the fish are biting - don't you?
When are you going to wise up and stop being the laughing stock of
this newsgroup?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5958. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:16:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB7C9.42FCE71E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35369

Dave Heil wrote:
> It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was
> generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in
> emergencies.

If you read your cohorts defense of tapping on pipes using railroad Morse,
you will rationally come to the same conclusion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5959. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:19:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7AB88A.8F7E660A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35370

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
>
> BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
> course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.

But PACTOR II comes back before CW. When is amateur radio going to catch
up with the trailing edge of technology?

Opon the second reading of your posting: Are you aware that an EMP will
destroy your CW transceiver?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5960. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:27:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7ABA43.273BCC6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Daniel Hicks wrote:
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license?

Do you think gun shops should be able to sell guns to people who
might use them to commit crimes? Get real! Many, many prospective
hams buy a transceiver to give them an incentive to get their licenses.
Do you want to discourage prospective hams?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5961. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:30:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7ABB0F.8B750584@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Daniel Hicks wrote:
> Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your
> mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios illegally
> and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.

What we want is the freedoms guaranteed by The Constitution. Do I have
a right to buy a gun even though I *might* use it for criminal activity?
The use of such by an unlicensed individual is a crime. The mere ownership
of such is NOT a crime, not should it be.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5962. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:39:25 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a5eejqrfu1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <bdye8.13027$wa3.1692565666@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>,
bpburke@prodigy.net says...
>
> "Steve Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:a5dmmq$16q$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > In article <ehse8.15957$086.2339739841@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>,
> > bpburke@prodigy.net says...
> >
> > I think that's the hardest part of this whole thing. How do handle the
> > busted calls, reversed letters, miscopied callsigns? In CW (I am not
> > starting this up here) my call can be misconstrued as KF2D if I send it
> > quickly. How would an electronic database handle matching that up or an
> > even better problem..not everyones computer clock is set the same. How
> > can you confirm a contact by computer, for record keeping, if the times
> > are different.
>
> Of course that contact is not valid reguardless of the method of QSL. If
> the other station sends back KF2D, and they were supposed to send KF2, you
> should correct it on the spot, before you hear QRZ.

Agree 100% that the contact is not valid and I am sure the real KF2D
would not accept a card for a contact that he did not make, but the
point is that a card was generated with the busted call.

As to why, I still hear the TI, even if the sending station is sending a
D, so he records the wrong call and I record the contact as good. I
doesn't happen too often, only when the pile-ups are big and you need to
get the call out very quickly, BUT, it still happens from time to time.

Normally if this happens and I get a NIL on my returned card, I can
contact the station and have him check for the busted call as long as my
date and time info are OK. Quite often the real good qsl managers will
pick up on it and correct everything as well.

Still gonna be a sticking point

> > BTW, did you know Jim, KH2D became a mainlander several months ago.
> > Here's still living on an island surrounded by H2O, but it's part of the
> > state of Fla. I remember you knew him when you were stationed there on
> > Guam way back.
>
> I hadn't heard. Makes me wonder who'se running the KH2 buro.

Jim was running the buro for many years and it was shut down several
years ago. If memory serves, the huge number of cards were actually for

Japanese stations that got KH2 calls and never bothered to subscribe to the Guam buro, so in the end it was costing JIM big$$$ out of pocket. Perfectly acceptable decision if you ask me. At this time there is no more KH2 buro. In fact, the only "real" KH2 is Danny, KH2JU

73, Steve

5963. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:56:18 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mize8.8244$FE4.505519@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35374

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7AB6CE.F988F003@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Cecil, there are any number of people on this and other groups who can
use
> > both clacker (American, Continental, railroad, etc) Morse and
> > International Morse on both clackers and beepers. I will grant you
that
> > it will take a bit of OJT but it should not take too long to figure
out
> > that di-dit di-dit is an L. At first it will be di-di-dit dit di-dit
a
> > lot but it will work.
>
> Egads, Dick, what are the chances of the trapped person and the rescuer
> both being able to use railroad code? You PCTA folk are so far out that
> I don't know where you get your oxygen. Probably 0.01% of the population
> knows railroad code. For any two random people to know it would be
0.00001%.
> I think I now understand what Kim is saying. If the chances of Morse
code
> saving the day is 0.00001%, why bother?
>
> By taking this completely irrational stand, Morse code is disgraced.
With
> supporters like that, Morse code doesn't need any enemies.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I am suggesting that there is not that much diff between copying a clacker
and copying a beep, some to be sure but not so much as to preclude
communication as witnessed by the number of people who have done it and do
it on the bands in American Morse. It is a wetware exercise, not an easy
one but not unsurmountable even in the heat of a problem. I think you
have been playing with chips so long that you can't believe that the brain
can make the switch between leading and trailing edge detection a lot

faster than you are going to rebuild the breadboard.

I would agree with you that none of this justifies testing on the subject; I would also agree that if prearrangement is possible a 5x5 or 3x3x3 matrix makes a far better tapping code. But in the heat of the moment, in the rare case where the victim is a pilot or mariner who learned Morse to copy beacons by sheer osmosis or an ex Cub Scout with a good memory, the 'implied dah' is not that formidable to overcome where it is the only method available.

The whole issue is the three-cornered war among those who simply enjoy and have enjoyed the benefits of Morse, those who are so enamored of silicon as to want to ban anything that confuses their compooters, and those for whom the mike is the end of the technical world. If anyone is out on an extreme limb here, Cecil, look in the mirror.

The whole thing is pretty silly to begin with, grant that.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5964. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:59:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7AC1CA.EBD514C4@uci.edu>
Source record: 35375

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The statement, "CW gets through when SSB doesn't", is the ***ONLY***
> > > statement so far that doesn't contain boundary conditions. What appears
> > > to be the problem is that you don't recognize boundary conditions when
> > > they are staring you in the face.
> >
> > Only a totally naieve person would think that it is an unbounded case.
>
> Only a person totally ignorant of logic would think it is a bounded case.

You just told me it was, Cecil. You said it is the ***ONLY*** one so
far.

Drink some prune juice for crissakes.

5965. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 22:59:51 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5ellqqvr1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 35383
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
>
> Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your
> mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
illegally
> and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> By the way, next time you send a post, why not try using your real email
> address. Your pathetic attempt to hide your identity only discredits your
> argument.
>
> Dan W8MMQ
>
> "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> news:u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
> > your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
> > of a license before sale? Give me a break!
> >
> > I bought my Swan 500C as incentive to get my Novice ticket. BEFORE
> > I had any HAM license at all. I got the Swan, listened to my friends,
and
> > practiced listening to code. Finally got my ticket.
> >
> > I bought my Kenwood TR-2400 as incentive to get my Tech license.
> > BEFORE I had privileges on 2M. Listening to 2M gave me the bug to
> > get off my butt and over to Dallas to take the test for upgrade.
> >
> > My Alinco DR-590 dual-bander for my car was a birthday gift from
> > my wife, who DIDN'T have a ticket. You're little Gestapo tactics would
> > rule out anyone buying a radio as a gift.
> >
> > I had decided (but actually didn't buy it) to get a K2 as my incentive
to
> > get back into CW and upgrade. Opps, should I not be allowed to buy
> > a radio out of class?
> >
> > Little people with little minds making a big agenda to control anyone
> > they can, any way they can. And when they can't build themselves up,
> > they try to put anyone else into a lower class. Hey, it's all relative.

> >
> > This kind of 'attitude' makes me be ashamed to be associated with some
> > HAMs. The 'little' people who just have to be controlling of anyone
they
> > can, and make a big thing out of nothing... I had a boss one time like
> > that. Managed by putting the people under him under his thumb. Didn't
> > last long...
> >
> > Mike
> >
> > "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> > >
> > > What do you think?
> > >
> > > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
> > amateur
> > > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This
is
> a
> > > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to
voice
> > > your opinions.
> > >
> > > No License? No Radio!
> > > http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
> > >
> > > Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> > > http://www.eham.net/survey/
> > > (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
> > >
> > > This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please
take
> > the
> > > time to review it, and consider taking part.
> > >
> > > 73 de,
> > > Dan, W8MMQ

And you guys complain about MY posts?

5966. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:12:44 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u7lh94h95jd54f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Good point!

NO ONE (regardless of what some small minds would like to imply)
has bought a radio illegally at Radio Shack. (With the possible
exception of some HAMs who came into Radio Shack in Jan of
1978 after the cutoff date and bought the 'junker' 23channel CB sets
to convert to 10M.)

It's how they USE them that's illegal. And know what? I'd be willing
to bet odds that if they actually tracked down the people who do the
jamming, they'd find a few HAMs in there too... HAMs who are
probably just expressing a grudge against the repeater and some of the
people on it.

I just wonder how some of the 'small minds' out in that area treat outsiders
to the 'clique' on the repeaters? They might have a real surprise if the
situation were to be really inspected!

Mike

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7ABB0F.8B750584@IEEE.org...
> Daniel Hicks wrote:
> > Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change
your
> > mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
illegally
> > and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> What we want is the freedoms guaranteed by The Constitution. Do I have
> a right to buy a gun even though I *might* use it for criminal activity?
> The use of such by an unlicensed individual is a crime. The mere ownership
> of such is NOT a crime, not should it be.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5967. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:20:43 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <fFze8.16562$ZC3.1347764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35377

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225145552.17584.00000502@mb-mf.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/25/2002 12:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020225133157.10663.00000086@mb-fp.aol.com>
>
> 39,000 bytes of repost without comment deleted.
>
> I suppose there was a reason for that, other than you were too stupid
to
> just provide a link to it?
>
> Steve

You expected more from him? Links do not allow you type many words
therefore boring to tears the audiences you are trying to reach. Must be an
LA-Hollywood thing

5968. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:33:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225183359.03198.00000552@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35378

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 2/25/2002 3:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <bdye8.13027$wa3.1692565666@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>> BTW, did you know Jim, KH2D became a mainlander several months ago.
>> Here's still living on an island surrounded by H2O, but it's part of the
>> state of Fla. I remember you knew him when you were stationed there on
>> Guam way back.
>
>I hadn't heard. Makes me wonder who'se running the KH2 buro.

Thanks for re-quoting an entire post that had nothing to do with the
comments you DID make.

>There's good gov't contract work in Florida. I was headed toward Melbourne
>area when I changed direction to Ohio. I'd still rather be in Florida,
>thunderstorm discharges and all.

Makes me glad I am an EX-Ohioan.

Steve, K4YZ

5969. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:36:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225183650.03198.00000554@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35379

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: Steve Adell - KF2TI kf2ti@arrl.net
>Date: 2/25/2002 4:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a5eejqrfu1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>

>
>Agree 100% that the contact is not valid and I am sure the real KF2D
>would not accept a card for a contact that he did not make, but the
>point is that a card was generated with the busted call.

I wound up with a bunch of sweet 160 meter QSL's that belonged to KC8MK
when my call used to be KC8M...So close, and yet so far!

I am sure they thought it was KC8M K. But that's what happens when you
don't adhere to established procedural signals

73

Steve, K4YZ

5970. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:41:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5ei6t$vm2$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35380

----- Original Message -----
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2002 3:26 PM
Subject: Re: CCR's in California...

> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> D. Sussy wrote:
> >> [Granted, there is no current definition of an amateur radio station
being
> >> a FIXED location, but if there were, it's possible that a very subtile
> >> change in the regulations could wipe out CC&R's.
> >
> >Go for it then. I'd be more than happy to see you win...but
> >I won't hold any expectations as to that outcome.
>
> Go for what? I've already defeated my CC&R's and didn't even have to go
to
> court to do so.

Go for that "subtle change." But since you state you defeated
YOUR CC&Rs, perhaps you could share how you actually
did that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5971. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-25 23:52:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5eiq9$3sa$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
>
> Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change your
> mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
illegally
> and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.

Just how effective do you think a law would be?
Answer...it wouldn't. Ham radios are sold in
many places besides Radio Shack.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5972. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 00:09:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5ejio02s7k@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35382

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7AB3E3.77A0984C@IEEE.org...
> > I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and
pans
> > were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
> > recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything
else
> > beyond that would be extremely difficult.
>
> So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
> be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
> Agenda just a little too far?

I think you're reading things into my post that aren't there and aren't intended. You of all people should know from my arguments with Dick, Larry, and Babbling Brucie, that I have no "pro-code test agenda." SOS is only one sound pattern that is recognizable to most people. "Shave and a Haircut" would be another, or anything else that gets the attention of rescuers. However, my point is that trying to carry on a CW-like conversation by tapping pipes would be extremely difficult. There's a big difference between trying to get attention and carrying on a QSO.

5973. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202122.29966.00000088@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35392

In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Communication work doesn't have to be "important" at all. We in
>Guinea-Bissau had no responsibilities to warn anyone of a nuclear
>holocaust.

Excuse for not getting that single-channel State Department
RTTY "synchronized?" :-)

>You must have been thinking of my 2nd AF commo days, Len.

Couldn't have, big Dave. Not having an authorized callsign in
amateur radio made me "ignorant" of your time inside Cheyenne
Mountain. Tell us how you liked it in there. Were you affected
by claustrophobia when those big blast doors closed?

Were you a child prodigy and a consultant to Curt Le May?

Does the Joint Chairman (General Myers) know of your
importance, etc.?

>We did do some work with NASA though. Do you know anything about that
>or did it not happen because you were unaware?

Well, big Dave, I've seen a LOT of NASA documents, both
classified and unclassifed, and can't recall any mention of
anyone surnamed "Heil" doing "work" for them.

Nobody at Huntsville or Michoud or Vandenburg or JPL or Clear
Lake mentioned your name. ["Houston, you've got a problem!"]
Never made it to the Cape, though, did you "do work" there?
In all honesty, some small talk at a restaurant in Santa Maria
did mention "Heil" but that was all about music systems
and sound equipment, not space things.

Spent a fair amount of time at Santa Su for SSME instrumentation
on static test stands, lots of hands-on with spacecraft fabrication.
Did you look cute in clean-room clothing? How did the finger cots
feel to you?

>We already knew of the self-glorification and romanticizing. We've seen
>your earlier and frequent descriptions of your Army service.

Feel slighted? :-)

Geez, big Dave, you really didn't understand the mention, did you?

I simply DESCRIBED US military HF communications, information
that had already been made public long ago. Mentioned for
CHRONOLOGICAL REFERENCE to methods and procedures and
technology of the biggies in 24/7 HF radio communications.

I never claimed any credit for designing the systems. Those were
already implemented well before I could even enlist. I did my job,
got my Honorable Discharge after eight years. It was interesting,
challenging, and offered a unique opportunity to be a part of
BIG COMMUNICATIONS in addition to serving my country in
uniform. There was a war on at the time, but it settled into a
sort of permanent truce. Guess that was before your time in
"the 2nd AF commo" wasn't it?

Oh, yeah, I got a good conduct medal and mentioned that once.
That must be the "glamorization and romanticizing" you charge. :-)

>Much of the material I transmitted and received was and is classified.
>Much of the methodology and technology used is classified. I signed
>forms indicating that I understood this and that I'd not reveal
>classified information under penalty of law.

Wow! Du bist verrrrry important!

Oh, my, myself and few hundred thousand or so civilians and military
contemporaries of mine had to operate THE VERY SAME! Yup,
Confidential, Secret, Top Secret, DOE nuclear, background checks,
forms up the gazoo, photographed, fingerprinted, all but retinal-
scanned, interviews with the FBI (about others) as well as FBI
interviewing friends and neighbors (for me), steel-bar-locked file
cabinets, even walk-in safes, passing through many a turnstile
talking with a disembodied voice after surrendering your wallet
and badge to a remotely-operated drawer, NEED TO KNOW
stamped on every neuron and synapse, never lose a badge,
security and vigilance and constant reminders of (which Title, Phil?
18?) espionage laws, national security, having ones life-of-the-past-
10-years details filed with a dozen federal agencies from the FBI
to DECASS.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE, big Dave. You, me,
and HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF OTHERS. No big deal.
Fact of existance. Par for the course. Work environment.
No heroism, no medals, no certificates, and never once did I
need to know morse code or take a VE test. :-)

>That it bothers some
>wizened, embittered geezer in California is pretty insignificant.

When I find one of those, big Dave, I'll let you know so you can
feel "justified." :-)

>It hasn't effected my ham radio activity at all.

...except in this newsgroup cum chat room. :-)

>More of your "it can't have been since I never heard it"?
>State had very few HF (AFRECONE) primary posts in the 80s and early 90s.
>Almost all were in Africa in countries where the infrastructure did not
>support leased line communications. CW was used for openings, closings,
>QSYs and to agree upon crypto sets for use. It happened. It took
>place. It was used daily. Don't let it eat you. Get over it. Go on
>with your life.

Yes, yes, yes, you were a VITAL ASSET for the Free World. Feel
free to digitize your Foggy Bottom certificates and send to everyone
for Glorious Proof. Let me know when your name appears on a key
list or in the page of honorees at the newly-revised NSA website.

Big Dave will be shocked to learn that early Cold War crypto gear
is very publicly known. There's a bunch of info and links to even
more info on such at the SSN Pampanito website, folks touring
that submarine (now a floating museum) might even get to TOUCH
a real, but not very live, CRYPTO MACHINE! Funny thing about
those old machines...didn't need any CW to "synchronize" any
part of them nor their schedules. SOME of the just-before-CWO-
Walkers' USSR sell-out crypto gear IS KNOWN to the electronics
industry and has even appeared on a couple of TV documentaries.
I daresay your burn-before-reading-classified machinery will soon
become public. Goodbye to your labels of mystery, glamour,
romance, self-importance, and all-around superhumany.

>Take up a hobby--maybe ham radio.

That's a nice suggestion. Thank you.

I've been a radio-electronics hobbyist for about 55 years, a
professional in the same general area for 50 years. Even
wrote up magazine articles on ham radio technology in a
magazine whose name was HAM RADIO! Fascinating
technology, big Dave, you ought to learn about some of that
technology. It might help stoke your boast furnace.

>What will we do about the stupid?

Educate them. There's a great BIG radio world out there! All
kinds of technologies and advancements in the radio arts. It
can be scary to the beginner, the boaster, big Dave. To begin,
get yourself educated. Then you lead the others.

>You've been ignorant before.

Absolutely, big Dave. I'm totally ignorant of what goes on within
your head to make you act they way you do in this newsgroup.

>You've
>been enlightened yet you continue to rail as if you can't accept
>reality.

Poor baby, confusing fantasy and reality again. I was born in
the 1930s but I didn't choose to live there or in the never-never

elsewhen you've promoted. I realize there IS a problem in starting out as a professional in HF communications. Once exposed to such a large, working reality in the 1950s, I've never been able to accept the artificialities of 1930s standards and practices that you and others set up as the epitome of radio arts, along with titles, status, and privileges and the "qualification" of the glory and nobility from being able to affix a radio station callsign on my name.

>That would have to make you stupid since you are attempting to
>argue something you know nothing about with someone who was there, has
>done it, has the T-shirt and the souvenirs.

Heh, heh, heh. Would you like a RACES card to add to your "souvenir" collection? Foggy Bottom had a couple of RACES, or did you know? :-)

>That would be as goofy as a non-ham telling hams how it should be.

Yes, isn't it awful? The FCC has been doing that to hams since 1934!

Ignorant morons, the nerve of them! Shame on them, ey? :-)

5974. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202124.29966.00000089@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35393

In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Leaving aside definitions of "is," let's define Guinea-Bisseau and "work."
>>
>> Guinea-Bisseau (or Bissau) is a small middle-Africa-general-location
>> country of 1.3 million whose chief exports are cashews and peanuts.
>> [see any almanac for details]
>>
>> It is stretching incredulity to attempt picturing this tiny former colony
>> as being "important" in world affairs or even general African affairs,
>> trade, religion of any kind. It doesn't seem to have attracted press
>> attention to any level higher than "filler" items over the last three-
>> plus decades. It is definitely not a "hotbed of intrigue and mystery,"
>> even in fictional works. It doesn't appear to have any strategic
>> military value for air bases or ports to any other nation except
>> maybe its immediate neighbors.
>
>This is another of your "because I don't know anything about it, it
>can't have happened" pieces of stupidity. The Soviet Union maintained
>quite a large presence in Guinea-Bissau back in the '80s. The Cubans
>had an even larger presence. Cuban troops returning from Angola and
>troops preparing to go there flew Aeroflot from Bissau.

Now, now, big Dave, you DO exaggerate a bit about "importance"
RELATIVE TO OVER A DOZEN OTHER NATIONS IN MIDDLE
AFRICA which had or still have a strong communist leaning,
governments, and staging areas for USSR troops. Bigger countries.

Despite all that "influence" and whatever can be implied about "aid"
from the old communist block (look up the year the USSR was
dissolved), last year's World Almanac STILL lists the chief export
of Guinea-Bissau as cashews and peanuts. Now that IS important
to nut lovers the world over, especially nut gourmets who love
cashews. On the world scene of geopolitics, Guinea-Bisseau is
still a "4th World" country struggling to get up into the "3rd" category.

>activity including USIA programs and libraries. Military assistance and
>training is another program the U.S. supports. Because no one sent
>Leonardo Heathcliffe Anderson a letter, those things can't have taken
>place.

Gosh, big Dave, no "letters" seem to have been sent to the big
wire services like AP and Reuters stressing the ENORMOUS
IMPORTANCE of that particular country and its been a long, long
time since a video bite from a TV correspondent. I don't see,

haven't seen much mention in any big historical write-ups either,
but, of course, you've just cleared this up.

>It might
>interest you to know that, for most of my two year tour in
>Guinea-Bissau, I was the only ham in the country. I made over 75,000
>QSOs on CW, SSB and RTTY on 10 through 6 meters.

Now THAT is of extreme importance...to DX-chasers. Imagine, a
RARE ONE not on a "DXpedition" but actually LIVING there!

As the ONLY HAM IN THE COUNTRY (out of how many, 1.3 million
population) does that mean big Dave "pioneered" ham radio in
Guinea-Bisseau? I guess so. A big PIONEER award to big Dave,
then. Did big Dave act as an "elmer" to Spread The Word of
Ham Radio there to the population? Dozens, hundreds eagerly
awaiting The Word, guidance, and leadership? Just curious.

>It is always nice to receive a history lesson from someone on the
>outside whether the subject is my work (which this isn't supposed to be
>about) or amateur radio which this doesn't touch on at all though this
>is an amateur radio newsgroup.

I've never elevated any STATE DEPARTMENT work or the IMPORTANCE
of Guinea-Bisseau in communications, or implied Great Secret Mysteries
of (horrors!) CLASSIFIED COMMUNICATIONS WORK! Maybe that's my
fault for not honoring an "unsung hero of government!" Terrible. Boo on
me for not bowing and scraping, saluting and kissing the ass of a self-
professed one-by-two "radio champion."

What I did originally (and big Dave is still smarting from ego blasting)
was to bash a snow job to others who had not worked any gubmint
comm on HF, would therefore be unknowing of what went on. Big Dave
tried to rationalize his way out of an avalanche by kicking in artificial
snow job machines about "procedures in government" and the usual
"insider" crap with overtones, implications, etc. of his "greatness."
The final snow job is the insistance that "if you haven't been IN it as a
FULLY AUTHORIZED PARTICIPANT you then DON'T KNOW
ANYTHING."

There's a terrific amount of PUBLIC INFORMATION available to the
public (that's why it is called "public") on just about EVERY area
and activity of the entire radio world. That INCLUDES military
communications, believe it or not. The problem with arrogant
elitists in a hobby activity is the ONLY radio information input they
have is from (guess what) their hobby activity's publishing media.

Is that a slam against amateur radio? No. It's a slam against some
of the editors and publishers who selectively spoon-feed their
readers what they (or the organization they work for) think
"important to hobbyists." Big Dave, there's your opportunity for
another Big Personal Attack again, feigning "insult against ham
radio" and assorted outrage. For a little while I was an INSIDER

of a part of that small part of the publishing world. HR didn't live in the midst of ancient fantasy and self-promotional propaganda and lasted 22 years. Another self-professed ham hero thinks they were a "failure" but then he was never any sort of insider in ham publishing.

You continually ATTACK on the specious claim of "ignorance of not knowing anything because of lack of AUTHORIZATION." Such is specious and vapid considering that amateur radio activities are one (if not the top) of the most OPEN areas of information input in the entire radio world. It is a hobby activity pursued mostly by civilians with many publications and references. Further, communications by encryption for the purposes of secrecy is specifically prohibited by both federal law and international agreement. Anyone with a receiver can hear/see EXACTLY what other radio amateurs hear/see. The only barrier that is real is natural, the physics of EM wave propagation and terrain. Within that real boundary there is NOTHING "secret" except for curious mindsets who think that all must think as they do or be considered "inferior" or "unworthy."

>Did you have anything on amateur radio you'd like to say?

Yes. It is my opinion that amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable recreational activity that allows non-professionals to engage in the fascinating technology of radio communications arts within the narrow mode selections and frequency bands allocated by federal agencies. It is supposed to be a social gathering point where individuals can convene, make friends, share information, socialize as other groups do for the sheer enjoyment of socializing.

Not all AUTHORIZED radio amateurs seem to think so. Quite a few seem to think that they are elite in radio, superior by achievement, some kind of important national asset, vital and valuable, fantasy "minutemen" available instantly to perform "emergency communications" to save their community, nation, and world from disaster. In short, self-styled supermen with an ego fertilized by myth and legend originated by predecessor self-professed supermen of the same kind.

The appearance of so many self-styled supermen is not unnoticed by majority of radio-active folks who are not AUTHORIZED to "work" ham bands. That appearance is not a good one. Strangely, although they claim super powers, their vision is lacking. They cannot visualize how others see them. Their super ego clouds vision. Some appear as comic book heroes.

Shazam, big Dave, you are a marvel. Now go leap tall pileups at a single bound. Leap high. Your own pileups are very big.

5975. Re: Making mention of others' comments ... routine practice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202125.29966.00000091@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35384

In article <3C7A6EC2.25F37A50@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>>NCI is not "the evil empire"
>
> That wouldn't keep it from being the "ignorant impire".

Is Dickie an "ugnorant umpire" or what? :-)

5976. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202125.29966.00000090@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35386

In article <mFoe8.13384$Im1.891589@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.gs2cbz2.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
>> On Sun, 24 Feb 2002 04:51:59 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> >You have to be one of the thickest guys I'm encountered in the past
>> >decade or two.
>>
>> Nah, he's just ignoring the facts because they go against his
>> perception of how things should be, and if he bangs on that
>> tea-kettle long enough, he thinks that they will come true.
>>
>> Operation Magic Wand......
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>If he holds his breath and stomps his foot, will it help?? :-)
>
>Time to send out for Mr. Smee, Captain Hook, and Rufus T. Firefly.

Did you spell "Houk" wrong? :-)

5977. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202127.29966.00000093@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35388

In article <c2356669.0202251004.3b274ee7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c7a4f40_1@news7.fast.net>...
>>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> > In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> > writes:
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>> > >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
>> > >preferred mode in an emergency.
>> >
>> > Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
>> different.
>> > Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff
>> KT4ST is
>> > involved in.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

>> Operator choice based on preference is fine ... however, it is
>> not legitimate to infer from this that the use of CW is ESSENTIAL
>> in any way to emergency communications.
>
>I'm not saying that any mode is essential. Personally, I find it
>amazing that digital modes (voice, image and data) are not more used
>by hams in emergency work.
>
>But the categorical denial that CW/Morse plays any role in emergency
>comms by hams is simply false.

Good grief, Yes! A motion picture has clearly shown the morse code mode is essential to SAVING THE ENTIRE WORLD!!!!

5978. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202128.29966.00000095@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35389

In article <20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020223161019.20570.00000036@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>> In article <3c770d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
>><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> >news:20020222080951.16371.00000019@mb-mr.aol.com...
>>> >> In article <3c75c519_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
>>> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>>> >> writes:
>>> >>

>>I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
>>preferred mode in an emergency.
>
>Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
>different.
>Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff KT4ST is
>involved in.

Didn't you forget the MV Oak on New Year's Eve? Tsk, tsk. :-)

5979. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202128.29966.00000094@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35391

In article <3C7A6DF4.BB639A38@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > What a strange thing to say.
>>
>> Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to support
>him.
>
>I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
>my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
>Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
>could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
>decode it, including most amateur radio operators.

Cecil, you need to take a break and see some motion pictures. That
will clearly demonstrate the ubiquitosity, essential qualities of morse
code modes in all sorts of emergency situations.

For example, blinker morse code can be used to communicate with
USN fighter interceptors who are armed and ready to shoot down a
hijacked 747! We've already been treated to the absolute proof that
window shade blinking was used by a victim on a still-erect tower
of the World Trade Center.

Morse code can be of extreme value in saving an entire world!

Motion pictures have pictured it very well, I think...
:-)

5980. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202130.29966.00000096@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35385

In article <3C7A703F.8DAA53C6@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of
>> opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
>
>Reminds me of the locker room scene in the movie The Right Stuff, when
>Deke Slayton was explaining what Gus "Bubba" Grissom was saying.
>
>No, Cecil. She didn't say that. I would have noticed.

Oh? Was Virgil I. Grissom called "Bubba?" I've never seen anything
for a nickname other than "Gus."

Of course, everyone knows that motion pictures are proof-positive
prima-facie references. Good old morse code saves the day on
airliner hijackings and outer-space alien invasions and ham radio
can do time travel with the right atmospheric conditions.

5981. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202130.29966.00000097@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35390

In article <3C7A6C54.92A2CD96@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C76C529.D809C673@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
>writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> What is N2EY's experience on CW or SSB above UHF?
>> >
>> >Tell us about yours, Len (he said reluctantly).
>>
>> Why?
>
>The same question occurred to me when you demanded to know about N2EY's
>experience.

Sorry to bother you so much, OM. My experience involved frequency-
multiplexed multiple voice channels on a non-amateur microwave band.
That's not comparable to ham SSB that was "pioneered in the 1930s."

Those who critique someone else's innovation (that used 2N3904s)
and never said boo about the details but just critiqued by saying
older, allegedly-better methods doesn't have as much experience
in solid-state as they imply. The 2N3904-2N3906, or 2N4124-2N4126
general purpose transistors have been in common use in industry for
THIRTY YEARS. Their price today is about 3 for a dollar in small
quantities, THE SAME PRICE as it was 20 years ago!

Jay-suss, there's a heaping big snow-job falling all over and or wayyyy
to many haven't left the 1930s. Hello? Thirty years ago was 1972.
This is the year 2002.

"Expertise" in radio is touted as "knowing all kinds of things about
grids in vacuum tubes." Yeah, sure. And morsemanship is the
ultimate in amateur radio that is supposed to be a vehicle for
"advancing knowledge in the state of the radio art."

5982. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:21:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225202131.29966.00000098@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 35387

In article <3C7A66FD.569A0D73@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>> . the same sort
>> of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
>> PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
>> to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."
>
> Are you *never* going to grow up and join the adult world? Evidently not,
>you've demonstrated the same juvenile attitude for at least the past 25 years.
>That we can accept, but to deny that radiotelegraphy is BASIC radio
>communications is inexcusable for a supposed professional. It is even used
>by professionals to do some high tech things.

Cite the "professional use of radiotelegraphy to do some HIGH TECH
THINGS."

Cite the "professional use of radiotelegraphy" today.

Go ahead, make your day.

5983. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:23:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AE37A.E32F56DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35394

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was
> > generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in
> > emergencies.
>
> If you read your cohorts defense of tapping on pipes using railroad Morse,
> you will rationally come to the same conclusion.

Okay, Mr. Wizard, tell me how reading them will cause me to come to the
same conclusion.

Dave K8MN

5984. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:41:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ae9a2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35396

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5c1p10154p@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of Websters.
> If
> > it isn't
> > > Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
> > applied) logic.
> > >
> >
> > Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was
that
> > wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in a
> > weekend? What was the title...?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I currently reading "Why I'm Not a Muslim" by Ibn Warraq. Well documented
> and interesting stuff.
>
>

I just looked the author up on the internet (Altavista). Read a review of that book (which, apparently, is a rare book). Then, came across (of course) this from an opposing point of view: " 'This seems to be the case with Ibn Warraq who writes that he was born Muslim, but who now considers himself a secular humanist "who believes that all religions are sick men's dreams, false-- demonstrably false-- and pernicious.' " [emphasis is the author of quoted material]

Maybe I'll get the change to investigate further...I always deeply desire an unbiased point of view...LOL...they are hard to find in politics and religion!

Kim W5TIT

5985. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:44:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7AE88E.905E975B@uci.edu>
Source record: 35395

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Sorry to bother you so much, OM.

I'll bet you say that to everyone. :-)

5986. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:45:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aeab7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35397

Psssstt, he opens every single one of them because he can't help himself...

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C79C60C.A7076E7C@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c7985ae_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C796C5A.87092296@worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > > Well, there he goes again, making a dash for the safety of
Websters.
> > If
> > > > it isn't
> > > > Webster's it's either the IEEE dictionary or the refuge of Pure (not
> > > applied) logic.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Hey, Little Dick, speaking of using books for safety...what book was
that
> > > wherein you learned all you needed to know about the Islamic faith in
a
> > > weekend? What was the title...?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > I currently reading "Why I'm Not a Muslim" by Ibn Warraq. Well
documented
> > and interesting stuff.
>
> I don't open TITS' posts (who wants to waste the time to read reams
of
> airhead twaddle?) but she just as well know the answer to her question. It
was
> the Koran.
>
>
> Of course there's lots of later writings that analyze Islam, particularly
> large radical
> sects who have vowed harm to the West, but hey, don't upset her little

world
> with
> anything unpleasant. She's all fun.
>

5987. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:48:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aeb7d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35399

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225062759.11751.00000480@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no
> >farther
> >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
> >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in
recent
> >> disasters.
>
> >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> >little if anything about its use.
>
> Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead of
> calling her conclusion "juvenile."
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Thank you, Ed. Really and truly. I am asking a simple(?) question. Maybe
there's no way to research it--heck I don't know.

Kim W5TIT

5988. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:55:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aed04_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35551

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
> >agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW
> >themselves. Why would we?
> >
> Because it works!
>
> Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate communications
> facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there would
be
> no
> need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better in this
> regard,
> though). Why should we copy what they do?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think when a Fire Chief I am shadowing wants me to relay a message over to the other end of town that additional tank trucks are needed in about 45 min., along with some relief provisions for 30 men, that the Fire Chief would much rather hear me say that than to wonder if I sent the right message.

I think if the Red Cross is liaisoning between an official government entity and a volunteer agency, and the message needs to be sent that volunteers are need at Area A, some relief can be made by transitioning some folks from Area C over to Area A, that the Red Cross person I am shadowing wants to hear or know that I sent the right message.

Don't they? I'll ask the Hunt County Emergency Management Officer and the City of Greenville Fire Chief the next time I see them what they would prefer. Maybe it's different from town to town, but I think our served agencies aren't going to want to wonder if what they said got relayed correctly.

Kim W5TIT

5989. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 01:57:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AEBB5.7977C085@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35398

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > ... to deny that radiotelegraphy is BASIC radio
> > communications is inexcusable for a supposed professional. It is even used
> > by professionals to do some high tech things.
>
> Uhhhhhhh Dick, BASIC is a programming language.

You mean Beginners Allpurpose Symbolic Instruction Code? You confuse *that*
with basic radio? Har har har...

5990. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:00:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AEC62.70884C31@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35400
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:

> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > What do you think?
> >
> > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
> amateur
> > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> > your opinions.
>
> What makes you think that this is a growing problem?

IF it was a problem it would be a very mature problem. Maybe it is.
Trying to change the effects of it all at this late date is futile. And the cure
might
easily be worse than the disease.

5991. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:01:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aee6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35552

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >
> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
worst.
>
> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
>

Oh good grief, Jim. You are near impossible to even attempt to communicate
with because everything must be black and white, just for you. OK--TAKE ANY
DAMNED DISASTER YOU WANT--BIG, LITTLE, MID-SIZED, WHATEVER!!!!!

>
> I'm NOT minimizing the tragedy or impact of 9/11, or the losses suffered
in
> NYC, Washington or Pennsylvania on that day. But on what grounds do you
> call the WTC disaster the WORST in USA history?
>
> >I don't think you'll find one.
>
> I don't have access to any of those messages. But I can pretty much
guarantee
> that any which were relayed on NTS went at least part of the way on CW.
>
> Did any emergency messages go by HF? If you can't provide one, will you
say
> that HF is not preferred in emergencies?
>

OK, JIM, I CAN'T VERIFY *ANY* MESSAGES LEFT THE WTC AREA VIA HAM RADIO...SO
I GUESS I SHOULD SAY THERE WERE NONE. GOOD F#$%&@ GRIEF.

> >
> > I am not saying anything against the mode,
> >its users, etc.
>
> Maybe not in this post.
>
> >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> >preferred mode in an emergency.
>
> Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
different.

> Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff KT4ST is
> involved in.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I wish there were a way to statistically show how often/much CW is used in emergencies--and *not* using H&W, because I do believe there are some people who still use CW nets on NTS---those are *not* directly from the scene, not operational messages.

Anyway, I am certain you are confused by my above sentence. I give up even trying with you, Jim.

Kim W5TIT

5992. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:05:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aef42_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35553

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7A300A.14F5899C@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > The key point (pun
> > intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly
different from
> > those noises.
>
> So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
> you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio Morse
> and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
> would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
> virtually useless in that situation.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The blatant ludicrousness of victims tapping out CW to get rescued is that all anyone need to is just tap, or bang, or kick, or yell, or.... CW taps coming from victims at a disaster scene is something I just ain't buying. Any noise is a potential call for help...and I hope all of you proponents of CW realize that.

Kim W5TIT

5993. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:06:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aef8c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35554

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202250537.1ba413c@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass codebashing
> > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help
asnwering one
> > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU the
goat.
> > Happens here all the time.
>
> The trick is not to get sucked in.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think your trick is to get lost in semantics...

Kim W5TIT

5994. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:08:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af01f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35555

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:7Mre8.15947$NL5.2338143271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c783dd9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
> > weren't
> > > > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
> > argument)
> > > > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
> > >
> > > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database. I've never
commented
> > > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only
stated
> > > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yeah, Brian ;) Didn't you know that you tread on a sacred circle?
> > Sheesh...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim, perhaps I should wash Dave's feet or kiss his ring. If I don't adore
> him I'm crap. Oh well.
>
> DXing wasn't about being known or famous or on 25,000 hamshack walls. It
> was just pure fun. I guess that make me unknowledgeable about it.
>
> When Jim, KH2D, Joe, N3EMA/KH2, and I would have a local roundtable going,
> there was always a european or a hundred wanting a signal report. No
> greenstamps required. Buro was fine. WMPY kept me supplied with
beautiful
> cards. So sorry.
>
> 73, Brian
>
>

'S ok, Brian. Dave is one of the bubbas. You know what that is, right?
It's kind of like "if you're a Mason and I'm a Mason, we're both OK" kind of
bubbas...but then the *real* Masons emerge and put a much better image on
the group.

Kim W5TIT

5995. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:16:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af1de_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35559

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e3f8a07c291b9a98969c@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
>
> > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > preparedness is totally bogus.
>
> Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.
>
> > As someone stated, the nets that exist to pass such radiograms
> > exist, not because someone really needs that sort of capability,
> > but because "it's always been that way" and the nets have come
> > to create most of the traffic solely for the purpose of justifying
> > their own continuation.
>
> Ah... so next up is No Traffic International?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

Joshua: I request that you try not to be so quick to buy into the routine that just because something "comes under question" in ham radio, that it means there must be an agenda of some sort. That there are people who don't think CW is as important for emergency communication doesn't mean they are speaking against the mode...and neither is NCI I don't think.

My statement about CW traffic nets was that there are CW traffic nets (not to be totally circular here :)). All NTS in this area, save the occasional Handy Hams message, etc., are contrived for the sake of the net itself. Does that mean I am speaking against NTS?! Hell no, not at all. NTS is great and the messages are contrived to stay in practice. The NTS is probably the best organized communication group there is...and they stay at it as ARES and RACES should. I can guarandamntee you that if a disaster arises, net activation will be second hat to NTS folks, while most ARES and RACES groups would probably flounder for at least a few minutes anyway.

So, just because I say "most NTS messages are contrived for the sake of a net" don't take that to mean that I am anti-NTS. You emulate a Dick Carroll, Larry Roll, Dave Heil, etc., when you do that. Their loudmouthed insults are just that and nothing else, if you go back in time and follow forward.

Kim W5TIT

5996. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:19:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af3aa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35561

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7A6DF4.BB639A38@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > What a strange thing to say.
> >
> > Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to support
him.
>
> I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

heh heh heh, yeah, so don't waste your time. Just band and someone is sure
to take it that there is someone who needs help.

Kim W5TIT

5997. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:20:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF0F8.81B595AD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35556

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> >
> > How do you suppose Morse got it with the telegraph sounder?
>
> Hopefully, you are aware that a telegraph sounder is NOT International Morse
> and that most hams could not read Morse code sent over a telegraph sounder.
>
> > The point is, if someone trapped could strike three quick taps, three with
> > longer spacing, and then three more quick ones, wouldn't anyone who
> > could read Morse code instantly recognize that as SOS, instead of some
> > part of the building just settling?
>
> Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
> 'S E E E S' and move on. You cannot be serious. Would someone involved
> in a rescue attempt ignore the tapping because it wasn't Morse code?
> You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
> die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?

Man, talk about someone worse off that anyone imagined. FAR worse.
You're the original Mr. One Dimension, to be sure. Not a clue. No wonder
you could never do 20wpm. It takes imagination. Before long you can discern
things like random building noise from structured, human-sent symbols. When
they are so close in form to an internationally recognized radio distress signal
that you were tested on over 50 years ago you WOULD be expected to
recognize it. Alzheimer's is a terrible thing....

5998. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:22:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF192.1BB03441@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35557

CAM wrote:

> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org...
> > > > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
> > >
> > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and pans
> > were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
> > recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything else
> > beyond that would be extremely difficult.
>
> So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
> be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
> Agenda just a little too far?

TTTWWWEEEEEEEEEEEEEEET!!!!!!!!

CECIL, wake up! It's morning! And you just slammed a nocoder!

5999. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:23:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225212310.24595.00000056@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 35558

In article <3C7AB88A.8F7E660A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Opon the second reading of your posting: Are you aware that an EMP will
>destroy your CW transceiver?

It won't destroy my Southgate Type 7 transceiver.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6000. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:23:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af3ab_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35562

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7A6E44.F945F46@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > preparedness is totally bogus.
>
> So hams preparing themselves to use the most basic radiocommunications
> mode is bogus.
>

Too bad Dick isn't reading my posts...*cough* yeah, right. Dick, did you
SEE Carl in some way say that hams preparing themselves to use CW is
bogus? What you and Larry and all you crappy people love to do is twist and
twist and twist until it says what you want to be so damned miserable about.
If you are so desperate to be miserable, why not just stare at yourself for
a while?

>
> We see where you're coming from. You're one of the people who
> would rather have no communications at all rather than "use that old
> stuff".
>

No, that would probably be *YOU*, Dick.

>
> That is exactly what I heard an administrator say once when all the
> computer
> comms were out of service and we HAD no communications.
>

Oh, so you learned about this as quickly and in the same way you learned all
about the Islamic faith in a weekend?

>
> Welcome to the 21st century, where either it's high tech or it doesn't
> exist.
>

You are one huge jerk, Little Dick. At least your huge at something...

Kim W5TIT

6001. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:25:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af42a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35563

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C7A7089.5D220634@uci.edu...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > What are you saying, Jim? Are you thinking that there are no CW
operators
> > at Field Days?
>
> You aren't really THAT clueless, are you?

I must be, Jim. Why don't you clue me in?

Kim W5TIT

6002. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:26:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF27D.EA011115@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35560

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?
> >
> > The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is indeed
> > a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?
>
> So if I forget to tap out an 'SOS', you just move on and let me die?

If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
structured
noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that won't be
lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any rescuer will
do.

You really need to get some help, OM.

End of story.

6003. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:35:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af65b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35566

Yep, you're right, Carl. NTS style traffic *and* CW are both by the wayside from what I've seen and heard on nets -- at least around here. Amateurs may choose, at their discretion to send H&W traffic via CW and that's terrific...but for the on-scene communication effort, straight forward phone seems to be the desire.

Kim W5TIT

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message news:3c7a7b2b_2@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e3f8a07c291b9a98969c@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> says...
> >
> > > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > > preparedness is totally bogus.
> >
> > Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.
>
> Try using (whatever) after a large EMP event.
> The issue is whether physical devices will be
> "fried" ... not whether a mode will work or not.
> (And let's not get into the "cobble something
> together in the field from scrap parts" argument.)
>
> Actually, there was something published (I believe
> by the ARRL) some years back that indicated that
> most ham gear, with reasonable precautions, would
> do surprisingly well in the event of an EMP.
>
> > > As someone stated, the nets that exist to pass such radiograms
> > > exist, not because someone really needs that sort of capability,
> > > but because "it's always been that way" and the nets have come
> > > to create most of the traffic solely for the purpose of justifying
> > > their own continuation.
> >
> > Ah... so next up is No Traffic International?
>
> No ... let's not be ridicuous ... if people enjoy the exercise
> of passing traffic via the NTS, who am I to try to suggest
> that they stop? The only point I was making is that NTS

> type "radiograms" are not what emergency management
> folks need or want and that the NTS creates a lot of
> message traffic simply to jusify its continued existence.
> (again, if people enjoy the activity, that's fine by me, but
> let's not distort reality to the degree of asserting that it is
> an essential function any more, when it's pretty much
> devolved into a recreational activity ...)
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPHp4G5e+N6+q84HiEQKGVACfXVSyYoMVu+qE7ZcjhAVliTibV+sAn1gN
> rox+ubP+iTr44gFA8woLocev
> =QJMm
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
>
>

6004. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:36:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF4CC.EE8CE2F4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35564

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
> >
> > BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> > ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
> > course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
>
> But PACTOR II comes back before CW. When is amateur radio going to catch
> up with the trailing edge of technology?
>

Probably never, given history and the pace of technology these days. The vast majority of hams just don't move to new technology that fast. Never did, probably
never will, since ham radio is basically for fun and no profit. As KH2D said, a lot of this new stuff just has no magic, at least for a lot of hams.
So does it have to be super efficient like Pactor 2 or you dump it? Why not have a little fun with some other modes, like PSK31 or even Hellschrieber?
You and Stevenson need to be on a desert island together, with nothing but two tin cans and a SHORT string.

> Opon the second reading of your posting: Are you aware that an EMP will
> destroy your CW transceiver?

Might get yours, but it won't get mine, at least the one I keep in steel cabinet.
If it does it probably wouldn't matter anyway.

6005. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:39:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af760_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35568

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0202251004.20cf1686@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7a4f40_1@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c783d44_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > [snip]
> > >
> > > >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> > > >preferred mode in an emergency.
> > > >
> > > Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
> > different.
> > > Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff
> > KT4ST is
> > > involved in.
> > > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > Another point ... in the vast majority of (the few) cases where CW
> > *is* used for emergency communications (including H&W traffic),
> > it is because the operator CHOOSES to use that mode as a
> > matter of personal preference, NOT because it is NECESSARY
> > or because it is the ONLY mode available or that would work.
>
> In the cases I cited, the operators used CW because SSB WOULD NOT GET
> THROUGH. Other modes were NOT available, or would not get through.
>
> Let me repaeat that in case it's not clear: In the cases I cited, CW
> was used because SSB simply couldn't do the job, and other modes were
> not available.
>
> Carl, let's see you cite the "vast majority of cases" where other
> available modes would not work.
>
> > Operator choice based on preference is fine ... however, it is
> > not legitimate to infer from this that the use of CW is ESSENTIAL
> > in any way to emergency communications.
>

> I'm not saying that any mode is essential. Personally, I find it
> amazing that digital modes (voice, image and data) are not more used
> by hams in emergency work.
>
> But the categorical denial that CW/Morse plays any role in emergency
> comms by hams is simply false.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And, Mr. Black & White, since when is a statement like: "I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a p-r-e-f-e-r-r-e-d m-o-d-e [emphasis added] in an emergency" to be construed as a *categorical* denial that CW/Morse plays any role in emergency communication by hams?

Yeah, I got sucked in again, didn't I?

Kim W5TIT

6006. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:40:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af7bc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:u7l0qbokpt4n6b@corp.supernews.com...
> Geesh, grow the F*** up! What do you want? Papers? Where are
> your PAPERS!! Photo IDs? 7 day waiting periods? On line verification
> of a license before sale? Give me a break!
>

I'm with you, Mike. Absolutely.

>
> I bought my Swan 500C as incentive to get my Novice ticket. BEFORE
> I had any HAM license at all. I got the Swan, listened to my friends, and
> practiced listening to code. Finally got my ticket.
>
> I bought my Kenwood TR-2400 as incentive to get my Tech license.
> BEFORE I had privileges on 2M. Listening to 2M gave me the bug to
> get off my butt and over to Dallas to take the test for upgrade.
>
> My Alinco DR-590 dual-bander for my car was a birthday gift from
> my wife, who DIDN'T have a ticket. You're little Gestapo tactics would
> rule out anyone buying a radio as a gift.
>
> I had decided (but actually didn't buy it) to get a K2 as my incentive to
> get back into CW and upgrade. Opps, should I not be allowed to buy
> a radio out of class?
>
> Little people with little minds making a big agenda to control anyone
> they can, any way they can. And when they can't build themselves up,
> they try to put anyone else into a lower class. Hey, it's all relative.
>
> This kind of 'attitude' makes me be ashamed to be associated with some
> HAMs. The 'little' people who just have to be controlling of anyone they
> can, and make a big thing out of nothing... I had a boss one time like
> that. Managed by putting the people under him under his thumb. Didn't
> last long...
>
> Mike
>
> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > What do you think?
> >
> > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell

> amateur
> > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is
a
> > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> > your opinions.
> >
> > No License? No Radio!
> > http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
> >
> > Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> > http://www.eham.net/survey/
> > (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
> >
> > This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
> the
> > time to review it, and consider taking part.
> >
> > 73 de,
> > Dan, W8MMQ
>
>
>
>

6007. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:41:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF5E8.7C5D2657@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35565

There is probably a very large grain of truth in that, Ed.

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:

> They know what the tests are and because they feel they can pass them easily
> after decades of hamming, they think they are trivial tests compared to the
> "hard" ones they took before they had decades of experience.

6008. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:42:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af804_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35570

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7A8B2B.6D602E13@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > The key point (pun
> > > > > intended) is that Morse tapping could be heard to be distinctly
different from
> > > > > those noises.
> > > > >
> > > > So could any number of other banging noises made by humans. How do
> > > > you overcome the differences between the dits and dahs of radio
Morse
> > > > and the clicks of telegraph Morse? Seems to me, any human banging
> > > > would perform the task. Seems to me, International Morse would be
> > > > virtually useless in that situation.
> > >
> > > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
> >
> > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
>
> How do you suppose Morse got it with the telegraph sounder?
>
> The point is, if someone trapped could strike three quick taps, three
with
> longer spacing, and then three more quick ones, wouldn't anyone who
> could read Morse code instantly recognize that as SOS, instead of some
> part of the building just settling?
>

You cannot be serious, Dick?! I hope you are never, never, never on a
disaster scene with someone simply slamming whatever they can...

Kim W5TIT

6009. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:45:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af8ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35572

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7A8CA4.FCE9CF1B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > What a strange thing to say.
> > >
> > > Cecil says a lot of strange things, and strangely, Ed leaps to
support him.
> >
> > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
>
> Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?
>
> The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is
indeed
> a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?
> If prisoners of war can invent a tap code to
> use to keep in touch with each other surely hams can learn 5wpm Morse
code.
>

And, why not call what those prisoners do, exactly what it is...idle
chit-chat, news from the next cell, etc. It is *NOT* "messages" of *HELP
ME* that they are sending. On a disaster scene, any banging should be
investigated...ANY.0

>
> If they don't want to use it they can consider it a public service. New
hams aren't
>
> really selfish, are they? That's what your attitude projects, that they
are too
> selfcentered
> to do such a minor thing as learn the basic radiocommunications mode.
>

No one, not one person, should be required to do more than they are willing/able/capable in public service. I would no more study CW for public service than I would stand in the heat for a parade down here.

Kim W5TIT

6010. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:45:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AF6DF.FBE6E470@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well yeah, but only becuz we like ya! 8^)

- mike -

KC8JBO wrote:

> And you guys complain about MY posts?

6011. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:46:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af8ed$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35573

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7A8CFF.15C39B0E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C796A74.FF685388@worldnet.att.net>...
> > >
> > > > Yep, that's the way rrap works. The blatantl horses ass
codebashing
> > > > insultmeisters will steadily rachet it up til you just can't help
asnwering one
> > > > or more of their insults, then they worm their way into making YOU
the goat.
> > > > Happens here all the time.
> > >
> > > The trick is not to get sucked in.
> >
> > Dick usually swallows it hook, line, and sinker. :-)
>
> And spits it right back in your face.
>
> And you don't realize what you just admitted to. Troll, troll, troll.
>

Caught again, eh, Little Dick?

Kim W5TIT

6012. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:46:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af913_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35574

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Joshua Houk wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> > >
> > > > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
> > > > preparedness is totally bogus.
> > >
> > > Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.
> >
> > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
>
> BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
> course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
>

You're getting nothing but desperate now...this is ridiculous.

Kim W5TIT

6013. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:50:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7af9e5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35575

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5e4cf01p9d@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org...
> > > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some help.
> > >
> > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and
pans
> > were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
> > recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything else
> > beyond that would be extremely difficult.
> >
> >

Yeah, when you're banging, the time length between bangs is the measure,
rather than the time length of the tone...dah or dit vs. tap-tap-tap
tap----tap----tap tap-tap-tap. HOWEVER, I maintain the attitude that
simple banging/tapping/stomping/pounding will do the trick in an
emergency...

Kim W5TIT

6014. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:51:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afa4f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35576

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no
> > >farther
> > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
> > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in
recent
> > >> disasters.
> >
> > >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> > >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> > >little if anything about its use.
> >
> > Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead of
> > calling her conclusion "juvenile."
>
> To what end, Ed? It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was
> generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in
> emergencies. Kim seems to think that the only emergencies that take
> place will be on the same order of the WTC bombing. She believes that
> because she is ignorant of the use of the mode, everyone is. If you want
> to play games with Kim, YOU fill in the blanks. I'm still of the
> opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of
> information.
>
> Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> subject at hand.
>
> Dave K8MN

READ: I can't come up with a thing.

Kim W5TIT

6015. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:53:54 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e497e783592c7998969d@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35571

In article <3c7a7b2b_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> Try using (whatever) after a large EMP event.
> The issue is whether physical devices will be
> "fried" ... not whether a mode will work or not.
> (And let's not get into the "cobble something
> together in the field from scrap parts" argument.)

Actually, the issue in regards to CW vs. voice would be the disruption to
the ionosphere that would occur immediately after an EMP blast.

> Actually, there was something published (I believe
> by the ARRL) some years back that indicated that
> most ham gear, with reasonable precautions, would
> do surprisingly well in the event of an EMP.

I vaguely remember this as well, and I'll dig it out if I manage to find
it.

joshua houk
kd7pos

6016. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:54:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afad8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35577

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7AB88A.8F7E660A@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
> >
> > BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> > ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either,
of
> > course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
>
> But PACTOR II comes back before CW. When is amateur radio going to catch
> up with the trailing edge of technology?
>
> Opon the second reading of your posting: Are you aware that an EMP will
> destroy your CW transceiver?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I said it before, I'll say it again...LOL

Dick thinks just because he is tapping something, that there is someone
listening somewhere.

Kim W5TIT

6017. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 02:56:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afb7a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35579

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7AB533.3B3A1CC4@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?
> >
> > The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is
indeed
> > a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?
>
> So if I forget to tap out an 'SOS', you just move on and let me die?
> Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test Agenda just a mite
> too far? What if I'm one of the 99.97% of the population who doesn't
> know Morse code? Do I deserve to die because I don't know Morse code?
> Does your wife know Morse code, Dick? Would you let her die because
> she didn't tap out 'SOS'? Good Grief!!!
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Ridiculous and scarey, huh?

Kim W5TIT

6018. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 03:00:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afc5c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35580

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7AB6CE.F988F003@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> >
> > Cecil, there are any number of people on this and other groups who can
use
> > both clacker (American, Continental, railroad, etc) Morse and
> > International Morse on both clackers and beepers. I will grant you that
> > it will take a bit of OJT but it should not take too long to figure out
> > that di-dit di-dit is an L. At first it will be di-di-dit dit di-dit a
> > lot but it will work.
>
> Egads, Dick, what are the chances of the trapped person and the rescuer
> both being able to use railroad code? You PCTA folk are so far out that
> I don't know where you get your oxygen. Probably 0.01% of the population
> knows railroad code. For any two random people to know it would be
0.00001%.
> I think I now understand what Kim is saying. If the chances of Morse code
> saving the day is 0.00001%, why bother?
>
> By taking this completely irrational stand, Morse code is disgraced. With
> supporters like that, Morse code doesn't need any enemies.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yeah, that is basically what I am saying...however, anyone who would wish to
bother having CW in their repertoire is bigger and better for it. My point,
now that you and maybe some others are understanding, is that keeping the
test element for CW because it is such a worthy emergency communication
mode, and public service mode, is not the argument we want to put forth. It
is *not* the reliable mode it once was--as operators are less and less.
And, no, keeping the test does not keep the operators up.

OK, now we can start all over again...LOL

Kim W5TIT

6019. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 03:07:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7AFBEC.597F7B7C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35578

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Dick usually swallows it hook, line, and sinker. :-)
> >
> > And spits it right back in your face.
>
> You wish.
>
> > And you don't realize what you just admitted to. Troll, troll, troll.
>
> Of course, I keep fishing as long as the fish are biting - don't you?
> When are you going to wise up and stop being the laughing stock of
> this newsgroup?

So when are you going to grow up stop acting like a childish sophomoric
horses
ass? I suppose it's much too late when you're already into Alzheimer's.

6020. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 03:09:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afe60_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35581

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AF0F8.81B595AD@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams
know)
> > > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> > >
> > > How do you suppose Morse got it with the telegraph sounder?
> >
> > Hopefully, you are aware that a telegraph sounder is NOT International
Morse
> > and that most hams could not read Morse code sent over a telegraph
sounder.
> >
> > > The point is, if someone trapped could strike three quick taps, three
with
> > > longer spacing, and then three more quick ones, wouldn't anyone who
> > > could read Morse code instantly recognize that as SOS, instead of some
> > > part of the building just settling?
> >
> > Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
> > 'S E E E S' and move on. You cannot be serious. Would someone involved
> > in a rescue attempt ignore the tapping because it wasn't Morse code?
> > You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
> > die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?
>
> Man, talk about someone worse off that anyone imagined. FAR worse.
> You're the original Mr. One Dimension, to be sure. Not a clue. No wonder
> you could never do 20wpm. It takes imagination. Before long you can
discern
> things like random building noise from structured, human-sent symbols.
When
> they are so close in form to an internationally recognized radio distress
signal
> that you were tested on over 50 years ago you WOULD be expected to
> recognize it. Alzheimer's is a terrible thing....
>

Uh yuh. I am sitting here laughing hysterically at this: imagine the Little Tweety Bird who states all the time, "I tought I taw a puddy tat..." Now, transform that to Little Dick on a disaster scene: "I tought I hud a dat dat dat when dere was 'sposed to be a dut dut dut..." And, the rest of the cartoon world comes into play: "Which way do I go from here, which way do I..."; "I say, I say, Son, slow down."

While Dick is standing there in the rubble trying to figure out what he just heard, I hope there's a lucid person around who's already begun running in the direction of the sound they just heard...

Kim W5TIT

6021. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 03:10:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7afec1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35582

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AF192.1BB03441@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C7A6CAA.174E759D@IEEE.org...
> > > > > That would likely be because Alzheimers has set in. Get some
help.
> > > >
> > > > Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams
know)
> > > > can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots
and pans
> > > were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
> > > recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything
else
> > > beyond that would be extremely difficult.
> >
> > So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
> > be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
> > Agenda just a little too far?
>
> TTTWWWEEEEEEEEEEEEEEET!!!!!!!!
>
> CECIL, wake up! It's morning! And you just slammed a nocoder!
>

A) You consider that a slam?
B) We logical, reasonable people *can* disagree and be human about it
C) Most of us aren't so rabid as you, Little Dick
D) Cecil, I don't think, was even attempting to slam anyone...

Kim W5TIT

6022. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 03:14:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7aff79_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35583

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AF27D.EA011115@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I'm picturing myself trapped in a collapsed building with a pipe in
> > > > my hand banging on another pipe. Exactly how can I use International
> > > > Morse code to communicate? What would I say? 'Hurry!'? Even if I
> > > > could send telegraph sounder code, virtually nobody would be able to
> > > > decode it, including most amateur radio operators.
> > >
> > > Have you been inside a cocoon for the past 65 years?
> > >
> > > The basic need is SOME sort of method to inform rescuers that there is
indeed
> > > a survivor in there somewhere. Again, what better than SOS?
> >
> > So if I forget to tap out an 'SOS', you just move on and let me die?
>
> If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
> structured
> noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that
won't be
> lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any
rescuer will
> do.
>
> You really need to get some help, OM.
>
> End of story.
>

Oh my God. I hang my head in shame and hope that anyone who reads this newsgroup who is not a ham--and even those who are--would never believe that this person (I'd like to call him a jerk, but I'm trying to be truly serious here) is representative of most of the rest of us.

Most any rescuer will attempt investigation of any sound they hear. This person (jerk) just has such an agenda of hate and contempt that he can't get passed it.

Kim W5TIT

6023. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:09:05 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <CQDe8.48840$2v1.1624196@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yup,

Does anyone think a "law" would stop all the CB shops around the truck stops
from selling
those so-called "10 meter" radios? I doubt it.

Jerry
K4KWH
www.qsl.net/k4kwh

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5eiq9$3sa$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
> >
> > Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change
your
> > mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
> illegally
> > and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> Just how effective do you think a law would be?
> Answer...it wouldn't. Ham radios are sold in
> many places besides Radio Shack.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

6024. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:15:38 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <WWDe8.48860$2v1.1626491@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35586
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'm told by a local Radio Shack manager that it is a policy of Radio Shack
(Tandy, Inc.) not
to sell amateur equipment to unlicensed persons. That is an internal
decision by the company,
according to the manager--who is a ham, BTW. Now, that doesn't mean that
IF such a
policy exists, that it doesn't get violated by locals. I'm just repeating
what I was told. I do
know that in the store I frequent, the manager will ask for a license and
explain what the radio
actually is. They often get mistaken for "CB" radios.

Jerry
K4KWH
CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7ABA43.273BCC6F@IEEE.org...
> Daniel Hicks wrote:
> > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
amateur
> > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license?
>
> Do you think gun shops should be able to sell guns to people who
> *might* use them to commit crimes? Get real! Many, many prospective
> hams buy a transceiver to give them an incentive to get their licenses.
> Do you want to discourage prospective hams?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6025. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:16:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7B0C29.CB486512@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35585

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Uhhhhhhh Dick, BASIC is a programming language.
>
> You mean Beginners Allpurpose Symbolic Instruction Code? You confuse *that*
> with basic radio? Har har har...

Basic radio is not all capitals.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6026. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:22:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7B0D97.2A89B83F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35587

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When
> they are so close in form to an internationally recognized radio distress signal
> that you were tested on over 50 years ago you WOULD be expected to
> recognize it.

So you conclude that anyone tapping in something other than Morse
code doesn't need help in a collapsed building? You are much farther
gone than I first suspected.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6027. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:27:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7B0EA0.855BDB00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35588

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
> structured
> noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that won't be
> lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any rescuer will
> do.

So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice guy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6028. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:32:46 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <SaEe8.48894$2v1.1630681@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35589

I defeated CCR's by moving/living in North Carolina. Seriously, the way to defeat them is to
vote with de-feet. MOVE to a place where they don't have them--read older neighborhood,
older house. My house is in very fine shape, was built in 1956, has real plaster walls, and is
built MUCH better than these matchbox, cookie-cutter houses built these days. And my city
has no "ordinances", and there are no CCR's that attempt to tell me what I can or cannot have
on my own property--except for a junk car parked in the yard with grass growing up around it!
I LOVE it!

73

Jerry
K4KWH
Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5ei6t$vm2$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Sent: Monday, February 25, 2002 3:26 PM
> Subject: Re: CCR's in California...
>
>
> > On Sun, 24 Feb 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> D. Sussy wrote:
> > >> [Granted, there is no current definition of an amateur radio station
> being
> > >> a FIXED location, but if there were, it's possible that a very
subtile
> > >> change in the regulations could wipe out CC&R's.
> > >
> > >Go for it then. I'd be more than happy to see you win...but
> > >I won't hold any expectations as to that outcome.
> >
> > Go for what? I've already defeated my CC&R's and didn't even have to go
> to
> > court to do so.
>
> Go for that "subtle change." But since you state you defeated
> YOUR CC&Rs, perhaps you could share how you actually

> did that?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

6029. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:35:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7B1085.222C25D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35590

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
> > > be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
> > > Agenda just a little too far?
> >
> > TTTWWWEEEEEEEEEEEEEET!!!!!!!!
> > CECIL, wake up! It's morning! And you just slammed a nocoder!
> >
>
> A) You consider that a slam?
> B) We logical, reasonable people *can* disagree and be human about it
> C) Most of us aren't so rabid as you, Little Dick
> D) Cecil, I don't think, was even attempting to slam anyone...

How can asking a couple of questions possibly be a slam?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6030. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:52:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225235236.27846.00000080@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 35593

In article <20020225133157.10663.00000086@mb-fp.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) inadvertently sent the wrong message reply, was chided by
outraged and vitriolic thought police (or SA fairies, its hard to tell which)
and
now resends what was originally intended:

>In article <20020224221056.19003.00000087@mb-bd.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:
>
>>In article <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>>>I wasn't born at the time ... were you? (If you are that much older
>>>than me, were you licensed and on the air at the time?)
>>
>>I didn't come along until years later - but so what? Must one have
>>been alive during the Civil War to be knowledgeable about it, and
>>the factors that influenced the people of the time?

Heh, heh, heh. Morse code was used during the American Civil
War. While the ARRL didn't write it up, an interesting couple of
mentions include suppression of the morse telegraph communications
for tactical communications on the Union side, the reason given in
official histories being that "it was too easily compromised by
interception." The replacement communications was visual, signal
flags by day, torches by night. [interesting "justification" :-)]
The crossed flags and torch are on the collar insignia worn by
US Army Signal Corps to this day.

Hmmm...a morseman born in the mid-1950s who speaks as if he
he was USING morsemodes in 1936, "knew full well the SSB
pioneering by hams" in those days. Whoa! Halt! Let me remind
you of the official orders given out by two Badass Extra Dudes
big Dave and the Goonery Sahgent: "YOU HAVE TO BE _IN_
SOMETHING TO _KNOW_ IT, IF YOU ARE NOT YOU DON'T
KNOW ANYTHING." If you were born 19 years after a date you
cannot possibly know anything about it! Geez, you guys have to
get your acts together.

>>indicates a hatred of the code itself and a big gap in your knowledge of the
>>history of US amateur radio licensing. Remember, we're talking about
>>history here, not the way things are today.

I doubt that. N2EY is practicing a rather laborious SELECTIVE
HISTORY extremely biased in favor of his particular viewpoint.

>>For 1936, was he not correct? At that time, Morse/CW was THE
>>major mode of both the military and commercial services. Yes, there
>>was some voice and some RTTY, but only a small amount compared
>>to Morse/CW.

Insufficient evidence and absolutely NO cites, there, Jimmie, it betrays
a very limited historical reference that is more hysterical and histrionic
than historic. For the commercial and military services try consulting
a few dozen other workd besides what is printed by the Newington
boys. Try the first "Collins SSB Book" (by Pappenfus, Bruene,
Schoenike) as a primer on commercial methods. Did you think that
half of the four voice-grade circuits on each SSB were going to be
used for morse?!?!? For military services try "A History of the U.S.
Signal Corps," by the Editors of The Army Times, Putnam, 1960.
For both and more detail on technological aspects, try the very
special 50th Anniversary edition of Electronics magazine (McGraw
Hill biweekly) of April 17, 1980. You can also visit the IEEE History
Society section and check out their many Milestones (you ARE an
important professional with good school grades have all those
contacts with the industry, right?). You can ask KT4ST to let you
see back copies of SIGNAL from his ability to access US documents
or even visit Fort Gordon's Signal Museum (it has public access
during the day and is not too far from PA). That's just a start, and
you might even try reading Thomas White's many historical
references to ALL of early North American radio before WW2, real
history with references and footnotes even! Interesting stuff to
someone who was born in 1932 and only four years old in 1936.
If you REALLY look hard there's all kinds of intersting stuff about a
really BIG technology field already jumping by 1936.

>>One of the justifications for the very existence of the ARS back in those
>>days was as a training ground for radio operators, and a ready reserve for
>>military and commercial needs.

Oh, wow, snow job and a half. Jimmie, Jimmie, you've failed to make
good grades in very ordinary US national history and its domestic political
climate of 1936. The 48 states were split and favoring ISOLATIONISM
with the edge going to isolation, non-involvement, its far away and don't
bother us kind of thinking, we don't need to prepare for anything. As far
as "WW2" was concerned the only fracas in 1936 was the Japanese
fooling around in far away Manchuria, an Asian thing that didn't involve
the Big USA. Important folks, even Charles Lindberg, thought Germany
was "okay" in 1936. The military draft wouldn't start until 1940, after
the Germans and Italians appeared to be a possible future trouble.

>>Of course the military and commercial services don't
>>need many Morse/CW operators today, but back in 1936 it was a VERY
>>different story! Hams who could not begin to approach commercial or
>>military standards of skill weakened this justification.

You make it sound like US amateur radio was some kind of "military
reserve" when all you are doing is wrapping very new political flags
and bunting over standard boilerplate political statements that were

used for many, many different things.

>>This idea is explained in DeSoto's book. Have you read the whole thing?

Somehow, being exposed to a larger world of radio, I doubt that
Clinton B. DeSoto was NOT the "official historian" of radio OR
anything but a nice little book that told old-timers things that they
WANTED TO HEAR OR SEE.

Have you read ANY of the specific mentions I've cited or ANYTHING
other than ham-interest books? You can't be a "renowned historian"
of ANY radio service by using tunnel vision like they were tunnel diodes.

>>Recall that early in WW1, there was a severe shortage of radio operators.
About
>>4000 US hams (a very large percentage of the US amateur radio population of
>>1917) served Uncle Sam in WW1.

According to DoD information supplied to The World Almanac, some
4,743,826 served all branches of the US military in WW1. That's one
ham for every thousand other beef. According to the Army Times
SigC history the major signal communications modes on land were
field telephones, signal flags and torches (still there since Civil War),
Lucas lamp blinker, and flag panels on the ground for the beginnings
of military aviations. There were many more couriers using foot,
vehicles (bicycle and motorcycle) than there were radio telegraphers.
Only the Lucas lamp was directly allied with on-off codings.

>>With the rise of communism and fascism in
>>Europe, the possibility of another war could not be ignored.

Really? The Hue and Cry and Anti-Communist hysteria had
boiled up in the western public in 1918 or even 1920?!?!? Yes, a
real anxiety period. The US State Department completely dissolved
its "Black Chamber" of cryptographers under the rationale of
"Gentlemen don't read other gentlemen's mail." That left a small
very small group of Army and Navy people to organize their own
(that's another part of history allied with radio, plenty of details)
with the result that the Navy won the race and was installing the
first of the "rotor" on-line encryption teleprinters in 1937. The USN
was already seeing the superiority of TTY over manual telegraphy
for use on cruiser class and heavier in the mid 1930s.

>>Having a large
>>contingent of skilled and technically knowledgeable hams helped justify the
>>continued existence of the ARS.

Or putting in some politically-motivated patriotic bunting on the
reviewing stand is just common, everyday boilerplate political
phrasing.

>>See above. I would respectfully suggest that your conclusions are
>>conjecture based mostly on lack of historical background of the time.

I respecfully suggest you get a far wider research base than paper out of Newington. I respectfully suggest you get in touch with those other Big Badass One-by-Twos in here and get your respective acts together on what is "officially correct." You three are just QRMing yourselves into nonsense.

Jimmie boy, when you were born I was already wearing flags and torches, had three up and one down on the sleeves, working Big Time HF Comm 24/7. My parents struggled through the Great Depression first hand as did the parents of my 378 high school classmates that graduated my 1951 class...I think that my class group as a finer, up-close and personal view of the year 1936 than you will ever have.

Come back when you have your Real time machine finished...

6031. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:52:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225235237.27846.00000081@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 35591

In article <3C7AB3E3.77A0984C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> I recall a commercial a few years ago for SOS steel wool pads. Pots and
>pans
>> were banging out the distress signal. This pattern could be easily
>> recognizable if it were tapped out by banging on a pipe, but anything else
>> beyond that would be extremely difficult.
>
>So the people who bang out anything else except 'SOS' on pipes will
>be left to die? Don't you think that's taking the Pro Code Test
>Agenda just a little too far?

Nah! Morse code can stop aircraft hijackings and alien invasions!

Gotta TEST for it to save the world! :-)

6032. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:52:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225235237.27846.00000082@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 35592

In article <3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>CAM wrote:
>
>> Joshua Houk wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <3c7a4cf8_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
>> >
>> > > The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
>> > > preparedness is totally bogus.
>> >
>> > Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.
>>
>> The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
>
> BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
>ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
>course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.

Heh heh heh..."CW gets through when nothing else will"...except when
the equipment is totally fried.

Tell us all about your EMP testing experience for TEMPEST,
Dickie.

Or did you "read all about it in a book?" :-)

6033. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 04:55:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020225235530.18488.00000629@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35594

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225202127.29966.00000093@mb-fa.aol.com>

>Good grief, Yes! A motion picture has clearly shown the morse code
>mode is essential to SAVING THE ENTIRE WORLD!!!!

You betcha!

I'm waiting for the one where a demented ex-radio technician is kissed by
a descendent of Samuel F. B. Morse and suddenly bestowes his genius on all the
peoples of the world, thereby halting famine, homelessness and disease.

6034. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:07:13 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e4b72369018f0a98969e@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35595

In article <3c7af913_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
says...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
> >
> > BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> > ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
> > course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
>
> You're getting nothing but desperate now...this is ridiculous.

Hardly. Check out the ARRL's Antenna Book in the chapter on Safety, which
describes the effects of an EMP event and the procedures to follow in
such an occurrence.

joshua houk
kd7pos

6035. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:28:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226002804.18488.00000631@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35596

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225202124.29966.00000089@mb-fa.aol.com>

>Now, now, big Dave, you DO exaggerate a bit about "importance"
>RELATIVE TO OVER A DOZEN OTHER NATIONS IN MIDDLE
>AFRICA which had or still have a strong communist leaning,
>governments, and staging areas for USSR troops. Bigger countries.

I guess you made this assessment based upon YOUR first hand experiences in
foreign service, Lennie?

You were there? You were briefed by foerign service operative of the time
on daily on-goings there?

>On the world scene of geopolitics, Guinea-Bisseau is
>still a "4th World" country struggling to get up into the "3rd" category.

As a power unto itself, perhaps...Dave's narrative clearly limited itself
to the Soviet and Cuban presence there...Not any "geopolitical" importance.
Most of the former Soviet bloc countries and those who were under it's
influence are STILL in that category today. I dare say that Russia itself is
barely emerging from that level today.

>Gosh, big Dave, no "letters" seem to have been sent to the big
>wire services like AP and Reuters stressing the ENORMOUS
>IMPORTANCE of that particular country and its been a long, long
>time since a video bite from a TV correspondent. I don't see,
>haven't seen much mention in any big historical write-ups either,
>but, of course, you've just cleared this up.

Well DAVE...How DARE you have any insight on something that Rather or
Cronkite didn't dedicate at LEAST 1000 hours to. We ALL know that if Lennie
can't find at least a small novella on it on the web, it DIDN'T happen!

>I've never elevated any STATE DEPARTMENT work or the IMPORTANCE
>of Guinea-Bisseau in communications, or implied Great Secret Mysteries
>of (horrors!) CLASSIFIED COMMUNICATIONS WORK!

Having never been involved in any of them, we'd hope not. Your track
record is already pretty porous.

>Boo on
>me for not bowing and scraping, saluting and kissing the ass of a self-
>professed one-by-two "radio champion."

As oppsed to a "zero by zero" hero like you...?!?!

>What I did originally (and big Dave is still smarting from ego blasting)
>was to bash a snow job to others who had not worked any gubmint
>comm on HF, would therefore be unknowing of what went on.

Jon Lovitz has your "Pathalogical Liars Association" membership card for you, Lennie...Shall I send him your address?

>There's a terrific amount of PUBLIC INFORMATION available to the
>public (that's why it is called "public") on just about EVERY area
>and activity of the entire radio world. That INCLUDES military
>communications, believe it or not. The problem with arrogant
>elitists in a hobby activity is the ONLY radio information input they
>have is from (guess what) their hobby activity's publishing media.

There are reams and reams of information NOT in the public domain, too. If a lot of the realtively low-intensity evolutions that I was involved in are NOT there, I can only imagine what serious things may or may not be out htere in "information land".

Some gall...The world allowing things to happen that didn't "cc" Lennie first......

>For a little while I was an INSIDER
>of a part of that small part of the publishing world. HR didn't live in
>the midst of ancient fantasy and self-promotional propaganda and
>lasted 22 years. Another self-professed ham hero thinks they were
>a "failure" but then he was never any sort of insider in ham publishing.

Didn't have to be...They are not publishing today...It failed.

Congratulations, by the way Lennie, on seeing HR back into "reprint". Must be nice to see all that 20+ year technology back inot print, huh?

>Yes. It is my opinion that amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable
>recreational activity that allows non-professionals to engage in the
>fascinating technology of radio communications arts within the
>narrow mode selections and frequency bands allocated by federal
>agencies.

"Narrow mode selections"?

The federal government does NOT allocate the modes I must use.

Also, the bands we are authorized to use outnumber the ones YOU are authorized to use 100%, Part 15 and Part 95 notwithstanding.

>It is supposed to be a social gathering point where
>individuals can convene, make friends, share information, socialize
>as other groups do for the sheer enjoyment of socializing.

Oh? And this is codified in which paragraph of Part 97? I musta missed it.

>Shazam, big Dave, you are a marvel. Now go leap tall
>pileups at a single bound. Leap high. Your own pileups
>are very big.

Compared to YOUR posts, Lennie?

Apologies to Dave, but YOU stack it much, MUCH higher!

Mrs A is waiting, Lennie...Run along!

Steve And The Boys

6036. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:37:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226003743.18488.00000632@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35597

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 10:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225235236.27846.00000080@mb-fg.aol.com>

>>>One of the justifications for the very existence of the ARS back in those
>>>days was as a training ground for radio operators, and a ready reserve for
>>>military and commercial needs.
>
>Oh, wow, snow job and a half. Jimmie, Jimmie, you've failed to make
>good grades in very ordinary US national history and its domestic political
>climate of 1936. The 48 states were split and favoring ISOLATIONISM
>with the edge going to isolation, non-involvement, its far away and don't
>bother us kind of thinking, we don't need to prepare for anything. As far
>as "WW2" was concerned the only fracas in 1936 was the Japanese
>fooling around in far away Manchuria, an Asian thing that didn't involve
>the Big USA. Important folks, even Charles Lindberg, thought Germany
>was "okay" in 1936. The military draft wouldn't start until 1940, after
>the Germans and Italians appeared to be a possible future trouble.

And YOU forget, Your Twitlessness, that while isolationism was the
"policy" of the government in that era, preparing for war was it's true intent,
hence "Lend/Lease", etc etc. \

The United States also turned a blind eye to certain provisions of U. S.
law as it pertained to American nationals fighting on behalf of other nations
while still holding American citizenship.

>I respecfully suggest you get a far wider research base than paper
>out of Newington. I respectfully suggest you get in touch with those
>other Big Badass One-by-Twos in here and get your respective acts
>together on what is "officially correct." You three are just QRMing
>yourselves into nonsense.

Please cite where anyone, EXCEPT YOU, has said "anything" is "offically
correct", Your Gutlessness.

And the only nonsense herein comes from you.

Your stroke is imminent.

6037. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:38:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B1F88.B66637C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35598

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
> > structured
> > noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that won't be
> > lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any rescuer will
> > do.
>
> So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
> for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice guy.
>

Troll, Troll,Troll. Poor terminally bored Cecil.

6038. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:40:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226004032.18488.00000633@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35599

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 10:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225235236.27846.00000080@mb-fg.aol.com>

I love this guy.....Lennie starts out railing against someone else over "...way back when"....

>Jimmie boy, when you were born I was already wearing flags and
>torches, had three up and one down on the sleeves, working Big
>Time HF Comm 24/7. My parents struggled through the Great
>Depression first hand as did the parents of my 378 high school
>classmates that graduated my 1951 class...I think that my class
>group as a finer, up-close and personal view of the year 1936 than
>you will ever have.

The finishes up with this...

>Come back when you have your Real time machine finished...

Lennie, Lennie, Lennie..........Two faced as always.

6039. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:42:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B203F.482A77FD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35600

Joshua Houk wrote:

> In article <3c7af913_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> says...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
> > >
> > > BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when the
> > > ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW either, of
> > > course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
> >
> > You're getting nothing but desperate now...this is ridiculous.
>
> Hardly. Check out the ARRL's Antenna Book in the chapter on Safety, which
> describes the effects of an EMP event and the procedures to follow in
> such an occurrence.
>

Don't confuse her by sending her to the book, she can't read, and besides, her
library is all comic books (they have pictures). Antenna? What's that?

6040. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:45:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226004500.18488.00000634@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35501

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/2002 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020225202122.29966.00000088@mb-fa.aol.com>

>Does the Joint Chairman (General Myers) know of your
>importance, etc.

Does he know of yours?

>Feel slighted?

LOL!! Lennie, yo really ARE ignorant!

Steve And The Boys

6041. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 05:52:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B2293.CCE7AC97@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35502

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Communication work doesn't have to be "important" at all. We in
> >Guinea-Bissau had no responsibilities to warn anyone of a nuclear
> >holocaust.
>
> Excuse for not getting that single-channel State Department
> RTTY "synchronized?" :-)

Do you mean to say that you are ignorant of the difficulties in
maintaining crypto sync during certain HF multipath condition?

> >You must have been thinking of my 2nd AF commo days, Len.
>
> Couldn't have, big Dave. Not having an authorized callsign in
> amateur radio made me "ignorant" of your time inside Cheyenne
> Mountain. Tell us how you liked it in there. Were you affected
> by claustrophobia when those big blast doors closed?

2nd AF was not at Cheyenne Mountain. Try Barksdale AFB Alfa and Bravo
nets.

> Were you a child prodigy and a consultant to Curt Le May?

Did you know Tesla personally?

> Does the Joint Chairman (General Myers) know of your
> importance, etc.?

Retirement galls you, does it? I think I'm handling it pretty well.
Of course I can get on the ham bands. I find that very relaxing. You
should really think about trying it.

> >We did do some work with NASA though. Do you know anything about that
> >or did it not happen because you were unaware?
>
> Well, big Dave, I've seen a LOT of NASA documents, both
> classified and unclassifed, and can't recall any mention of
> anyone surnamed "Heil" doing "work" for them.

You continue to amuse, Len. I love your, "I haven't seen it so it can't
be true" take on things. What bothers you about someone having done
things you haven't done or can't do?

> Nobody at Huntsville or Michoud or Vandenburg or JPL or Clear
> Lake mentioned your name. ["Houston, you've got a problem!"]
> Never made it to the Cape, though, did you "do work" there?
> In all honesty, some small talk at a restaurant in Santa Maria
> did mention "Heil" but that was all about music systems
> and sound equipment, not space things.

Are you bothering to read my posts? Did you see the discussion of Guinea-Bissau? After all, you are the fellow who'd rather discuss my work there than amateur radio. Maybe we can move this to alt.guinea-bissau.envy.

> Spent a fair amount of time at Santa Su for SSME instrumentation
> on static test stands, lots of hands-on with spacecraft fabrication.
> Did you look cute in clean-room clothing? How did the finger cots
> feel to you?

Ever been to Guinea-Bissau, Leonardo? Think you might like to hit the embassy and let 'em know that you're on to me? You might be able to get me on other work related things that you've never heard of and which therefore can't have taken place. You'd probably love to jump all over my stories of 15-18 hours per day of HF RTTY Freetown-Washington, D.C., six or seven days per week during the Liberian civil war. All coordinated via CW too. Absolutely no RTTY order wire. Can't have happened though. No one from government bothered to clue you in. I operated as 9L1US with over 65,000 QSOs from there. Wanna talk about it? Like to discuss long path 6m openings in the middle of the night from West Africa to Japan or Australia? You probably didn't know of them either.

> >We already knew of the self-glorification and romanticizing. We've seen
> >your earlier and frequent descriptions of your Army service.
>
> Feel slighted? :-)

No, I'm sort of embarrassed for you.

> Geez, big Dave, you really didn't understand the mention, did you?
>
> I simply DESCRIBED US military HF communications, information
> that had already been made public long ago. Mentioned for
> CHRONOLOGICAL REFERENCE to methods and procedures and
> technology of the biggies in 24/7 HF radio communications.
>
> I never claimed any credit for designing the systems. Those were
> already implemented well before I could even enlist. I did my job,
> got my Honorable Discharge after eight years. It was interesting,
> challenging, and offered a unique opportunity to be a part of
> BIG COMMUNICATIONS in addition to serving my country in
> uniform. There was a war on at the time, but it settled into a
> sort of permanent truce. Guess that was before your time in
> "the 2nd AF commo" wasn't it?

Yeah it was, Len. They have this neat system in place now. Some people
are born *after others* and do their work sometimes decades after others
are sitting the big recliner. The system seems to work pretty well too.
It keeps us all from being grumpy retirees at the same time.

> Oh, yeah, I got a good conduct medal and mentioned that once.
> That must be the "glamorization and romanticizing" you charge. :-)

Excuse me? You laid the charge, Leonard Hermione Anderson. I just
pointed out that you've once again done what you accuse others of doing.

> >Much of the material I transmitted and received was and is classified.
> >Much of the methodology and technology used is classified. I signed
> >forms indicating that I understood this and that I'd not reveal
> >classified information under penalty of law.
>
> Wow! Du bist verrrrry important!
>
> Oh, my, myself and few hundred thousand or so civilians and military
> contemporaries of mine had to operate THE VERY SAME! Yup,
> Confidential, Secret, Top Secret, DOE nuclear, background checks,
> forms up the gazoo, photographed, fingerprinted, all but retinal-
> scanned, interviews with the FBI (about others) as well as FBI
> interviewing friends and neighbors (for me), steel-bar-locked file
> cabinets, even walk-in safes, passing through many a turnstile
> talking with a disembodied voice after surrendering your wallet
> and badge to a remotely-operated drawer, NEED TO KNOW
> stamped on every neuron and synapse, never lose a badge,
> security and vigilance and constant reminders of (which Title, Phil?
> 18?) espionage laws, national security, having ones life-of-the-past-
> 10-years details filed with a dozen federal agencies from the FBI
> to DECASS.

Doesn't matter, Lenny. I still can't tell you.

> STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE, big Dave. You, me,
> and HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF OTHERS. No big deal.
> Fact of existance. Par for the course. Work environment.
> No heroism, no medals, no certificates, and never once did I
> need to know morse code or take a VE test. :-)

I did need to know morse code. Like you though, I never took a VE test.
The only difference there is, I have a ham ticket.

> >That it bothers some
> >wizened, embittered geezer in California is pretty insignificant.
>
> When I find one of those, big Dave, I'll let you know so you can
> feel "justified." :-)

You'll do nicely. In fact, for me, you are the epitomy of the "grumpy
old man".

> >It hasn't effected my ham radio activity at all.
>
> ...except in this newsgroup cum chat room. :-)

This is supposed to effect my ham radio activity? Worked PW0T Trindade
on 160 just a few moments ago while waiting for my modem to connect.
>
> >More of your "it can't have been since I never heard it"?
> >State had very few HF (AFRECONE) primary posts in the 80s and early 90s.
> >Almost all were in Africa in countries where the infrastructure did not
> >support leased line communications. CW was used for openings, closings,
> >QSYs and to agree upon crypto sets for use. It happened. It took
> >place. It was used daily. Don't let it eat you. Get over it. Go on
> >with your life.
>
> Yes, yes, yes, you were a VITAL ASSET for the Free World. Feel
> free to digitize your Foggy Bottom certificates and send to everyone
> for Glorious Proof. Let me know when your name appears on a key
> list or in the page of honorees at the newly-revised NSA website.

You were the one who desired discussion of my work in Guinea-Bissau,
Len. If you are interested, my name has appeared on Key Officers guides
published by State in the past. You can surely do some research and
find the issues. Have fun.

> Big Dave will be shocked to learn that early Cold War crypto gear
> is very publicly known. There's a bunch of info and links to even
> more info on such at the SSN Pampanito website, folks touring
> that submarine (now a floating museum) might even get to TOUCH
> a real, but not very live, CRYPTO MACHINE! Funny thing about
> those old machines...didn't need any CW to "synchronize" any
> part of them nor their schedules. SOME of the just-before-CWO-
> Walkers' USSR sell-out crypto gear IS KNOWN to the electronics
> industry and has even appeared on a couple of TV documentaries.
> I daresay your burn-before-reading-classified machinery will soon
> become public. Goodbye to your labels of mystery, glamour,
> romance, self-importance, and all-around superhumany.

You have to be one of the most biggest fools I've ever encountered.
You have demonstrated your ignorance of what I was doing and how I was
doing it on several occasions. Not many continue to wear their
ignorance like a badge after having been provided with information they
lacked. You're a true gold medalist among repugnant geezers.

> >Take up a hobby--maybe ham radio.
>
> That's a nice suggestion. Thank you.
>
> I've been a radio-electronics hobbyist for about 55 years, a
> professional in the same general area for 50 years. Even
> wrote up magazine articles on ham radio technology in a
> magazine whose name was HAM RADIO! Fascinating
> technology, big Dave, you ought to learn about some of that

> technology. It might help stoke your boast furnace.

Wow all that time and you still haven't managed to come up with a ham ticket despite your professed interest. Writing technical articles for a ham mag isn't quite the same as being a ham is it? There'd be that actually being able to get on the air part among other things.

> >What will we do about the stupid?

> Educate them. There's a great BIG radio world out there! All
> kinds of technologies and advancements in the radio arts. It
> can be scary to the beginner, the boaster, big Dave. To begin,
> get yourself educated. Then you lead the others.

How stupid would a man have to be to put off obtaining an amateur license he professes interest in for *decades*? How stupid would he have to be to remain ignorant of the way others feel about his lengthy, ponficating monologues posted to an amateur radio newsgroup?

> >You've been ignorant before.
>
> Absolutely, big Dave. I'm totally ignorant of what goes on within
> your head to make you act they way you do in this newsgroup.

...and apparently ignorant of what goes on in your own head in motivating your postings here.

> >You've
> >been enlightened yet you continue to rail as if you can't accept
> >reality.
>
> Poor baby, confusing fantasy and reality again. I was born in
> the 1930s but I didn't choose to live there or in the never-never
> elsewhen you've promoted. I realize there IS a problem in
> starting out as a professional in HF communications. Once
> exposed to such a large, working reality in the 1950s, I've never
> been able to accept the artificialities of 1930s standards and
> practices that you and others set up as the epitome of radio arts,
> along with titles, status, and privileges and the "qualification" of
> the glory and nobility from being able to affix a radio station
> callsign on my name.

You forget that others in this group have also had professional experience in communications which rival or surpasses your own. I'm one such professional. You've taken it upon yourself to as much as call me a liar in describing conditions of my work. You've attempted to belittle my work after you indicated that you wanted to discuss it. Other communications professionals who post here, unlike you, have other credentials in that they are radio amateurs.
That radio amateurs are proud of their calls, that they have status in amateur radio, that there are different classes of license seem to bother you to no end. You demand to be taken seriously here based only upon your professional past. It isn't something you can demand of radio

amateurs.

> >That would have to make you stupid since you are attempting to
> >argue something you know nothing about with someone who was there, has
> >done it, has the T-shirt and the souvenirs.
>
> Heh, heh, heh. Would you like a RACES card to add to your
> "souvenir" collection? Foggy Bottom had a couple of RACES,
> or did you know? :-)

Yeah, there are a number of races represented.

> >That would be as goofy as a non-ham telling hams how it should be.
>
> Yes, isn't it awful? The FCC has been doing that to hams since 1934!
>
> Ignorant morons, the nerve of them! Shame on them, ey? :-)

You are not, nor have you ever been part of the FCC. You are not, nor have you ever been a radio amateur. Sort of leaves you out in the cold, doesn't it?

Dave K8MN

6042. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 06:26:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B2A6B.5D1A889B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35503

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Leaving aside definitions of "is," let's define Guinea-Bisseau and "work."
> >>
> >> Guinea-Bisseau (or Bissau) is a small middle-Africa-general-location
> >> country of 1.3 million whose chief exports are cashews and peanuts.
> >> [see any almanac for details]
> >>
> >> It is stretching incredulity to attempt picturing this tiny former colony
> >> as being "important" in world affairs or even general African affairs,
> >> trade, religion of any kind. It doesn't seem to have attracted press
> >> attention to any level higher than "filler" items over the last three-
> >> plus decades. It is definitely not a "hotbed of intrigue and mystery,"
> >> even in fictional works. It doesn't appear to have any strategic
> >> military value for air bases or ports to any other nation except
> >> maybe its immediate neighbors.
> >
> >This is another of your "because I don't know anything about it, it
> >can't have happened" pieces of stupidity. The Soviet Union maintained
> >quite a large presence in Guinea-Bissau back in the '80s. The Cubans
> >had an even larger presence. Cuban troops returning from Angola and
> >troops preparing to go there flew Aeroflot from Bissau.
>
> Now, now, big Dave, you DO exaggerate a bit about "importance"
> RELATIVE TO OVER A DOZEN OTHER NATIONS IN MIDDLE
> AFRICA which had or still have a strong communist leaning,
> governments, and staging areas for USSR troops. Bigger countries.

So we're down to "my country is bigger than yours"?

> Despite all that "influence" and whatever can be implied about "aid"
> from the old communist block (look up the year the USSR was
> dissolved), last year's World Almanac STILL lists the chief export
> of Guinea-Bissau as cashews and peanuts. Now that IS important
> to nut lovers the world over, especially nut gourmets who love
> cashews. On the world scene of geopolitics, Guinea-Bisseau is
> still a "4th World" country struggling to get up into the "3rd" category.

Look up the years I was in Guinea-Bissau, Len. Your statement is then,
that a country is important only because of what it exports. In that
case, Portugal isn't very important. What will we ever do with all of
that butter, the vinho verde and those mounds of olives? Aside from

that, whoever claimeed great importance for the country. I've already explained to you what was going on in the country and I've explained what the United States embassy was involved in. You clearly decided that no matter what I wrote, you would dismiss it.

> >activity including USIA programs and libraries. Military assistance and
> >training is another program the U.S. supports. Because no one sent
> >Leonardo Heathcliffe Anderson a letter, those things can't have taken
> >place.
>
> Gosh, big Dave, no "letters" seem to have been sent to the big
> wire services like AP and Reuters stressing the ENORMOUS
> IMPORTANCE of that particular country and its been a long, long
> time since a video bite from a TV correspondent. I don't see,
> haven't seen much mention in any big historical write-ups either,
> but, of course, you've just cleared this up.

Do you really have a point to make, Len or is this simply more of your dismissive blather?

> >It might
> >interest you to know that, for most of my two year tour in
> >Guinea-Bissau, I was the only ham in the country. I made over 75,000
> >QSOs on CW, SSB and RTTY on 10 through 6 meters.
>
> Now THAT is of extreme importance...to DX-chasers. Imagine, a
> RARE ONE not on a "DXpedition" but actually LIVING there!

Actually, Len, you are quite correct. I took Guinea-Bissau from a position of about 64th most rare country to nearly off the list of needed countries.

> As the ONLY HAM IN THE COUNTRY (out of how many, 1.3 million
> population) does that mean big Dave "pioneered" ham radio in
> Guinea-Bisseau? I guess so. A big PIONEER award to big Dave,
> then. Did big Dave act as an "elmer" to Spread The Word of
> Ham Radio there to the population? Dozens, hundreds eagerly
> awaiting The Word, guidance, and leadership? Just curious.

No Len. I didn't pioneer amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau. There was a very active Cuban op in the country a year or so before my arrival and there was an active Ukrainian fellow. Erik SM0AGD has made several trips to the country both pre and post independence and an Italian group operated from the Bijagos Islands shortly after my arrival. There is no organized amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau though there is a fully equipped club station. People would seemingly prefer to eat than become radio amateurs.

> >It is always nice to receive a history lesson from someone on the
> >outside whether the subject is my work (which this isn't supposed to be
> >about) or amateur radio which this doesn't touch on at all though this
> >is an amateur radio newsgroup.

>
> I've never elevated any STATE DEPARTMENT work or the IMPORTANCE
> of Guinea-Bisseau in communications, or implied Great Secret Mysteries
> of (horrors!) CLASSIFIED COMMUNICATIONS WORK! Maybe that's my
> fault for not honoring an "unsung hero of government!" Terrible. Boo on
> me for not bowing and scraping, saluting and kissing the ass of a self-
> professed one-by-two "radio champion."

It is simply that you've as much as called me a liar for describing what
was used. I've not ascribed any undue importance on my work or upon the
country of Guinea-Bissau. Let me assure that it is not too late for
you. You may kiss my ass any time at all.

> What I did originally (and big Dave is still smarting from ego blasting)
> was to bash a snow job to others who had not worked any gubmint
> comm on HF, would therefore be unknowing of what went on. Big Dave
> tried to rationalize his way out of an avalanche by kicking in artificial
> snow job machines about "procedures in government" and the usual
> "insider" crap with overtones, implications, etc. of his "greatness."
> The final snow job is the insistance that "if you haven't been IN it as a
> FULLY AUTHORIZED PARTICIPANT you then DON'T KNOW
> ANYTHING."
>
> There's a terrific amount of PUBLIC INFORMATION available to the
> public (that's why it is called "public") on just about EVERY area
> and activity of the entire radio world. That INCLUDES military
> communications, believe it or not.

I can assure you that the Department of State does not make public much
of its communications procedures, equipment and the like. Since you
already know of the classified nature of the work, you'd not likely see
anything written up in an industry journal. The fact that you continue
this "snow job" crud in a silly effort to dismiss my statements only
makes you look like an old fool. My work in Guinea-Bissau wasn't the
topic and you've only taken this tack as a diversion.

> The problem with arrogant
> elitists in a hobby activity is the ONLY radio information input they
> have is from (guess what) their hobby activity's publishing media.

Your problem is that you see anyone who won't kow-tow to you as an
arrogant elitist. What ever gave you the idea that hams don't read
material other than ham radio publications? Why, that is simply elitist
and arrogant of you.

> Is that a slam against amateur radio? No. It's a slam against some
> of the editors and publishers who selectively spoon-feed their
> readers what they (or the organization they work for) think
> "important to hobbyists." Big Dave, there's your opportunity for
> another Big Personal Attack again, feigning "insult against ham
> radio" and assorted outrage. For a little while I was an INSIDER
> of a part of that small part of the publishing world. HR didn't live in

> the midst of ancient fantasy and self-promotional propaganda and
> lasted 22 years. Another self-professed ham hero thinks they were
> a "failure" but then he was never any sort of insider in ham publishing.

Yeah, that "insider" thing must have set you up as quite the expert there for a while. I've gotten the short notes of acceptance from McMullen followed by checks as I have from CQ in the past. It gave me a warm, fuzzy "insider" kind of a feeling. Give those editors and publishers hell, Len. Oh--the ones you are complaining about--are they the ones who didn't accept your stuff for publication?

> You continually ATTACK on the specious claim of "ignorance of not
> knowing anything because of lack of AUTHORIZATION." Such is
> specious and vapid considering that amateur radio activities are one
> (if not the top) of the most OPEN areas of information input in the
> entire radio world. It is a hobby activity pursued mostly by civilians
> with many publications and references. Further, communications by
> encryption for the purposes of secrecy is specifically prohibited by
> both federal law and international agreement. Anyone with a receiver
> can hear/see EXACTLY what other radio amateurs hear/see. The
> only barrier that is real is natural, the physics of EM wave propagation
> and terrain. Within that real boundary there is NOTHING "secret"
> except for curious mindsets who think that all must think as they do
> or be considered "inferior" or "unworthy."

Right, Len. Ham radio is an avocation which can be enjoyed by anyone: old folks, children, bakers, gas station attendants, farmers, bankers,etc. In short, it can be enjoyed, apparently, by just about anyone but you.
>
> >Did you have anything on amateur radio you'd like to say?
>
> Yes. It is my opinion that amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable
> recreational activity that allows non-professionals to engage in the
> fascinating technology of radio communications arts within the
> narrow mode selections and frequency bands allocated by federal
> agencies. It is supposed to be a social gathering point where
> individuals can convene, make friends, share information, socialize
> as other groups do for the sheer enjoyment of socializing.
>
> Not all AUTHORIZED radio amateurs seem to think so. Quite a
> few seem to think that they are elite in radio, superior by
> achievement, some kind of important national asset, vital and
> valuable, fantasy "minutemen" available instantly to perform
> "emergency communications" to save their community, nation,
> and world from disaster. In short, self-styled supermen with an
> ego fertilized by myth and legend originated by predecessor
> self-professed supermen of the same kind.

That's just a bunch of hooey grown in the fertile muck of your mind. Large numbers of radio amateurs give of their time and talents in

traffic handling and emergency preparedness work. You are you to pooh-pooh their efforts?

> The appearance of so many self-styled supermen is not
> unnoticed by majority of radio-active folks who are not
> AUTHORIZED to "work" ham bands. That appearance is not
> a good one. Strangely, although they claim super powers,
> their vision is lacking. They cannot visualize how others
> see them. Their super ego clouds vision. Some appear as
> comic book heroes.

Why not simply admit that you have no idea of what most non-hams who happen to be engaged in radio communication in other services? You've just made up this portion of your rant.

> Shazam, big Dave, you are a marvel. Now go leap tall
> pileups at a single bound. Leap high. Your own pileups
> are very big.

I'll continue to do what I choose in the ham bands. You do what you can.

Dave K8MN

6043. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 06:36:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B2CEA.CE83D869@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35504

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >
> > > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes no
> > > >farther
> > > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode for
> > > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in
> recent
> > > >> disasters.
> > >
> > > >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> > > >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> > > >little if anything about its use.
> > >
> > > Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead of
> > > calling her conclusion "juvenile."
> >
> > To what end, Ed? It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was
> > generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in
> > emergencies. Kim seems to think that the only emergencies that take
> > place will be on the same order of the WTC bombing. She believes that
> > because she is ignorant of the use of the mode, everyone is. If you want
> > to play games with Kim, YOU fill in the blanks. I'm still of the
> > opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of
> > information.
> >
> > Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > subject at hand.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> READ: I can't come up with a thing.

You've mistranslated: I think you're an airhead.

Dave K8MN

6044. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 08:41:36 UTC
From: michael jantzen <jantzen_michael@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4THe8.2593$TB2.27732@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 35505
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

One thing to consider - you kinda have to know what you are doing to make these things work - and if someone who is unlicensed knows I think they would also know how to get this equipment elsewhere to do illegal things.

I mean most linear amplifiers are not sold with their 10 meter modes unless you are a licensed operator - but you hear cb users using them all the time anyhow.

Same with modified 10 meter equipment and general coverage transimitters.

Michael Jantzen n7wsb

6045. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 08:46:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B4B75.F3B90036@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35506

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/25/2002 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020225202122.29966.00000088@mb-fa.aol.com>
>
> >Does the Joint Chairman (General Myers) know of your
> >importance, etc.
>
> Does he know of yours?
>
> >Feel slighted?
>
> LOL!! Lennie, yo really ARE ignorant!
>
> Steve And The Boys

Of that was there ever any doubt??

6046. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 09:13:00 UTC
From: Will White <googlyelmo@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B519F.D718FECF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Two problems (at least) with that idea. First, why should we think that permitting 15 minutes a week of broadcasting would satisfy K1MAN? I have followed his "career" for awhile, and heard him on the air enough to know that here is a person who likes to break rules for the sake of it. He would simply exceed the limit, and would make sure that everyone knew he was doing so.

The second problem is that if 15 minutes of broadcasting per week were allowed, the ham bands would be nothing but wall-to-wall with these transmissions. Assuming that only a quite conservative 1% of US licensed hams took advantage of such a privilege, that would mean about 7000 broadcasts per week, or about a thousand a day, or more than 40 per hour! Even if no hams outside the US did this, can you even begin to imagine the QRM? The bands would become completely unusable, all the time.

No, the solution to the K1MAN issue is to allow the FCC to do its job and either pressure him to cease broadcasting (as well as jamming, making unidentified transmissions, and verbally harassing other stations on the air), or to NAL him till he bleeds, and revoke his amateur licenses, and in the not entirely unlikely event that he continues even then, they ought to confiscate his ham rigs, amps, tuners, antennas, etc., over and over if necessary. It may take awhile, and he may be on the air for months to come, but its important not to respond to guys like this, that only encourages them. Eventually the FCC Compliance Office will put a stop to this. We've all seen them shut big nuisances like this down many times before, even if it takes longer than we would like. I have personally physically stood by and watched, with some satisfaction, the FCC and NYC police confiscate the entire stations of two "freebander"/CBers who were running close to 5KW AM into directional antennas and stomping all over 11 and 10 meters in much of downtown Brooklyn, as well as overloading TVs and getting into telephones for 3 or 4 blocks. This was in the early 80's, and of course the FCC slacked off mightily in the years after that and only in the past three years or so has it been getting back on track with reasonably vigorous amateur enforcement. Still, the law and the ham community are stacked heavily against K1MAN, whatever his claims to the contrary may be.

--
Will White, KD7BFX
Seattle WA US
King County, Grid CN87tq
ITU Zone 6, CQ Zone 3
****
"The wireless telegraph is not difficult to understand.
The ordinary telegraph is like a very long cat.
You pull the tail in New York, and it meows in Los Angeles.
The wireless is the same, only without the cat."

- Albert Einstein
****

cbjunkie@cb.org.au wrote:

> In article <u6asubc5e3asa7@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" says...
> >
> >i agree with you. when someone is a nuisence (sp?) enough to have someone
> >take the time to write /that/ big of a letter... big trouble! there are so
> >many laws that i would be willing to bet if he deals with them in the wrong
> >way (being rude like he is on amateur) he could regret he ever bought that
> >equipment.
> >
> >phil :)
>
> This guy is dangerous, he is one of those take matters into your own hands type.
> I have heard his broadcasts and they are strange. Why doesn't Ham Radio have a
> 15 minute maximum broadcasts per week rule. I can only see more people like him
> getting licensed and turning ham radio into a shortwave radio service.

6047. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 09:35:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226043537.16980.00000529@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35508

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

> So basically until the association tells a person not to use a TV antenna
>for any other reason they are free to do what they please with it.

A much more accurate statement than "the US government is making laws that prohibit me from listening to Radio Moscow." I will let Phil address the "free to do so until" aspect of this. There are many things you are "free to do" until you get sued.

> Of course, The ARRL can go ahead with their attempt for special legislation
>for ham only antennas, but it will not have any results. Go for a one
>antenna of a certain type for any use and that would have a better result.

The FCC has already said that it will not pre-empt ham antennas. To extend that request to include ham antennas, but antennas of all types, is, IMHO, even less likely to get FCC approval. Why would they? Now, if you want to include it to include receive-only antennas of all types, you might have a slim chance, but ARRL will not have a dog in that fight.

>The congress and associations know that if there is a ham radio exemption
>allowed their is going to be a ham that will insist on a 75 foot tower
>and will fight it out in the courts.

The present pre-emption does not pre-empt a 75-foot tower for an OTARD device. ARRL has asked that ham antennas similar in size to the pre-empted OTARD antennas also be pre-empted. If you are seeking a 75-foot tower pre-emption, I don't believe you will be successful.

Have you filed your court case yet? In what jurisdiction?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6048. Re: CCR's in California...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 09:37:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226043739.16980.00000530@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35509

From: "Jerry Oxendine" joxendi@bellsouth.net

> And my city
>has no "ordinances", and there are no CCR's that attempt to tell me what I
>can or cannot have
>on my own property--except for a junk car parked in the yard with grass
>growing up around it!
>I LOVE it!

Well, that would mean I have to move. :-) If there were CC&Rs in my neighborhood, the old 78 GMC pickup truck would be the first on the hit parade. Of course, I do drive it to work every day, so I might get to claim hardship. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6049. Re: Questions RE offical ham observers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 09:42:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226044207.16980.00000531@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35510

From: "Birdman67" Birdman67@wi.rr.com

>Second, I received a notice that I did not ID for 40 min during a QSO. I
>don't doubt it is true. I was wondering why the observer did not let me
>know after say 20 or 25 minutes that I needed to ID, Does the word
>"observer" mean just that he/she observes but does not participate.

Cecil can get out his dictionary, but yes, the OOs do not confront rules violators on the air. If they did, some of the differences of opinion would turn into a real argument and that would not be very good for the Amateur Radio Service.

>Third, I would be very happy to get any information on being a observer.

The OO is an appointed position in the ARRL Field Organization. See:

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/org/

for more information about this and other volunteer positions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6050. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 09:58:33 UTC
From: Will White <googlyelmo@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7B5C4F.6FDF063C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, in a word, yes. The FCC has notified manufacturers, importers, distributors, and major retailers that importation or sale, retail or wholesale, of so-called "10-meter export radios" will be banned as of 12/31/02 (the FCC keeps changing everything around on their website, so the URL I have for the pages that describe this action, as well as the very exact criteria they will use for determining what is designated a "10-meter export radio," but a search of that phrase and perhaps the words 'enforcment, ban, and/or sales.' should yield it up. This action doesn't stop RS selling its 10M rig, or unlicensed buyers from picking up a used HF ham rig, but a whole host of Rangers, Galaxys, and the like, the preferred radios of freebanders and over-power CB ops, are out. Next year those rigs become contraband, and as such the Customs Service gets into the act. The FCC may not exactly make truckstop CB shop owners quake in their boots, but Customs just might, and if not they should get the message after the first pallet of NIB radios is confiscated. Ouch, that's expensive! Illegal operators may keep right on, but nobody in business is going to ignore their bottom line so much they run themselves out of business, not at least for the sake of being willful. My brother helped gather the evidence the FCC needed to confront a Manhattan taxicab company in order to get them off the bottom of 10M. They were using Ranger 2950s and HTX-???s to dispatch cabs, and denied it. My bro and some other hams DFed these guys, tooks photos of cabbies using the radios, even "TX-fingerprinted" a few of them. They gave all this to the FCC, which used it to get the equivalent of a search warrant from an administrative law judge, and faced with the indisputable facts the cab company agreed to cease using 10M with 72 hours, rather than be fined many thousands and have the gear confiscated on the spot.

Likewise the FCC has contacted dealers and manufacturers of "10/12M" amplifiers and amp kits. Not that they ever were legal, but the FCC has given those in the trade notice they intend to enforce the existing law. They certainly didn't have to do this. They could have just set a date, waited, and swooped in and confiscated thousands of amps out of warehouses and stores. But they had the courtesy to give notice, and anyone in business stubborn enough to flout a good law of long standing that rests on solid legal ground ought to go out of business.

Not that any of this is going to eliminate every last caterwauling CBer with an amp so big it sets off the cardiac alarms at hospitals inside a 20-mile radius, or every "freebander" crawling and splattering all over the bottom 300 KHz of 10M, but it *will* clear up a lot of QRM. Locality by locality, neighborhood by neighborhood, it has cleared up much QRM since the whole freeband/linear CB thing got started in earnest in the 70s. Just now, things are focussing a bit more on the source and supply. There will still be unlicensed people with a dirty KW all over 26-32 MHz, but fewer off them, and maybe the added effort and

expense of buying cleaner (than most CB/freeband) ham gear and building amps at least will mean that some bozo who means to transmit on Channel 40 doesn't splatter so much he is S-7 on 28400!

--
Will White, KD7BFX
Seattle WA US
King County, Grid CN87tq
ITU Zone 6, CQ Zone 3
****
"The wireless telegraph is not difficult to understand.
The ordinary telegraph is like a very long cat.
You pull the tail in New York, and it meows in Los Angeles.
The wireless is the same, only without the cat."
- Albert Einstein
****

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> Yup,
>
> Does anyone think a "law" would stop all the CB shops around the truck stops
> from selling
> those so-called "10 meter" radios? I doubt it.
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
> www.qsl.net/k4kwh
>
> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a5eiq9$3sa$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> > >
> > > Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
> > >
> > > Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change
> your
> > > mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
> > illegally
> > > and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
> >
> > Just how effective do you think a law would be?
> > Answer...it wouldn't. Ham radios are sold in
> > many places besides Radio Shack.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >

> >

6051. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:02:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226050211.16980.00000534@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35512

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
>can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?

International Morse could be sent the same way landline telegraphy was sent and decoded. click-click is a dit and click-space-click is a dah. I am not sure I could send that way.

Maybe Dick is suggesting that the receiving test be done with all clicks. I AM sure I couldn't receive that way, so the test would have kept me out of ham radio. :-)

And, if I were tapped in the collapsed building and wanted to bang on pipes to give me something to do until the end, I would probably bang out 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, a sequence that would clearly say that there is a human down here.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6052. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:03:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226050344.16980.00000535@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35513

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
>'S E E E S' and move on.

I would instantly recognize it as SOS under the circumstances.

>You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
>die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?

It seems that you are the one who would "move on..."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6053. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:09:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226050915.16980.00000536@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35514

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>> The point is that the argument that CW is necessary for emergency
>> preparedness is totally bogus.

>Well, try using SSB after a large EMP event.

If your concern is EMP, before mandating knowledge of Morse code, another mandate would have to require that a ham maintain a station that is going to continue to function after that large EMP event. If your justification for the continuation of the Morse test is that there may be an EMP event, it probably won't hold up with the Commission.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6054. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:11:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226051124.16980.00000537@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35515

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Actually, there was something published (I believe
>by the ARRL) some years back that indicated that
>most ham gear, with reasonable precautions, would
>do surprisingly well in the event of an EMP.

The article series is among the articles available for download from the ARRL Tech Info Service "Lightning Protection" page. See:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/lightning.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6055. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:15:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35516

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
>subject at hand.

I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words that taught me new things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6056. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 10:18:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226051854.16980.00000539@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35517

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>I've never had a bit of a problem with any of the current tests. Retest? HA!
>I say, BRING 'EM ON!!!!! I'll take 'em and pass 'em easily, with NO prep
>at all.

To date, the FCC has not seen a need to retest for amateur or commercial
licenses. Do you believe there is a new problem that retesting will solve?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6057. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:04:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226060406.11763.00000449@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35519

And a note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil. I will point this out to you in the future every time I do so you will have a more balanced view of how often Cecil and I agree, or disagree, with each other.

Ed

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/26/02 5:02 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226050211.16980.00000534@mb-dd.aol.com>
>
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
>>can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
>
>International Morse could be sent the same way landline telegraphy was sent
>and
>decoded. click-click is a dit and click-space-click is a dah. I am not sure
>I
>could send that way.
>
>Maybe Dick is suggesting that the receiving test be done with all clicks. I
>AM
>sure I couldn't receive that way, so the test would have kept me out of ham
>radio. :-)
>
>And, if I were tapped in the collapsed building and wanted to bang on pipes
>to
>give me something to do until the end, I would probably bang out 2, 3, 5, 7,
>11, a sequence that would clearly say that there is a human down here.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

6058. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:04:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226060451.11763.00000450@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35518

Note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil.

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/26/02 5:03 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226050344.16980.00000535@mb-dd.aol.com>
>
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
>>'S E E E S' and move on.
>
>I would instantly recognize it as SOS under the circumstances.
>
>>You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
>>die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?
>
>It seems that you are the one who would "move on..."
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

6059. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:09:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226060940.21826.00000091@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 35520

In article <20020226051854.16980.00000539@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>I've never had a bit of a problem with any of the current tests. Retest? HA!
>>I say, BRING 'EM ON!!!!! I'll take 'em and pass 'em easily, with NO prep
>>at all.
>
>To date, the FCC has not seen a need to retest for amateur or commercial
>licenses.

Yup. In fact, as I recall, the FCC allowed hams who let their licenses expire during WW2 renew them without retesting. (I oughta go look that up to be absolutely sure).

> Do you believe there is a new problem that retesting will solve?

Nope. Not me. Carl and others think lots of us tested-long-ago hams couldn't pass the current tests without lots of study and review.. I'm simply saying, as

clearly as possible, that THIS tested-long-ago ham has always maintained his skills and knowledge at least at the level of being able to pass the current exams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6060. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:11:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226061135.11763.00000451@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 35521

The FCC's decision on this type of radio has a lot to with how easily modified they are. If it involves removing a jumper and powering the radio up again to get "export" coverage, the FCC considers that the radio is capable of out-of-band operation and thus would have to be Certificate before being offered for sale in the US.

Amateur transmitters, with the exception of power amplifiers, do not have to be Certificated before being marketed, so the ham-band-only rig that can only be modified by actual hardware changes is in no danger of FCC enforcement, IMHO.

Before ARRL reviewed the Ranger Communications RCI-2970DX, we determined that the DX version of this could not be modified easily. We found plenty of "mods" info on the non-DX version, but when we tried the mods on the 'DX, they didn't work. No amount of fiddling with jumpers resulted in a useable out-of-band mod.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: Will White googlyelmo@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/26/02 4:58 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C7B5C4F.6FDF063C@earthlink.net>
>
>Well, in a word, yes. The FCC has notified manufacturers, importers,
>distributors, and major retailers that importation or sale, retail or
>wholesale, of so-called "10-meter export radios" will be banned as of
>12/31/02
>(the FCC keeps changing everything around on their website, so the URL I have
>for the pages that describe this action, as well as the very exact criteria
>they will use for determining what is designated a "10-meter export radio,"
>but
>a search of that phrase and perhaps the words 'enforcment, ban, and/or
>sales.'
>should yield it up. This action doesn't stop RS selling its 10M rig, or
>unlicensed buyers from picking up a used HF ham rig, but a whole host of
>Rangers, Galaxys, and the like, the preferred radios of freebanders and
>over-power CB ops, are out. Next year those rigs become contraband, and as
>such the Customs Service gets into the act. The FCC may not exactly make
>truckstop CB shop owners quake in their boots, but Customs just might, and if
>not they should get the message after the first pallet of NIB radios is
>confiscated. Ouch, that's expensive! Illegal operators may keep right on, but
>nobody in business is going to ignore their bottom line so much they run
>themselves out of business, not at least for the sake of being willful. My
>brother helped gather the evidence the FCC needed to confront a Manhattan
>taxicab company in order to get them off the bottom of 10M. They were using

>Ranger 2950s and HTX-???s to dispatch cabs, and denied it. My bro and some
>other hams DFed these guys, tooks photos of cabbies using the radios, even
>"TX-fingerprinted" a few of them. They gave all this to the FCC, which used
>it
>to get the equivalent of a search warrant from an administrative law judge,
>and
>faced with the indisputable facts the cab company agreed to cease using 10M
>with 72 hours, rather than be fined many thousands and have the gear
>confiscated on the spot.
>
>Likewise the FCC has contacted dealers and manufacturers of "10/12M"
>amplifiers
>and amp kits. Not that they ever were legal, but the FCC has given those in
>the
>trade notice they intend to enforce the existing law. They certainly didn't
>have to do this. They could have just set a date, waited, and swooped in and
>confiscated thousands of amps out of warehouses and stores. But they had the
>courtesy to give notice, and anyone in business stubborn enough to flout a
>good
>law of long standing that rests on solid legal ground ought to go out of
>business.
>
>Not that any of this is going to eliminate every last caterwauling CBer with
>an
>amp so big it sets off the cardiac alarms at hospitals inside a 20-mile
>radius,
>or every "freebander" crawling and splattering all over the bottom 300 KHz of
>10M, but it *will* clear up a lot of QRM. Locality by locality, neighborhood
>by
>neighborhood, it has cleared up much QRM since the whole freeband/linear CB
>thing got started in earnest in the 70s. Just now, things are focussing a
>bit
>more on the source and supply. There will still be unlicensed people with a
>dirty KW all over 26-32 MHz, but fewer off them, and maybe the added effort
>and
>expense of buying cleaner (than most CB/freeband) ham gear and building amps
>at
>least will mean that some bozo who means to transmit on Channel 40 doesn't
>splatter so much he is S-7 on 28400!
>
>--
>Will White, KD7BFX
>Seattle WA US
>King County, Grid CN87tq
>ITU Zone 6, CQ Zone 3
>**
>"The wireless telegraph is not difficult to understand.
>The ordinary telegraph is like a very long cat.
>You pull the tail in New York, and it meows in Los Angeles.
>The wireless is the same, only without the cat."

> - Albert Einstein
>**********
>
>Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
>> Yup,
>>
>> Does anyone think a "law" would stop all the CB shops around the truck
>stops
>> from selling
>> those so-called "10 meter" radios? I doubt it.
>>
>> Jerry
>> K4KWH
>> www.qsl.net/k4kwh
>>
>> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:a5eiq9$3sa$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>> >
>> > "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
>> > news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>> > >
>> > > Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
>> > >
>> > > Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change
>> your
>> > > mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
>> > illegally
>> > > and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>> >
>> > Just how effective do you think a law would be?
>> > Answer...it wouldn't. Ham radios are sold in
>> > many places besides Radio Shack.
>> >
>> > Cheers,
>> > Bill K2UNK
>> >
>> >
>> >
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

6061. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:40:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5fsq7$6pj$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35522
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AF6DF.FBE6E470@adelphia.net...
> Well yeah, but only becuz we like ya! 8^)
>
> - mike -

LOL! Thanks, Mike!

> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > And you guys complain about MY posts?

6062. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 11:40:57 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a5fsq8$6pj$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 35523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5eiq9$3sa$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7aa1a0$0$35565$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > Okay, you dumb F*** -- see how stupid that looks.
> >
> > Come to Lansing Michigan and see how long it takes for you to change
your
> > mind. CBers walk right into Radio Shack, buy their mobile radios
> illegally
> > and start jamming our repeaters. But maybe you want that.
>
> Just how effective do you think a law would be?
> Answer...it wouldn't. Ham radios are sold in
> many places besides Radio Shack.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I can see the big budget spent on enforcement at all those hamfests in every
state throughout the year now.

6063. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 12:29:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35524

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
>has ALWAYS been BS.

It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was considered current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test served a valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in commercial and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC initiated and maintained the Morse test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6064. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 12:52:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226075235.03173.00000706@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35525

Note to Dick: I disagreed with Carl.

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 2/26/02 7:29 AM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com>
>
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
>>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
>>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
>>has ALWAYS been BS.
>
>It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was
>considered
>current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test served
>a
>valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in
>commercial
>and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC
>initiated and maintained the Morse test.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

6065. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:10:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226081004.21422.00000111@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35527

In article <3c7a64cf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020224221056.19003.00000087@mb-bd.aol.com...
>> In article <3c795dc1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>> >
>> >> >at one point, the ARRL asked the FCC to increase
>> >> >the speed to 12.5 wpm ...
>> >>
>> >> That's right - in 1936. They ALSO asked the FCC to revise the
>> >> WRITTEN exam so that it required more radio knowledge in
>> >> order to pass.
>> >
>> >The letter refers to "A slight stiffening of the basic
>examination,"
>> >then *discounts* the written exams as a means to the end of
>> >limiting the number of hams. Clearly, from the letter, which
>> >was published in an ARRL publication, as indicated, the
>> >emphasis was on code as a filter to keep people out of ham
>> >radio.
>>
>> The letter and the "200 Meters and Down" story are simply summaries
>of
>> the situation. The written tests WERE made tougher.
>
>Perhaps marginally so, but that is NOT what the ARRL
>asked for from the FCC, according to the account published
>by the ARRL itself

Without the actual tests, it's hard to say how much "tougher" the
tests were made.
>
>> >> > SPECIFICALLY to limit the number of
>> >> >hams "because the bands were too crowded."
>> >>
>> >> Incorrect.
>> >
>> >NOT INCORRECT ... read on ...
>>
>> No, it's incorrect. The idea was to slow down the growth. Imagine
>having
>> too many newcomers as a problem!
>

>SORRY ... the letter SPECIFICALLY states (read the quotes
>again) that:
>1) "the total number of amateurs will doubtless be controlled
> in the future" [this is population control, not growth control]

Controlled by whom? The FCC, of course. Not the ARRL.

>2) "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
> relatively constant during the past two years." [this indicates
> no problem with growth, but with a desire to control the TOTAL
> size of the population ... sort of "So 'our' (those of us who
>are
> currently amongst the 'haves') bands aren't more crowded
> than we'd like, we want to keep newcomers out."]

Nope. More like "we are having enormous turnover, the newcomers
aren't staying, and the FCC is getting ticked about hams' straying
outside the bands, putting bum signals on the air and being only
marginally skilled".
>>
>> >Here are quotes from an article posted on the NCI website.
>> >The specific URL to read the entire article is:
>> >
>> >http://www.nocode.org/articles/filter.html
>> >
>> >Begin quote from above-referenced article
>>
>> Do you have any other source material? Say, the QSTs of the era?
>> Interviews with hams who were on the air at the time?
>
>I am trusting that the ARRL published an accurate account
>of their request to, and the response from, the FCC.

In other words, NO. You haven't researched the context.

>Note
>also in the entire article on the NCI website, at the end, the fact
>that the article was researched by a professional archivist,
>not by me ...
>
The article, but not the historical context. That's my point.
>> >*********
>> >In Clinton B. DeSoto's classic book, Two Hundred Meters and Down,
>> >The Story of Amateur Radio (Published by the American Radio Relay
>> >League in 1936) is the following passage on page 179. DeSoto was
>> >a highly placed ARRL official at the time his book was written and
>> >published, so we assume it represents League thinking.
>> >
>> >"The growth of amateur radio and the total number of amateurs will
>> >doubtless be controlled in the future. The present condition of the
>> >amateur bands, while not intolerable, approaches saturation. ...
>> >[The number of amateurs at the time was 46,000]

>>
>> Which was approaching saturation given the typical techniques of the
>day,
>> and the band allocations of that time. Seems incredible today, but
>that
>> was the case back then.
>
>So you say ... I'm more inclined to think it was more a
>case of the "haves" vs. the "have-nots" ...

Those who have the qualifications vs. those who don't. Is that
not a fair system?

>the same sort
>of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
>PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
>to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."

Nope. Can you cite anything more recent than 1936 that talks
about it being necessary to control or limit the number of hams or
the growth of ham radio? I know of nothing in that vein from any credible
source, pro- or anti-code test.

You're actually missing the best argument by focusing on the wrong things,
Carl. The FCC thought 13 wpm was a good idea in 1936 - that's obvious. The
point to argue is that this isn't 1936, and while code skill is a good thing to
have, it's not the same necessity as in 1936.

>> > DeSoto goes on:
>> >
>> >"Obviously no competent person can be denied the right
>>> to become an amateur.
>>
>> Which means the total number cannot be controlled, and
>> this was realized by DeSoto, ARRL leadership and the
>> FCC back then.
>
>That's not what the letter says or contemplates ... the objective
>is CLEARLY to limit the total population of hams by using
>faster Morse requirements as a "filter."

Not the way I read it.

> The letter also CLEARLY
>states that the standards of competency had been raised "to
>the point where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur
>operator's license than it was ten years ago."

Sure. Because the rules and technology had changed radically. Do you know
what the rules were in 1926?

>[This in itself
>raises questions about the assertion that newcomers' qualifications

>were truly lacking ... and points to a purely "control the population
>for the benefit of the incumbents and to hell with everyone else"
>sort of attitude ... sorry ... I've seen the "not in my sandbox"
>attitude towards newcomers to ham radio too many times over
>the past 25 years to be so naive as to not be suspicious of
>the motives in this case ...]

You forget that the situation in 1936 was completely different than today.

>> >The only justifiable restrictive procedure is to raise the
>> >standards of competency. This has already been done to the point
>> >where it is many times more difficult to secure an amateur
>operator's
>> >license than it was ten years ago. Increasing the code speed
>> >equirement is one step in this direction. ..."
>> >
>> >DeSoto goes on to say that additional restrictions are not needed
>> >since "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
>> >relatively constant during the past two years. A slight stiffening
>of
>> >the basic examination, together with the increased code-speed
>> >requirement, would accomplish the desired result."
>> >
>> >At the 1936 annual ARRL Board Meeting held in West Hartford, CT)
>> >the Board "...voted to ask [the] FCC to raise the code speed
>> >requirement on license exams to 12.5 wpm..
>> >[From Official Broadcast 671, May 10, 1936]
>> >
>> >A letter was then sent by Mr. K. B. Warner, ARRL General Manager,
>to
>> >the FCC requesting a code speed increase from 10 to 12 words per
>> >minute. Here are some quotes from Warner's letter:
>> >
>> >"It has become desirable to raise the general standard of
>> >qualification for an amateur operator license. Observations show
>> >that too many licensed amateurs do not possess the qualifications
>> >presupposed by the regulations. Considering that the written part
>> >of the examination may be mastered with relative ease, the chief
>> >opportunity for a better selective process resides with the code
>> >examination. ..." [That is pretty clear!]
>>
>> Yep, it's pretty clear:
>
>Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>license than it was ten years ago." So, again, it seems that the
>"haves"
>simply wanted to keep the "have-nots" out of "their (the haves')
>sandbox."

Nope. They wanted to be sure that everyone had the necessary qualifications.
>

>> "Observations show that too many licensed amateurs do not possess
>> the qualifications presupposed by the regulations."
>
>Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>license than it was ten years ago." Smells pretty rotten to me. I
>think
>Mssrs. DeSoto and Warner "spoke with forked tongue" as they used
>to say in the cowboys and indians movies ...

I think they told it like it was. You weren't there, and neither was I. In
fact,
nobody on this NG was "there" at the time.
>
>> >"A general raising of the standards could help to confine the
>> >obviously limited facilities of amateur radio to those who have
>> >at least nominal aptitude for the same. It seems indicated that
>> >this situation could be best treated by an increase in the code
>> >speed. Consequently the League now requests the Commission
>> >to increase the code speed required in the amateur examination
>> >from ten words per minute to twelve and one-half words per minute."
>> >*********
>> >
>> >It's clear from the above that the ARRL, at the time, wanted to
>> >"control the population" and that the bands, with ~46k amateurs
>> >were "approaching saturation."
>>
>> The problem was that getting a license was so easy that huge
>> numbers of newcomers were raising havoc - on the bands
>> and with other services.
>
>Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>license than it was ten years ago." And "The total number of licensed
>amateur operators has remained relatively constant during the past two
>years." Sorry ... still having difficulty being naive enough to buy
>that
>this was a "benevolant move for the benefit of all."

I don't think you would ever accept any argument for code testing of any kind
at
any time in history.
>
>> >The referenced letter also states that "the chief opportunity for
>> >a better selective process resides with the code examination."
>> >
>> >The final paragraph above ALSO indicates QUITE CLEARLY
>> >that the increase in code speed which the ARRL requested was
>> >TO CONTROL THE NUMBER OF AMATEURS.
>>
>> And the earlier parts clearly show that no qualified person could be
>> denied a license, and that too many of the hams of the day
>> lacked the necessary qualifications.

>
>In the view of the (self-appointed) "elite" ... who admitted that it
>was
>"many times more difficult to secure an amateur operator's
>license than it was ten years ago."

So what are they referring to? The written test - which you said was
only "marginally more difficult"...
>
>> >> The concerns were:
>> >>
>> >> 1) the POPULAR bands of the day were overcrowded
>> >
>> >I find that hard to swallow with well more than an order of
>> >magnitude fewer hams than today ...
>>
>> Yet it is true. In 1936, US hams had 160, 80, 40, 20, 10 meters
>> on HF/MF, plus 5, 2-1/2 and 1-1/4 meters. (In fact, hams could
>> use almost all of the "ultrahighs" back then).
>>
>> But most hams clustered on 40, 80 and 160. Many hams used
>> only one band because of equipment and antenna limitations.
>>
>> Although a few hams were using SSB, (W6DEI and others, as
>> early as 1931), almost all amateurs on voice used AM.
>>
>> Using typical amateur equipment and methods of the mid 1930s,
>> how many QSOs do you think those bands could support?
>
>Typical response of the "haves" ... instead of accepting some
>inevitable congestion and embracing new technology to solve
>the "problem," take the approach of keeping out the "have-nots"
>(newcomers) and remaining largely stagnant, while acting in the
>role of the (self-proclaimed) elite ...

Nope. QST was FULL of articles on better equipment, better methods
and techniques. Use of 5, 2-1/2 and even 1-1/4 meters was described
and encouraged. Crystal and ECO transmitters, single-signal
receivers, all sorts of stuff. Same thing in the Handbooks of the era.
Not just ARRL publications, either.

Trouble was, the stuff was expensive unless you were one of the "haves",
moneywise. Would you rather have ham radio be limited to those
with lots of disposable income?

>> >also, even if it
>> >were true, which I don't buy, a better solution than
>> >"controlling the population" would have been to encourage
>> >folks to spread out a bit by using the other bands, which
>> >you insinuate were not "so crowded."
>>

>> The ARRL DID encourage the use of 10 meters, 5 meters
>> and up. As early as 1928 there were lots of articles on
>> getting on the "ultrahighs" - particularly after mobile
>> operation was authorized there. But the results obtained were
>> a far cry from what could be done with the same expenditure and
>> complexity of equipment on the HF bands.
>
>There's no such thing as a free lunch ... we hams are
>SUPPOSED to experiment and develop better methods
>("advance the radio art"), not sit around and bitch and
>whine that things are "too crowded" and "we need to keep
>newcomers out" ... we should be working to use our
>spectrum more efficiently so that ALL qualified applicants
>can be accomodated ... not generating artificial limits,
>barriers, and elitist attitudes.

How much of that have YOU been doing, on the ham bands, as
an amateur? I read a lot of preaching about what you think hams should do,
but not what you are doing as a ham in that regard.
>
>[snipped some lengthly detail, not to avoid the issue,
>but only for brevity, trying to cut to "the meat" of the issue]
>
>> Back in the 1930s, a typical amateur receiver had a passband of 10
>> kHz - 20 to 40 times that of a modern receiver. Shape factors of
>> 10:1 were common, and dynamic range was all over the place. Some
>> receivers were pretty good while others were awful in this regard.
>> There was also the split-frequency situation. End result was that
>> the spectral efficiency of CW was not realized in most situations,
>> and the bands were "very crowded" if one used the equipment
>> commonly used at the time.
>>
>> Proof of this is simple: Advanced hams were using SSB and
>> single-signal crystal filter receivers by the mid 1930s. This
>progress
>> was driven by the crowding of the bands.
>
>Fine ... so the "average" ham should have been adopting
>this technology in response to "crowding" rather than
>bitching an whining and doing noting to resolve it.

Do you know how much that technology cost, adjusted for
inflation? Sounds like you want ham radio to be the
sole property of those who can afford the latest technology.

> Limiting
>the population as an alternative to actually fixing the problem
>is a crappy, self-serving, elitist "solution," IMHO.

The population was NOT limited. The requirements were raised.
Different animal entirely.

>
>> >Why did they *discount* improvements
>> >in the written tests and focus ONLY on increasing code speed?
>> >(And why only in reference to "controlling the population?")
>> >
>> Controlling - not limiting. BIG difference.
>
>Actually controlling the total number of amateurs certainly
>implies that establishing some limit was the idea ...

Nope.
>
>> >> >The FCC felt that 12.5 wpm was an "awkward" speed to test
>> >> >for, so they rounded it up to 13 wpm ...
>> >>
>> >> Yup. And it stayed there for just 15 years - 4 of which were WW2.
>> >> Then 5 wpm was added.
>> >
>> >Yes, for a novice license, good for 1 year, non-renewable.
>> >"Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
>> >(Some "welcome"!!!)
>>
>> The same 1951 restructuring that gave us the Novice also gave us the
>
>> Technician - which had a 5 wpm code test!
>>
>> Have you forgotten about the Tech license?
>
>No ... the meat of the issue is, and always has been,
>access to the HF bands.

WHY? First you say that use of the other bands should be
encouraged, then when the FCC actually does so, you say
it's all about HF. Huh?

The FCC also (re)created the Extra back in 1951, and RAISED
the requirements for full privileges to 20 wpm and the Extra written.
But they changed their mind at the last minute and LOWERED the
requirements to General class getting all privs. Funny you don't
mention that.
>
>> Your statement:
>>
>> "Learn to beep fast fast or get the hell out of ham radio."
>>Some "welcome"!!!)
>>
>> indicates a hatred of the code itself
>
>It does NOT indicate a hatred of the code itself ..

Yes, it does. "Beep" sure isn;t meant as praise. And
nobody who knows much about Morse considers 13 per
"real fast".

>it
>indicates disgust with the way in which self-appointed
>elitists, whose elitism was based in many cases purely
>on code prowess, used the code for decades as a tool
>to systematically keep otherwise perfectly qualified
>people out of ham radio.

Who decides what makes a person "perfectly qualified"? The
FCC. They were convinced that 13 and later 20 wpm were required
to be "perfectly qualified".
>
>> >> >Was this decision made "for good reason" ???
>> >>
>> >> They thought so at the time - both the FCC and the ARRL. Are
>> >> you saying the FCC made a bad decision back then?
>> >
>> >Yes, I think so ... if you read the entire article, you'll find out
>> >that the FCC Chief Engineer at the time sounded a LOT like
>> >Larry or Dick "If you can't do 25-30 wpm, you're not much of
>> >an operator."
>>
>> For 1936, was he not correct? At that time, Morse/CW was THE
>> major mode of both the military and commercial services. Yes, there
>> was some voice and some RTTY, but only a small amount compared
>> to Morse/CW.
>>
>> >In fact, he states the view in his reply that "An
>> >operator whose top speed is not more than 12 words per
>> >minute would be classed as a poor operator."
>> >(Sounds a LOT like Larry or Dick ...)
>>
>> Why is that not correct - for 1936?
>
>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
>has ALWAYS been BS.

Sorry, Carl, but that just doesn't wash.
>
>> >I respectfully decline to concede, absent some more
>> >compelling evidence that your assertions are not little
>> >more than conjecture.
>>
>> See above. I would respectfully suggest that your conclusions are
>> conjecture based mostly on lack of historical background of the
>time.
>>

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>As I said ... we disagree ... let's agree to disagree.

What's the other option?

>I don't have
>the time to compose such lenthy posts when there is little prospect
>that we will persuade each other to change our views, so why
>bother?

To point out the errors in your interpretation of history.;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

6066. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:10:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226081004.21422.00000112@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35529

In article <20020222064213.13180.00000128@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>When was this? The Bash books started to show up here (EPA) in the late
>> 1970s. To this day I've never seen one.
>
>I have glanced at the one in the ARRL library. It ranges from being a bit
>more
>specific than the Q&A examples in the ARRL study guides to "this answer is
>wrong but the FCC says it is right" to "beats me."

Interesting! I know a few hams who say the Bash books made all the difference in getting their licenses.

>I recall when I looked at
>it, I wondered what all the hoopalah had been about. That could be just a
>first impression, though.
>
The big hoopla was that the books so closely matched the exam - allegedly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6067. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:10:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226081005.21422.00000113@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35528

In article <20020223054930.03609.00000195@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>> That's what I did in 1963. I met the requirements. Hams today meet the
>>> requirements.
>
>> So maybe the requirements are inadequate.
>
>The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level
>requirments of 1963.

I would not say they are greater, but not a lot greater. The privileges granted are a lot greater.

>The requirements today to obtain all amateur priveleges
>require the studying of a lot more than a 16-page study guide.

The same is true of the requirements of 1970, when I got full privileges back.

>If you are
>claiming Amateur Radio is in the tubes because of the requirements, you are
>claiming that it has been broken for almost 40 years. That is quite a bit to
>expect people to believe, considering the evidence of the continuous growth
>and
>evolution of Amateur Radio.

Hmmmm - so you're saying that having greater requirements has not hurt growth?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6068. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:10:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226081006.21422.00000114@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 35526

In article <3C784F76.35DBC3C6@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>That would be great, Jim. Thanks, - Mike -
>
>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Mike,
>>
>> Have you seen my article on the history of US ARS licensing since WW2? I
>> can post the latest updated version here if you like.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
OK, Mike, I'll dig it out. Will start a new thread because it's long enough to
require a few parts. Basically covers from the end of WW2 to the 2000
restructuring.
Look for it in the next few days.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6069. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:23:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226082337.03633.00000597@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35531

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>The big hoopla was that the books so closely matched the exam - allegedly.

They may have. As I hope I made clear with my use of the word "glanced," I read
a few passages and didn't get that impression.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6070. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:28:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226082855.03633.00000600@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35532

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level
>>requirments of 1963.

>I would not say they are greater, but not a lot greater. The privileges
>granted are a lot greater.

Yes, indeed, the priveleges are a lot greater. (Especially with priveleges
including the right to a permanent license.)

But I would say that an exam that required that a 13-year old read a 4-page
study guide vis a vis an exam whose question pool takes up about 80 pages is a
"lot greater" requirement.

Although one could offer that there are reasons that the requirements need to
be greater, going from an exam that requires studying a 4-page study guide to
one that requires a >100 page study guide is not "dumbing down" Amateur Radio.

>Hmmmm - so you're saying that having greater requirements has not hurt
>growth?

I have never said that is has; to the contrary, I have noted that the Amateur
Radio Service has continued to grow during all the time that some claim it has
been "in the tubes."

I have offered that a major reason that the growth does not come from 13-year
old hams is that the entrance requirements are much higher than this 13-year
old kid would have done. The level of difficulty does not seem to be too high
for adults, as can be evidenced by the growth of Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

>

6071. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:35:11 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <jaMe8.3131$eI1.851306@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 35530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not to take sides in this argument, but the reason for the NOSPAM in an email address is to help prevent the email "bots" from scouring newsgroups for email addys for spam. That is my understanding of that one singular point. Case in point, before I started doing that myself, I have been getting a TON of asian spammers as well as other spammers.

>
> Or do you think it's ok for you to doctor yours with 'nospam' and
> that's the only acceptable way of doing things?

6072. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 13:49:20 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ui3n7uk9k7smps2nftn4c4mj11ksjkuodc@4ax.com>
Source record: 35533

On 25 Feb 2002 00:24:09 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>>Date: 2/24/2002 9:09 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <320i7usr358gujfv94jqc9hesbmd83ftlg@4ax.com>
>
>>Steve do you suppose that you might find time to grow up soon?
>
> Hi Gerald. You and your other Los Alamos buddies out of secrets to sell
>to the Red Chinese, or just taking a break due to the current spate of
>patriotism?

Well this pretty much answers my question about your ever growing up.
I say something you don't like and you feel obligated to accuse the
thousands of scientists, engineers and technicians who have kept
this nation free for the past 60 years of treason. The folks up here
put an end to the Second World War and won the Cold War what
have you done to compare to that Ms. Robeson.

I find it very hard to believe you were ever a Marine all of the
Marines I have ever worked with have had a deep sense of
honor, you sir seem completely devoid of honor. I suppose
there could be Marines without honor I just never have met one.
>
>>Why don't you take this to email and spare the rest of us the
>>embarrassment of being the same species as you.
>
> I could say the same of you, Gerry. You felt compelled to get your
>"dings" in in a public forum.
>
> By the way...I don't remember seein a whole lot of posts of ANY
>meaningful content in any significant number of threads.
>
> You just like to pop in and be rude? If so, you're doing a fine job.
>
> By the way, just how many "kids" find thier way to Amateur Radio via RRAP?
>
> I tried several websearches for "Amateur" radio, "Ham" radio, "SWL",
>"radio hobby", "CB" and several other permeations, and NONE of them made ANY
>link to this forum.

Fired up Google groups yesterday using "Amateur Radio" as a subject
one of your RRAP schoolyard personal attacks was third on the list.
Methinks your lack of honor is affecting your ability to tell the

truth.
>
> Of the three Amateur Radio clubs I belong to, NO ONE knows of this forum.
>Certainly none of the Amateurs under 18 know about it.
>
> If you LIKE being made the target of such bile and filth the likes of
>which His Lyingness has spewed, be my guest.

Are you referring to yourself in the above. You seem to be the only
one
spewing bile filth and slander which interestingly enough was not even
directed at me but rather at a large group of very loyal American.
Those folks unlike you Ms. Robeson actually do something.

I'll have to leave dealing with you to others as sinking toward your
level is making me quite uncomfortable.
>
> Otherwise, AMF
>
>Steve
>
>
>

6073. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:16:01 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BA6A3.D5CD765D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35534

Hi Will,
The only reason that K1MAN gets by with his operations is
that W1AW, the ARRL Newington broadcast station, does
essentially the same thing. But, I suspect this will not
last much longer.

Using the ARRL Newington crowd logic recently used to
eliminate printing "moved and seconded" , a recent survey
would show that only 10% of the US ARS licensees regularly
copy W1AW. Therefore, the continuation of the expensive
operation of W1AW (not a moneymaker for Newington) would not
be justified. FCC defense of continued W1AW operation is
probably wavering in view of the justification being used to
permit operation of K1MAN and others broadcasting in the
ARS.

If W1AW voluntarily goes away then the FCC can proceed full
steam to shut down K1MAN without fear of ancillary damage.
The ARRL can use the transmit power savings, building
upkeep, utilities, sell off of equipment, insurance premium
savings, sale of property, [W1AW control operator salary
savings ;-)] etc. to increase the Newington crowd managers'
salaries even more, maybe even be able to hire Carl
Stevenson. It is a win-win.

73,
Clay N4AOX

Will White wrote:
>
> Two problems (at least) with that idea. First, why should we think that permitting
> 15 minutes a week of broadcasting would satisfy K1MAN? I have followed his
> "career" for awhile, and heard him on the air enough to know that here is a person
> who likes to break rules for the sake of it. He would simply exceed the limit, and
> would make sure that everyone knew he was doing so.
>

6074. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:22:27 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e5475027a8b54198969f@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35535

In article <20020226050915.16980.00000536@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...

> If your concern is EMP, before mandating knowledge of Morse code, another
> mandate would have to require that a ham maintain a station that is going to
> continue to function after that large EMP event. If your justification
> for the continuation of the Morse test is that there may be an EMP event,
> it probably won't hold up with the Commission.

The EMP event I mentioned is what is known as an "example."

Your twisting of the argument from the usefulness of CW during
emergencies to mandatory code testing is a wee bit perplexing. Do you
have an agenda or something?

joshua houk
kd7pos

6075. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:22:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202260722.454e592d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35536

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com>...

> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words that
> taught me new things.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Same here, Ed. In my case some of those words were spoken and others were
written.

But in all cases, I'm pretty sure that we took the time and effort to listen
or read those words and consider their meaning.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6076. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:25:49 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e54819e9c331b99896a0@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35537

In article <20020226060406.11763.00000449@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...

> And a note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil. I will point this out to you in
> the future every time I do so you will have a more balanced view of how often
> Cecil and I agree, or disagree, with each other.

Considering that you thought it so peculiar and notable (so much so that
you replied to your own post - twice!) we'll point out your amazement to
such as well. :)

joshua houk
kd7pos

6077. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:28:07 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e548a81a92c9cb9896a1@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35538

In article <3C7BA6A3.D5CD765D@worldnet.att.net>, wyn@worldnet.att.net
says...

> The only reason that K1MAN gets by with his operations is
> that W1AW, the ARRL Newington broadcast station, does
> essentially the same thing. But, I suspect this will not
> last much longer.

Please reread the Part 97 rules which define the word "broadcasting".

W1AW is *not* a broadcast station. Sorry.

joshua houk
kd7pos

6078. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 15:55:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bb027_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35539

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226051124.16980.00000537@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Actually, there was something published (I believe
> >by the ARRL) some years back that indicated that
> >most ham gear, with reasonable precautions, would
> >do surprisingly well in the event of an EMP.
>
> The article series is among the articles available for download from the
ARRL
> Tech Info Service "Lightning Protection" page. See:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/lightning.html
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I *knew* I could count on Ed to provide the reference :-)

Thanks, Ed!

Carl - wa6vse

6079. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:08:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226110823.03629.00000563@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35540

>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 2/26/2002 7:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ui3n7uk9k7smps2nftn4c4mj11ksjkuodc@4ax.com>

>Well this pretty much answers my question about your ever growing up.
>I say something you don't like and you feel obligated to accuse the
>thousands of scientists, engineers and technicians who have kept
>this nation free for the past 60 years of treason. The folks up here
>put an end to the Second World War and won the Cold War what
>have you done to compare to that Ms. Robeson.

You left yourself open to it, Gerry. Sorry. You took the first shot.
Just like Lennie the Limp, you think you can toss about insults and
humiliations and not be on the receiving end.

As for ending the cold war, Sir, THAT was done on the backs of hundreds of
thousands of Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines.

The "stuff" provided at Los Al was just ONE of the tools that that was
accomplished with. Unfortunately it was also one of the tools that STARTED the
Cold War, so don't even go there.

The Soviet block was beaten back as much by the sheer will of the western
nations to see it destroyed as much as anything.

>I find it very hard to believe you were ever a Marine all of the
>Marines I have ever worked with have had a deep sense of
>honor, you sir seem completely devoid of honor. I suppose
>there could be Marines without honor I just never have met one.

I am sure you find it emboldning to make such declarations.

My "sense of honor" does not include standing pat while taking a cheap
shot from some ne'r-do-well who at once admonishes me to "take it to e mail"
when making statements he does not like, all the while making THOSE comments in
the same public forum.

Two-facedness does not suit you, Gerry.

>Fired up Google groups yesterday using "Amateur Radio" as a subject
>one of your RRAP schoolyard personal attacks was third on the list.
>Methinks your lack of honor is affecting your ability to tell the
>truth.

Methinks you are the one with an honesty proplem, Gerry. Tried the same
thing, and to be relatively thorough, went several pages of "next search".
Nothing on RRAP came up until well over 50 items, and it was not me that was

involved in the thread.

But I will simply accept it as your "newsreader"...methinks you set a bit narrower parameter than just "amateur radio".

>Are you referring to yourself in the above. You seem to be the only
>one
>spewing bile filth and slander which interestingly enough was not even
>directed at me but rather at a large group of very loyal American.
>Those folks unlike you Ms. Robeson actually do something.

Gerry, is there a good reason why (a) you decry my posts yet have started an entirely new thread doing the exact smae thing, and (b) use "Ms" instead of my given name? THAT is a Lennie-tactic.

As for who the insults may have been directed at, you seem to have a bit of the same problem, making accusations about "honor" of Marines. You know nothing of which YOU speak, Sir.

>I'll have to leave dealing with you to others as sinking toward your
>level is making me quite uncomfortable.

I find that very humorous, Gerry. You initiate an exchange in a PUBLIC forum decrying the need for a PRIVATE exchange...begin the use of demeaning "titles" ala Lennie, then suggest that you are somehow sinking.

Had you been a man who does what he says and vice versa, you would have made those first comments in e mail. You didn't, which leads me to believe this was nothing more than a chest-beating exercise on your part to gain some imaginary foothold on the RRAP pecking order. Lennie calls them "messaging points". Well, I guess you scored your first ones. Ask Lennie for his address so he can mail you your certificate.

I would have repsected some well considered words in a private e mail...Instead you came out swinging in here.

You already sank, Gerry. That sound you hear is you desperately trying to find something to hold on to.

Have a nice day.

6080. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:23:29 UTC
From: Henry County American Red Cross <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <mJOe8.548$0e1.82267@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 35541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Daniel Hicks <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>

<snip>

> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ
>

Well if this were the case, them my friend who bought me my X-mas gift while I was volunteering with the Red Cross in NYC from October 3rd to December 26th would have been illegal, he knew of my desire, and plan to get my license, which I have got now, the license arrived in the mail yesterday.

I think that being able to buy them w/o a license is ok. What I think is that they should crack down on the "export" radios, and the selling of radios that can easilly be modified to work out of band i.e. the freebanders moding them to work 11m.

I have also seen and heard from being a shortwave listener for years, that the ham bands in some areas are as bad as 11m. Why not start by cleaning up our own bands before screaming and shouting at those who desire to join the amateur radio community. I have met both IRL, and online, some really great hams, I have also encountered real a$$holes, I do not let the jerks turn me away. I am currently learning the code, and studying for my general, I'd love to play with QRP, as well as PSK-31. I am also interested in setting up an IRLP node on one of my linux boxes.

73 de Keith KC8TCQ

6081. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:24:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BB6D8.1F415DDD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35542

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
> > > structured
> > > noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that won't be
> > > lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any rescuer will
> > > do.
> >
> > So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
> > for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice guy.
>
> Troll, Troll,Troll. Poor terminally bored Cecil.

It's no troll, Dick. 99.9+% of people don't know International Morse code.
The chances that there will ever be a time when the trapped and rescuer
both know railroad Morse code is infinitesimal. What do you propose to
do with the trapped people who don't know Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6082. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:29:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BB802.1E207DBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35543

W1RFI wrote:
> And, if I were tapped in the collapsed building and wanted to bang on pipes to
> give me something to do until the end, I would probably bang out 2, 3, 5, 7,
> 11, a sequence that would clearly say that there is a human down here.

Prime numbers in railroad code should make Dick happy. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6083. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:33:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BB8CE.52ECD2B6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35544

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
> >'S E E E S' and move on. You cannot be serious.
>
> I would instantly recognize it as SOS under the circumstances.
>
> >You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
> >die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?
>
> It seems that you are the one who would "move on..."

You left out the next sentence, Ed, which I have reinserted above.
It was rhetorical - not a serious statement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6084. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:39:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BBA43.2709A6CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35545

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> >subject at hand.
>
> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words that
> taught me new things.

And I'd dare say you took the time and interest to stop, close your mouth, listen
and learn, rather than just reject it all out of hand, and not insisting you
already knew
all about it all. As TITs does.

6085. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:41:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BBABD.441B459E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35546

W1RFI wrote:

> Note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil.

Good for your! Now please stay on track and help us stifle his ugly trolling nature.

>
>
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/26/02 5:03 AM Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020226050344.16980.00000535@mb-dd.aol.com>
> >
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> >>Nope, anyone with International Morse training would assume it said:
> >>'S E E E S' and move on.
> >
> >I would instantly recognize it as SOS under the circumstances.
> >
> >>You PCTA guys are worse off than I ever imagined. You would let someone
> >>die because their tapping didn't sound like Morse code?
> >
> >It seems that you are the one who would "move on..."
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

6086. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:45:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BBBB7.4D2B756A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35548

W1RFI wrote:

> And a note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil. I will point this out to you in
> the future every time I do so you will have a more balanced view of how often
> Cecil and I agree, or disagree, with each other.
>
> Ed
>

Ed: If you pay close attention you'll find that you would naturally do that
often, if he
keeps to his usual track. I think we might expect that he'll do the usual and
modify
his attitude slightly until he slips away, as he always does when caught. If
neither of
his dictionaries nor pure logic can fight it off, he backs off a little. Poor
fella..

>
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/26/02 5:02 AM Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020226050211.16980.00000534@mb-dd.aol.com>
> >
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> >>Dick, please describe how International Morse (the one that hams know)
> >>can be used with a pipe banging on a pipe. How do you get the 'dah'?
> >
> >International Morse could be sent the same way landline telegraphy was sent
> >and
> >decoded. click-click is a dit and click-space-click is a dah. I am not sure
> >I
> >could send that way.
> >
> >Maybe Dick is suggesting that the receiving test be done with all clicks. I
> >AM
> >sure I couldn't receive that way, so the test would have kept me out of ham
> >radio. :-)
> >
> >And, if I were tapped in the collapsed building and wanted to bang on pipes
> >to
> >give me something to do until the end, I would probably bang out 2, 3, 5, 7,
> >11, a sequence that would clearly say that there is a human down here.
> >

> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

6087. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 16:45:27 UTC
From: KD6SRI <kd6sri@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5ge26$13k$1@hatathli.csulb.edu>
Source record: 35547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Retailers should NOT be required to verify if someone has a valid amateur radio license. Considering how the law would hinder or eliminate the following:
-The ham who just passes the exam and wants to buy a radio-he can't

-The pre-ham that wants to buy a radio before he takes the test so he can listen to it and understand the rules of operation better.

-Sales at ham radio swapmeets. With guns, the right to buy them at a swapmeet has almost been eliminated.

-Gift purchase - What if your wife, etc, who is not a ham, wants to buy you a radio as a gift. With guns, this is illegal.

-Transfer/sale of radios - Is it going to be like guns sales? You must wait until they verify that your license is valid, and pay a processing fee, before you can buy a radio from a friend.

-What if you modify a amateur radio-will you be able to sell it? If you have a radio that can transmit out-of-band, will it be treated like an "assault rifle".

Having all these restrictions and government control on amateur radio sales would damage the hobby that is supposed to encourage good will. It's just a radio.

Out here in CA we have one repeater that people will occasionally get on and jam. We have several "Doppler teams" that chase these idiots down and post their pictures on a website. The Doppler teams are policing the frequency, just like hams are supposed to do.

KD6SRI

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>
> No License? No Radio!
> http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/

>
> Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> http://www.eham.net/survey/
> (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
>
> This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
the
> time to review it, and consider taking part.
>
> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ
>
>
>
>

6088. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:00:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BBF3A.32AA3833@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35549

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
> >is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
> >total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
> >has ALWAYS been BS.
>
> It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was considered
> current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test served a
> valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in commercial
> and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC
> initiated and maintained the Morse test.

And that use of Morse persisted far beyond the time when later technologies were available to supersede it. As an example radiotelegraphy was in nationwide use as a means of handling interstate police message traffic well into the second half of the twentieth century. The last vestiges of that net were deactivated in 1972. When I hired on to a state public safety communications position in early 1965 I was tested for Morse code proficiency, since the radiotelegraph equipment was still

in place as a backup system although a Model 28ASR whirling teletype system had just been installed for in-state traffic handling and the radiotelegraph station then handled only interstate relays. And in 1975 I was a part of the technical crew that removed all the radiotelegraph gear from the state HQ station. That gear was very impressive, and I wish I had the foresight to take some photos. The station consisted of two large Wilcox transmitters running 450TH tubes in the final and several Hammarlund receivers with dipole antennas on several frequencies. I suspect that my exposure to this system has something to do with my firm insistence that CW in ham radio isn't just some fad mode, rather is very capable of serious work when capable operators are available. It served very well for a LONG time.

There is one particular non-ham reader who posts here who refuses to believe that there actually was a police radiotelegraph net at work so recently. Of course he has no idea what he's talking about, but instead insists that anyone who says it's so is wrong. Poor fella. If people would stop giving him the attention he craves he'd go away, as he did before some ham posters started answering him again.

6089. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:01:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BBF61.D344D0B5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35550

W1RFI wrote:

> Note to Dick: I disagreed with Carl.
>

Hooray!!!

>
> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/26/02 7:29 AM Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com>
> >
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> >>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
> >>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
> >>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
> >>has ALWAYS been BS.
> >
> >It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was
> >considered
> >current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test served
> >a
> >valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in
> >commercial
> >and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC
> >initiated and maintained the Morse test.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

6090. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:07:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BC0CB.66347132@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35701

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3c7a64cf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >the same sort
> >of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
> >PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
> >to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."
>
> Nope. Can you cite anything more recent than 1936 that talks
> about it being necessary to control or limit the number of hams or
> the growth of ham radio? I know of nothing in that vein from any credible
> source, pro- or anti-code test.
>
> You're actually missing the best argument by focusing on the wrong things,
> Carl. The FCC thought 13 wpm was a good idea in 1936 - that's obvious. The
> point to argue is that this isn't 1936, and while code skill is a good thing to
> have, it's not the same necessity as in 1936.
>
>

Typical for Carl. He lets the years of accumulated bile corrode his common sense
into mush.Wonder where he'd be now if he had "just done it" years ago.

6091. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:12:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BC20B.45A6BCC5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35702

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >The big hoopla was that the books so closely matched the exam - allegedly.
>
> They may have. As I hope I made clear with my use of the word "glanced," I read
> a few passages and didn't get that impression.
>

I looked them over pretty close, though that was 25 years ago. I found them to be not nearly as exact as the advertising suggested, and in some ways they were more of a study guide than the current question pools. He wasn't able to get exact questions and answers on a large percentage of the questions, and often what was given was keywords to watch for in answers to certain questions in certain subject areas and in some cases not much information at all was available. He did continuously keep working to improve their accuracy, I understand.

6092. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:18:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BC363.474B319D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35703

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level
> >>requirments of 1963.
>
> >I would not say they are greater, but not a lot greater. The privileges
> >granted are a lot greater.
>
> Yes, indeed, the priveleges are a lot greater. (Especially with priveleges
> including the right to a permanent license.)
>
> But I would say that an exam that required that a 13-year old read a 4-page
> study guide vis a vis an exam whose question pool takes up about 80 pages is a
> "lot greater" requirement.
>

That's the best reason for retaining a Novice class. Tech is no substitute. Makes
one
wonder about the mindset at FCC. You wonder if the decision maker there has a clue
or if he's just taking the easy route. There needs to be an easy entry point, with

a serious technical level (for hams, not engineers) within the hobby, what the
restructuring did was move it all closer together, toward a single license. That's

effectively what we have now, when one can grab off an Extra with very little
knowledge and NO experience.
Clearly FCC really doesn't care what happens to the ARS.

6093. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:24:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BC4C6.3FF56EDD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35704

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to make a
> > > > structured
> > > > noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one that won't be
> > > > lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any rescuer will
> > > > do.
> > >
> > > So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
> > > for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice guy.
> >
> > Troll, Troll,Troll. Poor terminally bored Cecil.
>
> It's no troll, Dick. 99.9+% of people don't know International Morse code.
> The chances that there will ever be a time when the trapped and rescuer
> both know railroad Morse code is infinitesimal. What do you propose to
> do with the trapped people who don't know Morse code?

Why don't we just leave them to you since you think you're so damn smart?

6094. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:30:37 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1DPe8.350$106.27810@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35705

Ed, W1RFI, posted:

> And, if I were tapped in the collapsed building and wanted
> to bang on pipes to give me something to do until the end,
> I would probably bang out 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, a sequence that
> would clearly say that there is a human down here.

I think you'd have better luck with 1-800-CALL-ATT ;-)

Jim, K7JEB

6095. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 17:36:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OIPe8.413$gK2.38492@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35706

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202260722.454e592d@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com>...
>
> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
words that
> > taught me new things.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Same here, Ed. In my case some of those words were spoken and others
were
> written.
>
> But in all cases, I'm pretty sure that we took the time and effort to
listen
> or read those words and consider their meaning.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outside of Math, virtually all testing is reading and vocabulary far more than anything else. To go back when dinosaurs roamed the Earth in 1956 I was a snot-nosed freshman who enrolled in a general sci class to pad the schedule taught by the department head who had been in charge of testing at Lackland in WW2.

The senior physics book at the time was Modern Physics by Dull, Brooks, and Metcalf. It was modern in that it had acetate overlays of a steam shovel. As was usually the case, the publishers hired English and Education majors to revise good-selling texts so Charles Dull was the only scientist among the group and he died in 1917. Such was the state of American science education when Sputnik went up and this was a well-rated high school.

So I got to be a tackling dummy in our dephead's efforts and part of it was to take great piles of standardized tests in subjects in which I had no background mostly to show how little they meant. That is when I was not being a blocking dummy as nose moose on a team that included Gale Sayers whom I will tell you now was not the hardest tackle in that backfield. I got 92 percentiles in subjects like Biology that I despised at the time. It worked, he got the PSSC science curriculum installed and I became a professional test taker.

Some are indeed better than others but they are largely a matter of vocabulary and definition -- the latter being simply some realization of why the word was coined.

In traffic control, which when you think about it is the FCCs biz, there are the famous 3 Es, Engineering, Education, and Enforcement. Charlie has done a crappy job of the latter but by and large in the Amateur Service at least, decent Engineering and actually almost outstanding Education. Given that we are in the self-education biz the major function of the testing program is to lead the rookie in righteous paths and this the present structure does fairly well and in fact always did.

I am much more interested in maintaining the integrity of the system and the removal of pressure on the newbie that he doesn't impose on himself than I am on the difficulty level of the exams. By getting the words and ideas out there, the biggest piece of the job is done. It took a while for some of the concepts to sink in to the point of doing a lot about them: why the plus went to the rectifier cathode took a while to sink in.

The object is not exclusion but education. Removal of the Morse requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is the only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a damned thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the Amateur Service. I suspect it will have the effect of making it far more a talking shop than a think tank where fuzz like 'legacy modes' gets kicked around like it really meant something.

Dick, NBK

6096. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 18:09:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a5giiq$k19$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 35708

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225202130.29966.00000096@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <3C7A703F.8DAA53C6@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >> What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of
> >> opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
> >
> >Reminds me of the locker room scene in the movie The Right Stuff, when
> >Deke Slayton was explaining what Gus "Bubba" Grissom was saying.
> >
> >No, Cecil. She didn't say that. I would have noticed.
>
> Oh? Was Virgil I. Grissom called "Bubba?" I've never seen anything
> for a nickname other than "Gus."

> Of course, everyone knows that motion pictures are proof-positive
> prima-facie references. Good old morse code saves the day on
> airliner hijackings and outer-space alien invasions and ham radio
> can do time travel with the right atmospheric conditions.

What a stupid thing to say. Don't you ever get imbarassed by how foolishly
you behave in public?

6097. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 18:16:24 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a5giv9$k7u$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 35707

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c7af42a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C7A7089.5D220634@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > What are you saying, Jim? Are you thinking that there are no CW
> operators
> > > at Field Days?
> >
> > You aren't really THAT clueless, are you?
>
> I must be, Jim. Why don't you clue me in?

Ooooookay. I'm not thinking that there are no CW operators at Field Days.
What I said was, "as far as you know". I presume that it's an accurate
statement. I'm not wrong about that, am I? :-)

6098. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 18:19:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BD1C0.9F1F13F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35709

Richard McCollum wrote:
> The object is not exclusion but education. Removal of the Morse
> requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is the
> only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a damned
> thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the Amateur
> Service.

By "DO", I assume you mean to expend some effort. Sorry to disappoint you,
but my learning of Morse code was effortless. It took a lot more effort to
learn to understand and use the Smith Chart. Do you understand and use the
Smith Chart? My understanding of the Smith Chart is much more valuable to
me as an HF ham than my Morse code skill.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6099. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 18:21:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BD23E.1780371C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35710

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil.
>
> Good for your! Now please stay on track and help us stifle his ugly trolling
> nature.

You are just too much of a temptation, Dick. I can't resist and
you can't help yourself.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6100. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 18:23:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7BD2B2.C852631@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35711

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If neither of his dictionaries nor pure logic can fight it off,
> he backs off a little. Poor fella..

I'm only human, Dick. I have to sleep sometime.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6101. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 20:19:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bee52$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35712

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202251340.46c6efd4@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7a6a86_1@news7.fast.net>...

> > unfortunately, for the
> > ARS, I'd be willing to bet that the the percentage would
> > be disappointingly ... even disturbingly ... low.
>
> Pure conjecture on your part ;-)

I said "I'd be willing to bet ..." to me that implies that
it's opinion/conjecture/speculation.

> I know for a fact, Carl, that you could not pass the tests I took
> for General, Advanced and Extra.

You mean because those exact tests aren't offered any
more? Let's not play word games ...

If you're talking just about the high speed Morse test,
ask me if I care ...

> But I can pass the tests you took for Extra.

Jim ... I really don't doubt that YOU could ... however,
I would still bet, if it were feasible to arrange a broad
enough test case, that a disturbingly low percentage
of hams licensed (what did I say .. 20 years ago?)
could not pass today's G+E test without study and
practice.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHvt0Je+N6+q84HiEQIUsQCfZ6HMaAQAvmMjIoZZ/X/ZYmhzBU4AoO0q
djiWAKflN94DTxUkRr6dOE16
=7eb3
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6102. Re: K1MAN gets another letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 20:33:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5grav0opk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35714

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BA6A3.D5CD765D@worldnet.att.net...
>
> If W1AW voluntarily goes away then the FCC can proceed full
> steam to shut down K1MAN without fear of ancillary damage.
> The ARRL can use the transmit power savings, building
> upkeep, utilities, sell off of equipment, insurance premium
> savings, sale of property, [W1AW control operator salary
> savings ;-)] etc. to increase the Newington crowd managers'
> salaries even more, maybe even be able to hire Carl
> Stevenson. It is a win-win.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Does this mean that, eventually, W1AW will be available as a vanity call?

6103. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 20:40:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bf320_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35713

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226051854.16980.00000539@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >I've never had a bit of a problem with any of the current tests.
Retest? HA!
> >I say, BRING 'EM ON!!!!! I'll take 'em and pass 'em easily, with NO
prep
> >at all.
>
> To date, the FCC has not seen a need to retest for amateur or
commercial
> licenses. Do you believe there is a new problem that retesting will
solve?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I'd *personally* (not as an NCI position) agree with Jim. I'd
have no problem with periodic (say every 10 years at renewal)
retesting .. I have every intention of staying current technically
and don't view my new Extra class license as some sort of
"graduation certificate."

I don't think there's a "new" problem ... I think the problem has
been ignored for many years.

The "problem that retesting would solve" IMHO (again personal,
not an NCI position) is that I believe that far too many long-term
hams in our ranks have NOT kept ANYWHERE NEAR CURRENT
with respect to today's technology. Periodic retesting would ensure
that hams stay at least *reasonably* current technically.

Note, that I am NOT suggesting any sort of "bleeding edge"
requirement like, "Design, simulate, and code in VHDL, a
1-bit precision FSK modem with performance within 1.5 dB
or better of theoretical ideal." or "Specify a forward error
correction coding scheme that will provide __ dB of coding
gain in an additive white Gaussian noise environment." ... just
reasonably current BASIC things that the average ham should
know. The sort of stuff that you should be able to read about

in QST, on the ARRL web site, and hear about at local club
meetings ... not "rocket science."

Note that some percentage of hams ... myself included ...
ARE capable of doing the first two examples ... but that
does NOT mean that I believe that ALL should be able to.
On the other hand, I think it's sad that so many long-time
hams are essentially clueless about anything newer than
a 6146.

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHvyd5e+N6+q84HiEQLVDQCeNnLYY4sAXaVboaNZs98Iht65gh4An071
LTC9mQ0exmizOBlfQu0YPtCJ
=beQt
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

6104. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 20:40:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5grnp0pe8@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35715

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BC0CB.66347132@worldnet.att.net...
> > Nope. Can you cite anything more recent than 1936 that talks
> > about it being necessary to control or limit the number of hams or
> > the growth of ham radio? I know of nothing in that vein from any
credible
> > source, pro- or anti-code test.
> >
> > You're actually missing the best argument by focusing on the wrong
things,
> > Carl. The FCC thought 13 wpm was a good idea in 1936 - that's obvious.
The
> > point to argue is that this isn't 1936, and while code skill is a good
thing to
> > have, it's not the same necessity as in 1936.
> >
> >
>
> Typical for Carl. He lets the years of accumulated bile corrode his
common sense
> into mush.Wonder where he'd be now if he had "just done it" years ago.

So, as usual, you can't come up with any type of argument to counter what
Carl posted, so you resort to smartass remarks. You're a bigger troll than
what you call Cecil.

6105. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:03:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bf8a8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35717

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
> >is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
> >total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
> >has ALWAYS been BS.
>
> It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code
> was considered current commercial radio technology. In that
> era, the Morse code test served a valuable function, helping to
> self-train Morse operators for use in commercial and military
> radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC
> initiated and maintained the Morse test.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed ...

I did NOT say that a Morse proficency requirement was NEVER
a valid requirement.

I did NOT say that the Morse test was never current commercial
technology.

I did NOT say that the Morse test never served a useful purpose.

I did NOT say that the Morse test was always BS.

What I *did* say was that "the elitist attitude that Morse skill
is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
total worth of an amateur" was BS ...

I don't believe that, even in the days when I acknowledge
that a Morse proficiency requirement *was* a valid, reasonable
requirement, "Morse skill was the penultimate skill/knowledge
factor that defined the total worth of an amateur."
(And I doubt that you *really* believe that it was either ... there's
ALWAYS been more to being a ham than Morse skill, right?)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

```
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHv39Ze+N6+q84HiEQLTWQCcCJSFddZkvw/8rZo9teghs48kzc4An3rE
h5B0G5EyHD0XfrF62aCxB5l5
=ZQNb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6106. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:05:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bf919$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35718

Note to Dick: Don't gloat too much, because I believe
that after Ed reads my reply he'll gracefully admit that
he didn't read my words QUITE carefully enough and
retract his disagreement :-)

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226075235.03173.00000706@mb-cv.aol.com...
> Note to Dick: I disagreed with Carl.
>
> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >Date: 2/26/02 7:29 AM Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com>
> >
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >
> >>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
> >>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
> >>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
> >>has ALWAYS been BS.
> >
> >It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was
> >considered
> >current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test
served
> >a
> >valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in
> >commercial
> >and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the
FCC
> >initiated and maintained the Morse test.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

6107. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:05:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BF89D.7474BCE5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35716

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> >subject at hand.
>
> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words that
> taught me new things.

Here's your chance to repay that debt by clueing in our Kim. I'd be
curious if, during your period of unenlightenment, you went about
demonstrating your lack of knowledge or if you simply realized there
much you didn't know and sought out the advice of those who did.

Dave K8MN

6108. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:09:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BF9B3.5C5E58C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35719

Dick Carroll wrote:

a Model 28ASR whirling teletype system

Whew! Should have been 'wireline' teletype system...

6109. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 35720

In article <20020226082855.03633.00000600@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>The entry level requirements today are a lot greater than the entry-level
>>>requirments of 1963.
>
>>I would not say they are greater, but not a lot greater. The privileges
>>granted are a lot greater.
>
>Yes, indeed, the priveleges are a lot greater. (Especially with priveleges
>including the right to a permanent license.)

Let's see:

- permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license
- 1500 W peak output above 50 MHz vs. 75 W input
- All authorized modes and frequencies above 50 MHz vs. 145-147 CW, MCW and AM only
- All forms of authorized frequency control vs. crystal control only

Add the 5 wpm code test and get:
- 250 W peak output vs. 75 W input below 30 MHz
- CW and SSB on a piece of 10 M plus slices of 80/40/15 vs CW only on 80/40/15
- Vanity calls including 1X3 vs. sequentially issued calls that specifically point
out newcomer status

>But I would say that an exam that required that a 13-year old read a 4-page
>study guide vis a vis an exam whose question pool takes up about 80 pages is
>a
>"lot greater" requirement.

Ed, is reading the 4 page study guide the ONLY thing you did to prepare for the Novice exam? Did you never read any other radio or electronic books, magazines or articles? No Elmer, no QST, no Handbook, no library books? No other source of radio information other than the 4 page study guide in the LM?

>Although one could offer that there are reasons that the requirements need to
>be greater, going from an exam that requires studying a 4-page study guide to
>one that requires a >100 page study guide is not "dumbing down" Amateur
>Radio.

I would say that a lot depends on the content of the pages. How big was "How To Become A Radio Amateur" in 1963? How about "ABC's OF Ham Radio"

or "So You Want To Be A Ham?" (just so we don't focus exclusively on ARRL books of that era). Or the Ameco Study Guide?

>
>>Hmmmm - so you're saying that having greater requirements has not hurt
>>growth?
>
>I have never said that is has; to the contrary, I have noted that the Amateur
>Radio Service has continued to grow during all the time that some claim it
>has
>been "in the tubes."

Even after incentive licensing was enacted. In fact, it grew more in the 5 years after 1968 than in the 5 years before. HUH?

>
>I have offered that a major reason that the growth does not come from 13-year
>old hams is that the entrance requirements are much higher than this 13-year
>old kid would have done.

That's you. This 13 year old ham was probably dumber, because he needed to read a lot more than 4 pages to get started.

>The level of difficulty does not seem to be too
>high
>for adults, as can be evidenced by the growth of Amateur Radio.

One word: computers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6110. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:30:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BFE6F.366AD96D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35721

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0202251340.46c6efd4@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:<3c7a6a86_1@news7.fast.net>...
>
> > > unfortunately, for the
> > > ARS, I'd be willing to bet that the the percentage would
> > > be disappointingly ... even disturbingly ... low.
> >
> > Pure conjecture on your part ;-)
>
> I said "I'd be willing to bet ..." to me that implies that
> it's opinion/conjecture/speculation.
>
> > I know for a fact, Carl, that you could not pass the tests I took
> > for General, Advanced and Extra.
>
> You mean because those exact tests aren't offered any
> more? Let's not play word games ...
>
> If you're talking just about the high speed Morse test,
> ask me if I care ...
>
> > But I can pass the tests you took for Extra.
>
> Jim ... I really don't doubt that YOU could ... however,
> I would still bet, if it were feasible to arrange a broad
> enough test case, that a disturbingly low percentage
> of hams licensed (what did I say .. 20 years ago?)
> could not pass today's G+E test without study and
> practice.

So you still feel inferior because you couldn't do it then. You
weren't
required to do it then, just as they aren't required to do it now. Of
course
you had to forfeit the license, they don't. The Way it Works. Too bad
for
your Bile-Agenda.

6111. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:30:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7bfef7_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35722

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226081004.21422.00000111@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c7a64cf_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> The letter and the "200 Meters and Down" story are simply
summaries
> >of
> >> the situation. The written tests WERE made tougher.
> >
> >Perhaps marginally so, but that is NOT what the ARRL
> >asked for from the FCC, according to the account published
> >by the ARRL itself
>
> Without the actual tests, it's hard to say how much "tougher" the
> tests were made.

Agreed ... but the letter says that it was "many times more
difficult to secure an amateur operator's license than it was
ten years ago." That, in the words of a highly-placed ARRL
official of that time certainly would seem to imply a pretty
rigorous improvement had ALREADY been made ...

> >SORRY ... the letter SPECIFICALLY states (read the quotes
> >again) that:
> >1) "the total number of amateurs will doubtless be controlled
> > in the future" [this is population control, not growth
control]
>
> Controlled by whom? The FCC, of course. Not the ARRL.

The idea was CLEARLY to use Morse as a filter to control
the total population ... sorry, you can't put any other "spin"
on it ... it's worded QUITE CLEARLY.

> >2) "The total number of licensed amateur operators has remained
> > relatively constant during the past two years." [this
indicates
> > no problem with growth, but with a desire to control the
TOTAL
> > size of the population ... sort of "So 'our' (those of us who
> >are
```

> > currently amongst the 'haves') bands aren't more crowded
> > than we'd like, we want to keep newcomers out."]
>
> Nope. More like "we are having enormous turnover, the newcomers
> aren't staying, and the FCC is getting ticked about hams' straying
> outside the bands, putting bum signals on the air and being only
> marginally skilled".

So you're saying that the ARRL, recognizing an "enormous turnover"
(which is mentioned NOWHERE in the letter, but would imply a large
loss in numbers, absent replacments), wanted to make the test so
difficult that newcomers couldn't pass the test??? Wouldn't
that have DECIMATED the amateur population, rather than simply
"controlled" it??? (Now wouldn't THAT have been "nice" for
"the elite"???)

> >I am trusting that the ARRL published an accurate account
> >of their request to, and the response from, the FCC.
>
> In other words, NO. You haven't researched the context.

I'm simply talking about the facts as they were recorded
by the ARRL itself.

> >So you say ... I'm more inclined to think it was more a
> >case of the "haves" vs. the "have-nots" ...
>
> Those who have the qualifications vs. those who don't. Is that
> not a fair system?

No, those who already had licenses, granted under an
easier regieme, vs. those who would have to pass the
harder tests designed to keep them out ("control the
population") ... tests recommended by the incumbent
"haves" ... yea, that sounds REAL fair ... like the fox
guarding the henhouse.

> >the same sort
> >of "not in my sandbox" attitude that prompts so many
> >PCTAs to insist the such a ridiculous artificial barrier
> >to entry into the HF bands "must be maintained."
>
> Nope. Can you cite anything more recent than 1936 that talks
> about it being necessary to control or limit the number of hams or
> the growth of ham radio? I know of nothing in that vein from any
credible
> source, pro- or anti-code test.

Read r.r.a.p ... you'll find virtually countless passages from PCTAs
about how "code tests are what keeps 'the lids' out." (where 'lids'
are clearly "anyone who isn't interested in becoming real good at
Morse" ...)

> You're actually missing the best argument by focusing on the wrong
things,
> Carl. The FCC thought 13 wpm was a good idea in 1936 - that's
obvious. The
> point to argue is that this isn't 1936, and while code skill is a
good thing to
> have, it's not the same necessity as in 1936.

I don't see code skill as being necessary at all today. I won't
disagree that it may have been in 1936 ... but making the
test arbitrarily harder "just to keep people out" was, IMHO,
a very BAD public policy decision.

> >Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur
operator's
> >license than it was ten years ago." So, again, it seems that the
> >"haves"
> >simply wanted to keep the "have-nots" out of "their (the haves')
> >sandbox."
>
> Nope. They wanted to be sure that everyone had the necessary
qualifications.

Yet the problems you allege were technical in nature .... how did
an artificial code barrier "solve" that problem? ... we all know that
there are people who can do Morse real fast who are technical
idiots ...

> >> The problem was that getting a license was so easy that huge
> >> numbers of newcomers were raising havoc - on the bands
> >> and with other services.
> >
> >Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur
operator's
> >license than it was ten years ago." And "The total number of
licensed
> >amateur operators has remained relatively constant during the past
two
> >years." Sorry ... still having difficulty being naive enough to
buy
> >that this was a "benevolant move for the benefit of all."
>
> I don't think you would ever accept any argument for code testing of
any kind
> at any time in history.

Surprise ... I would acknowledge that a Morse test was almost
certainly a reasonable and valid requirement in 1936 ... what
I OBJECT to is the idea of using silly, arbitrary Morse requirements
as a "filter" solely to "control the population."

[snipped the rest, just because the XYL says it's dinner time ...]

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHv+YJe+N6+q84HiEQLAcQCfbs6wYQp7M3CTu5KXalZaTCkEaDEAn2Uu
55Fkg9Rn9m6CUsh5gvNpY5m0
=ToSC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

6112. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:35:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7BFF9B.8BAF0619@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35723

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>I think it's sad that so many long-time

> hams are essentially clueless about anything newer than
> a 6146.

What's sad is the likes of you who speak out of both sides of the mouth.
Who
immediately succumb to Microphoneitis while disparaging longtime hams like
me and
Larry who are the ones doing digital radio ON THE AIR, not in some lab at
work like you.

6113. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:39:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C008E.C82F138B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35724

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7BC0CB.66347132@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Nope. Can you cite anything more recent than 1936 that talks
> > > about it being necessary to control or limit the number of hams or
> > > the growth of ham radio? I know of nothing in that vein from any
> credible
> > > source, pro- or anti-code test.
> > >
> > > You're actually missing the best argument by focusing on the wrong
> things,
> > > Carl. The FCC thought 13 wpm was a good idea in 1936 - that's obvious.
> The
> > > point to argue is that this isn't 1936, and while code skill is a good
> thing to
> > > have, it's not the same necessity as in 1936.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Typical for Carl. He lets the years of accumulated bile corrode his
> common sense
> > into mush.Wonder where he'd be now if he had "just done it" years ago.
>
> So, as usual, you can't come up with any type of argument to counter what
> Carl posted, so you resort to smartass remarks. You're a bigger troll than
> what you call Cecil.

Don't bother looking now, Dipstick, but I was responding to Jim's remarks,
which are right on the money. For your enlightenment, Carl had attempted to
trash me far
more than I ever could do to him. Butt out. Or get your head out.

6114. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:41:57 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FiTe8.941$106.51234@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan, as we can see, someone already got their panties in a knot. The real problem (at least as I see it) is that years ago (I don't want to reveal my age, but I was first licensed in 1962), transmitters and receivers were often two seperate entities. Today, most rigs are transceivers - whether VHF/UFH HTs, mobile rigs, or HF rigs. Personally, I can't see spending $300 or so for a receiver, only to have to shell out 800 plus for a transceiver when I get my ticket. The answer lies in funding for the FCC. I doubt many (at least here, in Rochester, NY) get away with using HTs for very long. I can fire up a repeater and give the control op a shout and invariably he answers. The repeaters are watched, and it isn't difficult to spot someone who doesn't know what is happening (even assuming they know how to set the sub-audible tones). I worry more about the manufacturers who make the 'export' radios that can cover amateur bands and make them available to anyone. If memory serves me correctly, Radio Shack discontinued their original 10 meter rig as it was too easy to modify for 11. There may be a few problems, but let's not throw the baby out with the bath water. You have a valid point, but I would not try and attack every manufacturer - and certainly, I am not opposed to those who buy a rig to listen and learn (again, buying a receiver followed by a bigger purchase might be a bit much for some folks).

73 from Rochester and I'll check your URLs
Jim AA2QA

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>
> No License? No Radio!
> http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
>
> Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> http://www.eham.net/survey/
> (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
>
> This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
the

> time to review it, and consider taking part.
>
> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ
>
>
>
>

6115. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 21:47:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C0285.F0C48D0A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35726

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Note to Dick: Don't gloat too much, because I believe
> that after Ed reads my reply

So who's gloating? You're almost a Greek tragedy. Anyone who thinks that Morse skill was ever considered to be the
" penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
total worth of an amateur" is somewhat psycho. YOU never believed that, did you??? Morse is nothing more or less than a skill that gives a more universal
capability to a ham radio operator's toolbox. Got it?

6116. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:00:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5h0cj0ocb@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35728

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C008E.C82F138B@worldnet.att.net...

> Don't bother looking now, Dipstick, but I was responding to Jim's
remarks,
> which are right on the money. For your enlightenment, Carl had attempted
to
> trash me far
> more than I ever could do to him. Butt out. Or get your head out.

Yep. That'll really win over newcomers.

6117. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:17:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C09A5.D8327C42@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35727

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Read r.r.a.p ... you'll find virtually countless passages from PCTAs
> about how "code tests are what keeps 'the lids' out." (where 'lids'
> are clearly "anyone who isn't interested in becoming real good at
> Morse" ...)
>

WRONG,WRONG,WRONG!!!.Your "clearly" is clearly fogged in, with zero visibility. One of the factors proven by passing a code test, besides the skill
to communicate using radio's most basic mode, is that one is dedicated to investing whatever it takes into his ham radio license. LIDS who are eager to invest this energy and dedicate the time and -yes- WORK that learning and developing Morse skill requires of most people are rare, though not
totally absent. I know, and have long known, quite a number of good hams, non-
lids, who do not operate CW and have not done so since licensing. I don't consider them lids, in fact quite the contrary.

Your misperceptions are legendary.

>
>
> I don't see code skill as being necessary at all today.

Only the skills that YOU believe to be necessary are necessary today.
Right!

>

>
> > >Yet, it was "many times more difficult to secure an amateur
> operator's
> > >license than it was ten years ago." So, again, it seems that the
> > >"haves"
> > >simply wanted to keep the "have-nots" out of "their (the haves')
> > >sandbox."
>

The ONLY factor separating your "haves" and the "have nots" was
and is a code test which the applicant was required to copy only 20%
of what was sent. What a vast demarcation line! You
state it as though it was the difference between royalty and being a
pauper!
Did you *really* find it so difficult to learn the code to 13wpm?

> >
> > Nope. They wanted to be sure that everyone had the necessary
> qualifications.
>
> Yet the problems you allege were technical in nature .... how did
> an artificial code barrier "solve" that problem? ... we all know that
> there are people who can do Morse real fast who are technical
> idiots ...
>

Sure, the military trained them by the thousands, and many later became
hams,
who were not technically trained individuals and so, on their own, learned
only
enough to get the license and then to get along as practicing hams, many
at the
General class since they lacked advanced technical skills.. Just like you
didn't learn
Morse code adequately, so had to .... you know.

6118. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:39:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226173957.18513.00000511@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35729

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>W1RFI wrote:

>> Note to Dick: I disagreed with Carl.

>Hooray!!!

Just makin' sure I won't have to read "Ed always defends Carl" in some future post. Your memory of what I defend and what I take issue with has appeared to be very skewed of late.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6119. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:45:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226174510.18513.00000512@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35730

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>One of the factors proven by passing a code test, besides the
>skill
>to communicate using radio's most basic mode, is that one is dedicated to
>investing whatever it takes into his ham radio license.

In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any FCC regulation.

In the second place, if a Morse code test really served that sort of purpose, we could administer it to potential judges, Senators, school teachers and a whole slew of other so they can "prove their worth."

It is interesting you feel that memorizing over a thousand questions in trivial, but memorizing 26 letters, 10 number, 4 punctuation signs and a few prosigns is "proving that one is dedicated."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6120. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:46:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226174620.18513.00000513@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35731

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Good for your! Now please stay on track and help us stifle his ugly trolling
>nature.

Am I allowed to help stifle everything I consider to be ugly on rrap?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6121. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:47:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226174748.18513.00000514@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35732

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Why don't we just leave them to you since you think you're so damn smart?

Unless Cecil happens to be with you at the time, something I consider to be rather unlikely, for quite a few different reasons, that is not going to be a workable solution.

What will you do if Cecil is not there?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6122. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:50:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175011.18513.00000515@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35733

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/lightning.html

>I *knew* I could count on Ed to provide the reference :-)

Well, seeing as Al and I talk about a lot of the things that go on the page, I usually remember that something might be there.

I would say that most of the more definative QST technical articles that have been done over the past 10 years are available for download from the ARRL TIS pages. Some are members only, but all pages have some articles in the "public" site and those that Al and I felt are related to safety, or helping new hams get started in ham radio are also not in the members-only area.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

6123. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:52:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175229.18513.00000516@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35734

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> And a note for Dick: I disagreed with Cecil.

>Ed: If you pay close attention you'll find that you would naturally do that
>often, if he
>keeps to his usual track.

Are you telling me that now you believe that I don't "always" side with Cecil?
If you now remember that Cecil and I have had a number of disagreements over
the years, now that I have jogged your memory, I won't have to keep pointing it
out to you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6124. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:54:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175453.18513.00000517@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35735

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
>> >subject at hand.
>>
>> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words
>that
>> taught me new things.
>
> And I'd dare say you took the time and interest to stop, close your mouth,
>listen
>and learn, rather than just reject it all out of hand, and not insisting you
>already knew
>all about it all. As TITs does.

The FCC is not yet issuing 1X4 call signs, Dick.

But now I am curious. Kim, have you read some of my posts and rejected everything I had to say out of hand and assumed you already knew everything about what I was saying, or did you try to learn from some of them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6125. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:56:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175623.18513.00000519@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35736

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Here's your chance to repay that debt by clueing in our Kim. I'd be
>curious if, during your period of unenlightenment, you went about
>demonstrating your lack of knowledge or if you simply realized there
>much you didn't know and sought out the advice of those who did.

I am sure I remember that I politely paid attention to my elders and sought knowledge eagerly. I am sure my elders saw my behaviour for an entirely different point of view. My parents are both gone, or I would ask them. Would it help if I asked my sister, who still remembers me when I was 14.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6126. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:57:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175721.18513.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35737

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>Your twisting of the argument from the usefulness of CW during
>emergencies to mandatory code testing is a wee bit perplexing. Do you
>have an agenda or something?

Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6127. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 22:59:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226175903.18513.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35738

From: Keith nospamplease@newsguy.com

>>The FCC has already said that it will not pre-empt ham antennas. To extend
>>that request to include ham antennas, but antennas of all types, is, IMHO,
even
>>less likely to get FCC approval.

> I'm not talking about the FCC, I'm talking about Congress or even the
>courts changing this law.

My mistake. I will leave it to Phil to predict what the courts might do with a
"freedom in my own home" sort of challenge.

I don't think any of us can predict what Congress might do. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6128. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:05:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226180502.18513.00000523@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35739

From: "KD6SRI" kd6sri@yahoo.com

> Retailers should NOT be required to verify if someone has a valid amateur
>radio license.

I see a number of downsides to this. In the first place, the 10-meter only rigs are really not very attractive to the lawbreakers. The "freeband" rulebreakers seem to want rigs that go from 24 to 32 MHz or so. The FCC already has a list of those rigs that are "10-meter" rigs, but whose design obviously and deliberately included an easy way to get them to transmit out of band (ie, take the jumper plug out of the microphone bag and install it).

The dealers selling these rigs already are breaking the laws against selling or marketing non-Certificated radios, so making a law requiring them to ask for a license at the time of sale would probably not stop that already illegal sale.

And, frankly, if the "show your license" approach were in effect, some of these rulebreakers would get ham licenses for that very purpose. Although they would be legal in their operation on 10 meters, I have to suspect that many of those who deliberately flout the law by "freebanding" would be the law-abiding 10-meter ops that we would all like to see in our ranks.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6129. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:08:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226180807.18513.00000525@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35740

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I looked them over pretty close, though that was 25 years ago. I found them
>to
>be not nearly as exact as the advertising suggested, and in some ways they
>were
>more of a study guide than the current question pools. He wasn't able to get
>exact questions and answers on a large percentage of the questions, and often
>what was given was keywords to watch for in answers to certain questions in
>certain subject areas and in some cases not much information at all was
>available.
>He did continuously keep working to improve their accuracy, I understand.

Well, I'll be. Dick and I agree on something. :-)

Note for Cecil: I agree with Dick, so don't go posting that I always disagree
with whatever Dick says!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6130. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:24:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C1910.188F40A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35744

N2EY wrote:
> Ed, is reading the 4 page study guide the ONLY thing you did to prepare for
> the Novice exam? Did you never read any other radio or electronic books,
> magazines or articles? No Elmer, no QST, no Handbook, no library books?
> No other source of radio information other than the 4 page study guide in
> the LM?

Studying the 3 page study guide in 1951 was the only thing I did to prepare for
the Novice exam. I didn't have access to any other radio or electronic books,
magazines or articles. The local TV repairman was a ham who told me how to
order the LM, but he was too busy with his business to assist any more.
I had no other source of radio information other than the 3 page study guide
in the LM.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6131. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:25:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs5njn3.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35741

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 21:50:22 -0800, Keith wrote:

> So basically until the association tells a person not to use a TV
>antenna for any other reason they are free to do what they please with
>it. A person can do it until the Association says something. Well that
>should be great news for those that also have their FM stereo hooked
>up to the antenna they use for TV.

Yup. The beef is with the Association and its CC&Rs/rules/by-laws,
not with "the government".

> Like I said, the law is a great loop hole unless someone in the
>association moves for civil legal action against a person that has
>also hooked up a Stereo, shortwave or any other type of radio receiver
>to the antenna used for TV.

Ditto.

> If you use it for cb or ham radio transmission I think that if you
>cause RFI then you will probably have to disconnect the antenna from
>the ham rig or you can fight it out in the courts. If the association
>doesn't find out you shouldn't have any problems with a dual use of
>the TV antenna.

Until they find out, but then the FCC won't be on your side.

>The congress and associations know that if there is a ham radio
>exemption allowed their is going to be a ham that will insist on a 75
>foot tower

Why stop at 75 feet? If I have enough bucks to purchase, install,
and insure one properly I should be entitled to unlimited height.

>and will fight it out in the courts.

The umpire will decide what "reasonable" in "reasonable accomodation" is.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6132. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:25:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs5ny84.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35742

On 26 Feb 2002 09:35:37 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Now, if you want to include it to include receive-only antennas of
>all types, you might have a slim chance, but ARRL will not have a dog
>in that fight.

Actually, the ARRL will have a dog in that fight but one of
different spots. Segregating out "receiving antennas of all types"
is opening thr door to an inference that there is something
evil/wrong/unpleasant about transmitting antennas, ham antennas in
particular, and will result in that Catch-22 of an antenna that is
pre-empted for reception but not for transmission.

We'r there now - why go deeper into that cave?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6133. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:25:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gs5ojw5.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 35743

On 26 Feb 2002 13:10:04 GMT, N2EY wrote about the Bash books:

>The big hoopla was that the books so closely matched the exam - allegedly.

The big hoopla was about Dick "graduating" from asking exiting
examinees what they remembered about the questions in general, which
was bad enough, to sending people in wity specific tasks to memorize
specific questions and answers.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6134. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:27:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C19FC.FB6678B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> Dan, as we can see, someone already got their panties in a knot. The real
> problem (at least as I see it) is that years ago (I don't want to reveal my
> age, but I was first licensed in 1962), transmitters and receivers were
> often two seperate entities.

In 1951, I bought a Globetrotter transmitter before I received my ham
license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6135. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:33:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C1B66.6667FDAD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35746

W1RFI wrote:
> Note for Cecil: I agree with Dick, so don't go posting that I always disagree
> with whatever Dick says!

I recognize that Dick is not wrong 100% of the time. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6136. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:50:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rbVe8.35626$KX7.1317424175@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35747

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7AAC0C.B0C4E3EB@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database.
> >
> > Agreed, I recall you saying something about a tar-paper shack. Home
Depot
> > has a great video about plastic siding if you ever get over that way.
>
> These new fangled notions are slow to catch on in these parts. The
> nearest Home Depot is about 45 miles away. I used the money I saved on
> antennas.

Why don't I doubt that? Wife still using that old washboard down by the
crick?

> > > I've never commented
> > > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only
stated
> > > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, I really didn't need to know a whole lot about DX when I got
started.
> > Like you , I was the DX. And being the DX, I worked a lot of DX. So
sorry.
>
> I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
> didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
> encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
> wasting electricity.

Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get over
it.

>You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.

No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
DXer that you are. Right?

And that it was N0iMD whom you thought didn't know anything about DX.

Is this correct?

> I maintain that I only
> commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license class.

In which case, your assertion is wrong.

> > Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6 daily,
like
> > he was in KP4-land.
>
> I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't handle".
> I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it or
> not.

Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he verified that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned that I used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.

Your disdain to my reference of FR6 was obvious. Perhaps you just didn't like that FR6 Op, the Frenchman that verified that you were working other frenchmen out of band, Frenchmen in general, or me working FR6 so easily. But you definitely didn't like it. Only you can decide why.

Oh yeah, Malaysia was a cakewalk and the JT1 called me. ;^)

> > You just need a few more years on the noisy side of the
> > pileup, and you'll lose your snobbishness. Well, maybe you won't.
>
> Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> operated overseas on the ham bands.

You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few more years on the noisy side will be necessary.

> What you call snobbishness, others
> would call experience.

Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and not just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?

> I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> the other day

Do they have 6m privileges?

and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks.
> Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I
> should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX side
> of the Omni VI +.

Of course not Dave, just attenuate your disdain for any other hams, regardless of license class, having fun with what you consider to be your personal DX domain.

What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).

73, Brian

6137. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-26 23:55:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DfVe8.35631$n9.1317979205@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35748

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c7afa4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >
> > > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes
no
> > > >farther
> > > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode
for
> > > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in
> recent
> > > >> disasters.
> > >
> > > >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> > > >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> > > >little if anything about its use.
> > >
> > > Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters instead
of
> > > calling her conclusion "juvenile."
> >
> > To what end, Ed? It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic was
> > generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use in
> > emergencies. Kim seems to think that the only emergencies that take
> > place will be on the same order of the WTC bombing. She believes that
> > because she is ignorant of the use of the mode, everyone is. If you want
> > to play games with Kim, YOU fill in the blanks. I'm still of the
> > opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of
> > information.
> >
> > Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > subject at hand.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> READ: I can't come up with a thing.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Brian to the rescue.

I'm sure some of those FD repeaters ID'd in morris code.

Everyone feel better now?

6138. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:12:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226191250.18513.00000544@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35749

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>N2EY wrote:
>> Ed, is reading the 4 page study guide the ONLY thing you did to prepare for
>> the Novice exam? Did you never read any other radio or electronic books,
>> magazines or articles? No Elmer, no QST, no Handbook, no library books?
>> No other source of radio information other than the 4 page study guide in
>> the LM?
>
>Studying the 3 page study guide in 1951 was the only thing I did to prepare
>for
>the Novice exam. I didn't have access to any other radio or electronic books,
>magazines or articles. The local TV repairman was a ham who told me how to
>order the LM, but he was too busy with his business to assist any more.
>I had no other source of radio information other than the 3 page study guide
>in the LM.

I had some interest in electronics before I even thought that I could become a ham. I had read some Popular Electronics and had built a crystal-radio kit when I was about 10 years old. I don't think anyone should be surprised that an interest in electronics was a precursor to an interest in ham radio.

Hub, W1BNB was my Elmer. He bought me the study guide, I assumed it contained everything I needed to know, just like it said, and don't recall asking many, if any, questions. I found the material to be easy enough. When I passed, I felt that I had really done something special. Hub agreed.

Not once did some grumpy old timer chastize me for having been lazy and not passing the same test he did to enter ham radio, with all of those schematics and a 13 wpm code test. Had I run across more than a handful of hams like that, I would have quickly decided that I had enough of that sort of thing.

Unfortunately today, though there are still not more than a handful of hams whose main focus is critical, the internet seems to give them a forum that never existed in my day, giving them an apparent voice all out of proportion to their relative lack of importance to the overall big picture of ham radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6139. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:17:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226191721.18513.00000546@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 35750

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>The level of difficulty does not seem to be too
>>high
>>for adults, as can be evidenced by the growth of Amateur Radio.
>
>One word: computers.

I don't think there is a 'one word' answer to the question about why people are entering ham radio as adults and not as teenagers.

Why would computers not be as fascinating to a 25 year old as a 15 year old?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6140. Re: Questions RE offical ham observers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:31:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_NVe8.35645$531.1321592042@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35651

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226044207.16980.00000531@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Birdman67" Birdman67@wi.rr.com
>
> >Second, I received a notice that I did not ID for 40 min during a QSO. I
> >don't doubt it is true. I was wondering why the observer did not let me
> >know after say 20 or 25 minutes that I needed to ID, Does the word
> >"observer" mean just that he/she observes but does not participate.
>
> Cecil can get out his dictionary, but yes, the OOs do not confront rules
> violators on the air. If they did, some of the differences of opinion
would
> turn into a real argument and that would not be very good for the Amateur
Radio
> Service.
>
> >Third, I would be very happy to get any information on being a observer.
>
> The OO is an appointed position in the ARRL Field Organization. See:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/org/
>
> for more information about this and other volunteer positions.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, yes, its much more tactful to let someone know via postcard, rather than confront them on the air. Receipients should consider it a courtesy notification and not some kind of permanent mark on their record. Nearly 100% of hams will accept it at face value and simply improve their operating, much like Birdman has done. I think only flagrant or repeated violations ever get beyond the section OOC. I'm sure HQ has better things to do than wring their hands over a ham that id'd after 12 minutes instead of 10.

BTW, the actual on-the-air "corrections" that I've witnessed couldn't have been an OO. Big, big, disasters.

Also the OO has a name and callsign, and if you get a postcard he can be called upon explain what they heard. If he was wrong its not likely he'll hear the same infraction again, right?

Most OOs don't publicize their volunteer work. If they did, every infraction ever heard anywhere would be reported to them to "take care of,"

and they just don't have that kind of authority. The program relies on the ham to accept responsibility for their actions

Also, you don't have to worry that the OO will blab who they sent postcards to. That's unprofessional, and they want to keep a low profile anyway.

73, Brian

6141. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193502.10663.00000108@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35655

In article <OIPe8.413$gK2.38492@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>The object is not exclusion but education. Removal of the Morse
>requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is the
>only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a damned
>thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the Amateur
>Service. I suspect it will have the effect of making it far more a
>talking shop than a think tank where fuzz like 'legacy modes' gets kicked
>around like it really meant something.

Thanks for an attempt at discussing the subject rather than individuals.

I will take up some points on "exclusion" and "education."

As it is today, a US amateur radio license is for BOTH operator and station. The present regulations require every licensee to operate within the technical specification boundaries established for transmitters. This has somewhat recently been expanded to include EM radiation levels in the immediate space surrounding an antenna connected to a transmitter.

The skills of morse modes pertain solely to operating. There is no viable connection of operator skills to technical regulations regarding a station transmitter signal purity or to generated EM fields.

An emphasis on morse modes as established by the older regulations regarding morse rate versus class, with classes having graduated operating privileges, puts undue emphasis on operation. That made importance of transmitter signal purity and EM field generation secondary. Since the preponderance of radio amateur stations are in residential areas, this secondary importance posed a risk factor in everything from interference to other amateurs and radio services to possible harm to neighbors and those living in the same residence containing the amateur station.

By all photographic evidence in amateur radio publications and the rare item of amateur radio sales figures in EIA market information, the majority of amateur licensees use manufactured transmitters. This can cause those users to downplay or even ignore the technical signal purity regulations which pertain to all licensees. This can be interpreted (in the most extreme case) as disobediance of law. In most cases this is not disobediance but an undue confidence in the manufacturer OR a lack of technical skills and equipment access to adequately confirm that their transmitters are operating lawfully. No morse mode skills can substitute for confirming signal purity or

EM field regulations.

FCC regulations have always allowed US radio amateurs considerable freedom in station equipment. Transmitters may be manufacturered or home-built. That freedom, rather absolute as to freedoms, is far too often taken for granted. That freedom is also used as a rationale to deliberately or inadvertently ignore lawful technical regulations on transmitter signal purity. There has been very little, almost miniscule "educational" information available in amateur radio publications regarding measurement or measurement skills needed to comply with the law when compared with the relative masses of "educational" information on morse mode methods, learning, skills, jargon, lore in those same publications.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this emphasis on operating skills versus technical skills is that a "sea change" should have been done to make ALL amateur transmitters manufactured, type-accepted equipment and forbid use of home-built transmitters.

Another freedom also taken for granted is that the FCC has NOT required US radio amateurs to use a particular mode within a choice of modes as allocated on any amateur radio band. It has been several decades since there was a requirement to present proof of past operation as a requirement of license renewal. The FCC does NOT require exclusive use of morse modes over other allocated modes and each licensee has the option of individual preference within that allowed by their license class. However, the FCC requires only one mode demonstrated skill to be a first-license test requirement in two of the three US amateur radio license classes.

While it is, or should be well-known to others, a morse mode test for licensing is a common-agreement treaty matter established by the ITU-R. The FCC is constrained by the USA adminstration (as member of the ITU-R) to maintain the code test.

There is nothing technical to qualify morse modes as a viable test in regards to technical regulatory requirements. On-off keying was first used in radio for no other reason than it was the only practical method of transmitting any information by early, primitive radio equipment. On-off keying was already known and established for some time on landline telegraphy when the first true radio circuits were demonstrated in 1896.

That morse modes were tested at all in all radio operator licensing of 1912 in the US has absolutely NO bearing on the efficacy of manual telegraphy. Since it was the ONLY method used by everyone at the time, morse mode testing was simply practical.

The continued requirement for morse mode testing as a radio operator license requirement has been sustained largely through political pressure exerted by those who personally favored its use or the continuation of the morse test (for any given reason)

in amateur radio. There is NO technical qualification for morse mode testing 90 years after the first radio operator tests.

The choice for amateur radio then seems to be:
1. Retain morse mode testing and reduce amateur freedoms by requiring type-accepted transmitters.
2. Increase amateur freedom by removal of the morse tests.
3. Permit continued over-strong influence of old standards retention by a minority for the exclusive enjoyment of a minority.

6142. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193503.10663.00000109@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35652

In article <3c7af01f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
>news:7Mre8.15947$NL5.2338143271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
>> news:3c783dd9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
>> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > news:3C78361A.3CE0FA37@earthlink.net...
>> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > And I thought that you and Tanzania Dave decided that Tech Plussers
>> > weren't
>> > > > DXers of any sort, anytime, anyplace! (except when it suits your
>> > argument)
>> > > > Your nose needs a wee bit o' whittlin', my little Pinocchio.
>> > >
>> > > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
>> > > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database. I've never
>commented
>> > > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only
>stated
>> > > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
>> > >
>> > > Dave K8MN
>> >
>> > Yeah, Brian ;) Didn't you know that you tread on a sacred circle?
>> > Sheesh...
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>>
>> Kim, perhaps I should wash Dave's feet or kiss his ring. If I don't adore
>> him I'm crap. Oh well.
>>
>> DXing wasn't about being known or famous or on 25,000 hamshack walls. It
>> was just pure fun. I guess that make me unknowledgeable about it.
>>
>> When Jim, KH2D, Joe, N3EMA/KH2, and I would have a local roundtable going,
>> there was always a european or a hundred wanting a signal report. No
>> greenstamps required. Buro was fine. WMPY kept me supplied with
>beautiful
>> cards. So sorry.
>>
>> 73, Brian

>>
>
>'S ok, Brian. Dave is one of the bubbas. You know what that is, right?
>It's kind of like "if you're a Mason and I'm a Mason, we're both OK" kind of
>bubbas...but then the *real* Masons emerge and put a much better image on
>the group.

Some masons build stone walls, hiding nothing, yet wish to
stand on them and proclaim their glories within. <shrug> :-)

6143. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193504.10663.00000110@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35654

In article <3C7BBF3A.32AA3833@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
>> >is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
>> >total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
>> >has ALWAYS been BS.
>>
>> It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was
considered
>> current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test
served a
>> valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in
commercial
>> and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that the FCC
>> initiated and maintained the Morse test.
>
> And that use of Morse persisted far beyond the time when later technologies
were
>available to supersede it. As an example radiotelegraphy was in nationwide use
as
>a means of handling interstate police message traffic well into the second
half of the
>twentieth century. The last vestiges of that net were deactivated in 1972.
>When I hired on to a state public safety communications position in early 1965
I
>was tested for Morse code proficiency, since the radiotelegraph equipment was
still
>in place as a backup system although a Model 28ASR whirling teletype system
had
>just been installed for in-state traffic handling and the radiotelegraph
station then
>handled only interstate relays. And in 1975 I was a part of the technical crew
that
>removed all the radiotelegraph gear from the state HQ station. That gear was
>very impressive, and I wish I had the foresight to take some photos. The
station
>consisted of two large Wilcox transmitters running 450TH tubes in the final
>and several Hammarlund receivers with dipole antennas on several frequencies.
>I suspect that my exposure to this system has something to do with my firm

>insistence that CW in ham radio isn't just some fad mode, rather is very capable
>of serious work when capable operators are available. It served very well for a LONG time.
>
> There is one particular non-ham reader who posts here who refuses to believe
>that there actually was a police radiotelegraph net at work so recently. Of course
>he has no idea what he's talking about, but instead insists that anyone who says
>it's so is wrong.

In the original thread of this "state police have used CW" intermittent rationalizing,
Carroll stated "the LAPD was part of this network." I then went personally to an LAPD
division station and made inquiries regarding this assertion. I was told, both by a PR
dutied officer and another from the Technical Center (via telephone from the division
station's own phone) that no such communications mode was used in earlier times or even recent times. The current modes in use are voice telephone, data (both on
leased lines and through modems), imagery (facsimile, several formats including higher grades than common in personal computers) in the station; on radio there is
both single-channel and trunked voice, data (car-to-station with linkage to statewide
databases of several agencies), and multi-channel microwave. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has freeways and unincorporated County areas under its jurisdiction and has similar communications.

In the aftermath of this original exchange, I gave a toll-free number for LAPD Public
Relations. They are a courteous organization, eager to give out information.

Much later I posted websites containing a wealth of information, primarily technical
on both the LAPD and CHP communications by radio. Those websites still exist as
do many others throughout the nation, Canada, and a few sites around the world. None of those sites contain any reference to "CW" or any OOK-CW modes in use even though many of the sites are indicated as being maintained by radio amateurs.

If there is no evidence to indicate something existed, there is no reason to believe
it did.

6144. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193506.10663.00000111@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35653

In article <20020226072955.03170.00000646@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
>>Because it's based on the elitist attitude that Morse skill
>>is the penultimate skill/knowledge factor that defines the
>>total worth of an amateur ... that is BS now and IMHO it
>>has ALWAYS been BS.
>
>It certainly was not bullstuff during the years when Morse code was
>considered current commercial radio technology. In that era, the Morse code test >served a valuable function, helping to self-train Morse operators for use in >commercial and military radio communications. That was, IMHO, the reason that >the FCC initiated and maintained the Morse test.

Other honest opinions (opposing an IMHO) include statements within the body of a Part of Title 47 CFR as simply generalities (sometimes called "standard boilerplate" phrases) of a general political nature. Such things exist in many other areas of regulation and are not unknown.

The FCC did not exist prior to 1934. Three other predecessor radio-regulating agencies existed with the first year of federal licensing of all radio operators being 1912. In 1912 the general state of the art of ALL radio equipment can only be described as primitive. The ONLY method of transmitting any information in the beginning of radio was by means of on-off keying codes. In that beginning of radio, it made practical sense to test for the ONLY practical means (used by all radio services) to radio communicate.

The inertia inherent in politically-motivated conditions and regulations seems to have kept morse mode testing for an amateur radio license for HF privileges for 90 years. Such inertia is not a viable regulatory reason for continuation of anything for so long. The FCC realizes this and has made public statements to that effect as long ago as 1990. They are constrained by an international agreement which may or may not vote to effect a "sea change" in all six parts of ITU-R S25.

"Ready reserves" of our national defense organization are the National Guards, Active Reserves, Inactive Reserves, and some State Guards (not all states have those). Only the first three have direct command and control possible

under the federal government. There is NOTHING in federal planning visible to the public (nearly all of it is so visible) that indicates radio amateurs are somehow, even vaguely a part of some "reserve" group specializing in some skill.

Some are confused as to other possible interpretations of standard boilerplate political phrasing...especially so when none of those statements (in Part 97.1) reference morse codes specifically.

6145. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193509.10663.00000112@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35657

In article <3C7B2A6B.5D1A889B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>Look up the years I was in Guinea-Bissau, Len. Your statement is then,
>that a country is important only because of what it exports. In that
>case, Portugal isn't very important. What will we ever do with all of
>that butter, the vinho verde and those mounds of olives? Aside from
>that, whoever claimeed great importance for the country. I've already
>explained to you what was going on in the country and I've explained
>what the United States embassy was involved in. You clearly decided
>that no matter what I wrote, you would dismiss it.

A personal declaration of a country is not bona fide evidence such as
found in descriptions of countries in either The World Almanac or the
"CIA Factbook" (a non-agency Almanac-style document that is free
on the Internet, of printing cost fee if desired on paper). Such has no
verification as to its importance in world or African socio-political
affairs as has been detailed by major journalistic services. All the
major newspapers, wire services, documentaries, and many historical
reference works do NOT give a small country such importance as you
have indicated.

While the work of the Department of State is important and vital to
the USA, the entire department has been subject to much critical
scrutiny and some negative criticsm in the last half century. That is
painfully obvious from the same public references given above. They
are not sacrosanct nor noble nor pure nor pioneers in much of
anything except their task of being part of US foreign policy.

>No Len. I didn't pioneer amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau. There was a
>very active Cuban op in the country a year or so before my arrival and
>there was an active Ukrainian fellow. Erik SM0AGD has made several
>trips to the country both pre and post independence and an Italian group
>operated from the Bijagos Islands shortly after my arrival. There is no
>organized amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau though there is a fully
>equipped club station. People would seemingly prefer to eat than become
>radio amateurs.

The origin of the original thread involved a discussion of method
of control-command ("order-wire") of a State Department tele-

printer radio circuit. The claim was made by Heil that CW (mode) was somehow better ("neater" in the descriptor used then) than communicating in the circuit's assigned teleprinter mode.

Heil then tried to gloss over his rationalization by first stating that teleprinters "had to be synchronized," then changed that to "schedules established for certain communications" and eventually to disregard of everything and attempting to smokescreen everything under some cloak of secrecy (as in encryption of communications used in this exchange). NONE of that has any bearing on "being the only ham in Guinea-Bisseau" or even on amateur radio operation anywhere and is no reason for explanation of morse codes as being vital or necessary in amateur radio lincens testing..

>It is simply that you've as much as called me a liar for describing what
>was used. I've not ascribed any undue importance on my work or upon the
>country of Guinea-Bissau. Let me assure that it is not too late for
>you. You may kiss my ass any time at all.

In the original exchange I called the alleged method of order-wire use as "dumb" in comparison to what commercial and military teleprinter radio circuit operators used thirty years prior to the stated 1980s time period. It is my contention that such "reasons" stated for CW superiority in command-control of teleprinter circuits are still dumb...and that the original statement was simply a specious, unvalidated, unreferencible "State Department procedure" as claimed.

>I can assure you that the Department of State does not make public much
>of its communications procedures, equipment and the like. Since you
>already know of the classified nature of the work, you'd not likely see
>anything written up in an industry journal.

Government agencies' contract awards, cancellations, and equipment used frequently appear in industry journals. Sometimes they become cleared public news given out by the agencies themselves.

One such instance is the RCA Corporation RACES (Random Access Card Extraction System), a data storage machine using very large magnetic cards to store masses of information such as teleprinter messages. The Department of State purchased two of them in late 1960s, installed them in DC or nearby in the very early 1970s, allowed public disclosure of them "storing an entire month's worth of message information from the entire State Department communications." That same PR release stated that one RACES was main, the other a backup. Several dozen RACES were sold and used to civilian and government organizations at the same time, all the same and NOT classified in any way other than conventional trade secrets.

While I did not work directly on the RACES project at RCA EASD, that group was next to my group's lab area in Van Nuys, CA.

Knowing the storage capacity of a RACES and the amount of monthly message traffic of the third-largest US Army radio station in the mid-1950s, one RACES holding an entire content of State Department monthly messaging could not hold all of the monthly message traffic at ADA. The technical conclusion was therefore that State did not have near as large a communications capability in the 1970s compared to the US Army in the 1950s let alone entire US military. That conclusion could be drawn by anyone who collected publicly-cleared information.

There are many, many documents which have been cleared for public viewing, even document purchase through the GPO. One like the latter is what I have, a June 1967 USN Electronic Systems Command training and reference manual, "Principles of Telegraphy (Teletypewriter)," NAVSHIPS 0967-255-0010. Not only does it outline procedures and technical details for both wireline and radio teleprinter communications, the first chapter includes a history of ALL telegraphy that predated teletypewriters and the manual "morse telegraphy."

>The fact that you continue
>this "snow job" crud in a silly effort to dismiss my statements only
>makes you look like an old fool.

Invalid. The USN document does not reference any use of manual morse telegraphy as any sort of "order-wire" for a teletypewriter circuit. Stating that such WAS done twenty years ago, not giving any references, then hiding referencibility under some cloak of secrecy is foolish. QED.

>My work in Guinea-Bissau wasn't the
>topic and you've only taken this tack as a diversion.

I only stated that "Guinea-Bisseau has a population of about 1.3 million and its chief exports are cashews and peanuts." I added that this former colony is not an important topic of news reporting from the general middle of Africa. Readers are welcome to verify all of that. None need know of Heil's important, classified work.

>Your problem is that you see anyone who won't kow-tow to you as an
>arrogant elitist. What ever gave you the idea that hams don't read
>material other than ham radio publications? Why, that is simply elitist
>and arrogant of you.

Invalid again. I merely raise some points with publicly-referencible sources of verification to dismiss a number of arrogant and elitist viewpoints in here in regards to keeping the morse code test for US amateur radio license classes having below-30-MHz privileges.

I am aware that Ed Hare, Carl Stevenson, Cecil Moore read material other than amateur radio publications for radio information because they have made those statements. There is a wealth of information about the entire world of radio AND that small part of it used by

radio amateurs. The easy way out seems to be using the ARRL as
the major source of information (Big Brother leads the way) or just
stating "Hams have always done code testing and always will."

Radio amateurs are not exclusive in radio. They must share the
EM spectrum, co-exist with other radio services physically and
politically (vying for regulatory allotment). Hiding behind the past,
reputations, tunnel-vision selective history, and unreferencible
claims is not a good attitude for maintaining an existance in the
radio world.

>Yeah, that "insider" thing must have set you up as quite the expert
>there for a while. I've gotten the short notes of acceptance from
>McMullen followed by checks as I have from CQ in the past. It gave me a
>warm, fuzzy "insider" kind of a feeling. Give those editors and
>publishers hell, Len. Oh--the ones you are complaining about--are they
>the ones who didn't accept your stuff for publication?

I am not complaining about anything but the usual slanted-in-favor-
of-CW output of the ARRL. Their policy is automatic-first-rights-
with-no-possibility-of-compensation-for-reprints-as-they-see-fit.
For that reason I've never submitted any work to the ARRL, any
publication. HAM RADIO magazine was more mainstream and
negotiable in its 22 years of existance as an independent.
Radio hobby publications are not my only venue for professional
writing that started in 1967.

>Right, Len. Ham radio is an avocation which can be enjoyed by anyone:
>old folks, children, bakers, gas station attendants, farmers,
>bankers,etc. In short, it can be enjoyed, apparently, by just about
>anyone but you.

Invalid. Another gratuitous insult from Heil. This is followed by
another...

>> >Did you have anything on amateur radio you'd like to say?
>>
>> Yes. It is my opinion that amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable
>> recreational activity that allows non-professionals to engage in the
>> fascinating technology of radio communications arts within the
>> narrow mode selections and frequency bands allocated by federal
>> agencies. It is supposed to be a social gathering point where
>> individuals can convene, make friends, share information, socialize
>> as other groups do for the sheer enjoyment of socializing.
>>
>> Not all AUTHORIZED radio amateurs seem to think so. Quite a
>> few seem to think that they are elite in radio, superior by
>> achievement, some kind of important national asset, vital and
>> valuable, fantasy "minutemen" available instantly to perform
>> "emergency communications" to save their community, nation,
>> and world from disaster. In short, self-styled supermen with an
>> ego fertilized by myth and legend originated by predecessor

>> self-professed supermen of the same kind.
>
>That's just a bunch of hooey grown in the fertile muck of your mind.
>Large numbers of radio amateurs give of their time and talents in
>traffic handling and emergency preparedness work. You are you to
>pooh-pooh their efforts?

"SOME" does not equate to Heil's claim of "large numbers." Heil
is one of the "some." QED "hooey," "fertile muck," etc.

Attempts to change original wordings is not an unknown device in
trying to win message points.

6146. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:35:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226193511.10663.00000113@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 35656

In article <3C7B2293.CCE7AC97@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>You have to be one of the most biggest fools I've ever encountered.
>You have demonstrated your ignorance of what I was doing and how I was
>doing it on several occasions. Not many continue to wear their
>ignorance like a badge after having been provided with information they
>lacked. You're a true gold medalist among repugnant geezers.

The original thread was begun about "CW being an order-wire on
a State Department RTTY circuit" as somehow being a justification
for maintaining a morse code test in amateur radio. When someone
pointed out that such procedures are not done in OTHER radio
services, big Dave wrapped himself in "importance," the tarnkappen
of "secrecy at State," and the usual bullshit of "if you are not IN
ham radio you can't know anything about it." SOP, QED.

>Wow all that time and you still haven't managed to come up with a ham
>ticket despite your professed interest.

Tsk, tsk, another absolute, black-and-white, "if you don't love it
enough to get a 'ticket' you must hate it" sneer. :-)

The word "interest" does not indicate love, hate, or any gradation
in between of an avoaction. In US amateur radio any gradation
therein is overlaid by some sneering long-timers who want every
"interested" person to emulate them, to enjoy what the long-timers
enjoy whether they like it or not. :-)

In truth all long-timers are not of the same mould as Heil, they
simply enjoy what they enjoy and many of them just don't go
for the "traditional" aspects of working Deee-Eckks, tossing
their QSLs to the burro, sitting around belching and telling fish
stories of when they worked the "rare one." Then they puff out
sagging chests, thrust out their jaws, and beligerantly rant on
how "important" they are, their marvelous deeds and worthiness
as morsemen "keeping the skills and tradition alive". :-)

Those are a minority. Unfortunately they are a very vocal,
beligerant minority, who take great glee in putting down anyone
not liking what they like. They don't understand those that are

"different" (from them) and immediately charge "hatred" and
"lies" to opponents who are charged with something akin to
ham radio treason. :-)

>Writing technical articles for
>a ham mag isn't quite the same as being a ham is it?

Yes and no. Radio works on the same principles, using the same
hardware in amateurism as it does in all other radio services.

Those that want to stay ignorant of technology can just operate
and work Deee-Eckks and the "rare ones" and collect wallpaper
and certificates of "working" all different groups. Is that all about
"being a ham?"

>There'd be that
>actually being able to get on the air part among other things.

That is possible without any sort of license, perfectly permissible
by the FCC in the USA.

Having been ON the air, legally so, doing 24/7 HF communications
and VHF, UHF, microwave, MF, VLF communications, all within
appropriate regulations is not necessarily superseded by some
mystical joy and rapture doing it in a limited part of the spectrum
after obtaining authorization to be an amateur in a hobby. Of course
mileage does vary to some and a few still regard radio as akin to
mysticism or something the Rosicrucians will reveal to them after
writing to their scribe "Amorc" (or whatever it was).

>How stupid would a man have to be to put off obtaining an amateur
>license he professes interest in for *decades*?

Is that "stupidity" or is Heil engaging in yet-another insult fest?
I vote that he is a fest.

The word "interest" does not show Lust or Craven Desire or anything
else. The word has no specific gradation.

>How stupid would he
>have to be to remain ignorant of the way others feel about his lengthy,
>ponficating monologues posted to an amateur radio newsgroup?

No stupid. Brave enough, perhaps, to undergo an enormous amount
of pure insulting diatribe from self-professed "leaders" of ham radio
who wish to control hobbyists into strict, rigid adherence to their
magnifisence, royalty, and general claims of expertise in the past.

>You forget that others in this group have also had professional
>experience in communications which rival or surpasses your own. I'm one
>such professional.

...and also an amateur Brownshirt trying to make each non-agreement
with your own viewpoints as some excuse for Krystallnacht sequel.

Heil has shrouded his own efforts as a professional in a cloak of secrecy, a veil of self-professed importance, and all around smugmanship...and demanded worship and gratuitous praise for portraying a stereotypical Ugly American (ham).

>You've taken it upon yourself to as much as call me
>a liar in describing conditions of my work.

I have challenged Heil on WHAT HE WROTE IN THIS NEWSGROUP.
At no time was any communications directed to the State Department.

>You've attempted to
>belittle my work after you indicated that you wanted to discuss it.

I belittled what Heil WROTE IN THIS NEWSGROUP based on communications procedures on teleprinter circuits well established in government and commercial radio communications three decades before the alleged "neat idea (of CW)" was procedure was supposed to take place.

>Other communications professionals who post here, unlike you, have other
>credentials in that they are radio amateurs.

Let them post then. I have no problem with those who wish to discuss subjects. I have a problem with those who only want to belittle those who do not share their viewpoints. Heil is one of those latter types.

>That radio amateurs are proud of their calls, that they have status in
>amateur radio, that there are different classes of license seem to
>bother you to no end.

The problem is that Heil is OVERLY PROUD and cannot bear any disagreement to his viewpoint.

Why should there be a silencing of opposing discussion in regards to regulations involving GETTING INTO amateur radio?

Why should the only discussions about GETTING INTO amateur radio be those who are already IN and will never, ever be affected by license testing? That demand, which Heil trumpets loudly and off key is simply arrogant self-imposed leadership and pseudo-superiority, overly-proud eliteness that only benefits themselves.

>You are not, nor have you ever been part of the FCC. You are not, nor
>have you ever been a radio amateur. Sort of leaves you out in the cold,
>doesn't it?

No. I am a citizen of the USA who is a radio professional, a veteran, who still believes in the entire Constitution of the United States and the rights and freedoms guaranteed to all citizens. I don't believe in the suppression and control of interested parties by a minority of overweight-ego brownshirted control freaks who seek self-imposed rule just for their own personal benefits. I don't believe that any other citizen should be suppressed for having opposing viewpoints.

6147. Re: Call Sign as your Dot.com name $11.95

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 00:58:52 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <1103_1014771532@news.fuse.net>
Source record: 35658
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well in a sense, when you use EZ-DomainNameRegistration.com you are using GoDaddy. EZ is just a reseller of
GoDaddy. He just marks everything up by $3.00 or so. Go to www.godaddy.com and you can get the EXACT same
thing for a few bucks less.

On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 01:31:04 -0800, "Wayne" <wayneleake@wayneleake.net> wrote:
> I register many domains of my own, all at a cheaper cost of $8.95 or less
> per year.
> And I use www.godaddy.com for mine, which is less than what you charge.
> BTW, why is this crossposted to so many groups anyway?
> I don't do business with spammers, and I class you there.
>
> "News Editor" <news@ez-domainnameregistration.com> wrote in message
> news:u7j4vj5c9p2b9e@corp.supernews.com...
> > You're correct Charles... if you need domain forwarding, our fee is more
> than
> > you might pay at others... but then you don't get our outstanding,
> personalized
> > support. And, you forgot to mention that our registration fee of $11.95
> is
> > $4.05 cheaper than the other company... if you don't need forwarding, why
> pay
> > more?
> > www.Ez-DomainNameRegistration.com
> >
> > > Hello News Editor,
> > > I have used domain forwarding for years and it is very useful. However
> > > I pay only $16 / year for the domain registration, the email forwarding,
> > > URL forwarding, full-frame forwarding, toll-free tech support, domain
> > > parking, and full-featured DNS....all found at.....
> > > http://www.buydomains.com/
> > >
> > > Your price (from your site) is $23. IMHO if smart people shop around
> > > for these kinds of services they won't be contacting you.....your
> > > competition has already got you whipped but good.....
> > >
> > > --
> > >
> > > 73 / DX
> > >
> > > Charles T Johnston
> > > Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.

> > > charles@ab7sl.com
> > >
> > > AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> > > Official W9INN Antennas Page
> > > www.ab7sl.com
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

J. Duffy Beischel - Amateur Radio WB8NUT - www.wb8nut.com

Member of: ARRL, NRA, Kiwanis, Republican Party, Masons, and Shriners
and the vast Right Wing conspiracy to get the Clintons

"If the government owned all the guns, would we still be a free people?"

6148. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:02:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7C3031.6F031EF0@uci.edu>
Source record: 35659

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >One of the factors proven by passing a code test, besides the
> >skill
> >to communicate using radio's most basic mode, is that one is dedicated to
> >investing whatever it takes into his ham radio license.
>
> In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> FCC regulation.
>
> In the second place, if a Morse code test really served that sort of purpose,
> we could administer it to potential judges, Senators, school teachers and a
> whole slew of other so they can "prove their worth."
>
> It is interesting you feel that memorizing over a thousand questions in
> trivial, but memorizing 26 letters, 10 number, 4 punctuation signs and a few
> prosigns is "proving that one is dedicated."

I think that's absolutely right. It's not a trivial amount of work, and it's not monumental either. The side of the coin I think Dick is looking at is his perceived correlation between work ethics and on the air behavior. His experience, in the area in which he reside may indeed show a correlation. I don't know because I don't live there, and I haven't had Dick's experiences. There may indeed be some degree of correlation. I know that learning the code isn't entirely trivial. I think that in general, people value those things in which they have something invested. (Not only those things, but those things as well.) And I also know people who don't put much value in things in which they have nothing invested. All I'm saying is that one shouldn't dismiss the idea out of hand. I don't think the code test is the answer in the long term. But I also don't think the idea Dick is trying to convey is entirely without merit.

73 de ac6xg

6149. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:10:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3mWe8.35652$JY1.1325284498@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steve Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a5eejqrfu1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...

> > I hadn't heard. Makes me wonder who'se running the KH2 buro.
>
> Jim was running the buro for many years and it was shut down several
> years ago. If memory serves, the huge number of cards were actually for
> Japanese stations that got KH2 calls and never bothered to subscribe to
> the Guam buro, so in the end it was costing JIM big$$$ out of pocket.
> Perfectly acceptable decision if you ask me. At this time there is no
> more KH2 buro. In fact, the only "real" KH2 is Danny, KH2JU
>
> 73, Steve

Sounds like the island is closing down. The Joint Typhoon Warning Center on
Nimitz Hill closed shop a while back. DOD is using coarse storage data from
far away to fix storms now.

Maybe some transit flights to the PI right now.

Any news on Joel, KG6DX?

73, Brian

6150. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:16:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3396_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35664

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7B1F88.B66637C7@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to
make a
> > > structured
> > > noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one
that won't be
> > > lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any
rescuer will
> > > do.
> >
> > So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
> > for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice
guy.
> >
>
> Troll, Troll,Troll. Poor terminally bored Cecil.
>

I wonder if you are as small a man as you really act, Little Dick. I would
hope that your original post was the troll...and not a very funny or good
one at that.

Kim W5TIT

6151. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:17:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c33cb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35666

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7B203F.482A77FD@worldnet.att.net...
> Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> > In article <3c7af913_1@newsa.ev1.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > says...
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C7A8D82.AF2E3644@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > The EMP that blows up SSB also blows up CW.
> > > >
> > > > BUT, guess which mode makes it possible to communicate first, when
the
> > > > ionosphere begins gto settle down? Sure isn't SSB. It isn't CW
either, of
> > > > course, but CW sure comes back before SSB.
> > >
> > > You're getting nothing but desperate now...this is ridiculous.
> >
> > Hardly. Check out the ARRL's Antenna Book in the chapter on Safety,
which
> > describes the effects of an EMP event and the procedures to follow in
> > such an occurrence.
> >
>
> Don't confuse her by sending her to the book, she can't read, and
besides, her
> library is all comic books (they have pictures). Antenna? What's that?
>

It's an erection you're probably unfamiliar with there, Little Dick...

Kim W5TIT

6152. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:18:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226201816.20570.00000101@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35661

In article <20020226174620.18513.00000513@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Am I allowed to help stifle everything I consider to be ugly on rrap?
>
uh-oh. Good thing Ed's never seen a picture of me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6153. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:18:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226201816.20570.00000100@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35662

In article <20020226175721.18513.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net
>
>>Your twisting of the argument from the usefulness of CW during
>>emergencies to mandatory code testing is a wee bit perplexing. Do you
>>have an agenda or something?
>
>Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
>
All depends on how many hams learn it and use it without the test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6154. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:19:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3438$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35667

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7B2CEA.CE83D869@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > >
> > > > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes
no
> > > > >farther
> > > > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode
for
> > > > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use
in
> > recent
> > > > >> disasters.
> > > >
> > > > >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike
for
> > > > >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus
know
> > > > >little if anything about its use.
> > > >
> > > > Then give her some examples about its use in recent disasters
instead of
> > > > calling her conclusion "juvenile."
> > >
> > > To what end, Ed? It is Kim's contention that because no CW traffic
was
> > > generated during the WTC disaster that it is an invalid mode for use
in
> > > emergencies. Kim seems to think that the only emergencies that take
> > > place will be on the same order of the WTC bombing. She believes that
> > > because she is ignorant of the use of the mode, everyone is. If you
want
> > > to play games with Kim, YOU fill in the blanks. I'm still of the
> > > opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of
> > > information.
> > >
```

> > > Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > > subject at hand.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > READ: I can't come up with a thing.
>
> You've mistranslated: I think you're an airhead.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ya confirm you can't give me an example every time you do that type of penny ante stuff, Dave. By the way, I see you're leading by example...FB

Kim W5TIT

6155. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:22:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c34dc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35668

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> >subject at hand.
>
> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that words
that
> taught me new things.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

And, well, Dave just doesn't have any words that teach... His favorite
thing is to pontificate from that silver spoon hanging out of his mouth...

Kim W5TIT

6156. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:22:26 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a5hcho$h3h$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3mWe8.35652$JY1.1325284498@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
bpburke@prodigy.net says...

> > 73, Steve
>
> Sounds like the island is closing down. The Joint Typhoon Warning Center on
> Nimitz Hill closed shop a while back. DOD is using coarse storage data from
> far away to fix storms now.
>
> Maybe some transit flights to the PI right now.
>
> Any news on Joel, KG6DX?
>
> 73, Brian
>

According to the island DX association

http://www.guam.net/pub/midxa/

Quote "KH2JU is the only dx'er left in guam"

73, Steve

6157. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:27:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SBWe8.35657$_q2.1327229063@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35665

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020225183359.03198.00000552@mb-cv.aol.com...

> Thanks for re-quoting an entire post that had nothing to do with the
> comments you DID make.

Hey hey, my my. Thanks for reading.

> Makes me glad I am an EX-Ohioan.

That makes two. Did you leave any warrants behind or was it a clean break?

And stay the hell out of Florida! I may want to retire there in 2027 when I
take up the code again.

Brian

6158. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:31:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c37e6_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35669

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BFE6F.366AD96D@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0202251340.46c6efd4@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3c7a6a86_1@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > > > unfortunately, for the
> > > > ARS, I'd be willing to bet that the the percentage would
> > > > be disappointingly ... even disturbingly ... low.
> > >
> > > Pure conjecture on your part ;-)
> >
> > I said "I'd be willing to bet ..." to me that implies that
> > it's opinion/conjecture/speculation.
> >
> > > I know for a fact, Carl, that you could not pass the tests I took
> > > for General, Advanced and Extra.
> >
> > You mean because those exact tests aren't offered any
> > more? Let's not play word games ...
> >
> > If you're talking just about the high speed Morse test,
> > ask me if I care ...
> >
> > > But I can pass the tests you took for Extra.
> >
> > Jim ... I really don't doubt that YOU could ... however,
> > I would still bet, if it were feasible to arrange a broad
> > enough test case, that a disturbingly low percentage
> > of hams licensed (what did I say .. 20 years ago?)
> > could not pass today's G+E test without study and
> > practice.
>
> So you still feel inferior because you couldn't do it then.

Dick,

I never felt inferior ... never WAS inferior .. on the basis
that I wasn't interested in jumping through the hoop of

passing a 20 wpm code test.

My sense of self-worth is MUCH more solidly rooted
than that ... in solid accomplishments.

> You weren't required to do it then, just as they aren't
> required to do it now.

Not sure what you mean, but that's OK ... half the time
you don't make a lot of sense, so things are apparently
normal.

> Of course you had to forfeit the license, they don't.

I never forteited a license ... I've been licensed continuously
since the mid 70s ... should be hearing from the QCWA
folks any time now ...

BTW ... who are the "they" tha you keep referring to?
(You're back to not making much sense again ... forget
your meds?)

Carl - wa6vse

6159. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:32:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3738_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35673

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e5475027a8b54198969f@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <20020226050915.16980.00000536@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> says...
>
> > If your concern is EMP, before mandating knowledge of Morse code,
another
> > mandate would have to require that a ham maintain a station that is
going to
> > continue to function after that large EMP event. If your justification
> > for the continuation of the Morse test is that there may be an EMP
event,
> > it probably won't hold up with the Commission.
>
> The EMP event I mentioned is what is known as an "example."
>
> Your twisting of the argument from the usefulness of CW during
> emergencies to mandatory code testing is a wee bit perplexing. Do you
> have an agenda or something?
>
> joshua houk
> kd7pos

Joshua: While the gist of the whole CW issue here in this newsgroup often gets lost because of the intertwined debates...the most-often-used reason to keep CW testing in the licensure arena is to promulgate knowledge of a "useful..blah, blah, blah" (I can't remember the whole line--Larry or Dick can help you with that) and that it is most important to do so in the event of an emergency. Those of us who disagree with CW testing have the most-often-used reason as that CW knowledge is not "worth it" enough to have it as a part of the licensure testing. (Worth it, by the way, is a poor use of words...but man, I am beat today from work!)

That's why you'll see the debate often come full circle back to the mandatory CW testing. That's also why I posted in one of my posts last night, "now we can start all over again." It's really weird in this newsgroup--we're all stuck in a viscous circle of debate...LOL

Kim W5TIT

Kim W5TIT

6160. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:33:49 UTC
From: Birdman67 <Birdman67@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <bLWe8.2659$vl.1840186@twister.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 35671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Where I live, the repeater I use, is jammed by one or two people often. It is common knowledge who they are. Both ARE hams. I am not a board member of the repeater so I do not know what actions are or will be taken against those persons.
BTW I think owning, selling or buying ham equipment by non hams is fine. Transmitting by anyone on a frequency he/she doesn't have a license for (that includes hams with out of band radios) is, not only illegal, but very bad.
Thank you,
Dave kb9iig
"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>
> No License? No Radio!
> http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
>
> Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> http://www.eham.net/survey/
> (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
>
> This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take the
> time to review it, and consider taking part.
>
> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ
>
>
>
>

6161. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:33:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3798_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35674

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7BB6D8.1F415DDD@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > If you're so stupid that you can't realize that you really need to
make a
> > > > structured
> > > > noise that can easily be identified as of living human source, one
that won't be
> > > > lost in the din of the settling ruins, that is most likely what any
rescuer will
> > > > do.
> > >
> > > So if someone is injured, doesn't know Morse code, and is just banging
> > > for dear life, you are just going to pass him by and let him die? Nice
guy.
> >
> > Troll, Troll,Troll. Poor terminally bored Cecil.
>
> It's no troll, Dick. 99.9+% of people don't know International Morse code.
> The chances that there will ever be a time when the trapped and rescuer
> both know railroad Morse code is infinitesimal. What do you propose to
> do with the trapped people who don't know Morse code?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

I say let's really take it to the hilt...what does Dick propose to do with a
Rescuer who doesn't know CW?

Kim W5TIT

6162. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:35:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c38a6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35672

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BFF9B.8BAF0619@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >I think it's sad that so many long-time
>
> > hams are essentially clueless about anything newer than
> > a 6146.
>
> What's sad is the likes of you who speak out of both sides of the mouth.
> Who
> immediately succumb to Microphoneitis while disparaging longtime hams like
> me and
> Larry who are the ones doing digital radio ON THE AIR, not in some lab at
> work like you.
>

Dick ...

Seems that YOU are the one who's disparaging ... with your
smartass comments about "Micorphoneitis" ...

The fact of the matter is that you don't have a clue what I'm
doing, or where ... as usual, you're just spewing hot air.

Carl - wa6vse

6163. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:35:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c37ec$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35675

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BBA43.2709A6CB@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > >subject at hand.
> >
> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
words that
> > taught me new things.
>
> And I'd dare say you took the time and interest to stop, close your
mouth, listen
> and learn, rather than just reject it all out of hand, and not insisting
you
> already knew
> all about it all. As TITs does.
>

Little Dick, I can't think of anyone here on this newsgroup that doesn't do
that. We all have opinions. That they don't match yours is probably a
blessing.

Kim W5TIT

6164. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:37:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0LWe8.1529$106.82743@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35670

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7BD1C0.9F1F13F3@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > The object is not exclusion but education. Removal of the Morse
> > requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is
the
> > only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a
damned
> > thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the
Amateur
> > Service.
>
> By "DO", I assume you mean to expend some effort. Sorry to disappoint
you,
> but my learning of Morse code was effortless. It took a lot more effort
to
> learn to understand and use the Smith Chart. Do you understand and use
the
> Smith Chart? My understanding of the Smith Chart is much more valuable
to
> me as an HF ham than my Morse code skill.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Well, as they say down at the IRS: To some more is given and of some more
is expected.

6165. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:39:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c38f7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35676

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:a5giv9$k7u$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c7af42a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C7A7089.5D220634@uci.edu...
> > >
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > What are you saying, Jim? Are you thinking that there are no CW
> > operators
> > > > at Field Days?
> > >
> > > You aren't really THAT clueless, are you?
> >
> > I must be, Jim. Why don't you clue me in?
>
> Oooookay. I'm not thinking that there are no CW operators at Field Days.
> What I said was, "as far as you know". I presume that it's an accurate
> statement. I'm not wrong about that, am I? :-)
>
>

Jim, I don't know what you mean by "as far as you know." I don't operate the CW--we have loads of other folks around. In the wee hours of the morning, I can often walk out with a pot of fresh coffee and everyone is "resting" while the bands are dead. I can tell you that on occasion, I've even sat down while "ribbing" someone about slacking that they better start working stations I can find (CW). I don't find 'em, they don't find 'em...and the bottom fell out all about the same time +/- half hour or so...

Kim W5TIT

6166. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:42:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3980_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35677

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BF89D.7474BCE5@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > >subject at hand.
> >
> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
words that
> > taught me new things.
>
> Here's your chance to repay that debt by clueing in our Kim. I'd be
> curious if, during your period of unenlightenment, you went about
> demonstrating your lack of knowledge or if you simply realized there
> much you didn't know and sought out the advice of those who did.
>
> Dave K8MN

I'm all eyes, Dave. Give me some examples of CW that was used (not NTS) in an emergency or disaster. I am even making it so simple that I extend that to the use of CW on the Hurricane nets...do they use CW on the Hurricane nets? I know we never used CW on MARS...

Kim W5TIT

6167. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:44:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3a26_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35678

Dave has a washboard!!!!!!!???? ;)

Kim W5TIT

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:rbVe8.35626$KX7.1317424175@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7AAC0C.B0C4E3EB@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > > > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database.
> > >
> > > Agreed, I recall you saying something about a tar-paper shack. Home
> Depot
> > > has a great video about plastic siding if you ever get over that way.
> >
> > These new fangled notions are slow to catch on in these parts. The
> > nearest Home Depot is about 45 miles away. I used the money I saved on
> > antennas.
>
> Why don't I doubt that? Wife still using that old washboard down by the
> crick?
>
> > > > I've never commented
> > > > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only
> stated
> > > > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, I really didn't need to know a whole lot about DX when I got
> started.
> > > Like you , I was the DX. And being the DX, I worked a lot of DX. So
> sorry.
> >
> > I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
> > didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
> > encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
> > wasting electricity.
>
> Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get over
> it.
>

> >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
>
> No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> DXer that you are. Right?
>
> And that it was N0iMD whom you thought didn't know anything about DX.
>
> Is this correct?
>
> > I maintain that I only
> > commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license class.
>
> In which case, your assertion is wrong.
>
> > > Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6
daily,
> like
> > > he was in KP4-land.
> >
> > I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't handle".
> > I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it or
> > not.
>
> Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
verified
> that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned that
I
> used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
>
> Your disdain to my reference of FR6 was obvious. Perhaps you just didn't
> like that FR6 Op, the Frenchman that verified that you were working other
> frenchmen out of band, Frenchmen in general, or me working FR6 so easily.
> But you definitely didn't like it. Only you can decide why.
>
> Oh yeah, Malaysia was a cakewalk and the JT1 called me. ;^)
>
> > > You just need a few more years on the noisy side of the
> > > pileup, and you'll lose your snobbishness. Well, maybe you won't.
> >
> > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > operated overseas on the ham bands.
>
> You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> more years on the noisy side will be necessary.
>
> > What you call snobbishness, others
> > would call experience.
>
> Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and

not
> just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?
>
> > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > the other day
>
> Do they have 6m privileges?
>
> and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks.
> > Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I
> > should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX side
> > of the Omni VI +.
>
> Of course not Dave, just attenuate your disdain for any other hams,
> regardless of license class, having fun with what you consider to be your
> personal DX domain.
>
> What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).
>
> 73, Brian
>
>

6168. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 01:55:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c3d6f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35679

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com...
>
> Let's see:
>
> - permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license

[begin sarcasm mode]

Yup ... it's a shame those "newcomers" get a license for
longer than a year ... makes it harder for the cranky olde fartz
to find time and opportunity to drive them off, right?
(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
(not!)

> - 1500 W peak output above 50 MHz vs. 75 W input

[temporarily leaving sarcasm mode]

I've stated that I (personally) think that 1500W PEP is way
too much power for the level of technical competence that's
demonstrated by the tech test.

[re-entering sarcasm mode]

> - All authorized modes and frequencies above 50 MHz vs.
> 145-147 CW, MCW and AM only

Yup ... got to restrict what the newcomers can do to to the point
where it's not attractive ... otherwise, they'll over-run "our" bands
(Not!)

> - All forms of authorized frequency control vs. crystal control only

Yup ... keep 'em rock-bound, despite the fact that rig stability
isn't really an issue any more ... that'll make them easier to avoid
and make it harder for them to work something interesting ... heck,
if you let them move around at will, they might actually get together
and teach each other a few things, and realize that they're really
not an inferior species ... just a bit less experienced.
(Not!)

> Add the 5 wpm code test and get:

> - 250 W peak output vs. 75 W input below 30 MHz

Wow!!!! (Not!)

> - CW and SSB on a piece of 10 M plus slices of 80/40/15 vs CW only on
80/40/15

Wow ... let newcomers use SSB! What heresy! (Not!) BTW ... you forgot
that data is also allowed in that sliver on 10m, not just CW (more heresy).

> - Vanity calls including 1X3 vs. sequentially issued calls that
specifically
> point out newcomer status

Yup ... got to brand those newcomers so "real hams" can easily
recognize them, either to avoid them or to give them a bad time.
If they can "blend in" with "the rest of us" what would become of us?
(Not!)

[end sarcasm mode]

Jim,

Almost sounds like there's some "newcomer" prejudice
showing on your part ... sounds like you're irritated that
newcomers don't have to endure the same hardships that
you had to as a novice. You might want to think it over
from that perspective a bit and do some self-examination.

Or maybe, you're just listing some of the changes that
have taken place without really complaining about them ...

But can you see how to a newcomer it *might* sound like
you begrudge them their privileges and wish they didn't
have them?

Carl - wa6vse

6169. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:07:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226210752.28803.00000308@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 35681

In article <20020224055413.17463.00000344@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Larry has placed himself in charge of the crusade against such callsigns. He
>has insisted that he is not facincated with Kim, so I am sure he will share
>the
>letters he has sent to the callsign holder, telling him/her how he or she is
>ruining ham radio. If he has carped on W1SEX as often as he has carped on
>Kim,
>I will believe him when he says this is not personal fascination with Kim
>that
>is behind all the hoopolah.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix. Kim made it clear when she started posting in this newsgroup that she selected her vanity callsign in order to call attention to her self-admitted overly-endowed secondary sexual characteristics. Sex is something which applies equally to us all, and there is nothing inherently indecorous about it. Kim's callsign was chosen for the express purpose of inciting untoward attention to herself, for her own amusement. This is hardly an appropriate way for a mature, intelligent woman to behave, especially one who is married. It shows heinous disrespect for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6170. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:07:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226210753.28803.00000309@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 35680

In article <3C790602.6FDD019C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Yes, it's a simple question -- and since nobody's ever been "forced"
>> to take a code test, it's also an illogical question.
>
>All HF hams were required by circumstances (forced) to take a code
>test, Larry. Otherwise, they wouldn't be HF hams, would they?

Cecil:

You can delude yourself all you want with your twisted logic and
semantic pranks -- but nobody was ever "forced" to take a Morse
code test in the universally understood meaning of the term. And
you can post another volume equal to the Bible itself in quantity of
text, but you will never convince me that the term "force," when
applied to an entirely voluntary action, doesn't imply a nonexistent,
negative coercion.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6171. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:11:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c413b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35682

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226201816.20570.00000100@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <20020226175721.18513.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
> >
> >Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
> >
> All depends on how many hams learn it and use it without the test.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim ...

Your comment seems an admission that you like Morse
testing because it forces people to learn it whether they
care to or not, in hopes that some will decide (after the
fact) that they will use it.

Let me paraphrase Ed's question: "Do you find Morse
less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
If so, why?

Carl - wa6vse

6172. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:14:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c4208_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35683

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:rbVe8.35626$KX7.1317424175@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > operated overseas on the ham bands.
>
> You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> more years on the noisy side will be necessary.

Brian,

Whatever side Dave is on is, but definition, the noisy side,
since all he does is generate noise.

Carl - wa6vse

6173. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:29:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226212956.03662.00000800@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35684

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix. Kim made it
>clear when she started posting in this newsgroup that she selected her
>vanity callsign in order to call attention to her self-admitted overly-
>endowed secondary sexual characteristics. Sex is something which
>applies equally to us all, and there is nothing inherently indecorous
>about it.

So I can safely assume that because you don't object to a SEX callsign because sex applies to us all, some form of envy is in place here to explain your objection to Kim's callsign, which apparently applies to something you do not have in ample proportions. That sounds like fascination by my read.

> Kim's callsign was chosen for the express purpose of
>inciting untoward attention to herself, for her own amusement.

There is an element of that in my call sign selection, Larry. >It shows heinous disrespect
>for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
>her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
>being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.

You are responsible for your voyeurism, Larry -- no one else. Imagine, of all people, Larry is being a "victim."

What will the world ever come to?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6174. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:31:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226213122.03662.00000802@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35685

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> And
>you can post another volume equal to the Bible itself in quantity of
>text, but you will never convince me that the term "force," when
>applied to an entirely voluntary action, doesn't imply a nonexistent,
>negative coercion.

And you are not "forced" to talk about Kim's call sign, but you repeatedly do so. Your fascination with voyeuring her call sign is entirely voluntary.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6175. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:33:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226213358.03662.00000803@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35686

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I'm all eyes, Dave.

Not according to rumor. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6176. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:34:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C45CB.B15685CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35688

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >All HF hams were required by circumstances (forced) to take a code
> >test, Larry. Otherwise, they wouldn't be HF hams, would they?
>
> You can delude yourself all you want with your twisted logic and
> semantic pranks -- but nobody was ever "forced" to take a Morse
> code test in the universally understood meaning of the term.

A person either submits to the *force* of law embodied in the FCC
requirements or else that person doesn't obtain US amateur radio
privileges. Presently, a person who refuses to submit to the force
of law concerning the Morse code requirement, doesn't gain US HF
amateur radio privileges. Every US HF ham was forced (by the force
of law embodied in SS25.5) to pass a Morse code exam.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6177. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:36:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226213613.03662.00000806@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35687

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>uh-oh. Good thing Ed's never seen a picture of me.

Unfortunately, I don't have the luxury of saying the same, more'n'likely. My mug has been in QST and on the ARRL web site a few times. Membership took a drastic drop each time. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6178. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:37:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C4668.66D02A87@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35689

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> I say let's really take it to the hilt...what does Dick propose to do with a
> Rescuer who doesn't know CW?

I shudder to think.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6179. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:46:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C487F.F2363E10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35691

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix.

"SEX" is a lot dirtier than "TIT", Larry. Sex is primary.
Tits are secondary.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6180. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:47:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226214706.03662.00000813@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35690

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>But I also don't think the idea Dick is trying to convey is
>entirely without merit.

Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule has been satisfied?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6181. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:54:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226215432.03662.00000814@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 35692

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
>"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
>(not!)

Actually, I never heard him. Of course, I hung out on the CW bands, so I guess I never would have. Back then, the CW guys and gals were generally the friendly, welcoming type.

If one were to judge by this forum, one would think that the welcoming is less common on the CW bands. In some ways, it has come full circle.

As one who thinks that the only future my favorite mode has is going to be found in the way that the CW ops of today promote the mode, I get so disappointed to see some rake it through the mud and then hold up the mudraking as a badge of honor. They hurt the cause the same way you used to hurt the NCT cause with some of the things you used to say. You learned a degree of temperance, while others seem to have lost it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6182. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 02:57:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c4d24$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35694

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226175453.18513.00000517@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> >> >subject at hand.
> >>
> >> I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
words
> >that
> >> taught me new things.
> >
> > And I'd dare say you took the time and interest to stop, close your
mouth,
> >listen
> >and learn, rather than just reject it all out of hand, and not insisting
you
> >already knew
> >all about it all. As TITs does.
>
> The FCC is not yet issuing 1X4 call signs, Dick.
>
> But now I am curious. Kim, have you read some of my posts and rejected
> everything I had to say out of hand and assumed you already knew
everything
> about what I was saying, or did you try to learn from some of them?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yes, Ed, I have read some of your posts and always try to learn from
them--if nothing else than a little more about you as a person. I have
never seen you politicize, genderize, or oneupmanize anything I say.

I have a hard time with people who preach, rather than seek dialogue. You
are not one of those people. :)

Kim W5TIT

6183. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:03:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020226220353.15095.00000176@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 35693

In article <3c7c3438$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> You've mistranslated: I think you're an airhead.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Ya confirm you can't give me an example every time you do that type of penny
>ante stuff, Dave. By the way, I see you're leading by example...FB

Give him a break, Kim, all his examples are classified and
locked in a State Department commo vault at the US
embassy in Guinea-Bisseau. He can't post them for fear of
violating some espionage laws. :-)

6184. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:08:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c4fbe_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35695

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020226210752.28803.00000308@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <20020224055413.17463.00000344@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry has placed himself in charge of the crusade against such callsigns.
He
> >has insisted that he is not facincated with Kim, so I am sure he will
share
> >the
> >letters he has sent to the callsign holder, telling him/her how he or she
is
> >ruining ham radio. If he has carped on W1SEX as often as he has carped on
> >Kim,
> >I will believe him when he says this is not personal fascination with Kim
> >that
> >is behind all the hoopolah.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix. Kim made it
> clear when she started posting in this newsgroup that she selected her
> vanity callsign in order to call attention to her self-admitted overly-
> endowed secondary sexual characteristics. Sex is something which
> applies equally to us all, and there is nothing inherently indecorous
> about it.
>

Oh, this is funny! Larry, there are operations to make yourself larger, er,
up top anyway.

>
> Kim's callsign was chosen for the express purpose of
> inciting untoward attention to herself, for her own amusement.
>

My callsign was chosen on a dare from my friends here on the repeater. I
met the dare...it was actually more for their amusement. And yours, of
course, Larry.

>
> This

> is hardly an appropriate way for a mature, intelligent woman to
> behave, especially one who is married.
>

I have a problem with you thinking you can dictate the way I should behave, Larry. And, don't give me your "I'm not" crap. If I were to have entered in this newsgroup, behaved as you would like, not had the callsign you dislike, and called you Sir with ever post, you'd have a far different attitude toward me.

By the way, I live for me...no one else.

>
> It shows heinous disrespect
> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry, as you fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.

When you have a wife who loves and admires you, a job you are *really* happy about (instead of one you feel you have to defend every time), don't have the miserable attitude you have towards other people, and have impressed enough people to change their minds about how idiotic you are, then perhaps I'll value your opinion. Until then, you are the equivalent of a drunk who has a real hard-on for ruling over women.

Kim W5TIT

6185. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:09:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c4ff5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35696

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c7c413b_1@news7.fast.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020226201816.20570.00000100@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <20020226175721.18513.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> > >
> > >Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
> > >
> > All depends on how many hams learn it and use it without the test.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> Jim ...
>
> Your comment seems an admission that you like Morse
> testing because it forces people to learn it whether they
> care to or not, in hopes that some will decide (after the
> fact) that they will use it.
>
> Let me paraphrase Ed's question: "Do you find Morse
> less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
> If so, why?
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>

So well said!

Kim W5TIT

6186. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:12:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c5080$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35697

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226213358.03662.00000803@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I'm all eyes, Dave.
>
> Not according to rumor. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hmmmmm, uh, whoops. Should I phrase that, "I can read, too, Dave!" :o

Kim W5TIT (sitting back down)

6187. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:13:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c50c4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35698

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7C487F.F2363E10@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix.
>
> "SEX" is a lot dirtier than "TIT", Larry. Sex is primary.
> Tits are secondary.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

But, Larry's looking to be my match in tits...

Kim W5TIT

6188. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:23:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d8568_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35846

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020226215432.03662.00000814@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> >(not!)
>
> Actually, I never heard him. Of course, I hung out on the CW bands, so I
guess
> I never would have. Back then, the CW guys and gals were generally the
> friendly, welcoming type.
>
> If one were to judge by this forum, one would think that the welcoming is
less
> common on the CW bands. In some ways, it has come full circle.
>
> As one who thinks that the only future my favorite mode has is going to be
> found in the way that the CW ops of today promote the mode, I get so
> disappointed to see some rake it through the mud and then hold up the
mudraking
> as a badge of honor. They hurt the cause the same way you used to hurt
the NCT
> cause with some of the things you used to say. You learned a degree of
> temperance, while others seem to have lost it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Wow, I can't imagine a day when the CW guys predominantly were friendly.
Heh heh, actually that's a terrible generalization on my part, Ed. And,
actually folks like Larry, Little Dick, Dave Heil...whomever, are in the
minority. At least around here. Most of the CW folks are very accepting of
all hams, regardless of CW feelings. When the Restructuring debate *first*
hit the air down here, we had few nidyuts who said, "we're dumbing down the
bands."

But, when those of us who are already 5wpm hams, retorted that *we* were not
dumb, the quick response was, "Well, I am not talking about you." All we
had to do was say, "Then who *are* you talking about?" and they pretty much
re-surveyed what they had just said. (It's most of us Tech and Tech+ who,
at the time, would spend our entire weekends helping out those older hams
with antenna projects, retuning, etc.) We'd also ultimately fix problems
with antenna connections into tuners, computer peripherals wrongly attached

to TNCs, and on it goes. In fact, for a while there we Tech/Tech+'s would jokingly gloat that all this stuff would roll down our way, yet it was us who was keeping things going...heh heh

I have a feeling the folks like Little Dick and Larry and Dave would act the way they do without the ham radio forum. In fact, it is the ham radio forum that gives them the only soapbox they feel they can step up to, is my real suspicion.

Kim W5TIT

6189. Re: off topic postings question (was "Re: ")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:48:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7c5740$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35699

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020226210752.28803.00000307@mb-fo.aol.com...
> Interesting topic. How would we decide if a posting to this thread
> were off-topic?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry,

I'll 'fess up ... it's my fault ... I was going to change the
subject, then got distracted and screwed up and hit
the send button on a message and it's just gone from
there as "Re:"

There, I changed it ... are you happy now? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

6190. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 03:56:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5916.7904D92C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35700

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7C008E.C82F138B@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Don't bother looking now, Dipstick, but I was responding to Jim's
> remarks,
> > > which are right on the money. For your enlightenment, Carl had attempted
> to
> > > trash me far
> > > more than I ever could do to him. Butt out. Or get your head out.
>
> Yep. That'll really win over newcomers.

Some are automatic lost causes, and that seems to fit you like a glove.

6191. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:02:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5A62.2C2FDD88@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35601

W1RFI wrote:

> The FCC is not yet issuing 1X4 call signs, Dick.

So why do you think she chose that callsign, if not to call attention to "those"?

6192. Re: Questions RE offical ham observers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:05:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226230525.21406.00000387@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 35602

In article <v7oc8.2431$kq1.474327@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>, "Birdman67"
<Birdman67@wi.rr.com> writes:

>
>Let me first say "thank you" to all the volunteer observers who take take
>their time and effort to keep the ham bands a self policing entity and as
>good as they are.
>
>Keep up the good work.
>
>Second, I received a notice that I did not ID for 40 min during a QSO. I
>don't doubt it is true. I was wondering why the observer did not let me
>know after say 20 or 25 minutes that I needed to ID, Does the word
>"observer" mean just that he/she observes but does not participate.

Bird:

Yes, that is essentially correct. An OO is under no obligation to make on-air
corrections, since doing so can go pear-shaped quite easily, if the person
on the receiving end of the "correction" takes umbrage with being chastised
on-the-air -- regardless of how politely it is done.

>Why did
>the ham operator allow a rule that was obviously being broken continue to be
>broken.

He didn't allow anything of the sort. It was *you* to broke the rule.

>I have noticed that I have paid more attention to my IDing
>practices since I received the notice but,

Good for you, that's the whole point of the OO program -- to make hams
aware of routine, possibly unintended violations, and become better
operators as a result. Whether or not they do, or go on to become deliberate,
chronic violators and start collecting NAL's, is entirely up to them. Your
decision to take the notice seriously and pay attention to proper operating
practices shows you are a good ham -- so carry on!

I think I still would be paying
>just as much attention if I received a note for not IDing after 25 min. I am
>not angry, however, and have no ill will against the observer.

That's good, especially since the violation occurred on the first second of the
11th minute of your failure to ID. Receiving a notice for 40 minutes as
opposed to 25 is kind of an absurd complaint from someone who was in the
wrong in any case.

>Third, I would be very happy to get any information on being a observer. I
>have much time on my hands and would consider "offering" my time and service
>to help the hobby. I have had my ticket for 9 years and am a tec+.
>
>Do you have to "know some one" or be friends with the "right people".

Yeah, pretty much.

>Do you have to be appointed.

Yes, by your ARRL Section Manager, with the coordination of his OOC
(Official Observer Coordinator).

>Do you have to be an amateur extra.

No, unfortunately, that isn't a requirement, but it should be.

>Is offering you time and service enughf to be considered.

No, not nearly. You should have a long and well-rounded on-air
operating experience, encompassing more modes than just 2-meters
FM. You should know the Part 97 Rules and Regulations absolutely
stone cold. You will have to take an open book training course and
pass a test, and you will find that there are infinitely more things you
cannot do as an OO than you can. You are NOT a "radio cop." You
are merely an observer. You have the right to send out OO reports of
apparent infractions, but they must be carefully worded to ensure
that you are not coming across as an authority with actual enforcement
power. Only the FCC has that. You can report violative actions to
the FCC -- that is your sole enforcement capability, however. You
are strictly working in the background, with no authority, no power,
and infinite ways to get your own self wrapped around the legal
axle if you mess up.

>Do you pay your own postage on notices.

I always did.

>Is there a good web page to go to.

Just do a search on Official Observer on the ARRL web site, or use
the index.

>How much paper work is involved ETC....

Plenty. If documenting violations is a problem for you, don't
bother. You are an evidence collector, not Lennie Briscoe going
through a "perps" door with gun drawn.

>Finally, Thanks again to all the volunteer observers. You are all doing a
>GREAT job. I wold be proud to join your ranks.

How do you know they're *all* doing a great job? I used to be an OO
myself, but moved away from that area and didn't bother trying to
be one again, mainly because of the abuses of their non-existent
"power" I'd seen in other OO's. When I spoke to my SM about getting

back into it years ago, I was informed that OO's were supposed to be sending out "attaboy/attagirl" reports to good operators, as opposed to OO Reports of violations. This kind of political correctness annoys me, so I decided I couldn't be bothered. Knowing the rules and regulations, and conforming with them, is something that is EXPECTED of good hams -- there is no need to publicly praise them for being in compliance. When being done properly, being an OO should be a totally unrecognized and thankless task, and I don't think you're clear on that concept.

I think the requirements for becoming an OO should be broadened to the point where only hams with Extra-class licenses, high quality monitoring/recording equipment and the skills to properly utilize them, and a perfect record of conformity with the rules and regulations are allowed to participate in the program.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6193. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:06:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5B75.2D09FB94@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35603

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Your twisting of the argument from the usefulness of CW during
> >emergencies to mandatory code testing is a wee bit perplexing. Do you
> >have an agenda or something?
>
> Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?

You don't think that it would be changed by the fact that newcomers are no

longer required to learn it at all? Surely you don't believe that all those folks who
have so much problems finding time or enough interest will suddenly find that time
and get interested just because it is no longer a requirement, now do you?
If so, there's some nice beachfront property in Arizona I can get for you

cheap.

6194. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:13:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5CFE.7F25097D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35604

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > Ed, is reading the 4 page study guide the ONLY thing you did to prepare for
> > the Novice exam? Did you never read any other radio or electronic books,
> > magazines or articles? No Elmer, no QST, no Handbook, no library books?
> > No other source of radio information other than the 4 page study guide in
> > the LM?
>
> Studying the 3 page study guide in 1951 was the only thing I did to prepare for
> the Novice exam. I didn't have access to any other radio or electronic books,
> magazines or articles. The local TV repairman was a ham who told me how to
> order the LM, but he was too busy with his business to assist any more.
> I had no other source of radio information other than the 3 page study guide
> in the LM.
>

I suppose you want us to believe that you never ever looked further into the book

than the three pages of the Novice section. Right.

6195. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:19:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35605

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7AAC0C.B0C4E3EB@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > You thought wrong. Tanzania Dave has been West Virginia Dave for a
> > > > year-and-a-half now. Please update your database.
> > >
> > > Agreed, I recall you saying something about a tar-paper shack. Home
> Depot
> > > has a great video about plastic siding if you ever get over that way.
> >
> > These new fangled notions are slow to catch on in these parts. The
> > nearest Home Depot is about 45 miles away. I used the money I saved on
> > antennas.
>
> Why don't I doubt that? Wife still using that old washboard down by the
> crick?

That's much too far away. There aren't too many cricks on the tops of
hills.

> > > > I've never commented
> > > > on whether those holding Tech Plus tickets are DXers. I've only
> stated
> > > > that YOU don't know much about DXing.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, I really didn't need to know a whole lot about DX when I got
> started.
> > > Like you , I was the DX. And being the DX, I worked a lot of DX. So
> sorry.
> >
> > I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
> > didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
> > encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
> > wasting electricity.
>
> Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get over
> it.

It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
it. It was plain observation. Even a blind pig finds some acorns.

> >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
>
> No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> DXer that you are. Right?

Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.

> And that it was N0iMD whom you thought didn't know anything about DX.
>
> Is this correct?

Close enough.

> > I maintain that I only
> > commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license class.
>
> In which case, your assertion is wrong.

Then we disagree.

> > > Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6 daily,
> like
> > > he was in KP4-land.
> >
> > I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't handle".
> > I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it or
> > not.
>
> Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he verified
> that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned that I
> used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.

...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
Sheesh.

>
> Your disdain to my reference of FR6 was obvious. Perhaps you just didn't
> like that FR6 Op, the Frenchman that verified that you were working other
> frenchmen out of band, Frenchmen in general, or me working FR6 so easily.
> But you definitely didn't like it. Only you can decide why.

Huh? Neither you nor the FR6 are that high on my radar Brian. That
chip on your shoulder is still there, I see.
>
> Oh yeah, Malaysia was a cakewalk and the JT1 called me. ;^)
>
> > > You just need a few more years on the noisy side of the
> > > pileup, and you'll lose your snobbishness. Well, maybe you won't.
> >
> > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever

> > operated overseas on the ham bands.
>
> You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> more years on the noisy side will be necessary.

Necessary for what? Nope, I wasn't born with a license but have had one
since 1963. My basic math skills tell me that in November, I'll have
had a ticket for 39 years.
>
> > What you call snobbishness, others
> > would call experience.
>
> Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and not
> just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?

If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss and
turn much over the issue of smugness. You can have all the DX fun you
can muster.

> > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > the other day
>
> Do they have 6m privileges?

Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
they'll be happy to hear from you.
>
> and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks.
> > Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I
> > should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX side
> > of the Omni VI +.
>
> Of course not Dave, just attenuate your disdain for any other hams,
> regardless of license class, having fun with what you consider to be your
> personal DX domain.

Brian, your lack of DX knowledge is not based on your having fun working
stations with non-U.S. calls. Go back to your OH2BH nonsense or your
material on selling QSL cards for fun and profit for clues. One of the
wonderful things about being human is that I get to pick and choose
those for whom I reserve my admiration or my disdain. I don't reserve
blocks based on license class for either group.

> What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).

PW0, H7, OM, KG4, EA6, J3, V73, VP8 S. Georgia among others. Coaxial
loops work well. I use a 5 foot diameter hardline loop about two feet
off the ground here with a variable gain preamp and a U-100 to turn it.
An MFJ 1026 noise canceler helps too.

Dave K8MN

6196. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:20:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C5EB1.22EA66B4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35606

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>The level of difficulty does not seem to be too
> >>high
> >>for adults, as can be evidenced by the growth of Amateur Radio.
> > >
> > >One word: computers.
> >
> > I don't think there is a 'one word' answer to the question about why people are
> > entering ham radio as adults and not as teenagers.
> >
> > Why would computers not be as fascinating to a 25 year old as a 15 year old?

Are you kidding??? Cars, girls, booze and who knows what else that goes with,
for openers?

6197. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:37:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C6289.108DD047@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35607

N2EY wrote:
<some snippage>
> Ed, is reading the 4 page study guide the ONLY thing you did to prepare for
> the Novice exam? Did you never read any other radio or electronic books,
> magazines or articles? No Elmer, no QST, no Handbook, no library books?
> No other source of radio information other than the 4 page study guide in
> the LM?

I'm sure that the study guide wasn't the only thing. There isn't a vacuum here. I know in at least my case, I used the question pool, talking to other, more experienced hams in my club, a Rat Shack electronics manual that I got when just getting back into the electronics field, and a lot of info on the web. Smith charts especially on the web. My original line of work was as an electronics technician back almost 30 years, so there was some carryover there, or at least exposure.

- Mike -

6198. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:38:47 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5hnou02aff@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35618

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C5916.7904D92C@worldnet.att.net...
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7C008E.C82F138B@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > Don't bother looking now, Dipstick, but I was responding to Jim's
> > remarks,
> > > which are right on the money. For your enlightenment, Carl had
attempted
> > to
> > > trash me far
> > > more than I ever could do to him. Butt out. Or get your head out.
> >
> > Yep. That'll really win over newcomers.
>
> Some are automatic lost causes, and that seems to fit you like a glove.

...and I see that you're getting your daily exercise by jumping to
conclusions.

6199. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:40:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226234049.21406.00000393@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 35610

In article <3c7c4fbe_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim's callsign was chosen for the express purpose of
>> inciting untoward attention to herself, for her own amusement.
>>
>
>My callsign was chosen on a dare from my friends here on the repeater. I
>met the dare...it was actually more for their amusement. And yours, of
>course, Larry.

Kim:

I see. Somehow, I knew that external influences, and a repeater, were
somehow involved.

>> This
>> is hardly an appropriate way for a mature, intelligent woman to
>> behave, especially one who is married.

>I have a problem with you thinking you can dictate the way I should behave,
>Larry.

I'm not dictating a damn thing, Kim -- just holding your feet to the fire
for something you've already done.

>And, don't give me your "I'm not" crap.

Sorry, you're one sentence too late.

>If I were to have entered
>in this newsgroup, behaved as you would like, not had the callsign you
>dislike, and called you Sir with ever post, you'd have a far different
>attitude toward me.

Of course I would -- I would think that you were a polite, intelligent
fellow ham, worthy of my respect and courtesy. You have not earned
that good opinion from me.

>By the way, I live for me...no one else.

Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with many
people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of course,
here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then, I give
the devil it's due.

>> It shows heinous disrespect
>> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
>> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
>> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry, as you
>fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.

Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your opinion
regarding the validity of my "points" made here.

>When you have a wife who loves and admires you, a job you are *really* happy
>about (instead of one you feel you have to defend every time), don't have
>the miserable attitude you have towards other people, and have impressed
>enough people to change their minds about how idiotic you are, then perhaps
>I'll value your opinion. Until then, you are the equivalent of a drunk who
>has a real hard-on for ruling over women.

More wasted keystrokes. Well, perhaps not -- at least you're practicing your
typing -- which is a useful skill.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6200. Re: off topic postings question (was "Re: ")

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:40:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226234050.21406.00000394@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 35608

In article <3c7c5740$1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>I'll 'fess up ... it's my fault ... I was going to change the
>subject, then got distracted and screwed up and hit
>the send button on a message and it's just gone from
>there as "Re:"
>
>There, I changed it ... are you happy now? :-)
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Carl:

Yes, Sir -- very happy indeed! Thank you very much!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6201. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:40:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020226234050.21406.00000395@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 35609

In article <20020226213122.03662.00000802@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> And
>>you can post another volume equal to the Bible itself in quantity of
>>text, but you will never convince me that the term "force," when
>>applied to an entirely voluntary action, doesn't imply a nonexistent,
>>negative coercion.
>
>And you are not "forced" to talk about Kim's call sign, but you repeatedly do
>so. Your fascination with voyeuring her call sign is entirely voluntary.

Ed:

Sorry, but you're wrong on this one. I am not "voyeuring" her call sign --
she has "forced" me to observe it, and I reject it on the basis of it's
inappropriateness in a family-oriented hobbyist radio service. However,
I realize that in your own ARRL HQ enforced worldview, my "take"
on Kim's call sign is politically incorrect, so once again, I find I must
forgive you for doing what you are "forced" to do in order to maintain
the touchy-feely, PC, Welfare-state supporting image of a professional
ARRL apologist for everything that is weak and perverted in the ARS.
Carry on, Ed -- you're doing a good job!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6202. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:41:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5hp6m$em7$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35616

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a5f7p301te2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> >If the Association is out to get you, an Association lawyer will
> > send you what amounts to a "cease and desist" order to remove that
> > antenna because it does not comply wuth the terms of the CC&Rs and
> > thr Association's Rules.
>
> So basically until the association tells a person not to use a TV antenna
> for any other reason they are free to do what they please with it.

Pretty much the truth. Why would that not be the case?

> A person
> can do it until the Association says something.

Which can be triggered by a neighbor complaining to the
association.

> Well that should be great
> news for those that also have their FM stereo hooked up to the antenna
they
> use for TV.

If you say so. I've stated several times that IF the ONLY use a
TV antenna was put to was to RECEIVE only, odds are no
one would complain as long as the person that was doing the recieving
simply said they were ONLY using the antenna for TV reception.
Additional use for FM wouldn't be detectable by anyone UNLESS
the homeowner told the neighbors.

> Like I said, the law is a great loop hole unless someone in the
association
> moves for civil legal action against a person that has also hooked up a
> Stereo, shortwave or any other type of radio receiver to the antenna used
> for TV.

I agree...and I seriously doubt "the association" could ever PROVE
that the antenna was being used for "additional" receive purposes
beyond the TV channels.

> If you use it for cb or ham radio transmission I think that if you cause
> RFI then you will probably have to disconnect the antenna from the ham rig
> or you can fight it out in the courts. If the association doesn't find out
> you shouldn't have any problems with a dual use of the TV antenna.

Agree again, with the caveat as you note, that RFI could
be the downfall as to detection of use beyond that addressed by
the FCC pre-emption..

> Of course, The ARRL can go ahead with their attempt for special
legislation
> for ham only antennas, but it will not have any results. Go for a one
> antenna of a certain type for any use and that would have a better result.
> The congress and associations know that if there is a ham radio exemption
> allowed their is going to be a ham that will insist on a 75 foot tower
> and will fight it out in the courts.

Not sure that your conclusion is sound, but only time will tell.

Cheers,

Bill K2UNK

6203. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:42:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C7C639F.45F8508C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 35611

> Jim ... I really don't doubt that YOU could ... however,
> I would still bet, if it were feasible to arrange a broad
> enough test case, that a disturbingly low percentage
> of hams licensed (what did I say .. 20 years ago?)
> could not pass today's G+E test without study and
> practice.

That would be true of most any test. Could you pass
today the same final exams you took senior year to
graduate college 20 years ago without studying?

6204. Re: Phil Kane Educate Us.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:43:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5hp6n$em7$2@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35615

"Keith" <nospamplease@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:a5g5u302o76@enews1.newsguy.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >The FCC has already said that it will not pre-empt ham antennas. To
extend that
> >request to include ham antennas, but antennas of all types, is, IMHO,
even less
> >likely to get FCC approval.
>
> I'm not talking about the FCC, I'm talking about Congress or even the
> courts changing this law.

Congress? I doubt it...not enough clout by hams...although if there
was ever a more favorable time, this would be it based on "emergency
preparedness" in the light of September 11.

The courts? So far that has been a no win.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6205. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:46:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C64BF.E339C433@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35612

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >But I also don't think the idea Dick is trying to convey is
> >entirely without merit.
>
> Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> has been satisfied?

Get it right, will ya? Show where I ever said anyone memorized the entire pool.
You can't because I didn't. Only a dreamer would ever start on such a venture.
But some people DO memorize the part for an element. And keep retaking the
test for it till they have passed it, by some combination of sheer luck and an
agile
memory for word associations. Once that element is passed, assuming they want
to be licensed on the next level, they start again on that part of the pool.
Questions
are not usually memorized, but word associations are to match questions and
answers. Some people would never start toward a ham radio license if they couldn't
do it that way. I've had people tell me that they would have never attempted
to became a ham under any other system.

You already know all this, I told you all about it long ago. So why play dumb?

6206. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:48:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C7C653B.D78A9EB0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 35613

Why should the FCC care anyway if hams stay current or not?
As long as hams can hook up antennas to transceivers and
such boxes, and not splatter all over the spectrum...

They're not in the business of handing out gold stars....

>
>
> The "problem that retesting would solve" IMHO (again personal,
> not an NCI position) is that I believe that far too many long-term
> hams in our ranks have NOT kept ANYWHERE NEAR CURRENT
> with respect to today's technology. Periodic retesting would ensure
> that hams stay at least *reasonably* current technically.
>
> Note, that I am NOT suggesting any sort of "bleeding edge"
> requirement like, "Design, simulate, and code in VHDL, a
> 1-bit precision FSK modem with performance within 1.5 dB
> or better of theoretical ideal." or "Specify a forward error
> correction coding scheme that will provide __ dB of coding
> gain in an additive white Gaussian noise environment." ... just
> reasonably current BASIC things that the average ham should
> know. The sort of stuff that you should be able to read about
> in QST, on the ARRL web site, and hear about at local club
> meetings ... not "rocket science."

6207. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 04:51:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5hp6o$em7$3@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:WWDe8.48860$2v1.1626491@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> I'm told by a local Radio Shack manager that it is a policy of Radio Shack
> (Tandy, Inc.) not
> to sell amateur equipment to unlicensed persons.

When did that policy go into effect?

How is it checked?

> That is an internal decision by the company,
> according to the manager--who is a ham, BTW. Now, that doesn't mean that
> *IF* such a
> policy exists, that it doesn't get violated by locals. I'm just repeating
> what I was told. I do
> know that in the store I frequent, the manager will ask for a license and
> explain what the radio
> actually is. They often get mistaken for "CB" radios.

I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham
license. 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No
questions asked.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6208. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:01:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C67FE.34511FA3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35614

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7B2A6B.5D1A889B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >Look up the years I was in Guinea-Bissau, Len. Your statement is then,
> >that a country is important only because of what it exports. In that
> >case, Portugal isn't very important. What will we ever do with all of
> >that butter, the vinho verde and those mounds of olives? Aside from
> >that, whoever claimeed great importance for the country. I've already
> >explained to you what was going on in the country and I've explained
> >what the United States embassy was involved in. You clearly decided
> >that no matter what I wrote, you would dismiss it.
>
> A personal declaration of a country is not bona fide evidence such as
> found in descriptions of countries in either The World Almanac or the
> "CIA Factbook" (a non-agency Almanac-style document that is free
> on the Internet, of printing cost fee if desired on paper).

What the hell is a "personal declaration of a country"? It sounds like
you are contemplating proclaiming your street as a new entity.
Thanks for the spiffy info on the "CIA's World Factbook". Did you know
that each embassy and consulate receives a large box of 'em each year?

> Such has no
> verification as to its importance in world or African socio-political
> affairs as has been detailed by major journalistic services. All the
> major newspapers, wire services, documentaries, and many historical
> reference works do NOT give a small country such importance as you
> have indicated.

I didn't give it "such importance", Len. I told you what was going on
there and I told you what each embassy and consulate does regardless of
the relative importance of a country.

> While the work of the Department of State is important and vital to
> the USA, the entire department has been subject to much critical
> scrutiny and some negative criticsm in the last half century. That is
> painfully obvious from the same public references given above. They

> are not sacrosanct nor noble nor pure nor pioneers in much of
> anything except their task of being part of US foreign policy.

Everything in government has been under "negative criticism" and
critical scutiny, Len. The FBI has, the CIA has, the NSA has, the State
Department has, the DoD has. What are you really trying to say?

> >No Len. I didn't pioneer amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau. There was a
> >very active Cuban op in the country a year or so before my arrival and
> >there was an active Ukrainian fellow. Erik SM0AGD has made several
> >trips to the country both pre and post independence and an Italian group
> >operated from the Bijagos Islands shortly after my arrival. There is no
> >organized amateur radio in Guinea-Bissau though there is a fully
> >equipped club station. People would seemingly prefer to eat than become
> >radio amateurs.
>
> The origin of the original thread involved a discussion of method
> of control-command ("order-wire") of a State Department tele-
> printer radio circuit. The claim was made by Heil that CW (mode)
> was somehow better ("neater" in the descriptor used then) than
> communicating in the circuit's assigned teleprinter mode.

You misunderstood then. You misunderstand now. Those are the only two
options unless you aren't very bright or are being deliberately obtuse.

> Heil then tried to gloss over his rationalization by first stating that
> teleprinters "had to be synchronized," then changed that to
> "schedules established for certain communications" and eventually
> to disregard of everything and attempting to smokescreen every-
> thing under some cloak of secrecy (as in encryption of
> communications used in this exchange). NONE of that has any
> bearing on "being the only ham in Guinea-Bisseau" or even on
> amateur radio operation anywhere and is no reason for explanation
> of morse codes as being vital or necessary in amateur radio lincens
> testing..

This is a ham radio group, Len. Did you come here to discuss State
Department commo (which you seemingly know little about) or amateur
radio (which you seemingly know little about)? You brought up the
subject of my work in Guinea-Bissau. You are the one who as much as
called me a liar over that which you do not comprehend. You lied about
my stating that I'd originated what I described about FOUR OR FIVE YEARS
ago. You only play a game of "I know more than you do about your job"
which I have to describe as moronic.

> >It is simply that you've as much as called me a liar for describing what
> >was used. I've not ascribed any undue importance on my work or upon the
> >country of Guinea-Bissau. Let me assure that it is not too late for
> >you. You may kiss my ass any time at all.
>
> In the original exchange I called the alleged method of order-wire use
> as "dumb" in comparison to what commercial and military tele-

> printer radio circuit operators used thirty years prior to the stated
> 1980s time period. It is my contention that such "reasons" stated
> for CW superiority in command-control of teleprinter circuits are still
> dumb...and that the original statement was simply a specious,
> unvalidated, unreferencible "State Department procedure" as claimed.

a) You don't understand the reasons for use. b) I don't give a damn
what the military did. I didn't work for the military in
Guinea-Bissau. I used what was in place. Neither the Department of
State nor I owe you a rationalization.

> >I can assure you that the Department of State does not make public much
> >of its communications procedures, equipment and the like. Since you
> >already know of the classified nature of the work, you'd not likely see
> >anything written up in an industry journal.
>
> Government agencies' contract awards, cancellations, and equipment
> used frequently appear in industry journals. Sometimes they become
> cleared public news given out by the agencies themselves.
>
> One such instance is the RCA Corporation RACES (Random Access
> Card Extraction System), a data storage machine using very large
> magnetic cards to store masses of information such as teleprinter
> messages. The Department of State purchased two of them in late
> 1960s, installed them in DC or nearby in the very early 1970s,
> allowed public disclosure of them "storing an entire month's worth of
> message information from the entire State Department
> communications." That same PR release stated that one RACES
> was main, the other a backup. Several dozen RACES were sold and
> used to civilian and government organizations at the same time, all
> the same and NOT classified in any way other than conventional
> trade secrets.
>
> While I did not work directly on the RACES project at RCA EASD,
> that group was next to my group's lab area in Van Nuys, CA.
> Knowing the storage capacity of a RACES and the amount of
> monthly message traffic of the third-largest US Army radio station
> in the mid-1950s, one RACES holding an entire content of State
> Department monthly messaging could not hold all of the monthly
> message traffic at ADA. The technical conclusion was therefore
> that State did not have near as large a communications capability
> in the 1970s compared to the US Army in the 1950s let alone
> entire US military. That conclusion could be drawn by anyone who
> collected publicly-cleared information.

Keep breathing for a couple of decades more and you may be able to
"collect" what State is currently using. I can't fathom the reason for
your typing the several paragraphs of filler above. Is it more of the
"I know more about your job than you do" stuff?

> There are many, many documents which have been cleared for
> public viewing, even document purchase through the GPO. One
> like the latter is what I have, a June 1967 USN Electronic
> Systems Command training and reference manual, "Principles
> of Telegraphy (Teletypewriter)," NAVSHIPS 0967-255-0010. Not
> only does it outline procedures and technical details for both
> wireline and radio teleprinter communications, the first chapter
> includes a history of ALL telegraphy that predated teletypewriters
> and the manual "morse telegraphy."
>
> >The fact that you continue
> >this "snow job" crud in a silly effort to dismiss my statements only
> >makes you look like an old fool.
>
> Invalid. The USN document does not reference any use of manual
> morse telegraphy as any sort of "order-wire" for a teletypewriter
> circuit. Stating that such WAS done twenty years ago, not giving
> any references, then hiding referencibility under some cloak of
> secrecy is foolish. QED.

The State Department is not a branch of the United States military.
It's Bureau of IRM (formerly Office of Communications) can do whatever
it damn well pleases despite the Navy and/or you. Don't like it? Take
it up with State? Invalid indeed.

>
> >My work in Guinea-Bissau wasn't the
> >topic and you've only taken this tack as a diversion.
>
> I only stated that "Guinea-Bisseau has a population of about 1.3
> million and its chief exports are cashews and peanuts." I added
> that this former colony is not an important topic of news reporting
> from the general middle of Africa. Readers are welcome to verify
> all of that. None need know of Heil's important, classified work.

You've never written anything that brief in all of your time here,
Leonardo. That isn't all you wrote so your claim is false.

> >Your problem is that you see anyone who won't kow-tow to you as an
> >arrogant elitist. What ever gave you the idea that hams don't read
> >material other than ham radio publications? Why, that is simply elitist
> >and arrogant of you.
>
> Invalid again. I merely raise some points with publicly-referencible
> sources of verification to dismiss a number of arrogant and elitist
> viewpoints in here in regards to keeping the morse code test for
> US amateur radio license classes having below-30-MHz privileges.

Nothing is invalid simply because you proclaim it. What you claim that
you "merely" did is again false. You neatly snipped what you actually
said. It shows this latest statement to be a lie.

> I am aware that Ed Hare, Carl Stevenson, Cecil Moore read material
> other than amateur radio publications for radio information because
> they have made those statements. There is a wealth of information
> about the entire world of radio AND that small part of it used by
> radio amateurs. The easy way out seems to be using the ARRL as
> the major source of information (Big Brother leads the way) or just
> stating "Hams have always done code testing and always will."

So you are now stating that three hams read material other than amateur
radio publications.

> Radio amateurs are not exclusive in radio. They must share the
> EM spectrum, co-exist with other radio services physically and
> politically (vying for regulatory allotment). Hiding behind the past,
> reputations, tunnel-vision selective history, and unreferencible
> claims is not a good attitude for maintaining an existance in the
> radio world.

Hams know that they are not the only users of the radio spectrum. I'm
quite certain that they don't depend on you to inform them of it. I do
like your boogeyman act in spreading alarm based on your own negativity
toward amateur radio--quite scary!

Ham radio is not in imminent danger of losing its spectrum.

> >Yeah, that "insider" thing must have set you up as quite the expert
> >there for a while. I've gotten the short notes of acceptance from
> >McMullen followed by checks as I have from CQ in the past. It gave me a
> >warm, fuzzy "insider" kind of a feeling. Give those editors and
> >publishers hell, Len. Oh--the ones you are complaining about--are they
> >the ones who didn't accept your stuff for publication?
>
> I am not complaining about anything but the usual slanted-in-favor-
> of-CW output of the ARRL. Their policy is automatic-first-rights-
> with-no-possibility-of-compensation-for-reprints-as-they-see-fit.
> For that reason I've never submitted any work to the ARRL, any
> publication. HAM RADIO magazine was more mainstream and
> negotiable in its 22 years of existance as an independent.
> Radio hobby publications are not my only venue for professional
> writing that started in 1967.

Your anti-ARRL bias grows tiresome. Regarding your claim to have done
professional writing, allow me to use one of your own favorite tools: I
haven't seen it or heard anything about it so it can't exist.

> >Right, Len. Ham radio is an avocation which can be enjoyed by anyone:
> >old folks, children, bakers, gas station attendants, farmers,
> >bankers,etc. In short, it can be enjoyed, apparently, by just about
> >anyone but you.
>
> Invalid. Another gratuitous insult from Heil. This is followed by
> another...

Oh, it's valid alright, Len. Those folks *are* involved in amateur
radio. You are not.

> >> >Did you have anything on amateur radio you'd like to say?
> >>
> >> Yes. It is my opinion that amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable
> >> recreational activity that allows non-professionals to engage in the
> >> fascinating technology of radio communications arts within the
> >> narrow mode selections and frequency bands allocated by federal
> >> agencies. It is supposed to be a social gathering point where
> >> individuals can convene, make friends, share information, socialize
> >> as other groups do for the sheer enjoyment of socializing.
> >>
> >> Not all AUTHORIZED radio amateurs seem to think so. Quite a
> >> few seem to think that they are elite in radio, superior by
> >> achievement, some kind of important national asset, vital and
> >> valuable, fantasy "minutemen" available instantly to perform
> >> "emergency communications" to save their community, nation,
> >> and world from disaster. In short, self-styled supermen with an
> >> ego fertilized by myth and legend originated by predecessor
> >> self-professed supermen of the same kind.
> > >
> > >That's just a bunch of hooey grown in the fertile muck of your mind.
> > >Large numbers of radio amateurs give of their time and talents in
> > >traffic handling and emergency preparedness work. You are you to
> > >pooh-pooh their efforts?
> >
> > "SOME" does not equate to Heil's claim of "large numbers." Heil
> > is one of the "some." QED "hooey," "fertile muck," etc.

It doesn't matter what the actual number is, Len. You'd still find it
easy to insult and belittle them. What you can't do or can't know, you
try to pull down. You aren't converting anyone to your way of thinking,
Len. You simply piss folks off.

> Attempts to change original wordings is not an unknown device in
> trying to win message points.

Yeah? Where are the records of these "message points" kept? What
constitutes a score? I haven't seen any list of message points so they
must not exist.

Dave K8MN

6209. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:01:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C6836.62E5BDCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35619

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I've had people tell me that they would have never attempted
> to became a ham under any other system.

Memorizing was the only hope I had of getting a ham license when I
was 14 years old. From that came a EE degree and 40 years of
engineering productivity. From little acorns mighty oaks grow.
What's wrong with that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6210. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:07:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C6999.17C4984@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35620

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> You don't think that it would be changed by the fact that newcomers are no
> longer required to learn it at all?

There's a long list of things that newcomers are not required to learn.
Typing (keyboarding) is one of them. Yet, most people who need to know
how to type learn how to type. Most people who need to know Morse code
will learn it. I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6211. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:09:00 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <m6qo7uk0amq5jtd35mcg09kfocr6tks75r@4ax.com>
Source record: 35621

On 24 Feb 2002 03:12:17 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Radio Policy

Robeson I do not require any e-mail from you. You have acted in an immature and dishonorable way and I wish not correspondence. You seem to fight with anyone and every one I have no interest in such a person.

If you want to fight there are more than enough people in RRAP to accommodate you. If you can find the spare time from the fights you might try to grow up.

Plonk

6212. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:15:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C6B5D.DB5D0052@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35622

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Studying the 3 page study guide in 1951 was the only thing I did to prepare for
> > the Novice exam. I didn't have access to any other radio or electronic books,
> > magazines or articles. The local TV repairman was a ham who told me how to
> > order the LM, but he was too busy with his business to assist any more.
> > I had no other source of radio information other than the 3 page study guide
> > in the LM.
>
> I suppose you want us to believe that you never ever looked further into the book
> than the three pages of the Novice section. Right.

That's true for the Novice exam. A year later, I memorized the ten pages in
the General section. Four years later, in 1955, I subscribed to QST and sprang
for an ARRL Handbook. I didn't really start to understand the technical material
until 1957, my junior year in college.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6213. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:18:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7C6C36.8AD5B928@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35624

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm not dictating a damn thing, Kim -- just holding your feet to the fire
> for something you've already done.

And for that today, she is thankful. The temperature in Dallas right now
is 23 degrees F and falling fast.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6214. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:20:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C6CCC.3168163D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35623

Robert Casey wrote:

> Why should the FCC care anyway if hams stay current or not?
> As long as hams can hook up antennas to transceivers and
> such boxes, and not splatter all over the spectrum...
>
> They're not in the business of handing out gold stars....
>

Aw, don't grace it with an answer, it's just more of Kandid Karl's
"vision"
for the ARS.

>
> >
> >
> > The "problem that retesting would solve" IMHO (again personal,
> > not an NCI position) is that I believe that far too many long-term
> > hams in our ranks have NOT kept ANYWHERE NEAR CURRENT
> > with respect to today's technology. Periodic retesting would ensure
> > that hams stay at least *reasonably* current technically.
> >
> > Note, that I am NOT suggesting any sort of "bleeding edge"
> > requirement like, "Design, simulate, and code in VHDL, a
> > 1-bit precision FSK modem with performance within 1.5 dB
> > or better of theoretical ideal." or "Specify a forward error
> > correction coding scheme that will provide __ dB of coding
> > gain in an additive white Gaussian noise environment." ... just
> > reasonably current BASIC things that the average ham should
> > know. The sort of stuff that you should be able to read about
> > in QST, on the ARRL web site, and hear about at local club
> > meetings ... not "rocket science."

6215. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:28:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C6EA6.F7521168@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35625

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I've had people tell me that they would have never attempted
> > to became a ham under any other system.
>
> Memorizing was the only hope I had of getting a ham license when I
> was 14 years old. From that came a EE degree and 40 years of
> engineering productivity. From little acorns mighty oaks grow.
> What's wrong with that?

"What's wrong with that" is that YOU said it. One year you were the
boy
genuis that snowed all his math teachers with his astronomical IQ and
photographic
memory, never ever cracked a book and got his EE purely by rote
memorization.
Now we find you have an entirely foreign story for a different
viewpoint of the same
set of circumstances.
By we know that is exactly what we can expect from you and
that you'll deliver right on schedule.

6216. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:36:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C7073.E92F49C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35626

CAM wrote:

> . I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
> of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
> than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.

Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It doesn't matter
to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went through the
same process to learn that fact that we all did. At least an equal number of us who
went through that same process learned that we DO have some level of attraction
to radiotelegraphy, and so we progressed in skill until we can use it effectively

on the air (and that doesn't necessarily mean at any particularly high speed).
THAT is what will be lost by dropping all code testing. Most new hams will
never learn, will never know, the most basic of all radiocommunication modes.

6217. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:37:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C70B2.6B703DCD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35627

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >One of the factors proven by passing a code test, besides the
> >skill
> >to communicate using radio's most basic mode, is that one is dedicated to
> >investing whatever it takes into his ham radio license.
>
> In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> FCC regulation.
>

There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations. You don't

know that?

> In the second place, if a Morse code test really served that sort of purpose,
> we could administer it to potential judges, Senators, school teachers and a
> whole slew of other so they can "prove their worth."
>

As a matter if fact there have been judges, Senators, school teachers, doctors,
lawers, merchants, chiefs and many more professions licensed as hams. Your point?
Surely you ARE referring to ham radio licensing.

>
> It is interesting you feel that memorizing over a thousand questions in
> trivial, but memorizing 26 letters, 10 number, 4 punctuation signs and a few
> prosigns is "proving that one is dedicated."

Surely you know that isn't what I think, and for sure it isn't what I said.
The question is, what does your lame statement prove? Nothing I can identify.

6218. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 05:46:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35628

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7B2293.CCE7AC97@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C7A2E5F.98CE78DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >You have to be one of the most biggest fools I've ever encountered.
> >You have demonstrated your ignorance of what I was doing and how I was
> >doing it on several occasions. Not many continue to wear their
> >ignorance like a badge after having been provided with information they
> >lacked. You're a true gold medalist among repugnant geezers.
>
> The original thread was begun about "CW being an order-wire on
> a State Department RTTY circuit" as somehow being a justification
> for maintaining a morse code test in amateur radio. When someone
> pointed out that such procedures are not done in OTHER radio
> services, big Dave wrapped himself in "importance," the tarnkappen
> of "secrecy at State," and the usual bullshit of "if you are not IN
> ham radio you can't know anything about it." SOP, QED.

Gee, that isn't even close to correct, is it, Lenny? The thread (some
four or five years back was over whether the U.S. government was using
morse. I commented on that idea and explained that the Department of
State used CW as late as the late eighties/early nineties. It was a
fact. I was there. I used it. That you casually dismiss my statement
as false is asinine. You recently gagged it up again for reasons known
only to yourself. At no time did I mention my "importance" and if USG
security bothers you, take it up with your congressman.

> >Wow all that time and you still haven't managed to come up with a ham
> >ticket despite your professed interest.
>
> Tsk, tsk, another absolute, black-and-white, "if you don't love it
> enough to get a 'ticket' you must hate it" sneer. :-)
>
> The word "interest" does not indicate love, hate, or any gradation
> in between of an avoaction. In US amateur radio any gradation
> therein is overlaid by some sneering long-timers who want every
> "interested" person to emulate them, to enjoy what the long-timers
> enjoy whether they like it or not. :-)

...as in, "I am interested in taking up oil painting but perhaps I'll postpone it for forty years". If you aren't interested in what hams do, you probably aren't interested in amateur radio at all.

> In truth all long-timers are not of the same mould as Heil, they
> simply enjoy what they enjoy and many of them just don't go
> for the "traditional" aspects of working Deee-Eckks, tossing
> their QSLs to the burro, sitting around belching and telling fish
> stories of when they worked the "rare one." Then they puff out
> sagging chests, thrust out their jaws, and beligerantly rant on
> how "important" they are, their marvelous deeds and worthiness
> as morsemen "keeping the skills and tradition alive". :-)

There are numerous areas of interest within amateur radio. You need to become a ham to become a participant. You haven't done so despite claims of "interest" which go back decades. All the rest of your rant, including those your description of attributes of DXers are addition products of Anderson Mfg.

> Those are a minority. Unfortunately they are a very vocal,
> beligerant minority, who take great glee in putting down anyone
> not liking what they like. They don't understand those that are
> "different" (from them) and immediately charge "hatred" and
> "lies" to opponents who are charged with something akin to
> ham radio treason. :-)

:-) You aren't playing with a full deck :-)

> >Writing technical articles for
> >a ham mag isn't quite the same as being a ham is it?
>
> Yes and no. Radio works on the same principles, using the same
> hardware in amateurism as it does in all other radio services.

Then your answer is no. I didn't ask you how radio works.

> Those that want to stay ignorant of technology can just operate
> and work Deee-Eckks and the "rare ones" and collect wallpaper
> and certificates of "working" all different groups. Is that all about
> "being a ham?"

Those who are up on the latest technology can do the same things if they like. Their ham tickets permit any number of activities.

> >There'd be that
> >actually being able to get on the air part among other things.
>
> That is possible without any sort of license, perfectly permissible
> by the FCC in the USA.
>
> Having been ON the air, legally so, doing 24/7 HF communications
> and VHF, UHF, microwave, MF, VLF communications, all within
> appropriate regulations is not necessarily superseded by some
> mystical joy and rapture doing it in a limited part of the spectrum

> after obtaining authorization to be an amateur in a hobby. Of course
> mileage does vary to some and a few still regard radio as akin to
> mysticism or something the Rosicrucians will reveal to them after
> writing to their scribe "Amorc" (or whatever it was).

You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe. You
can't operate on the ham bands sans license. You remember, that
"interest" of yours which goes back decades.

> >How stupid would a man have to be to put off obtaining an amateur
> >license he professes interest in for *decades*?
>
> Is that "stupidity" or is Heil engaging in yet-another insult fest?
> I vote that he is a fest.

> The word "interest" does not show Lust or Craven Desire or anything
> else. The word has no specific gradation.

Decades, Len? Decades? You've farted around here long enough for even
the slowest of the slow to obtain an amateur ticket.

> >How stupid would he
> >have to be to remain ignorant of the way others feel about his lengthy,
> >ponficating monologues posted to an amateur radio newsgroup?
>
> No stupid. Brave enough, perhaps, to undergo an enormous amount
> of pure insulting diatribe from self-professed "leaders" of ham radio
> who wish to control hobbyists into strict, rigid adherence to their
> magnifisence, royalty, and general claims of expertise in the past.

Okay, Walter Mitty, you're BRAVE. If you're brave, stifle that twitch
in your breast and go forth and obtain even a no-code ticket.

> >You forget that others in this group have also had professional
> >experience in communications which rival or surpasses your own. I'm one
> >such professional.
>
> ...and also an amateur Brownshirt trying to make each non-agreement
> with your own viewpoints as some excuse for Krystallnacht sequel.

Aaaaaah, let me show you how to fold your Nazi stuff before insertion,
Len. Your use of it makes you look small.

> Heil has shrouded his own efforts as a professional in a cloak of
> secrecy, a veil of self-professed importance, and all around
> smugmanship...and demanded worship and gratuitous praise for
> portraying a stereotypical Ugly American (ham).

I'm great on shrouding, Len. The Department of State makes us shroud.
I was told not to reveal things to just any inquisitive clod on the
street. I think they meant you. The remainder of your rant is evidence
of mental imbalance on your part.

> >You've taken it upon yourself to as much as call me
> >a liar in describing conditions of my work.
>
> I have challenged Heil on WHAT HE WROTE IN THIS NEWSGROUP.
> At no time was any communications directed to the State Department.

I don't care if you call or write State, Len. They're quite used to getting quizzed by fruitcakes. I know you "challenged" WHAT I WROTE IN THIS NEWSGROUP. If it wasn't for this newsgroup, I'd have NO CONTACT AT ALL WITH YOU. Ask yourself this, Leonardo: What reason would I have to manufacture material stated in this newsgroup? Would it change the outcome of the code debate? Would it gain me riches? Would it convert numbers of "code test haters" to my way of thinking?

> >You've attempted to
> >belittle my work after you indicated that you wanted to discuss it.
>
> I belittled what Heil WROTE IN THIS NEWSGROUP based on
> communications procedures on teleprinter circuits well established
> in government and commercial radio communications three decades
> before the alleged "neat idea (of CW)" was procedure was supposed
> to take place.

Is it okay with you if State used its own procedures on the African continent and in a couple of other remote areas of the world? Is it conceivable to you that you don't necessarily have a lock on all of the world's commo knowledge? Was the Department supposed to get clearance from you before embarking on such a radical move?

> >Other communications professionals who post here, unlike you, have other
> >credentials in that they are radio amateurs.
>
> Let them post then. I have no problem with those who wish to
> discuss subjects. I have a problem with those who only want to
> belittle those who do not share their viewpoints. Heil is one of
> those latter types.

Hell, Len. YOU belittle those who don't share YOUR viewpoint and you aren't even a ham! You aren't a grain of sand in the hourglass of amateur radio.

> >That radio amateurs are proud of their calls, that they have status in
> >amateur radio, that there are different classes of license seem to
> >bother you to no end.
>
> The problem is that Heil is OVERLY PROUD and cannot bear any
> disagreement to his viewpoint.

Please define "OVERLY PROUD" for us, Len. There are always going to be those who do things you can't do and those who do things you haven't done. Are they all "OVERLY PROUD"? I recognize those who have done things I have not accomplished, have gone places I haven't been able to go and who are better at some things than I am. I don't call them

"OVERLY PROUD". Get a grip, man.

> Why should there be a silencing of opposing discussion in regards
> to regulations involving GETTING INTO amateur radio?

Is there such a silencing? You've certainly had more than your fifteen minutes of fame here. I've said it before: Say what you want. Just don't expect folks to fawn all over you in agreement with you. It isn't likely to happen and apparently hasn't happened. Remember though, even through these tough times, you are BRAVE.

> Why should the only discussions about GETTING INTO amateur
> radio be those who are already IN and will never, ever be affected
> by license testing? That demand, which Heil trumpets loudly and
> off key is simply arrogant self-imposed leadership and pseudo-
> superiority, overly-proud eliteness that only benefits themselves.

You've had your say. No one is obliged to give your views much credence or to give a big "Hurrah for Leonard H. Anderson!" in response. Getting into amateur radio has been largely made easier than ever. Still, you've not even attempted to obtain a license. I think you to be "OVERLY PROUD".

> >You are not, nor have you ever been part of the FCC. You are not, nor
> >have you ever been a radio amateur. Sort of leaves you out in the cold,
> >doesn't it?
>
> No. I am a citizen of the USA who is a radio professional, a veteran,
> who still believes in the entire Constitution of the United States and
> the rights and freedoms guaranteed to all citizens. I don't believe in
> the suppression and control of interested parties by a minority of
> overweight-ego brownshirted control freaks who seek self-imposed rule
> just for their own personal benefits. I don't believe that any other citizen
> should be suppressed for having opposing viewpoints.

Yeah? So? I'm a citizen and think most of us here are citizens. I'm a veteran. I don't believe your views have been suppressed. In fact, I think you've blown smoke here for longer than most. Your purpose isn't an amateur radio license. Your hobby is haunting this newsgroup.

Dave K8MN

6219. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 06:00:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C75FF.31881590@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35629

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:rbVe8.35626$KX7.1317424175@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > > operated overseas on the ham bands.
> >
> > You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> > more years on the noisy side will be necessary.
>
> Brian,
>
> Whatever side Dave is on is, but definition, the noisy side,
> since all he does is generate noise.

I understand you've been generating some noise yourself on the bands as
well as in your more typical postings here. Did you have something to
contribute other than noise?

Dave K8MN

6220. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 06:08:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C77CB.C11275F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35630

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3c7c3438$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> You've mistranslated: I think you're an airhead.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Ya confirm you can't give me an example every time you do that type of penny
> >ante stuff, Dave. By the way, I see you're leading by example...FB
>
> Give him a break, Kim, all his examples are classified and
> locked in a State Department commo vault at the US
> embassy in Guinea-Bisseau. He can't post them for fear of
> violating some espionage laws. :-)

You know, for a guy who knows as much about Guinea-Bissau and the State Department as you do, I'd think you'd have realized that our embassy in Bissau has been closed for quite some time after a coup d'etat in that country. Guess you still have a few things to learn.

Dave K8MN

6221. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 06:43:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C8043.C41029F3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35631

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>"Do you find Morse

> less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
> If so, why?

A real no-brainer. When there are enough of "you" CW will be gone.
Seems a worthwhile mission to prevent you from cloning yourself.

6222. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 06:49:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C818F.E1A1CD66@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35632

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> >(not!)
>
> Actually, I never heard him. Of course, I hung out on the CW bands, so I guess
> I never would have. Back then, the CW guys and gals were generally the
> friendly, welcoming type.
>
> If one were to judge by this forum, one would think that the welcoming is less
> common on the CW bands. In some ways, it has come full circle.
>
> As one who thinks that the only future my favorite mode has is going to be
> found in the way that the CW ops of today promote the mode, I get so
> disappointed to see some rake it through the mud and then hold up the mudraking
> as a badge of honor. They hurt the cause the same way you used to hurt the NCT
> cause with some of the things you used to say. You learned a degree of
> temperance, while others seem to have lost it.

> You just refuse to face the reality. The only reason that the vast majority of
> hams

who are competent CW operators became that way is because they were required to learn the Morse code and pass a test to prove it. When that test is gone the CW bands will, sometime hence, begin to lose their populations which is exactly what the Carl Stevensons want. Then not to far in the future it will be wall-to-wall SSB.

6223. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 06:57:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C8367.5741FF22@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35633

Dave Heil wrote:

> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > news:rbVe8.35626$KX7.1317424175@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > > > operated overseas on the ham bands.
> > >
> > > You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> > > more years on the noisy side will be necessary.
> >
> > Brian,
> >
> > Whatever side Dave is on is, but definition, the noisy side,
> > since all he does is generate noise.
>
> I understand you've been generating some noise yourself on the bands as
> well as in your more typical postings here. Did you have something to
> contribute other than noise?

So far all he has had to offer has been noise of the rudest sort. Even after Extra Lite time, what did he do, stick a mike in his face and try to make up for 25 years lost
time. All the while trying to bash those of us who "just did it" for doing it while he
sat out his adult life in protest of an "awful hazing ritual" known as a code test!!

Ain't it amazing!!!

6224. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 07:11:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227021138.17460.00000778@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35634

>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 2/26/2002 11:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <m6qo7uk0amq5jtd35mcg09kfocr6tks75r@4ax.com>

>
>Robeson I do not require any e-mail from you.

I don't care what you "require", "Schmitt". This present exchange began
at your instigation. I didn't know you from squat until you found it necessary
to take your own swipes.

Now that you have gotten your nose rubbed back in your own foolishness,
you don't care for it. So sorry about that.

>You have acted in an
>immature and dishonorable way and I wish not correspondence.

Well, let's see about this, "Schmitt"...YOU take me to task in a PUBLIC
forum about what YOU percieve is an "e mail" matter...

Then you make inflammatory comments of a personal nature, none of the like
had I ever directed at you, and then tell ME how "dishonorable" and "immature"
I am.

>You seem to fight with anyone and every one...(snip)

Nope. You haven't been paying attention. My other comments are against
one person and one person only. And that after I absorbed several weeks of HIS
angst for not agreeing with him over Morse Code, of all things.

YOU brought this on yourself, Gerry.

>..... I have no interest in such a person.

Thank God for that, Gerry. You don't know how worried I was about how I
was going to explain THAT to my wife.

>If you want to fight there are more than enough people in RRAP to
>accommodate you.

So far, there's only two. Lennie the Liar Anderson, And Gerry the Jerk
Schmitt.

>If you can find the spare time from the fights you
>might try to grow up.

Back at ya, Gerry. Maybe next time YOU have such "criticisms" that you
feel you just HAVE to vent, YOU will take your OWN advice and do it in a

private forum, and then make sure it IS some of your business.

>Plonk

Very mature. I can see you sitting there with your hands over your ears
going 'ICAN'THEARYOUICAN'THEARYOUICAN'THEARYOU....."

6225. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 07:16:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227021615.17460.00000779@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35635

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 2/26/2002 7:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <SBWe8.35657$_q2.1327229063@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>And stay the hell out of Florida! I may want to retire there in 2027 when I
>take up the code again.

My pleasure. Only dopers and octagenarians there...

Enjoy...

Steve

6226. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 07:27:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227022712.17460.00000780@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35636

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/26/2002 6:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226193506.10663.00000111@mb-fp.aol.com>

>There is NOTHING in federal
>planning visible to the public (nearly all of it is so visible)
>that indicates radio amateurs are somehow, even vaguely
>a part of some "reserve" group specializing in some skill.

Oooooops.

Military Affiliate Radio System. Air Force MARS, in particular,
incorporates thier members into various local base resource teams.

By the way, with the exception of a few military members assigned for
liasion or leadership roles, ALL members of all three MARS programs are, and
must be, licensed Amateur Radio operators.

Guess if they (the MARS chiefs and the branches themselves) didn't think
it was too important, they'd let CBers and FRSers do it too, huh?

73

Steve, K4YZ

6227. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 07:37:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227023745.17460.00000781@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35637

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/26/2002 6:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226193506.10663.00000111@mb-fp.aol.com>

>There is NOTHING in federal
>planning visible to the public (nearly all of it is so visible)
>that indicates radio amateurs are somehow, even vaguely
>a part of some "reserve" group specializing in some skill.

AND...lest you forget, Oh Worldy Knowlegeless One...

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of Defense, and
the Department of State have Memorandums of Understanding with the Amateur
community through the American Radio Relay League.

Further operating agreements exist with the two auxiliaries and various
other governmental and private agencies.

>Some are confused as to other possible interpretations of
>standard boilerplate political phrasing...especially so when
>none of those statements (in Part 97.1) reference morse
>codes specifically.

Not a one of those MoU's mention ANY mode. No interpretations are
necessary, except by those trying to denigrate or dismiss the service of
thousands of fellow Americans in thier chosen "avocation" and insist on making
the unwary believe in thier "Big Lie" techniques.

Worked on one New Mexican...guess if he keeps at it....

Steve and The Boys

6228. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 08:04:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227030458.17496.00000941@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35638

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/26/2002 6:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226193502.10663.00000108@mb-fp.aol.com>

>An emphasis on morse modes

There is no such thing as a "morse mode".

There are modes in which the Morse Code may be used to encode
intelligence, but it is NOT a "mode".

Just like there is not now nor has there ever been a "CW Test".

>While it is, or should be well-known to others, a morse mode test
>for licensing is a common-agreement treaty matter established by
>the ITU-R. The FCC is constrained by the USA adminstration (as
>member of the ITU-R) to maintain the code test.

Oh...NOW the FCC is constrained by the treaty.....Hmmm...Very interesting
that you now conceed this fact. You have only been denying this for three
years that I have been in here.

Finally realize that you are at the BACK of the parade screaming "WAIT FOR
ME!"..?!?!

>The choice for amateur radio then seems to be:
>1. Retain morse mode testing and reduce amateur freedoms by
> requiring type-accepted transmitters.
>2. Increase amateur freedom by removal of the morse tests.
>3. Permit continued over-strong influence of old standards
> retention by a minority for the exclusive enjoyment of a
> minority.

Well, Lennie, the FCC has already stated that they will be glad to drop
the Code tests as soon as the covenants of the treaty requiring it are removed.
The ARRL has removed thier objections to it, and it would appear that the
great majority of Amateurs either favor that, or are resigned to it's
inevitiability.

So why do you find it necessary to be such a Putz about insisting that it
is anything EXCEPT the way it is?

Never mind an answer...we already know how myoptic your response will be.

SR

6229. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 08:10:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227031038.17496.00000943@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35639

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/26/2002 6:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020226193504.10663.00000110@mb-fp.aol.com>

>In the original thread of this "state police have used CW" intermittent
>rationalizing,
>Carroll stated "the LAPD was part of this network." I then went personally
>to
>an LAPD
>division station and made inquiries regarding this assertion. I was told,
>both
>by a PR
>dutied officer and another from the Technical Center (via telephone from the
>division
>station's own phone) that no such communications mode was used in earlier
>times
>or even recent times.

Not correct...Popular Communications published a rather interesting item
some many years ago in which a picture of a Los Angeles communications facility
was using CW. This was, according to the article, part of the Interpol net,
and was used for liason with the FBI.

Needless to say, this was mid-thirties.

Sorry, Lennie. Some of the Yuppies in LAPD need to review thier own
history.

Steve

6230. What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 09:12:56 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35640
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over what mine described as *a weird hobby*?

Regards
toxic_waste

6231. Re: Call Sign as your Dot.com name $11.95

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 09:29:43 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u7p9o9stc089c1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35641
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hmm, if he resells Godaddy.com, then what shows up when you go to
administer your domains?
I deal with Godaddy directly, and I can change where my domains point at
any time.
There are some registrars that do a bit more for you, but they charge extra
for that service. They just don't tell you about that.

"J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:1103_1014771532@news.fuse.net...
> Well in a sense, when you use EZ-DomainNameRegistration.com you are using
GoDaddy. EZ is just a reseller of
> GoDaddy. He just marks everything up by $3.00 or so. Go to
www.godaddy.com and you can get the EXACT same
> thing for a few bucks less.
>
> On Mon, 25 Feb 2002 01:31:04 -0800, "Wayne" <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
wrote:
> > I register many domains of my own, all at a cheaper cost of $8.95 or
less
> > per year.
> > And I use www.godaddy.com for mine, which is less than what you charge.
> > BTW, why is this crossposted to so many groups anyway?
> > I don't do business with spammers, and I class you there.
> >
> > "News Editor" <news@ez-domainnameregistration.com> wrote in message
> > news:u7j4vj5c9p2b9e@corp.supernews.com...
> > > You're correct Charles... if you need domain forwarding, our fee is
more
> > than
> > > you might pay at others... but then you don't get our outstanding,
> > personalized
> > > support. And, you forgot to mention that our registration fee of
$11.95
> > is
> > > $4.05 cheaper than the other company... if you don't need forwarding,
why
> > pay
> > > more?
> > > www.Ez-DomainNameRegistration.com
> > >
> > > > Hello News Editor,
> > > > I have used domain forwarding for years and it is very useful.
However

> > > > I pay only $16 / year for the domain registration, the email
forwarding,
> > > > URL forwarding, full-frame forwarding, toll-free tech support,
domain
> > > > parking, and full-featured DNS....all found at.....
> > > > http://www.buydomains.com/
> > > >
> > > > Your price (from your site) is $23. IMHO if smart people shop
around
> > > > for these kinds of services they won't be contacting you.....your
> > > > competition has already got you whipped but good.....
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > >
> > > > 73 / DX
> > > >
> > > > Charles T Johnston
> > > > Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
> > > > charles@ab7sl.com
> > > >
> > > > AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
> > > > Official W9INN Antennas Page
> > > > www.ab7sl.com
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
>
> _____
> J. Duffy Beischel - Amateur Radio WB8NUT - www.wb8nut.com
>
> Member of: ARRL, NRA, Kiwanis, Republican Party, Masons, and Shriners
> and the vast Right Wing conspiracy to get the Clintons
>
> "If the government owned all the guns, would we still be a free people?"
> _____
>
>

6232. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:01:57 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <3ibp7usmlca54i2jcb6hb0hllfs7k1chqs@4ax.com>
Source record: 35642
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
waste) wrote:

>My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, she said to me, *either
>the Cb goes or I do*

Sensible girl!!!!!

:-)

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6233. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:25:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227052527.26494.00000720@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35643

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> It is interesting you feel that memorizing over a thousand questions in
>> trivial, but memorizing 26 letters, 10 number, 4 punctuation signs and a
>> few prosigns is "proving that one is dedicated."

> Surely you know that isn't what I think, and for sure it isn't what I said.

Okay, then it is not what you think, can we assume that you believe that memorizing over a thousand questions would not be trivial and that measuring 26 letters, 10 number, 4 punctuation signs and a few prosigns is does not prove that one is dedicated?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>The question is, what does your lame statement prove? Nothing I can identify.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

6234. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:32:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227053202.26494.00000721@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35644

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>CAM wrote:

>> Memorizing was the only hope I had of getting a ham license when I
>> was 14 years old

>One year you were the
>boy
>genuis that snowed all his math teachers with his astronomical IQ and
>photographic
>memory, never ever cracked a book and got his EE purely by rote
>memorization.

>Now we find you have an entirely foreign story for a different
>viewpoint of the same
>set of circumstances.

What is so "foreign" about his story, Dick. He says he memorized the material to get his license and he memorized the material to get his EE. His point, by my read, is that if amateur radio is broken because some hams can memorize enough to pass the tests, it has been "broken" for more than half a century.

You think that hordes of hams are "word associating" their way to passing the tests and I believe that most hams pass their tests the same way I did -- with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that the tougher questions don't appear on the exam they get.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6235. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:32:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pB2f8.36097$_N5.1372837044@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steve Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a5hcho$h3h$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> In article <3mWe8.35652$JY1.1325284498@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>,
> bpburke@prodigy.net says...
>
> > > 73, Steve
> >
> > Sounds like the island is closing down. The Joint Typhoon Warning
Center on
> > Nimitz Hill closed shop a while back. DOD is using coarse storage data
from
> > far away to fix storms now.
> >
> > Maybe some transit flights to the PI right now.
> >
> > Any news on Joel, KG6DX?
> >
> > 73, Brian
> >
>
> According to the island DX association
>
> http://www.guam.net/pub/midxa/
>
> Quote "KH2JU is the only dx'er left in guam"
>
> 73, Steve

Thanks for the link. There was no MIXDA when I was there, just MARC.
Getting to see KH2D and AH2S yelling at each other was probably one of the
reasons for the new club.

That's a bold statement that KH2JU makes. The military drawdown in the
early 90's must have taken a severe toll on the ham community there.

73, Brian

6236. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:35:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227053514.26494.00000722@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35646

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>However,
>I realize that in your own ARRL HQ enforced worldview

Um, Larry, how can a fellow of your claimed intelligence fail to grasp the simple, oft-repeated concpet that ARRL HQ doesn't give a rats butt about rrap? Maybe you are the one that Dick feels rote-memorized his way to an Extra.

As to the rest of your post, it degraded into near-meaningless buzzwords and gibberish, so it is not even possible to give a rational response. Is this your "save the code" crusade, or your "let's see how many people we can honk off today" inner need?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6237. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:35:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UD2f8.36098$7P5.1372911763@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35647

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227021615.17460.00000779@mb-cr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 2/26/2002 7:27 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <SBWe8.35657$_q2.1327229063@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >And stay the hell out of Florida! I may want to retire there in 2027
when I
> >take up the code again.
>
> My pleasure. Only dopers and octagenarians there...

Just as long as its not littered with a bunch of your ex-wives.

6238. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:36:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227053646.26494.00000723@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35648

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> So far all he has had to offer has been noise of the rudest sort.

Do you think being rude and insultive helps anyone's cause?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6239. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:39:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sH2f8.36101$_R5.1373099192@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35650

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c71a6bd$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020218100049.18959.00001551@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >I think he made his point. The mystery to me is that even with the
facts
> > >on the side of reducing/eliminating code testing sane adults generally
> > >prefer to be in the tent pissing out than outside of it pissing in.
> >
> > I prefer to be in an area where no one is pissing at all. Sane adults
> don't
> > piss into or out of tents.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Then the sane ones would be all the women....heh heh heh
>
> Kim W5TIT

Not according to Howard Sterno. He once hosted a contest of women...

6240. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:39:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227053953.26494.00000724@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35649

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Why would computers not be as fascinating to a 25 year old as a 15 year
>old?

> Are you kidding??? Cars, girls, booze and who knows what else that goes
>with, for openers?

I can understand how a 15-year old can use a computer to look at girls and
cars, but how and why could a 15-year old use a computer to enjoy booze?

And what would a 15-year old's fascination with girls, cars and booze have to
do with the reason that 15 year olds find computers more interesting than
amateur radio but 25 year olds do not?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6241. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:41:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VJ2f8.36102$3S5.1373104144@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35751

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c7c3a26_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Dave has a washboard!!!!!!!???? ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

Abs? No. His wife uses a washboard to do laundry.

6242. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:45:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227054551.26494.00000726@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35752

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?

> You don't think that it would be changed by the fact that newcomers are no
> longer required to learn it at all?

Are you saying, then, that the other modes are not useful because newcomers do not have to learn them to pass their tests? They thrive in amateur radio just fine without pass/fail mandatory testing. Is the usefulness of CW so little in your mind that you feel it should be the only mode that requires a welfare state support system?

>Surely you don't believe that all those folks who have so much problems
>finding time or enough interest will suddenly find
>that time and get interested just because it is no longer a requirement,
>now do you?

I don't believe that dropping the requirement will increase the number of hams that want to use Morse code. Is that really the question you intended to ask me?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6243. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:48:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227054843.26494.00000727@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35753

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>What matters is that they went through the same process to learn that fact
>that we all did.

That is the precise description of a hazing ritual, Dick.

>*THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing.

You do not feel that Morse code has much merit, then, if you feel that people
will not be attracted to use it. Your saying that is NOT a very good
endorsement for the mode, Dick.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6244. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:49:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <KQ2f8.1682$gK2.162215@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35754
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> Regards
> toxic_waste

Could have been worse for you: she might have insisted on a code test.

Could have been worse for her: you might have taken up golf and dressed
like a pimp.

All things considered, you are both better off.

6245. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:50:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227055014.26494.00000728@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35755

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>"Do you find Morse less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
>> If so, why?

> A real no-brainer. When there are enough of "you" CW will be gone.

If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl doesn't use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since Carl stopped using about 10 years ago?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6246. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:53:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227055303.26494.00000729@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35756

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>So why do you think she chose that callsign, if not to call attention to
>"those"?

I think she chose the call sign for precisely the reasons she said she did.

And I dare say that your reaction to that choice calls more attention to it
than the call sign itself.

Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6247. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 10:58:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227055828.26494.00000730@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35757

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>The only reason that the vast majority of hams who are competent CW
>operators became that way is because they were required
>to learn the Morse code and pass a test to prove it. When that test is gone
>the CW bands will, sometime hence, begin to lose their populations
>which is exactly what the Carl Stevensons want.

Carl Stevenson doesn't care one way or the other whether Morse code operation continues on the band or not. Why should he?

If the test goes away -- some think we should say when the test goes away -- the things you are saying about Morse code lacking sufficient usefulness to survive without a pass/fail test and the way you drop insults at potential users will serve to hasten its demise.

You are creating a self-fulfilling prophecy of doom and gloom, not Carl. IMHO, you are a greater enemy of Morse code use than you believe you are.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6248. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:10:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <c83f8.36104$A86.1374233700@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 35758

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
> > > didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
> > > encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
> > > wasting electricity.
> >
> > Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> > Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get
over
> > it.
>
> It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> it. It was plain observation.

Exactly my point. So smug that he follows up with:

> Even a blind pig finds some acorns.

There you go again. Whatta prick.

> > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> > DXer that you are. Right?
>
> Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.

Good. Now try to remember some other things you said or didn't say.

> > And that it was N0iMD whom you thought didn't know anything about DX.
> >
> > Is this correct?
>
> Close enough.
>
> > > I maintain that I only
> > > commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license
class.
> >
> > In which case, your assertion is wrong.
>
> Then we disagree.
>
> > > > Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6
daily,
> > like

> > > > he was in KP4-land.
> > >
> > > I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't
handle".
> > > I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it
or
> > > not.
> >
> > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
verified
> > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned
that I
> > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
>
> ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> Sheesh.

Oh no, there's that selective memory again.

> > > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > > operated overseas on the ham bands.
> >
> > You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> > more years on the noisy side will be necessary.
>
> Necessary for what? Nope, I wasn't born with a license but have had one
> since 1963. My basic math skills tell me that in November, I'll have
> had a ticket for 39 years.

You must be pretty old, but a few years younger than the median age of US
hams.

> > > What you call snobbishness, others
> > > would call experience.
> >
> > Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and
not
> > just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?
>
> If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss and
> turn much over the issue of smugness. You can have all the DX fun you
> can muster.

There's that selective memory again.

> > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > > the other day
> >
> > Do they have 6m privileges?
>
> Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> they'll be happy to hear from you.

Just curious. Wouldn't want you to get into trouble again.

> > and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks.
> > > Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I
> > > should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX
side
> > > of the Omni VI +.
> >
> > Of course not Dave, just attenuate your disdain for any other hams,
> > regardless of license class, having fun with what you consider to be
your
> > personal DX domain.
>
> Brian, your lack of DX knowledge is not based on your having fun working
> stations with non-U.S. calls. Go back to your OH2BH nonsense or your
> material on selling QSL cards for fun and profit for clues. One of the
> wonderful things about being human is that I get to pick and choose
> those for whom I reserve my admiration or my disdain. I don't reserve
> blocks based on license class for either group.

True, Marty doesn't need my nonsense, but I was commenting that one
individual can have such a large impact on that segment of the hobby, and
large, well moneyed groups (such as the ARRL) has so little. Outside of
running the DXCC. It was not meant to detract from his good deeds. I just
didn't need to hear how a VP of Nokia lives in a low income neighborhood.

Selling contacts. Welp Dave, just the other day Steve made a little slip
about "charging for a contact." This idea is so pervasive that even people
whom you think are knowledgeable about DX think it. They have to retrain
their common senses to reconcile Part 97. Its unnatural.

> > What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> > monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).
>
> PW0, H7, OM, KG4, EA6, J3, V73, VP8 S. Georgia among others. Coaxial
> loops work well. I use a 5 foot diameter hardline loop about two feet
> off the ground here with a variable gain preamp and a U-100 to turn it.
> An MFJ 1026 noise canceler helps too.

Damn that's good. This neighborhood is so full of noise that its hard to
hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes.

Brian

6249. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:43:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5igs4tcv1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35759

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C7073.E92F49C4@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > . I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
> > of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
> > than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
>
> Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It
doesn't
> matter
> to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went
through
> the
> same process to learn that fact that we all did. At least an equal number
of us
> who
> went through that same process learned that we DO have some level of
attraction
> to radiotelegraphy, and so we progressed in skill until we can use it
effectively

Yep, sure sounds like Dick doesn't want to take
on the task of being a proactive recruiter to one
of his favorite modes...but rather wants to sit back
and do nothing on the basis that as long as every new
HF ham must pass "the test", some of them will
join the CW affinity group.

Sure doesn't bode well for CW's future...IMHO.

> on the air (and that doesn't necessarily mean at any particularly high
speed).
> *THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing. Most new hams
will
> never learn, will never know, the most basic of all radiocommunication
modes.

Like most hunters don't learn bow hunting,
like most drivers won't ever learn to drive manual gearboxes,
like most engineers won't ever learn to use a sliderule,
ad nauseum...

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6250. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:49:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5ih8dvul1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35762

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7C6B5D.DB5D0052@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Studying the 3 page study guide in 1951 was the only thing I did to
prepare for
> > > the Novice exam. I didn't have access to any other radio or electronic
books,
> > > magazines or articles. The local TV repairman was a ham who told me
how to
> > > order the LM, but he was too busy with his business to assist any
more.
> > > I had no other source of radio information other than the 3 page study
guide
> > > in the LM.
> >
> > I suppose you want us to believe that you never ever looked further
into the book
> > than the three pages of the Novice section. Right.
>
> That's true for the Novice exam. A year later, I memorized the ten pages
in
> the General section.

I did the same thing...1957/8 and then the General theory about
a year later.

> Four years later, in 1955, I subscribed to QST and sprang
> for an ARRL Handbook. I didn't really start to understand the technical
material
> until 1957, my junior year in college.

And my understanding came in a combination of High School physics,
a shop class on electrical wiring and then Two years (AAS) of technical
school.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:50:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227065019.26726.00000108@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 35760

In article <3c7c4ff5_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:3c7c413b_1@news7.fast.net...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20020226201816.20570.00000100@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> > In article <20020226175721.18513.00000520@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>> (W1RFI)
>> > writes:
>> > >
>> > >Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
>> > >
>> > All depends on how many hams learn it and use it without the test.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>> Jim ...
>>
>> Your comment seems an admission that you like Morse
>> testing because it forces people to learn it whether they
>> care to or not, in hopes that some will decide (after the
>> fact) that they will use it.
>>
>> Let me paraphrase Ed's question: "Do you find Morse
>> less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
>> If so, why?
>>
>> Carl - wa6vse
>>
>
>So well said!
>
Thank you!

73 de Jim, N2EY

6252. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:50:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227065021.26726.00000109@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 35761

In article <3c7c3d6f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com...
>>
>> Let's see:
>>
>> - permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license
>
>[begin sarcasm mode]

Wasn't meant as sarcasm, Carl. I was just listing the differences.
Are any of my facts incorrect?
>
>Yup ... it's a shame those "newcomers" get a license for
>longer than a year ... makes it harder for the cranky olde fartz
>to find time and opportunity to drive them off, right?

The first QSO I ever had was with an old-timer who did not
try to drive me off. Now I'm the old timer. Do you see me trying
to drive off newcomers? Do you see me calling anyone names
like "stupid", "idiot", "twit", "cranky olde fartz", "a$$hole", "fossil" or
some such?

>(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
>"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
>(not!)

That was Mike, W2OY. He was on phone - 75 meter AM, actually. Not
CW and not in the Novice subbands. He's been dead several years now.

Do you know what his gripe was?
>
>> - 1500 W peak output above 50 MHz vs. 75 W input
>
>[temporarily leaving sarcasm mode]
>
>I've stated that I (personally) think that 1500W PEP is way
>too much power for the level of technical competence that's
>demonstrated by the tech test.

We know you don't like high power, Carl. Do you know of any
abuses of the power allowed to hams because of lack of technical
knowledge? If not, why do you insist on making folks jump through
technical test hoops just to use 1500 W?

>
>[re-entering sarcasm mode]
>
>> - All authorized modes and frequencies above 50 MHz vs.
>> 145-147 CW, MCW and AM only
>
>Yup ... got to restrict what the newcomers can do to to the point
>where it's not attractive ... otherwise, they'll over-run "our" bands
>(Not!)
>
>> - All forms of authorized frequency control vs. crystal control only
>
>Yup ... keep 'em rock-bound, despite the fact that rig stability
>isn't really an issue any more ... that'll make them easier to avoid
>and make it harder for them to work something interesting ... heck,
>if you let them move around at will, they might actually get together
>and teach each other a few things, and realize that they're really
>not an inferior species ... just a bit less experienced.
>(Not!)
>
>> Add the 5 wpm code test and get:
>
>> - 250 W peak output vs. 75 W input below 30 MHz
>
>Wow!!!! (Not!)

We all know you hate high power.

Another thing that has changed from those days is homebrewing. How many newcomers start out with homebrew equipment today? It was common back in 1963. My first rig was homebrew, and it has been followed by many others.

>
>> - CW and SSB on a piece of 10 M plus slices of 80/40/15 vs CW only on
>80/40/15
>
>Wow ... let newcomers use SSB! What heresy! (Not!) BTW ... you forgot
>that data is also allowed in that sliver on 10m, not just CW (more heresy).

Sounds to me like you have a prejudice against CW and cannot imagine that it could be fun for newcomers.

Do you know WHY Novices and Techs got 10 meters?
>
>> - Vanity calls including 1X3 vs. sequentially issued calls that
>specifically
>> point out newcomer status
>
>Yup ... got to brand those newcomers so "real hams" can easily
>recognize them, either to avoid them or to give them a bad time.
>If they can "blend in" with "the rest of us" what would become of us?
>(Not!)

Actually the Novice call was a pain in the neck in some ways because
you had to get new QSL cards after upgrading.

>[end sarcasm mode]
>
>Jim,
>
>Almost sounds like there's some "newcomer" prejudice
>showing on your part ...

Only in your imagination, Carl. I'm simply stating facts.
Ed constantly mentions the "4 page study guide of 1963"
so I filled in the blanks.

> sounds like you're irritated that
>newcomers don't have to endure the same hardships that
>you had to as a novice.

I'm simply pointing out the enormous differences 40 years has made.

I have also suggested (with Richard Plourde) a post-S25.5 license structure to
address some of the imbalances of the current system (like 1500 W for
newcomers) and at the same time LOWER the requirements for new hams.

One additional fact: Nobody is required to start out with a Tech today, just as
nobody was required to start with a Novice in 1963. All newcomers have always
had the option to skip over the "entry level" and go straight for General or
its
historic equivalent.

>You might want to think it over
>from that perspective a bit and do some self-examination.

Good suggestion. After careful consideration it seems to me that the
comparisons
made could be taken out of context, even though nowhere have I said "we should
go back to the way it was". In other words, some readers may project their own
biases on what I wrote.
>
>Or maybe, you're just listing some of the changes that
>have taken place without really complaining about them ...

Now you've got it. In fact, think about it the other way - perhaps
the complaint is that the old Novice was too restrictive.
>
>But can you see how to a newcomer it *might* sound like
>you begrudge them their privileges and wish they didn't
>have them?

Only a newcomer that was biased against the past....

Are any of my facts incorrect?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6253. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 11:52:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5ihds$k2s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35763
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?

I've seen similar "situations" in many hobbies. It usually
is a matter of "not balancing" family, spouse, hobby, work, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6254. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:22:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227072206.20570.00000117@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35764

In article <3c7c38f7_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>I don't operate
>the CW--we have loads of other folks around.

Hmm - first you say it's not relaible because of lack of operators, then there
are loads of other folks around...

>In the wee hours of the
>morning, I can often walk out with a pot of fresh coffee and everyone is
>"resting" while the bands are dead.

They aren't using the right bands, then. Maybe they just aren't serious
ironbottom operators. Maybe their setups are not very good. (I've seen some
really poor excuses for antennas used on FD).

Maybe they just want sleep and disconnected the antennas so you wouldn't bother
'em anymore ;-).

>I can tell you that on occasion, I've
>even sat down while "ribbing" someone about slacking that they better start
>working stations I can find (CW). I don't find 'em, they don't find
>'em...and the bottom fell out all about the same time +/- half hour or so...

Yes, 10 meters usually fades late at night.

I've been on every Field Day since 1968, and I can tell you that at least some
bands stay open all night. I've done the overnight thing almost every year -
even had a story published in QST about one FD occurrence.

80 and 40 meters are THE bands to be on after dark on FD. in fact, 80 meters
doesn't really get going until after midnight most of the time. 40 is good
around the clock, but really shines when the sun goes down. 20 and above are
sometimes good and sometimes not.

But don't tell me the bands all go dead late at night on FD. I've got the
experience
and the logs that show otherwise.

True fact: Couple years ago, W3RV & I worked AC6XG on Field Day. 20 meter
CW, some time after midnight. I think it was the year the group used my call.
Gawd, that was fun.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6255. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:40:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7cd4b5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35765

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C7C653B.D78A9EB0@ix.netcom.com...
> Why should the FCC care anyway if hams stay current or not?
> As long as hams can hook up antennas to transceivers and
> such boxes, and not splatter all over the spectrum...
>
> They're not in the business of handing out gold stars....

It's not a question of "handing out gold stars" ...

Two of the primary purposes of the ARS are:

1) self-training and education in radio/electronics
2) advancing the radio art

Someone who's stagnated in the distant technical
past obviously isn't doing #1 and is incapable of
doing #2.

Thus, It would seem that the FCC *should* have some
incentive to provide a mechanism that would assure
that, at least most, hams remain reasonably technically
competent in terms of relatively current technology.
(I say "most" because NO testing system is 100%
perfect.)

Carl - wa6vse

6256. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:44:22 UTC
From: Alan Mears <tech2000@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <Aw4f8.12831$Hg1.1813415@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 35766
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

My partner hates the 2 things I enjoy the most, Radio and Computers.

I trtied to offer the option of all day down the pub, or in front of the
football and for some reason that didn't appeal either ;-)

Seems that anything that doesn't involve being with them 100 % of the time
is likely to cause problems ;-)

Best Regards,
Alan
"toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> Regards
> toxic_waste

6257. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:50:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227075013.26502.00000802@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35767

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>I don't operate the CW--we have loads of other folks around.

>Hmm - first you say it's not relaible because of lack of operators, then
>there are loads of other folks around...

I estimate about 20% of hams have useable proficiency in Morse code. That is
about 125,000 folks, a number I could reasonably term "a load."

However, unless there are at least 5 hams available, odd are that none will be
useabily proficient in Morse code. I would not deem that very reliable.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6258. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:54:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227075441.26502.00000803@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35768

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>The first QSO I ever had was with an old-timer who did not
>try to drive me off. Now I'm the old timer. Do you see me trying
>to drive off newcomers? Do you see me calling anyone names
>like "stupid", "idiot", "twit", "cranky olde fartz", "a$$hole", "fossil" or
>some such?

You have always been a gentleman, Jim, and even those that disagree with you respect you, and have some expectation that both will learn from reasonable discourse with you.

Unfortunately, there have been too many insults to go around on both sides of this debate. But for completeness, don't leave out "inferior," and "knuckledragger."

The really sad thing is that often those who devolve to insult somehow think that cussing and calling names strenghtens their points. It is almost as if they envision that everyone will gasp and think that this MUST be a serious thing because it even made a great guy like <name> act in such a childish manner.

In reality, I bet the opposite is true. If the only counter to the NCTA position were the insults, the PCTA position would lose in a heartbeat. And vice versa, of course.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6259. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:56:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227075646.26502.00000804@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35769

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Sure doesn't bode well for CW's future...IMHO.

Fortunately, there are others who are actively promoting the mode in a reasonable and helpful fashion. It should be around as long as I am. In fact, it will be around as long as I am. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6260. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 12:59:04 UTC
From: Jay in the Mojave <jay123a@qnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C7CD818.88E4FEE@qnet.com>
Source record: 35770
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello Toxic Waste:

Your better off without her I would think. I think she would incourage a hobby that you enjoyed.

However women are like bus's, when one leaves, another will show up sooner or later.

Now you can affor to buy a large Linear Amplifier, and massivly high gain antenna system, every thing has a silver linning.

Jay in the Mojave

toxic waste wrote:
>
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> Regards
> toxic_waste

6261. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:11:19 UTC
From: A Different Nick <nicholas@commcen.co.uk>
Message-ID: <8jmp7ugdv0ufjm03v07hcldodnbtduj9kq@4ax.com>
Source record: 35773
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jay in the Mojave <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote:

>However women are like bus's, when one leaves, another will show up
>sooner or later.
>
True, but its when they shout "Room for one more inside" It puts me
off a bit :-)

I'm beginning to get a complex.

Nick

6262. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:15:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7cdcbd_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35771

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227065021.26726.00000109@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3c7c3d6f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Let's see:
> >>
> >> - permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license
> >
> >[begin sarcasm mode]
>
> Wasn't meant as sarcasm, Carl. I was just listing the differences.
> Are any of my facts incorrect?

Note the placement of the [begin ... end sarcasm mode] markers.
I was pointing out that MY new text in response to your list of
comparisons was sarcasm, NOT that you were being sarcastic,
Jim.
> >
> >Yup ... it's a shame those "newcomers" get a license for
> >longer than a year ... makes it harder for the cranky olde fartz
> >to find time and opportunity to drive them off, right?
>
> The first QSO I ever had was with an old-timer who did not
> try to drive me off. Now I'm the old timer. Do you see me trying
> to drive off newcomers? Do you see me calling anyone names
> like "stupid", "idiot", "twit", "cranky olde fartz", "a$$hole",
"fossil" or
> some such?
>
> >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> >(not!)
>
> That was Mike, W2OY. He was on phone - 75 meter AM, actually. Not
> CW and not in the Novice subbands. He's been dead several years now.
>
> Do you know what his gripe was?

Does it REALLY matter in terms of the impression his
diatribe must have made on newcomers?

> >> - 1500 W peak output above 50 MHz vs. 75 W input
> >
> >[temporarily leaving sarcasm mode]
> >
> >I've stated that I (personally) think that 1500W PEP is way
> >too much power for the level of technical competence that's
> >demonstrated by the tech test.
>
> We know you don't like high power, Carl. Do you know of any
> abuses of the power allowed to hams because of lack of technical
> knowledge? If not, why do you insist on making folks jump through
> technical test hoops just to use 1500 W?

Because, without adequate technical competency, 1500W at
VHF/UHF with unlimited antenna gain can be downright
dangerous, not only to the person who's (mis)using it, but to
his/her family and neighbors ... not to mention that most 1500W
amps still use thermionic FETs (tubes) and therefore have high
plate voltage supplies, which introduces yet another danger
factor for the incompetent and those around him/her.

Thus, a test of adequate technical competency would be a
RELEVANT, REASONABLE requirement for such high powers,
not just a "hazing ritual" "hoop to jump through."

> >[re-entering sarcasm mode]
> >
> >> - All authorized modes and frequencies above 50 MHz vs.
> >> 145-147 CW, MCW and AM only
> >
> >Yup ... got to restrict what the newcomers can do to to the point
> >where it's not attractive ... otherwise, they'll over-run "our"
bands
> >(Not!)
> >
> >> - All forms of authorized frequency control vs. crystal control
only
> >
> >Yup ... keep 'em rock-bound, despite the fact that rig stability
> >isn't really an issue any more ... that'll make them easier to
avoid
> >and make it harder for them to work something interesting ... heck,
> >if you let them move around at will, they might actually get
together
> >and teach each other a few things, and realize that they're really
> >not an inferior species ... just a bit less experienced.
> >(Not!)
> >
> >> Add the 5 wpm code test and get:

> >
> >> - 250 W peak output vs. 75 W input below 30 MHz
> >
> >Wow!!!! (Not!)
>
> We all know you hate high power.

I don't "hate high power" ... I simply thing that it is misused A LOT,
that it presents potential dangers (electrical or RF exposure ... the
latter particularly at VHF/UHF and up), and that better antennas
and modulation and coding schemes offer FAR more "bang for the
buck" than brute force power. However, if the more elegant solutions
(antennas, modulation, coding) don't provide adequate link margin,
then I have no problem with someone using higher, allowable powers.
(But, according to the minimum power rule, which is probably the
MOST violated rule in ham radio, the guys who are telling each other
that they are all S9+40+ to everyone else in the group are MISusing
their amps, IMHO.)
>
> Another thing that has changed from those days is homebrewing.
> How many newcomers start out with homebrew equipment today?
> It was common back in 1963.
> My first rig was homebrew, and it has been followed by many others.

Because of code testing, most newcomers today enter as techs. The
most versatile piece of gear they can acquire as a 1st rig is a 2m HT.
How many "experienced, long-time" hams do you think are technically
capable of building the equivalent of, for example, a Yaesu VX-5R?
(let alone building it cost-effectively, when buying parts in small
quantities
at outrageous prices compared to what the OEMs pay?)

> >> - CW and SSB on a piece of 10 M plus slices of 80/40/15 vs CW
only on
> >80/40/15
> >
> >Wow ... let newcomers use SSB! What heresy! (Not!) BTW ... you
forgot
> >that data is also allowed in that sliver on 10m, not just CW (more
heresy).
>
> Sounds to me like you have a prejudice against CW and cannot imagine
that it
> could be fun for newcomers.

- From my experience, most don't find it fun ... or even interesting ...
that's why so many refuse to do it.
I don't find it fun ... I don't use it. I have NO problem with anyone
who WANTS TO using it to their heart's content. I DO have a
problem with it being used as an unnecessary barrier designed
to keep people off of HF.

> Do you know WHY Novices and Techs got 10 meters?

Because the FCC wanted to make ham radio at least marginally
more attractive to newcomers ("novice enhancement"). But I'll
bet that the "traditional society" lobbied the FCC to make sure
that they didn't get "real ham" privs in the other HF bands.

> >> - Vanity calls including 1X3 vs. sequentially issued calls that
> >specifically
> >> point out newcomer status
> >
> >Yup ... got to brand those newcomers so "real hams" can easily
> >recognize them, either to avoid them or to give them a bad time.
> >If they can "blend in" with "the rest of us" what would become of
us?
> >(Not!)
>
> Actually the Novice call was a pain in the neck in some ways because

> you had to get new QSL cards after upgrading.

So what? With any "mark of Cain" newbie call, I'd think that most
upgraders would check the "give me a new call that reflects my new
class of license" box on the form, just to get away from the nagging
and derision from the cranky olde fartz.

> >[end sarcasm mode]
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >Almost sounds like there's some "newcomer" prejudice
> >showing on your part ...
>
> Only in your imagination, Carl. I'm simply stating facts.

OK ... I believe you to be an honorable person, so I'll
take your word on that.

However, I think in all honesty, you'd have to admit that
a LOT of what I said in sarcasm above really DOES
represent the feelings of quite a lot of long-time "real hams."

> Ed constantly mentions the "4 page study guide of 1963"
> so I filled in the blanks.
>
> > sounds like you're irritated that
> >newcomers don't have to endure the same hardships that
> >you had to as a novice.
>
> I'm simply pointing out the enormous differences 40 years has made.

40 years has made enormous differences in EVERYTHING. That's
part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was 40 years
ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long haul.

EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.

> I have also suggested (with Richard Plourde) a post-S25.5 license
structure to
> address some of the imbalances of the current system (like 1500 W
for
> newcomers) and at the same time LOWER the requirements for new hams.

You're right ... I remember seeing some of that, but it got a bit
involved and I missed a lot due to business travel, then it seemed
to be gone ...

> One additional fact: Nobody is required to start out with a Tech
today, just as
> nobody was required to start with a Novice in 1963. All newcomers
have always
> had the option to skip over the "entry level" and go straight for
General or
> its historic equivalent.

Yes, but I believe that the leap from nothing to General is a larger
leap today than it was in the past, with the exception of 5 wpm vs.
13.
There is a place for an entry-level license ... and other than the
power and lack of HF-specific material, I think the tech is not TOO
far off the mark for a "starter" ... I'd beef it up just a bit, get
rid of
code and add HF privs when the ITU Radio Regs allow it, and
I think it would be a good replacement for the old Novice entry point.
Much more versatile, agreed, but I think that is necessary to make
the ARS attractive to newcomers.

> >You might want to think it over
> >from that perspective a bit and do some self-examination.
>
> Good suggestion. After careful consideration it seems to me that the
> comparisons
> made could be taken out of context, even though nowhere have I said
"we should
> go back to the way it was". In other words, some readers may project
their own
> biases on what I wrote.
> >
> >Or maybe, you're just listing some of the changes that
> >have taken place without really complaining about them ...
>
> Now you've got it. In fact, think about it the other way - perhaps
> the complaint is that the old Novice was too restrictive.

I do think the old Novice was FAR too restrictive ... maybe
when it first came out ... but technology made it reasonable
to ease many of the restrictions ... like VFOs, 250W PEP,

etc. You *seemed* to be (at least on the edge of) complaining
about those liberalizing changes ... if you weren't my sarcasm
wasn't for you ... it really was for those who actually DO feel
the way I was expressing in sarcasm.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPHzb0Je+N6+q84HiEQI5aACgjAT9qnrkhBXR6EqY4zRzUntZU2oAoNDM
aGal9xujjfwTNifVC+OmxtOJ
=onJF
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

6263. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:17:19 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ptmp7uoj04h7pio3ugiprslo1tp450fi25@4ax.com>
Source record: 35772

As I said I do not wish to receive E-mail from you Robeson please
do not send me any further e-mail. You should already understand
that I don't think much of you stalking me is not improving my
opinion,

cc: abuse@AOL.COM

On 26 Feb 2002 16:08:23 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>>Date: 2/26/2002 7:49 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <ui3n7uk9k7smps2nftn4c4mj11ksjkuodc@4ax.com>
>
>>Well this pretty much answers my question about your ever growing up.
>>I say something you don't like and you feel obligated to accuse the
>>thousands of scientists, engineers and technicians who have kept
>>this nation free for the past 60 years of treason. The folks up here
>>put an end to the Second World War and won the Cold War what
>>have you done to compare to that Ms. Robeson.
>
> You left yourself open to it, Gerry. Sorry. You took the first shot.
>Just like Lennie the Limp, you think you can toss about insults and
>humiliations and not be on the receiving end.
>
> As for ending the cold war, Sir, THAT was done on the backs of hundreds of
>thousands of Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines.
>
> The "stuff" provided at Los Al was just ONE of the tools that that was
>accomplished with. Unfortunately it was also one of the tools that STARTED the
>Cold War, so don't even go there.
>
> The Soviet block was beaten back as much by the sheer will of the western
>nations to see it destroyed as much as anything.
>
>>I find it very hard to believe you were ever a Marine all of the
>>Marines I have ever worked with have had a deep sense of
>>honor, you sir seem completely devoid of honor. I suppose
>>there could be Marines without honor I just never have met one.
>
> I am sure you find it emboldning to make such declarations.
>
> My "sense of honor" does not include standing pat while taking a cheap
>shot from some ne'r-do-well who at once admonishes me to "take it to e mail"
>when making statements he does not like, all the while making THOSE comments in

>the same public forum.
>
> Two-facedness does not suit you, Gerry.
>
>>Fired up Google groups yesterday using "Amateur Radio" as a subject
>>one of your RRAP schoolyard personal attacks was third on the list.
>>Methinks your lack of honor is affecting your ability to tell the
>>truth.
>
> Methinks you are the one with an honesty proplem, Gerry. Tried the same
>thing, and to be relatively thorough, went several pages of "next search".
>Nothing on RRAP came up until well over 50 items, and it was not me that was
>involved in the thread.
>
> But I will simply accept it as your "newsreader"...methinks you set a bit
>narrower parameter than just "amateur radio".
>
>>Are you referring to yourself in the above. You seem to be the only
>>one
>>spewing bile filth and slander which interestingly enough was not even
>>directed at me but rather at a large group of very loyal American.
>>Those folks unlike you Ms. Robeson actually do something.
>
> Gerry, is there a good reason why (a) you decry my posts yet have started
>an entirely new thread doing the exact smae thing, and (b) use "Ms" instead of
>my given name? THAT is a Lennie-tactic.
>
> As for who the insults may have been directed at, you seem to have a bit
>of the same problem, making accusations about "honor" of Marines. You know
>nothing of which YOU speak, Sir.
>
>>I'll have to leave dealing with you to others as sinking toward your
>>level is making me quite uncomfortable.
>
> I find that very humorous, Gerry. You initiate an exchange in a PUBLIC
>forum decrying the need for a PRIVATE exchange...begin the use of demeaning
>"titles" ala Lennie, then suggest that you are somehow sinking.
>
> Had you been a man who does what he says and vice versa, you would have
>made those first comments in e mail. You didn't, which leads me to believe
>this was nothing more than a chest-beating exercise on your part to gain some
>imaginary foothold on the RRAP pecking order. Lennie calls them "messaging
>points". Well, I guess you scored your first ones. Ask Lennie for his address
>so he can mail you your certificate.
>
> I would have repsected some well considered words in a private e
>mail...Instead you came out swinging in here.
>
> You already sank, Gerry. That sound you hear is you desperately trying to
>find something to hold on to.

>
> Have a nice day.
>
>

6264. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:36:13 UTC
From: Alan Mears <tech2000@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <ch5f8.13206$Hg1.1854630@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 35775
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Does she have a sister? ;-)
"Brian Reay" <brian.reay@bigfoot.com> wrote in message
news:sg5f8.56605$Ah1.7088390@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com...
>
> "toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
> news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> > My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> > the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> > though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> > other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> > what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
> >
> > Regards
> > toxic_waste
>
>
> Mine is licensed (as G6MXR) but not really active. I am 'allowed' my
antenna
> etc., a nice pair of rooms for the shacks, and a I don't recall any grief
> over buying rigs etc. She has even said I can have a rig in the bedroom
when
> I have finished all the DIY.
>
> 73
>
> Brian
>
>
>

6265. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:36:34 UTC
From: Brian Reay <brian.reay@bigfoot.com>
Message-ID: <sg5f8.56605$Ah1.7088390@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 35774
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> Regards
> toxic_waste

Mine is licensed (as G6MXR) but not really active. I am 'allowed' my antenna etc., a nice pair of rooms for the shacks, and a I don't recall any grief over buying rigs etc. She has even said I can have a rig in the bedroom when I have finished all the DIY.

73

Brian

6266. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 13:45:42 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <siop7ukj54hur69ba5hq5rkrknt7q3sc42@4ax.com>
Source record: 35776
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 04:59:04 -0800, Jay in the Mojave
<jay123a@qnet.com> wrote:

>However women are like bus's, when one leaves, another will show up
>sooner or later.

Women are like buses .... sometimes it seems they're *never* going to
come.

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6267. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 14:34:02 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <mirp7uk5ab316lhdqk13dkpk78kgvsu79o@4ax.com>
Source record: 35777

Mr. Robeson,

All e-mail received from you is filtered and forwarded to
abuse@AOL.com send whatever you want I'll never see
it and AOL will. As previously noted growing up would
be in your best interests perhaps some anger management
classes would also be good. Remember I'm not the one
who has accused thousands of innocent people of treason.

I wonder what kind of zero places his entire self worth in Morse
Code and abusing people. I guess I have an idea now. Just
a friendly suggestion if you redirected your hate into personal
development you might make something of your self.

Have a nice life.

On 27 Feb 2002 07:11:38 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>>Date: 2/26/2002 11:09 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <m6qo7uk0amq5jtd35mcg09kfocr6tks75r@4ax.com>
>
>>
>>Robeson I do not require any e-mail from you.
>
> I don't care what you "require", "Schmitt". This present exchange began
>at your instigation. I didn't know you from squat until you found it necessary
>to take your own swipes.
>
> Now that you have gotten your nose rubbed back in your own foolishness,
>you don't care for it. So sorry about that.
>
>>You have acted in an
>>immature and dishonorable way and I wish not correspondence.
>
> Well, let's see about this, "Schmitt"...YOU take me to task in a PUBLIC
>forum about what YOU percieve is an "e mail" matter...
>
> Then you make inflammatory comments of a personal nature, none of the like
>had I ever directed at you, and then tell ME how "dishonorable" and "immature"
>I am.
>
>>You seem to fight with anyone and every one...(snip)
>
> Nope. You haven't been paying attention. My other comments are against

>one person and one person only. And that after I absorbed several weeks of HIS
>angst for not agreeing with him over Morse Code, of all things.
>
> YOU brought this on yourself, Gerry.
>
>>..... I have no interest in such a person.
>
> Thank God for that, Gerry. You don't know how worried I was about how I
>was going to explain THAT to my wife.
>
>>If you want to fight there are more than enough people in RRAP to
>>accommodate you.
>
> So far, there's only two. Lennie the Liar Anderson, And Gerry the Jerk
>Schmitt.
>
>>If you can find the spare time from the fights you
>>might try to grow up.
>
> Back at ya, Gerry. Maybe next time YOU have such "criticisms" that you
>feel you just HAVE to vent, YOU will take your OWN advice and do it in a
>private forum, and then make sure it IS some of your business.
>
>>Plonk
>
> Very mature. I can see you sitting there with your hands over your ears
>going 'ICAN'THEARYOUICAN'THEARYOUICAN'THEARYOU....."
>
>
>
>
>

6268. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 14:49:38 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0202270649.6eb51e8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35778
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:<3ibp7usmlca54i2jcb6hb0hllfs7k1chqs@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
> waste) wrote:
>
> >My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, she said to me, *either
> >the Cb goes or I do*
>
> Sensible girl!!!!!
>
> :-)

Lets look on the bright side Walt, personally I have no trouble in finding a girlfriend, unlike the average British Ham, who takes up the hobby purely because he is incapable of pulling a bit of totty, although it might help if he bought a bar of soap and a toothbrush.

I suppose its fair to say, a British Hams radio is his equivalent of a blow up doll...

Yeuk, dont even bear thinking about ;-))

Have a nice day Walt.
toxic_waste

6269. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 15:36:20 UTC
From: knights <gate4000@rubbish.com>
Message-ID: <a5iudj$qt9$1@paris.btinternet.com>
Source record: 35779
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

tell her there is no harm talking to freinds.Better than half these idiots
drunk outside,pub,etc.
"Alan Mears" <tech2000@lineone.net> wrote in message
news:ch5f8.13206$Hg1.1854630@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com...
> Does she have a sister? ;-)
> "Brian Reay" <brian.reay@bigfoot.com> wrote in message
> news:sg5f8.56605$Ah1.7088390@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com...
> >
> > "toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
> > news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> > > My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> > > the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> > > though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> > > other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> > > what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
> > >
> > > Regards
> > > toxic_waste
> >
> >
> > Mine is licensed (as G6MXR) but not really active. I am 'allowed' my
> antenna
> > etc., a nice pair of rooms for the shacks, and a I don't recall any
grief
> > over buying rigs etc. She has even said I can have a rig in the bedroom
> when
> > I have finished all the DIY.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Brian
> >
> >
> >
>
>

6270. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 15:54:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7C8662.8EC42674@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35780

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> >> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> >> >reliability is a moot point.
> >>
> >> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
> >>
> >> 73,
> >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
> >that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.
>
> Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
those operators come from that source these days that if
hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
communications mode because of that singular fact.
It has been made more than clear
that almost all others who intended to become hams do not
realize nor understand the basic utility of radiotelegraphy,
and instead prefer to just skip learning it beyond the level
mandatory for licensing. That should make it clear what the
future holds when testing is no longer here.
The old NCI saw that "Morse lovers must 'sell' the mode'"
is a total
fraud, as they well know. You can't sell to most people what
they don't
understand and have no experience with, yet think they know
all about.

6271. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:01:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D02D8.A8C5FDE1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35781

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> The fact of the matter is that you don't have a clue what I'm
> doing, or where

So, you lie about it, then?

6272. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:14:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D05F8.1581691E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35782

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I've had people tell me that they would have never attempted
> > > to became a ham under any other system.
> >
> > Memorizing was the only hope I had of getting a ham license when I
> > was 14 years old. From that came a EE degree and 40 years of
> > engineering productivity. From little acorns mighty oaks grow.
> > What's wrong with that?
>
> "What's wrong with that" is that YOU said it. One year you were the
> boy
> genuis that snowed all his math teachers with his astronomical IQ and
> photographic
> memory, never ever cracked a book and got his EE purely by rote
> memorization.
> Now we find you have an entirely foreign story for a different
> viewpoint of the same set of circumstances.

How is that an entirely foreign story? I do have a high IQ and
I did have a photographic memory for numbers and graphs when
I was young. Using a photographic memory *IS* memorizing, Dick.
There's no inconsistency. Do you think because it was easy for
me to memorize that I should have avoided memorizing? Get real!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6273. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:17:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5j0l30un2@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35789

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C7073.E92F49C4@worldnet.att.net...

> on the air (and that doesn't necessarily mean at any particularly high
speed).
> *THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing. Most new hams
will
> never learn, will never know, the most basic of all radiocommunication
modes.

IOW, you think that morse code can't survive on it's own merits. It needs a government mandate, despite the fact that the HF privileges that went along with it were entirely unrelated.

6274. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:17:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D0697.FEE143AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35784

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> > FCC regulation.
>
> There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations. You don't
> know that?

How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?
Who does the enforcement for "investing whatever it takes"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6275. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:19:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227111936.26469.00000693@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35783

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 2/27/2002 8:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <mirp7uk5ab316lhdqk13dkpk78kgvsu79o@4ax.com>

>Mr. Robeson,

Ahhhhh...NOW it's "Mr" Robeson.

>All e-mail received from you is filtered and forwarded to
>abuse@AOL.com send whatever you want I'll never see
>it and AOL will.

OkieDokie, Gerry, whatever your preference.

Cowardism suits you, I see. You demand people "take it to e mail", but
then you cut and run when they do.

I imagine it's been that way your whole life.

>As previously noted growing up would
>be in your best interests perhaps some anger management
>classes would also be good. Remember I'm not the one
>who has accused thousands of innocent people of treason.

I have no anger to deal with, Gerry. Just a morbid humor at ididot like
you who will initiate something like this and then run for cover when it get's
dumped back in yuor lap.

>I wonder what kind of zero places his entire self worth in Morse
>Code and abusing people.

Hmmmmm.....Interesting.....

First of all I DON'T place my "entire self worth" in Morse Code. I'd
challenge you to provide soem sort of doucumentary evidence of such, but you
are a non-hacker, so I won't wast the time.

Secondly, spin as much as you'd like, you are STILL the one who initiated
this. All you have to do is shut up and it stops. I KNOW an apology for
opening the flood gates is impossible, so we'll just leave it at that.

>I guess I have an idea now. Just
>a friendly suggestion if you redirected your hate into personal
>development you might make something of your self.

Speaking of classes, Your Selfworshipness, may I suggest some objectivity
training?

You make accusations of others and decray thier behaviour, but you do the same exact thing. This ahs gone on for a couple of days now...It would have been just my post about Lennie getting caught lying again, which is NOT in dispute. But then you added your spite and bileness to it and here we are.

So what does that make you?

>Have a nice life.

It's going along rather nicely, thanks. Some major disappointments along the way, but some major accomplishments too.

And all without you, Gerry. Imagine that.

Steve

>cc: abuse@AOL.COM
>
>On 26 Feb 2002 16:08:23 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>>>From: Ge

6276. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:25:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D0890.662A35C9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35786

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
> services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
> those operators come from that source these days that if
> hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
> communications mode because of that singular fact.

Why do so few CW ops come from the military nowadays, Dick?
What percentage of presentday hams regularly use CW?
What percentage of future hams will learn CW after the
requirement is dropped? What will happen if hams organize
for the purpose of keeping CW alive? What would happen
if you got off your lazy butt and helped that effort?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6277. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:28:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D0916.901A24D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35787

Dick Carroll wrote:
> A real no-brainer. When there are enough of "you" CW will be gone.
> Seems a worthwhile mission to prevent you from cloning yourself.

Again, you confuse CW with Morse code testing. Morse code testing
may be gone. But CW will outlive you and me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6278. Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:28:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227112837.26469.00000694@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 35785

>Subject: Re: Lennie Caught In The Back Peddle Again
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 2/27/2002 7:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ptmp7uoj04h7pio3ugiprslo1tp450fi25@4ax.com>

>As I said I do not wish to receive E-mail from you Robeson please
>do not send me any further e-mail. You should already understand
>that I don't think much of you stalking me is not improving my
>opinion,

You opinion is not worth much, Gerry, and I am not overly concerned with your threats either.

You initiate a series of flaming posts in RRAP, demand that others "take it to e mail", then make a big deal about how "abused" you are when they do.

Be my guest, drop this in AOL's lap if you'd like. The original posts are archived in Google, and if it comes to the point of an attorney having to get involved, we can simply allow them to retrieve that and see "what's what".

You are not being "stalked" in ANY definition of the word, Gerry. Like Lennie, methinks you enjoy creating a confrontational enviroment and then claiming "victim" status when it come back to you.

Spine and honesty do not seem to be your two strong suits, now are they?

Adios, Gerry. Keep your insults, lies and threats to yourself. I am sure you enjoy them more than anyone else.

Steve

6279. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:30:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D09A4.DF803C38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35788

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
> > of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
> > than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
>
> Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It doesn't matter
> to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went through the
> same process to learn that fact that we all did.

So whether it's useful to a ham or not, he should go through what you did?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6280. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 16:36:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D0B0E.62B1E79F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35790

Dick Carroll wrote:
> who are competent CW operators became that way is because they were required
> to learn the Morse code and pass a test to prove it.

I learned Morse code in Cub Scouts long before I knew about ham radio, Dick.
I don't use CW because I was required to learn it. I use it because it is
fun for me. No matter what happens to the Morse code requirement, there
will be hams who learn Morse code because CW is fun. Those hams who consider
CW to be fun will find it to be useful, just like today.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6281. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:21:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D15BF.EBE9A8CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35791

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/26/2002 6:35 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020226193504.10663.00000110@mb-fp.aol.com>
>
> >In the original thread of this "state police have used CW" intermittent
> >rationalizing,
> >Carroll stated "the LAPD was part of this network." I then went personally
> >to
> >an LAPD
> >division station and made inquiries regarding this assertion. I was told,
> >both
> >by a PR
> >dutied officer and another from the Technical Center (via telephone from the
> >division
> >station's own phone) that no such communications mode was used in earlier
> >times
> >or even recent times.
>
> Not correct...Popular Communications published a rather interesting item
> some many years ago in which a picture of a Los Angeles communications facility
> was using CW. This was, according to the article, part of the Interpol net,
> and was used for liason with the FBI.
>
> Needless to say, this was mid-thirties.
>
> Sorry, Lennie. Some of the Yuppies in LAPD need to review thier own
> history.

Yes, and that isn't the BEST part, by a bunch. Go to the APCO (Associated Police Communications Officers) website and read the "history of police communications". You will find not a single mention of the extensive and longlived interstate police radiotelegraph net, yet the APCO manuals that I have in my possession, one for the year 1945 and the other 1951 both have extensive information regarding the entirety of that net, with detailed callsign and frequency information for all participating agencies.
These were the handbooks used by participants on this net to address messages, route traffic, and otherwise find information needed in the business of police communications. Note that there was a large amount of other information in the manuals, they were a comprehensive file of ALL police radio activity of the time, including all agencies' frequencies,

contacts with
neighboring departments, and frequency monitoring activities.
Not all agencies participated in the CW net, of course, just those where there was a need to
pass long distance communications regarding police work and where the traffic load warranted the installation of a station. Most states had a single point of contact with this net, though some used extensive instate CW nets as well, and most smaller agencies handed off their long distance message traffic to this contact station.
The reason for those nets was not obscure in the least. MONEY. In the days when AT&T
had a monopoly on long distance telephone (and teletype) circuits, and charged whatever
the traffic would bear, and at the same time government administrations were more sensitive
to tax issues, and costs of service, the CW nets were a very attractive and cost effective
communications device. Since all departments who used radio had console dispatchers

already on the payroll, it made excellent economic sense to use them for dual duty, and also
make long distance CW operators of them. That's exactly what they did, and many hams
wound up sitting at those consoles working CW a part of their shifts. As always, some of
the dispatchers liked to work CW more than voice, and I knew one ham who is now SK

who spent a large part of his career doing nothing but working CW on that net. Since others
preferred to do only voice, that was an easy work schedule task to resolve.
And of course the most populated states had an internal wire teletype net that handled most
of their intrastate messaging needs. But even they also participated in the interstate police CW net, and the few who had no station on the net could be contacted through one who did.
California had one of the wire line TTY nets, as well as a station on the interstate CW net
that was located in Sacramento. Of course LA had a CW station that could be brought up on
the net as needed. As local circumstances changed so did the activity on the net, naturally. It's all in the APCO manuals published during those years.
The police CW net was in use to a diminishing extent into the early 1970's, and one of the
last stations to close down operations was the CW relay station at Flagstaff, AZ. Where I
worked, wire teletype replaced CW just before I hired on, but the CW installation remained in
place for another year, and the state HQ station, which was a major interstate relay, continued in service on the CW net to its closure. And yes, I was given a Morse code test as a part of
the pre employment tests I took.
For a time you

could read more about all this in the first person report of a ham who worked for 13 years
at the Flagstaff police CW relay station, which was a division of the Arizona Highway Patrol
at this website....

<http://fohnix.metronet.com/~nmcewen/tel_off.html>

Last time I looked that entry was evidently no longer shown. Maybe Lennie got to

him with one of his enchanting rants about "how things really were" as opposed to the true
facts. Fortunately I printed a copy while it was still there.

6282. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:36:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D194B.8ADEB309@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35792

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Why would computers not be as fascinating to a 25 year old as a 15 year
> >old?
>
> > Are you kidding??? Cars, girls, booze and who knows what else that goes
> >with, for openers?
>
> I can understand how a 15-year old can use a computer to look at girls and
> cars, but how and why could a 15-year old use a computer to enjoy booze?
>
> And what would a 15-year old's fascination with girls, cars and booze have to
> do with the reason that 15 year olds find computers more interesting than
> amateur radio but 25 year olds do not?

Looks like you're coming down with a bad case of Cecilitis. You say you don't
think
there's one word that explains why kids don't find an attraction to ham radio, I
give several
more words and now you deny it all. Poor Ed.

6283. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:38:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D19B5.1BCB7521@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35793

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The only reason that the vast majority of hams who are competent CW
> >operators became that way is because they were required
> >to learn the Morse code and pass a test to prove it. When that test is gone
> >the CW bands will, sometime hence, begin to lose their populations
> >which is exactly what the Carl Stevensons want.
>
> Carl Stevenson doesn't care one way or the other whether Morse code operation
> continues on the band or not. Why should he?
>
> If the test goes away -- some think we should say when the test goes away --
> the things you are saying about Morse code lacking sufficient usefulness to
> survive without a pass/fail test and the way you drop insults at potential
> users will serve to hasten its demise.
>
> You are creating a self-fulfilling prophecy of doom and gloom, not Carl. IMHO,
> you are a greater enemy of Morse code use than you believe you are.

Carl is a morse code hater. You are a touchy-feely wishywashy League functionary
who will instantly bend to the prevailing breeze. I am a realist.

6284. ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:41:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202270941.5580176a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35794

A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)

by N2EY - Part 1 of 4

Introduction

This is a brief history of the past 56 years of amateur radio licensing. We'll look at how the current structure came to be, and what the future may hold. Along the way we'll also take a look at the development of the amateur radio service.

To really understand how we got where we are today, it's necessary to look back at least 50 years or so. Amateur radio has existed since the very first days of radio, and licensing of hams goes back to a least 1912, but to save time we'll start about 50 years ago.

The Postwar Period (1946 - 1950)

In the years following World War 2, ham radio was quite different than it is today. The prewar 160 meter band had been taken over by LORAN during the war, and was not available to hams. Over the next several decades it would be reopened to hams, a little at a time. The 15 meter band had been allocated to amateurs in 1947, but had not been opened yet. The 30, 17 and 12 meter bands were far in the future. VHF and UHF allocations were plentiful, but equipment for those bands was primitive, and almost all homemade or converted surplus. The prewar 5 and 2-1/2 meter bands had been shifted to the new 6 and 2 meter allocations.

Most hams used the 80, 40, 20 and 10 meter bands. The 40 meter band had no phone segment - it was all CW. The 11 meter band had not existed before the war - it was a sort of compensation for the loss of 160. It was also odd in that it was not harmonically related to the other bands, and was shared with medical and industrial RF users.

Almost all operation was CW or AM phone. All equipment used tubes, and was large, heavy and expensive by today's standards. The transistor was invented in 1948, but reasonably priced transistors would not be readily available to hams until the mid '50s. Most ham stations were a mixture of homemade, commercially built, and converted war surplus gear - a station with only manufactured gear was rare. Separate transmitters and receivers were almost universal. Many stations used crystal control, and it was common to work another station on a different frequency, because crystals were expensive. Long CQs and replies to CQs were common, because most hams tuned the entire band looking for replies.

Hams in the continental 48 states had callsigns like W1AW and W3ABT - W, followed by a numeral, followed by two or three letters. Hams in the US possessions had calls like KH6IJ and KL7ABT - K, followed by a letter/number

combination denoting the possession, followed by two or three letters. There was a very limited "vanity call" program - if a ham wanted a 1X2 call and met several criteria, such a call would be issued. If a ham moved to a different call area, he/she had to get a new callsign that matched the district of the new location. You could always tell where a ham station was located by its callsign.

World War 2 had several effects on amateur radio. Amateur radio was shut down soon after Pearl Harbor, due to the security risk. Amateurs in most of the rest of the world had already gone off the air in 1939. Thousands of amateurs went into the military and merchant marine services, and many did not come back. In addition to those amateurs who did return, many thousands of newcomers who had been exposed to radio in the service wanted to get ham licenses. The war also sped up the rate of electronic development, and had forced mass production methods on the electronics industry. The cost of producing high quality components dropped dramatically. Technologies that were laboratory experiments in 1938 were in common use less than five years later. The trend toward miniaturization began during this time.

After the war, large quantities of radio and electronic equipment and parts were declared surplus and offered for sale at pennies on the dollar. Much of it was brand new, and easily adapted to amateur use. The cost of putting a station on the air, and the time required to build it, dropped dramatically.

During this time there were also the first signs of things to come. Television, first promised as far back as the late '20s and in limited operation before the war, spread quickly in the late '40s. Television interference became a major concern of hams in TV areas. SSB, used by a few hams in the early '30s, became much more practical for amateur radio use with the development of low cost crystal and mechanical filters and phasing networks. Wartime developments in VHF/UHF technology, as well as surplus parts and equipment, made that part of the spectrum much more accessible to hams. The first amateur RTTY stations began to appear, using mechanical teletype equipment obtained as surplus from various sources. Some amateurs used narrow band FM voice, which required a less expensive transmitter than AM.

Before and immediately World War 2 there were 3 classes of amateur license - Class A, Class B, and Class C. The requirements for each license class were:

Class A - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and advanced written tests on theory and regulations. At least one year of experience as a Class B or C licensee. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur privileges were granted with a Class A license.

Class B - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written test on theory and regulations. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur privileges EXCEPT 75 and 20 meter phone were granted with a Class B license.

Class C - Same as Class B, except tests given by mail.

There was also discussion of a "Class D" license, with privileges above 200 MHz only. This was not acted upon until 1951.

All amateurs could operate on any amateur frequency, with up to the legal limit of power - but only Class A hams could operate phone on the popular 20 and 75 meter bands. Class B and C hams' phone privileges were limited to the bits and pieces of 160 that hams were allowed to use, 11 and 10 meters, and VHF/UHF.

Licenses were good for 5 years, and renewable. Renewal required that the operator certify that he/she could meet all of the current requirements for licensing. Also, renewal required that the license holder make least 3 contacts on the amateur bands in the six months prior to the renewal application - and the contacts had to be on CW, not voice. All licensees had to be US citizens.

An accurate log of all transmissions had to be kept. Mobile and portable operation were allowed, but if a ham wanted to operate away from his fixed station, and would be gone for a period of more than 48 hours, written notice of the mobile/portable operation had to be sent to the FCC. Before 1949, mobile operation was limited to the ham bands above 25 MHz. Mobile and portable stations had to identify themselves on the air as "mobile" or "portable".

The FCC had district offices that conducted exams in many major cities. In addition, the FCC would send out examiners to scheduled examining points on a regular schedule. If you lived within 125 miles of a quarterly examining point, you had to appear in person for the exam. Exams were usually given only on weekdays, which meant taking at least a half day off from work for adults and waiting for vacation if you were still in school. The district offices usually required no appointment, but the quarterly exam points often required advance notice.

All tests for a given license (code and written) had to be passed in the same session. If you failed any test, you got no partial credit and had to wait 30 days or more to take the test again. If you passed, you could go on the air only when you received your new license in the mail, which was typically a six to eight week wait.

If you lived more than 125 miles from an examining point, or had a permanent physical disability that prevented you from going to an exam session, or were on active military duty, the Class C exam could be taken by mail. First, you found a volunteer examiner to give you the test. This was usually another ham, but could be a person with a commercial telegraph license as well. You then sent away to the FCC for the proper forms, filled them out and had them notarized. The written exam was in a sealed envelope. The volunteer examiner gave you the code test, and if you passed, certified that you did so and gave you the written test. The volunteer examiner acted as a proctor only - he/she wasn't supposed to even look at the exam. The written exam was sent back to the FCC for marking, and if you passed, your new license came in the mail, and you could go on the air as soon as it arrived. If you failed, you had to do the whole thing all over again. The process typically took about six to eight weeks to complete.

If you had a Class C license and moved to within 125 miles of a quarterly examining point, you had to appear for reexamination within a certain time, or lose your license. If you had a Class C license and wanted to upgrade to Class A, you not only had to travel to a quarterly examining point, but you would have to take the Class B exams as well as the Class A written exam. No credit

was given for exam elements taken by mail.

There were about 60,000 U.S. amateurs in 1946, and about 90,000 in 1950. The amateur allocations in 1949 looked like this: (Frequencies in MHz):

3.5-4 CW 3.85-4 Phone, Class A only
7-7.3 CW
14-14.4 CW
14.2-14.3 Phone, Class A only
26.96-27.23 CW/Phone
28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone
50-54 CW/Phone
144-148 CW/Phone
220-225 CW/Phone
420-450 CW/Phone (50 watt power limit)
1215-1295 CW/Phone
2300-2450 CW/Phone
5250-5650 CW/Phone
10000-10500 CW/Phone
21000-22200 CW/Phone

Restructuring, Changes and More Changes (1951 - 1956)

In the early '50s ham radio changed very quickly. A major influence was growing concern about television interference, or TVI. Transmitters had to be designed and built for to produce a much higher level of harmonic rejection than was needed with prewar designs. SSB was becoming common on the ham bands. Manufactured equipment was more common and less expensive. A few companies were offering equipment in kit form, which resulted in substantial savings for the builder. Coaxial cable and pi network output circuits, practically unused by amateurs only 10 years earlier, rapidly replaced parallel tuned tank circuits and open wire line.

But the biggest changes came in the area of licensing and regulations. In 1951 the FCC overhauled the venerable ABC system, and added three new licenses - the Novice, Technician, and Extra. The new license requirements and privileges were:

Novice - 5 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Simplified written test on theory and regulations. No experience required or allowed - anyone who had previously held any class of amateur license was ineligible for a Novice. Extremely limited CW privileges in parts of the 80 and 11 meter bands, plus CW and phone privileges on part of 2 meters. 75 watts maximum power input, crystal control only. One year license term, nonrenewable. Exams given at FCC examination points or by mail if conditions for mail exams were met. The Novice was meant to be a sort of "learner's permit" to help new hams get started.

Technician - 5 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written test on theory and regulations - same written test as General class. All amateur privileges above 220 MHz. Exams given at FCC examination points or by mail if conditions for mail exams were met. The Technician was meant for those who were more interested in VHF/UHF experimentation than HF operating. The proposed

Class D license was implemented as the Technician.

General (old Class B) - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written test on theory and regulations. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur privileges EXCEPT 75 and 20 meter phone were granted with a General license.
Conditional (old Class C) - Same as General, except tests given by mail.

Advanced (old Class A) - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and advanced written tests on theory and regulations. At least one year of experience as a General or Conditional licensee. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur privileges were granted with an Advanced license. This license was to be phased out and replaced by the Extra. To this end, no new Advanced class tests were given after 1952, but holders of Advanced class licenses could renew and modify them indefinitely.

Extra - 20 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and higher level written tests on theory and regulations. At least two years of experience as a General, Conditional or Advanced licensee. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur privileges were granted with an Extra license.

The new Novice license was an instant success, and thousands of new Novices got licenses and went on the air as soon as the license became available. The Technician got off to a slower start, but became more popular when first 6 meter and later 2 meter privileges were added. These new licenses became so popular that in 1954 the FCC made them available by mail only.

The announcement that there would be no more new Class A/Advanced licenses after the end of 1952 caused many hams to get one while they were still available, rather than face the more difficult requirements of the new Extra license. A few amateurs went after the Extra, though.

But in early 1953 the FCC made a surprise about-face and announced that all amateur privileges would be granted to all holders of General, Conditional, Advanced and Extra class licenses.

Callsigns were changed slightly. In some districts all of the W prefix callsigns were issued, so the prefix K began to be used. Novices got distinctive callsigns, in the following fashion: In the continental US, Novices got callsigns like KN5LZO and WV2ABC. The letter immediately preceding the numeral was either an N or a V, denoting Novice. When the Novice upgraded, this letter was dropped. In the possessions, the first letter of a Novice callsign was made a W instead of a K, as in WL7DEF. Upon upgrading, the W became a K.

Several more changes also occurred in this time period. In 1953, 40 meters got a phone segment, and Novices got a subband on 40. In 1954, the 15 meter band was opened to amateur use and Novices got a subband there, but lost access to 11 meters. 50 kHz of 20 meters was lost to other services. The retest requirement for Conditionals was dropped in 1952, and the distance requirement for a Conditional license was reduced to 75 miles in 1954. The procedures for mail and in person exams remained the same.

By 1956 there were over 140,000 US hams, and growth was exceeding 10,000 per year.

160 meters was returned to hams in a very limited fashion. Access was dependent on geographic location and time of day, ranging from 1000 watts to 25 watts to no access at all. It was confusing, but better than losing the band altogether. The amateur allocations in 1956 looked like this: Frequencies in MHz):

1.8-1.825 1.875-1.925 1.975-2 CW/Phone (Subject to geographic and power limitations)
3.5-4 CW 3.8-4 Phone Novices 3.7-3.75 CW
7-7.3 CW 7.2-7.3 Phone Novices 7.15-7.2 CW
14-14.35 CW 14.2-14.3 Phone
21-21.45 CW 21.25-21.45 Phone Novices 21.1-21.25 CW
26.96-27.23 CW/Phone
28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone
(Technicians had all privileges above 30 MHz except 144-148)
50-54 CW/Phone
144-148 CW/Phone Novices 145-147 CW/Phone
220-225 CW/Phone
420-450 CW/Phone (50 watt power limit)
1215-1300 CW/Phone
2300-2450 CW/Phone
3300-3500 CW/Phone
5650-5925 CW/Phone
10000-10500 CW/Phone
21000-22000 CW/Phone
All above 30000 CW/Phone

End of Part 1

73 de Jim, N2EY

6285. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:50:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7D1C5F.C836029E@uci.edu>
Source record: 35795

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >But I also don't think the idea Dick is trying to convey is
> >entirely without merit.
>
> Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> has been satisfied?

I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it. If he saw
it as a meaningless waste of his time, he probably wouldn't have much
respect for the system. If he saw it as a valuable use of his time, he
would probably have a better attitude about it. People can have such
opinions any kind of testing; Morse code, or otherwise.

6286. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 17:59:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D1E90.3C9A6CA8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35796

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> >
> > We all know you hate high power.
>
> I don't "hate high power" ... I simply thing that it is misused A LOT,

....

> according to the minimum power rule, which is probably the
> MOST violated rule in ham radio, the guys who are telling each other
> that they are all S9+40+ to everyone else in the group are MISusing
> their amps, IMHO.)
>

The problem is YOU decide for them and you should know better. If a group
on a frequency runs high power, how do YOU know that one of them doesn't
need the rest to run that power level to overcome a bad local noise problem,

poor propagation conditions to his location, which may be in a distant area
from the others, or some other such variable? You DON'T. Just because
most of the stations in a group don't need to run high power to talk to
each other doesn't mean that a single station couldn't be the cause of
the need for the others to run it. Those of us with extensive HF background

have seen this happen repeatedly.
You just insist on dictating your version
of your vision onto the rest of ham radio. FCC sure needs to put you
in charge of rule making. NOT!

Fortunately FCC, at least, has a grasp of this concept, and wisely
did not attempt to define that rule in detail. What a contorted can of worms

that would be.

6287. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:05:56 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <u7q7vh1opg2lce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35797
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gail absolutely DETESTS it when I'm on the HF rig, because it blows the front end of her six-meter rig off the bench. She likes that sunspot cycle DX, don'cha know.

Jim WX6RST
Gail KB9MII

6288. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:07:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D2088.32A0EEFC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35798

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Someone who's stagnated in the distant technical
> past obviously isn't doing #1 and is incapable of
> doing #2.

The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
"stagnating"
is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
witness.
Til then, it will be you with the SSB microphone stuck in your
mouth and some of us
"olde fartz" who are actually on the air with the digital modes.

6289. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:10:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D2116.80D83E44@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35799

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> > over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> > has been satisfied?
>
> I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it.

Maybe we need a gang of Feeling Police? If someone doesn't feel
correctly about their license, they don't get one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6290. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:16:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202271016.7d62e667@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35800

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C7C8662.8EC42674@worldnet.att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most reliable
> > >> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
> > >> >reliability is a moot point.
> > >>
> > >> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
> > >>
> > >> 73,
> > >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
> > >Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite obvious
> > >that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.
> >
> > Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
>
> In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
> services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
> those operators come from that source these days that if
> hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
> communications mode because of that singular fact.

Unfortunate but true. And it worked the other way, too - hams often
became military or commercial radio operators, aided in large part
by their CW/Morse and technical experience.

But both the military and commercial communications folks have long
been reducing/eliminating their dependence on radio operators. Not
just
Morse/CW ops, but the whole idea of a person whose job is specific to
operating radio sets. The Navy, for instance, no longer has the
"Radioman" classification at all.

> It has been made more than clear
> that almost all others who intended to become hams do not
> realize nor understand the basic utility of radiotelegraphy,
> and instead prefer to just skip learning it beyond the level

> mandatory for licensing. That should make it clear what the
> future holds when testing is no longer here.

Maybe. But some of them DO learn it beyond the bare minimum
required for licensing, just as some go beyond the theory
knowledge required to pass the written test.

> The old NCI saw that "Morse lovers must 'sell' the mode'"
> is a total fraud, as they well know.
> You can't sell to most people what they don't
> understand and have no experience with, yet think they know
> all about.

Maybe - but it's up to us Morse users to "sell" the mode anyway.

It's pretty obvious that the FCC, for whatever reasons, wants to
get rid of code testing ASAP. They've been pushing that agenda
since 1975 - it's nothing new. Now the only thing keeping the
one remaining test in place is S25.5, which will almost certainly
not remain after WRC 2003.

We will not be able to "sell" all hams on the merits of CW/Morse,
but we don't have to "sell" everyone. Just a reasonable number.

Consider what has happened to AM voice. Back in the late 1950s and
early 1960s the mode almost died out in amateur radio, pushed out
by inexpensive SSB transceivers. But a few AMers kept interest
alive, and began to "sell" the mode. And the number of amateur AM
stations on the air began to grow again, and continues to grow.
Equipment that once sold for pennies on the dollar, or was literally
junked, has become prized and expensive even if in need of major
work. Hams are building new AM rigs from the ground up. There are
AM demo/special event stations at many major hamfests. And many of
the AM crowd are hams who weren't even born back when AM was displaced
by SSB!

The thing to do is not waste time and energy on the naysayers and code
haters, but instead to project a positive image and improve the
visibility of Morse/CW. There are plenty of hams and prospective hams
who simply need to be shown.

How many prospective hams have ever even SEEN a real live CW station
and operator in action, with a coherent explanation of what's going
on? Too
few, in my experience. That can be fixed, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6291. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:16:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D228F.7546EA3A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35801

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Carl is a morse code hater. You are a touchy-feely wishywashy League functionary
> who will instantly bend to the prevailing breeze. I am a realist.

Part of your realism seems to be that you believe that CW doesn't have
enough merits to survive in competition with the other modes. I think
you are wrong. Do you think forcing a code exam upon Carl would turn
him into a code lover? If so, you are not a realist at all. Things
that are forced upon people are often hated with a passion. Why you
prefer vinegar to honey is beyond comprehension.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6292. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:20:15 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <uB9f8.11141$sH1.1388735@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If YOU know who is doing the jamming via "common knowledge", etc. why don't you report
their activity to RH? What they are doing is certainly illegal, and if the control ops also "know"
who it is, then they are liable for not taking action to stop it. That's what control ops, club officers, etc. are for. Actually, they could be severely questioned and/or held responsible for
NOT trying to get it stopped.

That sort of stuff is not tolerated around here on any frequency. Any such "doings" will get
a ham "posse" together pretty quickly to DF the interference. One of these was actually quite
funny. One night around 9 PM, a dead carrier came up onto the 145.35 machine and remained
with the television clearly audible in the background. Eventually, we began to hear snoring as the "perp" had gone fast asleep. We DFed it to the home of a ham who had laid his mike on the arm of the chair. At some point, it fell down beside him, and when he changed position, he
mashed the mike key. It was completely unintentional, and we were laughing amongst ourselves
as the hunt progressed. This man was very redfaced when he was awakened and told what happened.

Another one was concerning those "export" and so-called "ten meter" rigs. There was a CBer
on the west side of our town that was taunting, even mocking, the hams up on 28.610. Several
hams, being new and unfamiliar with DFing, had tried to find him without success. They called me and asked me to try my luck. They thought, in fact, that they had the correct house and wanted me to verify it. The CB guy even bragged that "y'all can't find me". I drove out to the
house the newbies thought was it, and confirmed that it was NOT the correct address. I then
followed the signal simply by attenuation. I drove right in front of the perp's house, and the signal stopped (hmmmm, I guess he saw my screwdriver antenna on the car). We haven't heard him since.

I do hope that the info concerning FCC's approach to the illegal equipment targeted towards
11 meters is true. It is high time at the interference and actual "bandit" operations up on 10 meters is dealt with.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Birdman67 <Birdman67@wi.rr.com> wrote in message
news:bLWe8.2659$vl.1840186@twister.kc.rr.com...
> Where I live, the repeater I use, is jammed by one or two people often.
It
> is common knowledge who they are. Both ARE hams. I am not a board member
> of the repeater so I do not know what actions are or will be taken against
> those persons.
> BTW I think owning, selling or buying ham equipment by non hams is fine.
> Transmitting by anyone on a frequency he/she doesn't have a license for
> (that includes hams with out of band radios) is, not only illegal, but
very
> bad.
> Thank you,
> Dave kb9iig
> "Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message
> news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...
> >
> > What do you think?
> >
> > Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell
> amateur
> > radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is
a
> > growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> > your opinions.
> >
> > No License? No Radio!
> > http://www.petitiononline.com/kf4jdp/
> >
> > Also, be sure to check out eHam.Net:
> > http://www.eham.net/survey/
> > (You can vote on the main eHam.Net web page)
> >
> > This petition and survey was put together by Scott, KF4JDP. Please take
> the
> > time to review it, and consider taking part.
> >
> > 73 de,
> > Dan, W8MMQ
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

6293. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:22:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D23F2.22B6D06F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35802

N2EY wrote:
> We will not be able to "sell" all hams on the merits of CW/Morse,
> but we don't have to "sell" everyone. Just a reasonable number.

Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
knuckledragger?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6294. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:35:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C7D185E.AAF820A0@hotmail.com>
Source record: 35804
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
> news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> > My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> > the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> > though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> > other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> > what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> I've seen similar "situations" in many hobbies. It usually
> is a matter of "not balancing" family, spouse, hobby, work, etc.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
over such and unimportant thing.

6295. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 18:36:29 UTC
From: mocki@freeserf.co.uk
Message-ID: <MPG.16e7378587be9c649896e9@news.freeserve.net>
Source record: 35805
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <1f2adfc1.0202270649.6eb51e8f@posting.google.com>,
toxic_waste@citizensband.com says...
> Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:<3ibp7usmlca54i2jcb6hb0hllfs7k1chqs@4ax.com>...
> > On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
> > waste) wrote:
> >
> > >My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, she said to me, *either
> > >the Cb goes or I do*
> >
> > Sensible girl!!!!!
> >
> > :-)
>
> Lets look on the bright side Walt, personally I have no trouble in
> finding a girlfriend, unlike the average British Ham, who takes up the
> hobby purely because he is incapable of pulling a bit of totty,
> although it might help if he bought a bar of soap and a toothbrush.
>
> I suppose its fair to say, a British Hams radio is his equivalent of a
> blow up doll...
>
> Yeuk, dont even bear thinking about ;-))
>
> Have a nice day Walt.
> toxic_waste
>
uuuuuuuuuuurrrrkkkkkkkk......hell of a mental image there.....hell of a
way to make the pages of radcon stick together.....

6296. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 19:46:17 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7D3789.71488885@uci.edu>
Source record: 35806

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> > > over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> > > has been satisfied?
> >
> > I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it.

> Maybe we need a gang of Feeling Police? If someone doesn't feel
> correctly about their license, they don't get one?

That's a wonderful idea, Cecil. You should go down right now and tell
authorities about it. Have lots of sharp objects in your pockets when
you go, and wear a hat made of aluminum foil.

6297. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:01:12 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <cWaf8.3921$106.211715@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35807

>> Robert Casey, WA2ISE, wrote:

>> Why should the FCC care anyway if hams stay current or not?
>> As long as hams can hook up antennas to transceivers and
>> such boxes, and not splatter all over the spectrum...

>> They're not in the business of handing out gold stars....

> Carl R. Stevenson, WA6VSE replied:

> It's not a question of "handing out gold stars" ...

> Two of the primary purposes of the ARS are:

> 1) self-training and education in radio/electronics
> 2) advancing the radio art

> Someone who's stagnated in the distant technical
> past obviously isn't doing #1 and is incapable of
> doing #2.

> Thus, It would seem that the FCC *should* have some
> incentive to provide a mechanism that would assure
> that, at least most, hams remain reasonably technically
> competent in terms of relatively current technology.
> (I say "most" because NO testing system is 100%
> perfect.)

I hate to say this, Carl, but I think you have just put
one foot into the same licensing quagmire the code-test
folks have been wallowing in for years.

Any "incentive" licensing scheme, whether based on a
manual skill such as receiving Morse code at a given
speed or a technical one involving the design and
development of electronic circuits, is basically
arbitrary and capricious. It forces every licensee
to conform to a rigid set of requirements based on
what someone, somewhere, with their own agenda, decides
is good for the country and its citizens.

The "Basis and Purpose" clause in Part 97 is, in my
opinion, the hoped-for outcome of granting licenses
to amateur radio stations and operators, not a set of
requirements that have to be met on a case-by-case
basis. The language used in the clause is so general
as to apply to just about any degree of self-training
that occurs under its auspices. And that generality

is not resolved in the remainder of the Part, unlike the very specific language concerning operating frequencies, power output levels, spurious emissions, etc. that is present in abundance.

In my own opinion, somebody who wants to get on the air with the one-tube transmitter he built as a teenager back in 1938 is just as much deserving of a license grant as another who is designing and building state-of-the-art digital communications systems. Each, in their own way, self-trains and advances the radio art.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

6298. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:02:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D3B39.10BEE9B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35808

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c7c3a26_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Dave has a washboard!!!!!!!???? ;)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Abs? No. His wife uses a washboard to do laundry.

Actually, we're saving up for one. For the moment we just pump the water into the tubs and rub the clothes together with our fists. It isn't really too unpleasant except in the winter. I'm a little nervous about buying the washboard for fear the neighbors will become envious and think we're showing off.

Dave K8MN

6299. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:06:15 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <6mdq7uon07vbh3e5gnfr4tnba0enjr95lc@4ax.com>
Source record: 35809
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 27 Feb 2002 06:49:38 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
waste) wrote:

>I suppose its fair to say, a British Hams radio is his equivalent of a
>blow up doll...

And his crank-up mast is his penile extension.

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6300. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:06:16 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com>
Source record: 35810
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:

>I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
>wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
>over such and unimportant thing.

Please re-post in English.

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6301. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:14:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiojim@hotmail.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D2FA7.CC05B6F2@hotmail.net>
Source record: 35811
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Suggest you learn to read English.

Walt Davidson wrote:
>
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >over such and unimportant thing.
>
> Please re-post in English.
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6302. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:22:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D3FF7.F451EB98@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35812

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > I've known any number of hams in any number of fairly rare spots who
> > > > didn't know what they were doing in handling a pileup. I've likewise
> > > > encountered many U.S. hams who were doing nothing more in pileups than
> > > > wasting electricity.
> > >
> > > Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> > > Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get
> over
> > > it.
> >
> > It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> > it. It was plain observation.
>
> Exactly my point. So smug that he follows up with:
>
> > Even a blind pig finds some acorns.
>
> There you go again. Whatta prick.

DXing isn't learned overnight. I didn't know much when I began. I
listened and learned. Others can listen and learn too unless they're too
busy flapping their gums to hear.

> > > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> > > DXer that you are. Right?
> >
> > Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.
>
> Good. Now try to remember some other things you said or didn't say.

To what end? Is there going to be an exam? Are cash and valuable
prizes involved?

> > > And that it was N0iMD whom you thought didn't know anything about DX.
> > >
> > > Is this correct?
> >
> > Close enough.
> >
> > > > I maintain that I only

> > > > commented on you as an individual and never singled out a license
> class.
> > > >
> > > In which case, your assertion is wrong.
> >
> > Then we disagree.
> >
> > > > > > Meanwhile, you couldn't handle the idea of a Tech talking to FR6
> daily,
> > > like
> > > > > > > he was in KP4-land.
> > > > >
> > > > > I haven't the slightest idea of what you mean by "you couldn't
> handle".
> > > > > I'd have to know about it before I could decide if I could handle it
> or
> > > > > not.
> > > >
> > > > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
> verified
> > > > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned
> that I
> > > > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
> >
> > ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> > Sheesh.
>
> Oh no, there's that selective memory again.

Brian, you've have to become a bigger part of my life for your frequent
contacts with an FR6 to become important to me. I don't really want you
to become a bigger part of my life.

>
> > > > > Brian, I had 22 years of the noisy side of the pileup before I ever
> > > > > operated overseas on the ham bands.
> > > >
> > > > You were born with a license? Whatever. It appears that at least a few
> > > > more years on the noisy side will be necessary.
> >
> > Necessary for what? Nope, I wasn't born with a license but have had one
> > since 1963. My basic math skills tell me that in November, I'll have
> > had a ticket for 39 years.
>
> You must be pretty old, but a few years younger than the median age of US
> hams.

I haven't reached "Lenny status" as a fossil but I'm just about to age
53.

> > > > What you call snobbishness, others
> > > > would call experience.
> > >
> > > Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and
> not
> > > just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?
> >
> > If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss and
> > turn much over the issue of smugness. You can have all the DX fun you
> > can muster.
>
> There's that selective memory again.

Is that supposed to mean something?

>
> > > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > > > the other day
> > >
> > > Do they have 6m privileges?
> >
> > Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> > they'll be happy to hear from you.
>
> Just curious. Wouldn't want you to get into trouble again.

Well, there'd be the part where I haven't gotten into trouble the first
time. Is that what you mean by "selective memory"? How did you make
out with the French authorities in laying waste to those wine-swilling,
radio scofflaws in Gaul?

> > > and have added about 20 new ones on 160 in recent weeks.
> > > > Am I supposed to be suffering while chasing DX from the U.S.? Maybe I
> > > > should tear down a couple of towers and put an attenuator on the RX
> side
> > > > of the Omni VI +.
> > >
> > > Of course not Dave, just attenuate your disdain for any other hams,
> > > regardless of license class, having fun with what you consider to be
> your
> > > personal DX domain.
> >
> > Brian, your lack of DX knowledge is not based on your having fun working
> > stations with non-U.S. calls. Go back to your OH2BH nonsense or your
> > material on selling QSL cards for fun and profit for clues. One of the
> > wonderful things about being human is that I get to pick and choose
> > those for whom I reserve my admiration or my disdain. I don't reserve
> > blocks based on license class for either group.
>
> True, Marty doesn't need my nonsense, but I was commenting that one
> individual can have such a large impact on that segment of the hobby, and
> large, well moneyed groups (such as the ARRL) has so little.

It's "Martti" as has been pointed out to you before (selective memory?)
and you added material about his being rich, which he wasn't and isn't.
That was also pointed out to you.

> Outside of
> running the DXCC. It was not meant to detract from his good deeds. I just
> didn't need to hear how a VP of Nokia lives in a low income neighborhood.

After stating that I am "a Marty Laine apologist" (selective memory?)
you did detract from his "good deeds". You were never told that he
lives in a "low income neighborhood" (selective memory?); you were told
that he lives in a middle income neighborhood. You were also told that
he didn't always work for Nokia, that he was, during a large portion of
his DX travels, in the employ of OH2BC at a company called Mikrolog
(selective memory?)

> Selling contacts. Welp Dave, just the other day Steve made a little slip
> about "charging for a contact."
> This idea is so pervasive that even people
> whom you think are knowledgeable about DX think it. They have to retrain
> their common senses to reconcile Part 97. Its unnatural.

He also correct his statement. Maybe selective memory caused you to
forget. Don't let it detract from your original rant about what you
perceived to be money for QSOs.

>
> > > What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> > > monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).
> >
> > PW0, H7, OM, KG4, EA6, J3, V73, VP8 S. Georgia among others. Coaxial
> > loops work well. I use a 5 foot diameter hardline loop about two feet
> > off the ground here with a variable gain preamp and a U-100 to turn it.
> > An MFJ 1026 noise canceler helps too.
>
> Damn that's good. This neighborhood is so full of noise that its hard to
> hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes.

The MFJ box will only help if your noise is coming from a single noise
source. Multiple sources will kill it.

Dave K8MN

6303. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:28:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5jfcs020r3@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35818

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7D09A4.DF803C38@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
> > > of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
> > > than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
> >
> > Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It
doesn't matter
> > to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went
through the
> > same process to learn that fact that we all did.
>
> So whether it's useful to a ham or not, he should go through what you did?

"I did it, so everyone else should have to do it."

Mark that down as pro-code #1324a or whatever alphanumeric sequence you want
to assign to it

6304. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:33:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5jfm7021cu@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35819

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C8662.8EC42674@worldnet.att.net...

> In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
> services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
> those operators come from that source these days that if
> hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
> communications mode because of that singular fact.
> It has been made more than clear
> that almost all others who intended to become hams do not
> realize nor understand the basic utility of radiotelegraphy,
> and instead prefer to just skip learning it beyond the level
> mandatory for licensing. That should make it clear what the
> future holds when testing is no longer here.
> The old NCI saw that "Morse lovers must 'sell' the mode'"
> is a total
> fraud, as they well know. You can't sell to most people what
> they don't
> understand and have no experience with, yet think they know
> all about.

"Selling the mode" is not a fraud. It simply that means that you're lazy
when it comes to doing it to prove that morse code is a viable
communications mode. You'd rather have welfare-like support and, in essence,
have the government do what you're too lazy to do.

6305. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:37:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D436B.548399A0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35813
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt Davidson wrote:
>
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >over such and unimportant thing.
>
> Please re-post in English.

It should be perfectly clear to you, Walt. The fellow has an eating disorder of some sort and now everything is too loose. He is even sad about it.

Dave K8MN

6306. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:40:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227154030.26927.00000203@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35815

In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Is there such a silencing?

A direct attempt was made on 25 January 1999. That is public
record in FCC archives. It did not work.

>You've certainly had more than your fifteen minutes of fame here.

Oh, is this a "timed activity?" Is "authorization by credential"
needed to engage in free speech? :-)

>I've said it before: Say what you want. Just
>don't expect folks to fawn all over you in agreement with you.

Nothing like that expected. :-)

Interesting that those who make such comments hold up a
mirror looking at themselves when writing such statements. :-)

>You've had your say. No one is obliged to give your views much credence
>or to give a big "Hurrah for Leonard H. Anderson!" in response.

:-) ...look into the mirror...look deep...you are becoming silly....

>Getting into amateur radio has been largely made easier than ever.

Has it? There's not much common agreement other than today's
newcomers are demeaningly labeled with everything from "extra
lite" to "CBplussers" to, in Heil's specialty, BEGINNERS!!!! :-)

Yes, join the ranks, The Strong, The Proud, The Amateur Corps!
Stand at attention while the long-timer Dill Instructor struts in
front of "recruits" with swagger key tucked under arm extolling
the Virtues of Rank, Obediance, Discipline, the TRADITION OF
THE CORPS! The Morsemen are Your Leaders and all Shall
enjoy as They enjoy...whether anyone likes it or not!

ALL WILL DO AS THEY DO! :-)

Of course that is an exaggeration, but it is not far from the
implicit meaning of so many long-timers. It is not a pretty
picture to others yet it is taken as a "masterpiece" to
themselves.

>... Your purpose isn't an amateur radio license.

My purpose in this newsgroup is to argue for the elimination of the morse code test for an amateur radio license. Stated before, stated again.

That purpose has continually been clouded, obscured by artificial smoke from a certain group of long-time Morsemen who DEMAND that all DO AS THEY SAY!

Those long-time morsemen have NO authority and no special "right" to demean, belittle, or attempt humiliation of others who do not share their views. They still continue. They do not die for their ego gives them everlasting life.

>Your hobby is haunting this newsgroup.

Ghosts know about haunting. I am an optimist and perhaps too much the idealist to think that human beings can engage in rational discourse on subjects, looking at many sides rather than just one. My fault.

6307. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:40:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227154031.26927.00000204@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35816

In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Gee, that isn't even close to correct, is it, Lenny? The thread (some
>four or five years back was over whether the U.S. government was using
>morse. I commented on that idea and explained that the Department of
>State used CW as late as the late eighties/early nineties. It was a
>fact. I was there. I used it.

Incorrect. Heil first stated that the idea of using morse on a teleprinter
circuit was his idea. He later changed that to "procedures for
synchronizing" without specifying what was synchronized. Finally,
in the last go-around of that he stated that it was "State Department
Procedure."

>That you casually dismiss my statement as false is asinine.

Nothing was "dismissed." My opinion, stated in the original
thread, was that such a procedure was "dumb" based on existing
procedures on radio-teleprinter circuits used by the US military
and commercial services established decades before this
innovation. There is no stated technical necessity for doing so
and in this go-around Heil is shrouding the matter in "security"
as a justification. Good smokescreen. Such cannot be
proved or disproved for "reasons of security." :-)

>... At no time did I mention my "importance" and if USG
>security bothers you, take it up with your congressman.

As I've tried to point out to Heil before, hundreds of thousands
of us have done the "security" thing in regards to classified
documents. That is commonplace, a fact of life, important to
national security. It is not some "special activity" exclusive to
the Department of State.

>...as in, "I am interested in taking up oil painting but perhaps I'll
>postpone it for forty years". If you aren't interested in what hams do,
>you probably aren't interested in amateur radio at all.

? As an artist-illustrator with natural talent and professional
experience in other media as well as oils, this is a puzzling
analogue. Artists are not licensed by the federal government for
either amateur or professional art activities. The only possible
link can be the very tenuous fact that Samuel F. B. Morse was
an itinerant portrait painter before getting involved in telegraphic
communications. :-)

>There are numerous areas of interest within amateur radio.

Agreed.

>You need to become a ham to become a participant.

No, no, no. Authorization to TRANSMIT RF energy requires
grant of an amateur radio license to be a lawful participant.
Everything else can be done by unlicensed-in-amateur-radio
individuals.

>Those who are up on the latest technology can do the same things if they
>like. Their ham tickets permit any number of activities.

Be consistent and aware of federal regulations. Radio amateurs
are NOT AUTHORIZED to engage in deliberate transmission of
RF energy outside of amateur bands through their amateur license.

>You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.

...as I said before, calm rational discourse is not a quality of
Heil's correspondence. :-)

6308. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:40:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227154033.26927.00000205@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35817

In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.

Heh heh heh...thus is demonstrated another calm, dispassionate
discourse...

>You can't operate on the ham bands sans license.

Untrue. See which bands are primary or secondary in allocation
in Part 2, Title 47 CFR. See also Parts 15 and 95, same CFR.

>You remember, that "interest" of yours which goes back decades.

"Interest" in radio need not be confined to just amateur radio.

>> Is that "stupidity" or is Heil engaging in yet-another insult fest?
>> I vote that he is a fest.
>
>> The word "interest" does not show Lust or Craven Desire or anything
>> else. The word has no specific gradation.
>
>Decades, Len? Decades? You've farted around here long enough for even
>the slowest of the slow to obtain an amateur ticket.

My purpose in this newsgroup has always been stated simply
as arguing for the removal of the morse code test in amateur
radio licensing. Since the PCTA have never yet made but one
reasonable case for the retention of that test, many seem to
fall back on the false charge of personal vindictiveness on the
basis of "never having passed, or been able to pass an amateur
license." Such a charge is false, bogus, a smokescreen for
not having a viable counterargument for retention of the morse
code test.

The charge that one must be "credentialled" with an amateur
radio license in order to discuss getting into amateur radio at
all is absurd. Radio communication is not exclusive to
amateur radio nor are the arts of radio communication solely
determined by amateur experience, techniques, or
accomplishments within a specific amateur activity.

>Okay, Walter Mitty, you're BRAVE. If you're brave, stifle that twitch
>in your breast and go forth and obtain even a no-code ticket.

That is an immature "challenge" based on the bogus "necessity"
of "do as we did or shut up." It is the primal fraternal order

emotionalism syndrome on the edge of going bananas.

Heil seems to need constant reminders that the FCC does not need credentialism of fraternal amateurism in order to set the regulations of US amateur radio hobbyists nor is it allowed to seek comment on those regulations solely from amateurs.

The necessity for an amateur callsign to discuss primary policy of getting into amateur radio is just bogus, false, irrelevant.

>Aaaaaah, let me show you how to fold your Nazi stuff before insertion,
>Len. Your use of it makes you look small.

Does it? How does Heil feel about his own image reflected right back to him when he uses the same tactics?

>I'm great on shrouding, Len. The Department of State makes us shroud.
>I was told not to reveal things to just any inquisitive clod on the
>street. I think they meant you. The remainder of your rant is evidence
>of mental imbalance on your part.

"Mental imbalance?" If so, there are hundreds of thousands of us in aerospace and government agencies who have ALL had to follow the same laws and precautions regarding classified material as State. The Department of State has no exclusivity on that matter.

>I don't care if you call or write State, Len. They're quite used to
>getting quizzed by fruitcakes. I know you "challenged" WHAT I WROTE IN
>THIS NEWSGROUP. If it wasn't for this newsgroup, I'd have NO CONTACT AT
>ALL WITH YOU. Ask yourself this, Leonardo: What reason would I have to
>manufacture material stated in this newsgroup? Would it change the
>outcome of the code debate? Would it gain me riches? Would it convert
>numbers of "code test haters" to my way of thinking?

Heil's primal reason seems to concern his ego. That is a common syndrome in computer-modem communications, to win "message points" however possible, make yourself look superior.

>Hell, Len. YOU belittle those who don't share YOUR viewpoint and you
>aren't even a ham! You aren't a grain of sand in the hourglass of
>amateur radio.

I present opposing arguments to certain amateur radio regulations and their retentions, trying to stay on the subject. All too often those who "reply" do so on my person instead of the subject. In some cases I will "return fire" in a like manner to those who insist on attacking the messenger instead of the message. That invariably results in cries of "outrageous objections!"

One of the extreme cases of this is a current subject thread supposedly identifying myself but is an exchange between two others in a heated fashion. The originator of that other subject thread feels "perfectly justified" in everything he says, does, or thinks and will not back down. He is an extra class licensee

with a one-by-two callsign.

Heil is an extra class licensee with a one-by-two callsign.
Except for the names, there seems to be little distinction
between the two.

6309. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:40:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227154034.26927.00000206@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 35814

In article <3C7D09A4.DF803C38@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
>> > of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
>> > than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
>>
>> Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It
>> doesn't matter
>> to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went
>> through the same process to learn that fact that we all did.
>
>So whether it's useful to a ham or not, he should go through what you did?

That seems to be the basic reason behind the beligerant PCTA
group. Carroll is one of those. It shines brightly through nearly
every "message." :-)

What makes it all so ludicrous is that the beligerant PCTAs are
not in agreement. They differ markedly in "reasons." They
cannot understand that others see them differently from how
they see themselves, therefore they have no cognizance of the
clearly-stated difference in "reasons" for keeping the code test.

The only near-common "reason" is "You have to do as I did!"

Not a good reason.

6310. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:45:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5jgbc022ks@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35820

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7D0890.662A35C9@IEEE.org...
> Why do so few CW ops come from the military nowadays, Dick?
> What percentage of presentday hams regularly use CW?
> What percentage of future hams will learn CW after the
> requirement is dropped? What will happen if hams organize
> for the purpose of keeping CW alive? What would happen
> if you got off your lazy butt and helped that effort?

This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling. I don't see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate. Yes, it would be worthless as far as the FCC is concerned, but they would then have their "real" hams to tout.

6311. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 20:54:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5jgsf023ne@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35821
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >over such and unimportant thing.
>
> Please re-post in English.
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Why is it that there always has to be some smart-arse Brit chime in and say that Yanks really don't speak/write English? We communicate in the same language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English. Canadian French is different from that spoken in France, but it's still called French. Ditto Mexico and Spain. However, English is supposed to have a different set of rules, according to wankers like you.

6312. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 21:52:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d56ca$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35822

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7D02D8.A8C5FDE1@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >
> > The fact of the matter is that you don't have a clue what I'm
> > doing, or where
>
> So, you lie about it, then?
>

Certainly not ... my point is just that you really don't know what I'm doing, or where ... I haven't seen you in my shack, peering in my windows, at the same locations where I travel to, etc.

In fact, I believe you live many states away from me, so how could you POSSIBLY monitor my activities, even if you were so inclined?

Thus, you really don't have a clue what I'm doing, or where.

(I know this is too logical for you to understand, having seen you struggle with some of the more elementary examples of logic presented by Cecil, so I really don't expect you to get this either, but I just thought I'd set the record straight. End of discussion on this matter ...)

Carl - wa6vse

6313. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 21:56:12 UTC
From: Ron <bofars@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <WFcf8.12729$R16.2060258@news11-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 35823
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:u7q7vh1opg2lce@corp.supernews.com...
> Gail absolutely DETESTS it when I'm on the HF rig, because it blows the
> front end of her six-meter rig off the bench. She likes that sunspot
cycle
> DX, don'cha know.
>
> Jim WX6RST
> Gail KB9MII
>
is a large blow a gail ?

6314. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:12:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227171236.17520.00001064@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35824

I said:

>> Why would computers not be as fascinating to a 25 year old as a 15 year
>>old?

Dick heard:

>You say you don't think there's one word that explains why kids don't find
>an attraction to ham radio

Dick concludes:

> Looks like you're coming down with a bad case of Cecilitis.

Poor Dick.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6315. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:14:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227171410.17520.00001065@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35825

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Carl is a morse code hater. You are a touchy-feely wishywashy League
>functionary
>who will instantly bend to the prevailing breeze. I am a realist.

Got an "answer" for nearly everything there, Dick. An overly simplistic
answer, but an answer.

You think you are upholding the code standard, but you are helping to destroy
it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6316. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:17:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227171744.17520.00001067@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35826

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>The old NCI saw that "Morse lovers must 'sell' the mode'"
>is a total
>fraud, as they well know.

Will it be a total fraud if the FCC removes code testing altogether? If they do, how much are you going to have to change the tune you sing if you want to see new hams learn and use the code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6317. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:17:52 UTC
From: Graham Sharp <sharpg@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <lnmq7ukg76mnp5n3vpnh6cc37od6ja3l9r@4ax.com>
Source record: 35831
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
>news:apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com...
>> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
>> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
>> >over such and unimportant thing.
>>
>> Please re-post in English.
>>
>> --
>> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
>Why is it that there always has to be some smart-arse Brit chime in and say
>that Yanks really don't speak/write English? We communicate in the same
>language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English. Canadian
>French is different from that spoken in France, but it's still called
>French. Ditto Mexico and Spain. However, English is supposed to have a
>different set of rules, according to wankers like you.
>

Looser

6318. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:20:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227172014.17520.00001068@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35827

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling. I don't
>see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as
>FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate. Yes,
>it would be worthless as far as the FCC is concerned, but they would then
>have their "real" hams to tout.

Attaining 13 or 20 wpm is a real demonstration of a real skill and in doing so,
a ham does demonstrate worth to himself or herself and to the Amateur Radio
Service. It certainly can form part of the worth of a "real ham."

Many people enjoy getting certificates to commemorate their accomplishments. I
wouldn't expect Morse code proficiency to be any different.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6319. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:21:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d5dca_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35832

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7D1E90.3C9A6CA8@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > >
> > > We all know you hate high power.
> >
> > I don't "hate high power" ... I simply thing that it is misused A LOT,
>
> ....
>
> > according to the minimum power rule, which is probably the
> > MOST violated rule in ham radio, the guys who are telling each other
> > that they are all S9+40+ to everyone else in the group are MISusing
> > their amps, IMHO.)
> >
>
> The problem is YOU decide for them and you should know better. If a group
> on a frequency runs high power, how do YOU know that one of them doesn't
> need the rest to run that power level to overcome a bad local noise
problem,
> poor propagation conditions to his location, which may be in a distant
area
> from the others, or some other such variable? You DON'T. Just because
> most of the stations in a group don't need to run high power to talk to
> each other doesn't mean that a single station couldn't be the cause of
> the need for the others to run it.

Dick ... you really don't read well, do you? I said that ALL stations
in the group were reporting ALL others as S9+40+ ... in other words
ALL stations had WAY beyond "solid copy" of all others ... on its
face, that certainly implies that they were running more power than
necessary to accomplish the communications.

> Those of us with extensive HF background

Bla, bla, bla ... Dick you suffer from the misconception that
I have little or no HF experience. Many years ago, I was
designing HF equipment and systems for military use, with
several different, wellp-known companies ... one of which was
Rockwell-Collins ... you HAVE heard of them, right?

Have you ever designed a nation-wide HF voice and data
system for an entire COUNTRY's government? I have.

Don't try to preach your "superiority" to me ... it doesn't square
with reality.

Carl - wa6vse

6320. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:23:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227172306.17520.00001069@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35828

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>But some of them DO learn it beyond the bare minimum
>required for licensing, just as some go beyond the theory
>knowledge required to pass the written test.

As a Novice, as a General, and then later as an Extra, my Morse code
proficiency exceeded the requirements for my licensing.

I think it is more accurate to state that most hams go beyond the theory
knowledge required to pass the written tests.

>The thing to do is not waste time and energy on the naysayers and code
>haters, but instead to project a positive image and improve the
>visibility of Morse/CW.

I couldn't agree more! Well said, Jim!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6321. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:25:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227172501.17520.00001070@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35829

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
>"stagnating"
>is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
>witness.

Carl, I am an old time ham and a supporter of CW use (by example and by believing that the mode has value).

Do you think that I am stagnating in Amateur Radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6322. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:26:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227172628.17520.00001071@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35830

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Note the placement of the [begin ... end sarcasm mode] markers.
>I was pointing out that MY new text in response to your list of
>comparisons was sarcasm, NOT that you were being sarcastic,
>Jim.

Perhaps it would have been more effective if you had used a better tool than
sarcasm to make your point.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6323. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:29:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227172902.17520.00001073@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35833

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Get it right, will ya? Show where I ever said anyone memorized the entire
>pool.
>You can't because I didn't. Only a dreamer would ever start on such a
>venture.
>But some people DO memorize the part for an element.

Okay, I cede the point.

I think that a ham who rote memorizes over 300 questions in a question pool three times can be deemed to have met the unwritten "work ethic" requirement.

Most hams, though, probably pass the tests the same way I did -- with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that not too many of the tough ones appear on the exam they get.

> You already know all this, I told you all about it long ago. So why play
>dumb?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6324. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:34:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d60c9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35834

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7D2088.32A0EEFC@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > Someone who's stagnated in the distant technical
> > past obviously isn't doing #1 and is incapable of
> > doing #2.
>
> The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
> "stagnating"
> is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
> witness.

Dick, not all "oldtimer CW supporters" are "stagnated in the
distant technical past" ... I admit that freely.

You have a way of twisting things that I (or anyone else who
doesn't agee with your agenda of mandatory Morse testing)
say.

Carl - wa6vse

6325. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 22:45:02 UTC
From: A Different Nick <nicholas@commcen.co.uk>
Message-ID: <u9oq7ucr60v1lpjdls4cqq6aotgivhqsjl@4ax.com>
Source record: 35835
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote:

> She likes that sunspot cycle
>DX, don'cha know.

My Mrs likes the g-spot cycle

6326. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 23:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227180954.23126.00000131@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 35836

In article <a5jgbc022ks@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling.

Well, selling, anyway. Aggression can turn people off.

>I don't
>see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as
>FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate.

Such a program already exists, and has for years. The ARRL Code Proficiency
Program offers certificates and endorsements in 5 wpm intervals from 10 to
at least 40 wpm.

This program goes back many decades.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6327. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 23:11:50 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D67A7.6CF6648B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35837

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> Unfortunately today, though there are still not more than a handful of hams
> whose main focus is critical, the internet seems to give them a forum that
> never existed in my day, giving them an apparent voice all out of proportion to
> their relative lack of importance to the overall big picture of ham radio.

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

I am sure someone in
Newington sees it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

One could interpret the preceding position this way: "Until
today things weren't so bad. Now it's bad old internet, bad
old 1st amendment rights. It sure makes manipulating the US
ARS from behind closed doors difficult." But, I am sure
that is not what the poster had in mind. ;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

6328. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 23:37:04 UTC
From: Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3C7D6D9F.41F65113@yahoo.com>
Source record: 35838
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Kind of confused by this one (the following). I have received many QSL's
from DX that I did not originate (I did not send them a card first) so what
makes receiving a card from a eQSL log any different than a paper one ??

Come on people eQSL are the way it has to be done going forward into the 21st
Century.

Ron

"eQSL does not do this. eQSL receives a log and immediately makes
cards available to all stations in that log without checking the
information the other station has in his log or on his QSL. This
is not acting as a QSL Manager; this is just plain presumptive
QSLing. It is not adequate that the receiving station look at
the QSL and confirm it. How many do you think will refuse a QSL
from a really rare one who put the wrong call in his log so the
eQSL went to the wrong person, or if the signal reports don't
match, etc? There is no independent check here, thus eQSL is not
performing the duties of a QSL manager, thus the eQSLs are not
accepted by ARRL.

Jim Higgins wrote:

> On Sat, 23 Feb 2002 14:46:18 -0700, in
> <3c780dab$1@news.bnb-lp.com>, "Charles Johnston"
> <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote:
>
> >The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the original
> >historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL Cards - ARE - accepted for
> >DXCC....this remark from the eQSL Webmaster found at this
> >
> >URL: http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
> >"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are mailed. AG or
> >not" (Webmaster)
> >15-Feb-2002
>
> Charles,
>
> The eQSL Webmaster is incorrect. His statement is based on a
> misunderstanding of the response received from ARRL.
>
> The ARRL response, available at the eQSL site if you look for it
> follows:
>

> ==== Begin ARRL Email ====
>
> From: Moore, Bill, NC1L [mailto:bmoore@arrl.org]
> Sent: Friday, February 08, 2002 12:31 PM
> To: 'Richard B. Drake'
> Cc: DXCC
> Subject: RE: Professionally Printed and mailed eQSL's
>
> Hi Rich: Something does not sound right here. You are saying that
> Dave is physically mailing out QSL cards by the US postal system?
> This is news to me.
>
> If you are my QSL manager and I send you my logs by e-mail, I am
> sending them direct from point A to point B. Just as if I was
> sending them to you by regular mail. This is OK. I remember
> somewhere several years ago that some people used to get their
> logs over the air on RTTY and another digital mode (AMTOR I
> think). Not a problem.
>
> However, if as the result of a log being sent to E-QSL, someone
> goes in and receives a card electronically and uses it for DXCC,
> that e-QSL cannot be accepted for DXCC credit under rule 2. I
> spent a bit of time with a simple shareware program to prove the
> unreliability of that method.
>
> However, if Dave, acting as QSL manager with station logs
> completes a card (even one from his printer) and sends it by mail
> to you, this is an acceptable exchange and we have see this often
> for several years now. (assuming he phyiscally checks the log).
> Many people use self-made cards from their printer. Each one is
> evaluated on a case by case basis, and many times under Section
> IV rule 4(b) we have conducted an audit to insure the vaildity of
> a card like this.
>
> In cases like this it would be REAL nice if they used a stamp or
> placed their initials or signature on it, but this is not
> required by the rules. However, this issue has been discussed and
> has been given some consideration.
>
> To clarify, if Dave is sending out cards through the US Postal
> System as the result of the log(s) he receives, this is OK.
> (This would basically be operating as QSL manager).
>
> Regards, Bill Moore NC1L
> DXCC Manager
>
> Note: Use of this message is authorized in discussions as long as
> it is used in its entirity and as long as parts are not edited
> out.
>

> ==== End ARRL Email ====
>
> The key to understanding what this means, which eQSL clearly does
> not, is found in the words "acting as QSL manager with station
> logs."
>
> A QSL manager receives a log from the managed station and waits
> for QSLs (or in the case of an operation like eQSL they would
> wait for individual or bulk uploaded contact information) to
> arrive requesting a QSL from the station he manages. He then
> checks the received card (contact info) vs the managed station's
> log to see that the contact is valid; i.e., call sign, signal
> report, band, mode, date and time (within a reasonable clock
> setting/drift error) match. If it is a valid QSO, he issues a
> card. If it isn't he should trash that QSL, not pass it along to
> the station he manages. It's an invalid QSO.
>
> eQSL does not do this. eQSL receives a log and immediately makes
> cards available to all stations in that log without checking the
> information the other station has in his log or on his QSL. This
> is not acting as a QSL Manager; this is just plain presumptive
> QSLing. It is not adequate that the receiving station look at
> the QSL and confirm it. How many do you think will refuse a QSL
> from a really rare one who put the wrong call in his log so the
> eQSL went to the wrong person, or if the signal reports don't
> match, etc? There is no independent check here, thus eQSL is not
> performing the duties of a QSL manager, thus the eQSLs are not
> accepted by ARRL.
>
> The ARRL has not changed their policy as regards acceptance of
> eQSLs for DXCC credit.
>
> Now, I can't speak for the ARRL, but it seems to me that some
> software changes by eQSL could probably overcome the objections I
> see.
>
> Let everyone who wants to QSL via eQSL upload their logs and let
> the software do the cross checking a QSL manager does. Do not
> show anyone any information (except what he posted himself) in
> any form, especially not as a QSL ready for download, until that
> cross check has been completed, then display cards only for QSOs
> that match. Now *THAT* seems to stand a chance of passing muster
> for acceptance for DXCC credit. Whether or not eQSL would need
> to print and mail a QSL at that point vs just present the card
> for download/printing I don't know, but eQSL is too far from that
> point to worry about that right now. The mechanism is already in
> place to print and mail if required, so that isn't a hurdle
> anyhow.
>
> So, as I see it, eQSL need to put the rest of the requirements

> met by authorized QSL managers in place. In the meantime they
> apparently are accepting $1 per card printed and mailed for cards
> that will *NOT* be accepted for DXCC credit.
>
> --
> Jim Higgins, quasimodo AT yahoo DOT com
> icbm: 33.55.34N, 80.24.21W

6329. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 23:39:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7D6E46.62A58856@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35839

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> ... my point is just that you really don't know what
> I'm doing, or where ... I haven't seen you in my shack, peering
> in my windows, at the same locations where I travel to, etc.

Dick has this supernatural ability not only for remote viewing
through space, but remote viewing through space-time. He was
nine years old when I memorized the stuff for the Conditional
exam. Yet he somehow knows and is certain that I didn't memorize
the material.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6330. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-27 23:59:25 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c7d72da.9954304@news.bright.net>
Source record: 35840
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 13:20:15 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
<joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:

<snip>

>
>I do hope that the info concerning FCC's approach to the illegal equipment
>targeted towards
>11 meters is true. It is high time at the interference and actual "bandit"
>operations up on 10 meters is dealt with.
>
>73
>
>Jerry
>K4KWH
>

Here is how I see it, and if I am wrong, I am wrong. I am new to the
amateur radio community. Ok, the FCC needs to crack down on the
"export" rigs, and the companies that manufacture radios that can be
too easilly modified to operate out of band. They also need to crack
down on the makers of the amps that these fools love to use i.e.
davemade, x-force ect. At the same time, there are hams out there that
are also partaking in these activities, they should also be held
accountable. Same rules apply to all, and amateur radio is a self
policing group right?

73 de Keith KC8TCQ

KC8TCQ
Vice President: REACT of Henry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

6331. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 00:19:34 UTC
From: "." <noemailaaa111@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3ptq7u05t088u352koaofjr89dvjda0jad@4ax.com>
Source record: 35841
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic waste) wrote:

>My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
>the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
>though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
>other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
>what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
>Regards
>toxic_waste

I think my present woman thinks its quite interesting. she likes to listen in on my receiver occasionally and does find the 2m conversations rather interesting though Im not sure its for the right reasons!!. I think she sees herself as a bit of an armchair amateur psychologist!!.

Anyway,when she first saw my erection she was gobsmakced and thought it most impressive. Even now she is rather in awe of it and it has given both of us a great deal of pleasure..

G0 Joe

6332. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 00:51:45 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Wmff8.13612$sH1.1552327@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35843
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HEY, now, Walt,

Watch it there! LOL! Harumph! Sensible girl, indeed!

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:3ibp7usmlca54i2jcb6hb0hllfs7k1chqs@4ax.com...
> On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
> waste) wrote:
>
> >My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, she said to me, *either
> >the Cb goes or I do*
>
> Sensible girl!!!!!
>
> :-)
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6333. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:00:55 UTC
From: Gone Forever <none@noneanonnowhere.com>
Message-ID: <a5jvfgoss0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 35842

February 1958 - - Good evening Sir and how is the family

this evening? It was Al on the radio, a friend of my

dad's on 20 meters. Pretty good Al, and did Mike tell you the news? He passed his General class test today at the FCC office.

Gentlemen, can we make an announcemet on frequency? Go ahead sir. My son Mike passed his General class test today and is already studying for the advanced. Multiple congratulations

from hams around the country came in on the old National NC-303.

Mike had passed his General earlier today at the FCC office before a FCC examiner in a suit who knew as much or more than Mike about the various schematic diagrams that Mike was required to draw and explain on his General class test.

Mike's big brother Tom, fresh out of the military in the field
of communications intelligence and with a college degree and a ham ticket himself had recently been hired by the FCC in another office.

In times of emergency and during public demonstrations of ham radio, the press and local government viewed the amateur service as sophisticated communicaitons professionals who spoke professionally and with the utmost of courtesy to each other on the air.

Hams used "handles" but also called each other "Sir" and "Gentlemen" Theirs was an exclusive fraternity with its own stiff entrance requirements.

Traffic nets handled tens of thousands of pieces of "traffic" for overseas U.S. military personnel, free of charge.

The Old National NC-303 and the Viking Valiant were my passport to world adventure as I grew to know hundreds of ham operators around the world and the U.S.

"YOU FUCKING PIECE OF WHITE TRASH! YOU MOTHER FUCKING QRMer YOU BASTARDS ARE QRMing TRAILER TRASH! FUCKING PSYCHOS WHO FUCKING JAM ALL DAY"!

Ahhhhh,,,, ohhh what is going on? Ohhhhh, I was sleeping. I had dozed off and was dreaming. It was NOT February 1958, Fast forward 44 years! In reality it was February 2002 and I had dozed off, leaving the solid state ham rig tuned to 14313 and an operator mobile in Atlanta, a regular on 14313, was in an argument with

several
other hams on 14313. He was accusing one particular ham in Florida of
running a "QRM Gang" whatever that was? Ohhhh, yes, I WAS
only dreaming. Ham radio, circa 1958 is gone forever!!!!!

6334. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:08:05 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <hCff8.13827$sH1.1559797@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35847
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I, too, find myself in the "ex" catagory. Like your ex, my wife always referred to my radios as
"all those 'dumb' radios".....most particularly the ones in the car. She even made me put my
radio station in the closet! I built a desk that would just fit in the closet in our den, and allow the louvered doors to close. This way, when we had company, she could close the doors and
hide those "awful" radios! LOL! Seriously, it worked out pretty well because, with the doors
closed, you wouldn't even know I had a radio station. When she borrowed my car, she would
make me take the antennas off.

She was only half serious about the radios, tho, I found out later. No, she didn't like them at all, but she tolerated them, and actually enjoyed putting them down. It got better during the time I was working out of town. Every Friday night, I would start home and get on the HF
mobile and talk to my friends, or check into various nets. I arrived home one night and she had
forgotten to turn it off. I went into the den, and saw the HF was on, and I wondered out loud
why. She looked like a Cheshire cat caught in the "act" of eating the pet bird!! Even though she razzed me about how "useless" my radios were, she had been listening to me on the drive
home from Atlanta, GA every week! It was her way to see that I was OK, and not in a wreck;
as long as I was talking on the radio, she knew all was well. It was my turn to razz HER! LOL!

73

Jerry

toxic waste <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message news:1f2adfc1.0202270112.28aa64ef@posting.google.com...
> My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
>
> Regards
> toxic_waste

6335. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:09:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d856a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35845

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C5A62.2C2FDD88@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > The FCC is not yet issuing 1X4 call signs, Dick.
>
> So why do you think she chose that callsign, if not to call attention to
"those"?
>

Dick: You're such an easily distracted man. Allow me to be absolutely blunt about it; when a woman has tits the size of mine, a callsign is *NOT* needed to draw attention to them. What a putz. How many times do you have to read that I got this callsign on a dare from friends on the home repeater?

Kim W5TIT

6336. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227200954.17584.00000158@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 35844

In article <3c7c3980_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Give me some examples of CW that was used (not NTS) in
>an emergency or disaster.

Why not NTS? If an emergency- or disaster-related message gets
passed via NTS, why shouldn't it count as much as one that doesn't
use NTS?

>I am even making it so simple that I extend that
>to the use of CW on the Hurricane nets...do they use CW on the Hurricane
>nets?

According to KT4ST, yes, they do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6337. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:16:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d86fa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35848

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020226234049.21406.00000393@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c7c4fbe_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
>
> >I have a problem with you thinking you can dictate the way I should
behave,
> >Larry.
>
> I'm not dictating a damn thing, Kim -- just holding your feet to the fire
> for something you've already done.
>

You still don't read very carefully, Larry. I said you *thinking* you can
dictate the way I should behave--not that you are.

Holding my feet to the fire? Doesn't that imply that I should somehow be,
what?, embarrassed, humiliated, what Larry? You are far from "holding my
feet to the fire."

> >
> >And, don't give me your "I'm not" crap.
>
> Sorry, you're one sentence too late.
>
> >If I were to have entered
> >in this newsgroup, behaved as you would like, not had the callsign you
> >dislike, and called you Sir with ever post, you'd have a far different
> >attitude toward me.
>
> Of course I would -- I would think that you were a polite, intelligent
> fellow ham, worthy of my respect and courtesy. You have not earned
> that good opinion from me.
>

Oh good grief, Larry. The day I win respect and courtesy from the likes of
you would be the day I'd hope I'd come to my senses.

> >By the way, I live for me...no one else.
>
> Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with many
> people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
> the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of course,
> here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
> like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then, I

give
> the devil it's due.
>

If you are so concerned, Larry, about the affect you have on other people,
you'd be a lot different kind of person. I suspect you are exactly the same
in real life as you are on this newsgroup.

> >> It shows heinous disrespect
> >> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
> >> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
> >> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> >Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry, as
you
> >fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.
>
> Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your
opinion
> regarding the validity of my "points" made here.
>

Ditto from me to you, Larry.

> >When you have a wife who loves and admires you, a job you are *really*
happy
> >about (instead of one you feel you have to defend every time), don't have
> >the miserable attitude you have towards other people, and have impressed
> >enough people to change their minds about how idiotic you are, then
perhaps
> >I'll value your opinion. Until then, you are the equivalent of a drunk
who
> >has a real hard-on for ruling over women.
>
> More wasted keystrokes. Well, perhaps not -- at least you're practicing
your
> typing -- which is a useful skill.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, it is wasted keystrokes to think there's a "when" to you ever having
any of the above...

Kim W5TIT

6338. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:17:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7d8744$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 35849

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020226234050.21406.00000395@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <20020226213122.03662.00000802@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >> And
> >>you can post another volume equal to the Bible itself in quantity of
> >>text, but you will never convince me that the term "force," when
> >>applied to an entirely voluntary action, doesn't imply a nonexistent,
> >>negative coercion.
> >
> >And you are not "forced" to talk about Kim's call sign, but you
repeatedly do
> >so. Your fascination with voyeuring her call sign is entirely voluntary.
>
> Ed:
>
> Sorry, but you're wrong on this one. I am not "voyeuring" her call
sign --
> she has "forced" me to observe it, and I reject it on the basis of it's
> inappropriateness in a family-oriented hobbyist radio service. However,
> I realize that in your own ARRL HQ enforced worldview, my "take"
> on Kim's call sign is politically incorrect, so once again, I find I must
> forgive you for doing what you are "forced" to do in order to maintain
> the touchy-feely, PC, Welfare-state supporting image of a professional
> ARRL apologist for everything that is weak and perverted in the ARS.
> Carry on, Ed -- you're doing a good job!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Ain't he hilarious? Larry's the kind of man who still believes rape is a
sexual crime, and that someone can *make* him do it.

Kim W5TIT

6339. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 01:21:00 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <zHff8.79300$2v1.2178304@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 35850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

See Below.....

Keith Hosman <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
news:3c7d72da.9954304@news.bright.net...
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 13:20:15 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
> <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
>
> >
> >I do hope that the info concerning FCC's approach to the illegal
equipment
> >targeted towards
> >11 meters is true. It is high time at the interference and actual
"bandit"
> >operations up on 10 meters is dealt with.
> >
> >73
> >
> >Jerry
> >K4KWH
> >
>
>
>
> Here is how I see it, and if I am wrong, I am wrong. I am new to the
> amateur radio community. Ok, the FCC needs to crack down on the
> "export" rigs, and the companies that manufacture radios that can be
> too easilly modified to operate out of band. They also need to crack
> down on the makers of the amps that these fools love to use i.e.
> davemade, x-force ect. At the same time, there are hams out there that
> are also partaking in these activities, they should also be held
> accountable. Same rules apply to all, and amateur radio is a self
> policing group right?
>
>
> 73 de Keith KC8TCQ

No question. Illegal is illegal. And if hams are aiding and abetting
illegal activities, then they
should have to pay the piper as well. I don't cull 'em out when it comes to
what's right. I truly
hope to see the makers, the sellers, and the users getting busted for it.

I, for one, am fed up with the activities on the low end of 10 meter and down on 12. Every one they smack down
is a victory for Amateur Radio, IMHO.

Jerry

6340. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:15:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5k456$do0$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35852

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C8662.8EC42674@worldnet.att.net...
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
reliable
> > >> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it,
its
> > >> >reliability is a moot point.
> > >>
> > >> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
> > >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
> > >Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite
obvious
> > >that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.
> >
> > Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
>
> In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
> services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
> those operators come from that source these days that if
> hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
> communications mode because of that singular fact.
> It has been made more than clear
> that almost all others who intended to become hams do not
> realize nor understand the basic utility of radiotelegraphy,
> and instead prefer to just skip learning it beyond the level
> mandatory for licensing. That should make it clear what the
> future holds when testing is no longer here.
> The old NCI saw that "Morse lovers must 'sell' the mode'"
> is a total
> fraud, as they well know. You can't sell to most people what
> they don't
> understand and have no experience with, yet think they know
> all about.

Clearly, if that is YOUR attitude toward your favorite
mode, then you aren't up to the task of teacher,
enthusiast, example.

That said, there are, indeed, others (Cecil, Ed, etc.) who will
fill the void your lack of inspiration creates.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6341. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:18:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5k457$do0$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35851

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5jgbc022ks@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7D0890.662A35C9@IEEE.org...
> > Why do so few CW ops come from the military nowadays, Dick?
> > What percentage of presentday hams regularly use CW?
> > What percentage of future hams will learn CW after the
> > requirement is dropped? What will happen if hams organize
> > for the purpose of keeping CW alive? What would happen
> > if you got off your lazy butt and helped that effort?
>
> This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling. I
don't
> see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as
> FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate.
Yes,
> it would be worthless as far as the FCC is concerned, but they would then
> have their "real" hams to tout.

To my knowledge, no one in NCI opposes any such
"voluntary", private certification idea/concept.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6342. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:22:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5k4bd$ft6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35853

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227180954.23126.00000131@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a5jgbc022ks@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling.
>
> Well, selling, anyway. Aggression can turn people off.

Aggressive doesn't jhave to mean "in your face" selling.
I suspect Krell was implying being proactive rather than
passive in support.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6343. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:27:36 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5k4el017b3@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35854

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227180954.23126.00000131@mb-fy.aol.com...
> Such a program already exists, and has for years. The ARRL Code
Proficiency
> Program offers certificates and endorsements in 5 wpm intervals from 10 to
> at least 40 wpm.
>
> This program goes back many decades.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Then FISTS, the ARRL, or any PCTA types should be pushing these endorsements
if they want morse code to endure. They've depended on welfare support of
the mode via code testing, and now it's time to work for it.

6344. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:29:29 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5k4h0017jk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35855

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7D6E46.62A58856@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > ... my point is just that you really don't know what
> > I'm doing, or where ... I haven't seen you in my shack, peering
> > in my windows, at the same locations where I travel to, etc.
>
> Dick has this supernatural ability not only for remote viewing
> through space, but remote viewing through space-time. He was
> nine years old when I memorized the stuff for the Conditional
> exam. Yet he somehow knows and is certain that I didn't memorize
> the material.

...and he was, no doubt, trained by Ed Dames.

6345. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:53:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D9BCE.1906A996@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35856

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
>
> > You don't think that it would be changed by the fact that newcomers are no
> > longer required to learn it at all?
>
> Are you saying, then, that the other modes are not useful because newcomers do
> not have to learn them to pass their tests? They thrive in amateur radio just
> fine without pass/fail mandatory testing.

Aw, yes, the Cecil "Stupid" defense.

6346. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:58:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D9CFF.74FAB257@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35857

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >What matters is that they went through the same process to learn that fact
> >that we all did.
>
> That is the precise description of a hazing ritual, Dick.

"Going through a process to learn facts" is a hazing ritual? Not on planet Earth,
maybe
in NCI land

>
>
> >*THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing.
>
> You do not feel that Morse code has much merit, then, if you feel that people
> will not be attracted to use it.

No, thetas what YOU are saying. I'm saying what I always have said-
Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.

> Your saying that is NOT a very good
> endorsement for the mode, Dick.

That doesn't make it inaccurate.

6347. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 02:59:20 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <c2hf8.3065$gK2.264052@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35858

Jim, thanks for the post. I am looking forward to the rest of it. Yep, I remember everthing above 30 GHz was legal territory, although it would have been a real bear of a problem to generate any measurable power (likely microwatts) and the receiving systems would have been noisy indeed. Usually just a mixer up front on the microwave bands as I remember. A 4 dB noise figure was pretty good on 440 MHz back when I was first licensed (1962). One local guy built a 440 transceiver - complete with 1 tube. Superregen on receive. Good for a couple of blocks - maybe half a mile if you could find someone to talk to. Yepper, on 160 as a general (later an extra) we had 1.8 to 1.825 plus (I think) 1.875 to 1.925. On one of those two 'bands', we were limited to 25 watts (at least here in Rochester, NY). I think the limit may have been 75 watts on the other, but I was running a Johnson Ranger I and only could muster 75 watts CW and 65 watts AM. Ah, you brought back some memories! Looking forward to the other parts.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202270941.5580176a@posting.google.com...
> A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2
(1946-2002)
(snip)
> By 1956 there were over 140,000 US hams, and growth was exceeding 10,000
per
> year.
>
> 160 meters was returned to hams in a very limited fashion. Access was
> dependent on geographic location and time of day, ranging from 1000 watts
> to 25 watts to no access at all. It was confusing, but better than losing
> the band altogether. The amateur allocations in 1956 looked like this:
> Frequencies in MHz):
>
> 1.8-1.825 1.875-1.925 1.975-2 CW/Phone (Subject to geographic and power
> limitations)
> 3.5-4 CW 3.8-4 Phone Novices 3.7-3.75 CW
> 7-7.3 CW 7.2-7.3 Phone Novices 7.15-7.2 CW
> 14-14.35 CW 14.2-14.3 Phone
> 21-21.45 CW 21.25-21.45 Phone Novices 21.1-21.25 CW
> 26.96-27.23 CW/Phone
> 28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone
> (Technicians had all privileges above 30 MHz except 144-148)
> 50-54 CW/Phone
> 144-148 CW/Phone Novices 145-147 CW/Phone
> 220-225 CW/Phone

> 420-450 CW/Phone (50 watt power limit)
> 1215-1300 CW/Phone
> 2300-2450 CW/Phone
> 3300-3500 CW/Phone
> 5650-5925 CW/Phone
> 10000-10500 CW/Phone
> 21000-22000 CW/Phone
> All above 30000 CW/Phone
>
>
> End of Part 1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

6348. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:00:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D9D54.EB1989F2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35859

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >>"Do you find Morse less useful because *I* don't choose to use it?"
> >> If so, why?
>
> > A real no-brainer. When there are enough of "you" CW will be gone.
>
> If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl doesn't
> use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since Carl
> stopped using about 10 years ago?

Are you kidding? Carl never got started using it on the air.

6349. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:01:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D9DA7.14C5650A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35860

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >So why do you think she chose that callsign, if not to call attention to
> >"those"?
>
> I think she chose the call sign for precisely the reasons she said she did.
>
> And I dare say that your reaction to that choice calls more attention to it
> than the call sign itself.
>
> Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

Have you been sleeping close to Cecil or what?

6350. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:05:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7D9E9C.D5417899@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35861

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7C7073.E92F49C4@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > on the air (and that doesn't necessarily mean at any particularly high
> speed).
> > *THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing. Most new hams
> will
> > never learn, will never know, the most basic of all radiocommunication
> modes.
>
> IOW, you think that morse code can't survive on it's own merits. It needs a
> government mandate, despite the fact that the HF privileges that went along
> with it were entirely unrelated.

From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own merits. It
keeps
being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".

6351. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:10:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227221006.17584.00000160@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 35863

In article <OIPe8.413$gK2.38492@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0202260722.454e592d@posting.google.com...
>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com>...
>>
>> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
>words that
>> > taught me new things.
>> >
>> > 73,
>> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>> Same here, Ed. In my case some of those words were spoken and others
>were
>> written.
>>
>> But in all cases, I'm pretty sure that we took the time and effort to
>listen
>> or read those words and consider their meaning.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Outside of Math, virtually all testing is reading and vocabulary far more
>than anything else. To go back when dinosaurs roamed the Earth in 1956 I
>was a snot-nosed freshman who enrolled in a general sci class to pad the
>schedule taught by the department head who had been in charge of testing
>at Lackland in WW2.
>
>The senior physics book at the time was Modern Physics by Dull, Brooks,
>and Metcalf. It was modern in that it had acetate overlays of a steam
>shovel. As was usually the case, the publishers hired English and
>Education majors to revise good-selling texts so Charles Dull was the only
>scientist among the group and he died in 1917. Such was the state of
>American science education when Sputnik went up and this was a well-rated
>high school.

Yup. In fact, some folks say that one of the FCC's driving forces in pushing "incentive licensing"
was Sputnik fever. The FCC first started asking questions about how to get more hams to
upgrade beyond General in 1958.
>

>So I got to be a tackling dummy in our dephead's efforts and part of it
>was to take great piles of standardized tests in subjects in which I had
>no background mostly to show how little they meant. That is when I was
>not being a blocking dummy as nose moose on a team that included Gale
>Sayers whom I will tell you now was not the hardest tackle in that
>backfield. I got 92 percentiles in subjects like Biology that I despised
>at the time. It worked, he got the PSSC science curriculum installed and
>I became a professional test taker.

HAW!!
>
>Some are indeed better than others but they are largely a matter of
>vocabulary and definition -- the latter being simply some realization of
>why the word was coined.

True, 'specially at the high school level. I used to get in some odd
arguments as early as the 5th grade because I "knew too much".
>
>In traffic control, which when you think about it is the FCCs biz, there
>are the famous 3 Es, Engineering, Education, and Enforcement. Charlie has
>done a crappy job of the latter but by and large in the Amateur Service at
>least, decent Engineering and actually almost outstanding Education.
>Given that we are in the self-education biz the major function of the
>testing program is to lead the rookie in righteous paths and this the
>present structure does fairly well and in fact always did.

All depends on who you ask. Some folks think we're in the radio "Dark Ages"
because we still do things like dedicated repeater pairs.
>
>I am much more interested in maintaining the integrity of the system and
>the removal of pressure on the newbie that he doesn't impose on himself
>than I am on the difficulty level of the exams. By getting the words and
>ideas out there, the biggest piece of the job is done. It took a while
>for some of the concepts to sink in to the point of doing a lot about
>them: why the plus went to the rectifier cathode took a while to sink in.
>
>The object is not exclusion but education.

AMEN!

And Education includes a whole bunch of things - not just the purely technical.
How to conduct oneself on the air without a lot of formal training, procedures
and Enforcement is part of Education.

>Removal of the Morse
>requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is the
>only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a damned
>thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the Amateur
>Service.

I suspect that you have hit upon the very reason the Morse/CW test is so
hated in some circles. Except for a very few who have learned the code

elsewhere, most prospective hams have to start at dead zero and learn it from the bottom up. Functions as a Great Equalizer - and some folks really hate that.

>I suspect it will have the effect of making it far more a
>talking shop than a think tank where fuzz like 'legacy modes' gets kicked
>around like it really meant something.

Some folks predicted (not promised, predicted) big technological changes from the dropping of the code test for Techs back in '91. Yet we're still running early 1980s-style packet and mid-1950s style FM as the two most popular modes on amateur radio above 50 MHz. "They gave a revolution and nobody came".

73 de Jim, N2EY

6352. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:10:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020227221007.17584.00000161@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 35862

In article <3c7aed04_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
>> >agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use CW
>> >themselves. Why would we?
>> >
>> Because it works!
>>
>> Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate communications
>> facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there would
>be
>> no
>> need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better in this
>> regard,
>> though). Why should we copy what they do?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think when a Fire Chief I am shadowing wants me to relay a message over to
>the other end of town that additional tank trucks are needed in about 45
>min., along with some relief provisions for 30 men, that the Fire Chief
>would much rather hear me say that than to wonder if I sent the right
>message.

Why would the Chief have to hear you say it, if you have established that
hams get messages through correctly?

Obviously for short-range tactical communication in a situation like that,
voice
is probably more practical than Morse or any digital mode.
>
>I think if the Red Cross is liaisoning between an official government entity
>and a volunteer agency, and the message needs to be sent that volunteers are
>need at Area A, some relief can be made by transitioning some folks from
>Area C over to Area A, that the Red Cross person I am shadowing wants to
>hear or know that I sent the right message.

So if PSK31 or packet or PACTOR were available, you would not use it?
>

>Don't they? I'll ask the Hunt County Emergency Management Officer and the
>City of Greenville Fire Chief the next time I see them what they would
>prefer. Maybe it's different from town to town, but I think our served
>agencies aren't going to want to wonder if what they said got relayed
>correctly.

Sounds like you don't have much confidence in the ability of hams to get a message through without someone looking over their shoulder, or through the use of nonvoice modes. Even asking the questions you ask indicates that you doubt the "savvy" of the hams involved, or of any nonvoice mode.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6353. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:15:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA0C8.D7E012E6@adelphia.net>
Source record: 35864

Thank you very much, Jim! This one gets saved. A lot of very good
information.

- Mike -

N2EY wrote:
>
> A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)
>
> by N2EY - Part 1 of 4
>
> Introduction
>
> This is a brief history of the past 56 years of amateur radio licensing. We'll
> look at how the current structure came to be, and what the future may hold.
> Along the way we'll also take a look at the development of the amateur radio
> service.
>
> To really understand how we got where we are today, it's necessary to look back
> at least 50 years or so. Amateur radio has existed since the very first days
> of radio, and licensing of hams goes back to a least 1912, but to save time
> we'll start about 50 years ago.
>
> The Postwar Period (1946 - 1950)
>
> In the years following World War 2, ham radio was quite different than it is
> today. The prewar 160 meter band had been taken over by LORAN during the war,
> and was not available to hams. Over the next several decades it would be
> reopened to hams, a little at a time. The 15 meter band had been allocated
> to amateurs in 1947, but had not been opened yet. The 30, 17 and 12 meter bands
> were far in the future. VHF and UHF allocations were plentiful, but equipment
> for those bands was primitive, and almost all homemade or converted surplus.
> The prewar 5 and 2-1/2 meter bands had been shifted to the new 6 and 2 meter
> allocations.
>
> Most hams used the 80, 40, 20 and 10 meter bands. The 40 meter band had no
> phone segment - it was all CW. The 11 meter band had not existed before the war
> - it was a sort of compensation for the loss of 160. It was also odd in that
> it was not harmonically related to the other bands, and was shared with medical
> and industrial RF users.
>
> Almost all operation was CW or AM phone. All equipment used tubes, and was
> large, heavy and expensive by today's standards. The transistor was invented in
> 1948, but reasonably priced transistors would not be readily available to hams
> until the mid '50s. Most ham stations were a mixture of homemade, commercially

> built, and converted war surplus gear - a station with only manufactured gear
> was rare. Separate transmitters and receivers were almost universal. Many
> stations used crystal control, and it was common to work another station on a
> different frequency, because crystals were expensive. Long CQs and replies to
> CQs were common, because most hams tuned the entire band looking for replies.
>
> Hams in the continental 48 states had callsigns like W1AW and W3ABT - W,
> followed by a numeral, followed by two or three letters. Hams in the US
> possessions had calls like KH6IJ and KL7ABT - K, followed by a letter/number
> combination denoting the possession, followed by two or three letters. There
> was a very limited "vanity call" program - if a ham wanted a 1X2 call and met
> several criteria, such a call would be issued. If a ham moved to a different
> call area, he/she had to get a new callsign that matched the district of the
> new location. You could always tell where a ham station was located by its
> callsign.
>
> World War 2 had several effects on amateur radio. Amateur radio was shut down
> soon after Pearl Harbor, due to the security risk. Amateurs in most of the rest
> of the world had already gone off the air in 1939. Thousands of amateurs went
> into the military and merchant marine services, and many did not come back. In
> addition to those amateurs who did return, many thousands of newcomers who had
> been exposed to radio in the service wanted to get ham licenses. The war also
> sped up the rate of electronic development, and had forced mass production
> methods on the electronics industry. The cost of producing high quality
> components dropped dramatically. Technologies that were laboratory experiments
> in 1938 were in common use less than five years later. The trend toward
> miniaturization began during this time.
>
> After the war, large quantities of radio and electronic equipment and parts
> were declared surplus and offered for sale at pennies on the dollar. Much of it
> was brand new, and easily adapted to amateur use. The cost of putting a station
> on the air, and the time required to build it, dropped dramatically.
>
> During this time there were also the first signs of things to come. Television,
> first promised as far back as the late '20s and in limited operation before the
> war, spread quickly in the late '40s. Television interference became a major
> concern of hams in TV areas. SSB, used by a few hams in the early '30s, became
> much more practical for amateur radio use with the development of low cost
> crystal and mechanical filters and phasing networks. Wartime developments in
> VHF/UHF technology, as well as surplus parts and equipment, made that part of
> the spectrum much more accessible to hams. The first amateur RTTY stations
> began to appear, using mechanical teletype equipment obtained as surplus from
> various sources. Some amateurs used narrow band FM voice, which required a less
> expensive transmitter than AM.
>
> Before and immediately World War 2 there were 3 classes of amateur license -
> Class A, Class B, and Class C. The requirements for each license class were:
>
> Class A - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and advanced written
> tests on theory and regulations. At least one year of experience as a Class B

> or C licensee. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur
> privileges were granted with a Class A license.
>
> Class B - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written test on theory
> and regulations. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All amateur
> privileges EXCEPT 75 and 20 meter phone were granted with a Class B license.
>
> Class C - Same as Class B, except tests given by mail.
>
> There was also discussion of a "Class D" license, with privileges above 200 MHz
> only. This was not acted upon until 1951.
>
> All amateurs could operate on any amateur frequency, with up to the legal limit
> of power - but only Class A hams could operate phone on the popular 20 and 75
> meter bands. Class B and C hams' phone privileges were limited to the bits and
> pieces of 160 that hams were allowed to use, 11 and 10 meters, and VHF/UHF.
>
> Licenses were good for 5 years, and renewable. Renewal required that the
> operator certify that he/she could meet all of the current requirements for
> licensing. Also, renewal required that the license holder make least 3 contacts
> on the amateur bands in the six months prior to the renewal application - and
> the contacts had to be on CW, not voice. All licensees had to be US citizens.
>
> An accurate log of all transmissions had to be kept. Mobile and portable
> operation were allowed, but if a ham wanted to operate away from his fixed
> station, and would be gone for a period of more than 48 hours, written notice
> of the mobile/portable operation had to be sent to the FCC. Before 1949, mobile
> operation was limited to the ham bands above 25 MHz. Mobile and portable
> stations had to identify themselves on the air as "mobile" or "portable".
>
> The FCC had district offices that conducted exams in many major cities. In
> addition, the FCC would send out examiners to scheduled examining points on a
> regular schedule. If you lived within 125 miles of a quarterly examining
> point, you had to appear in person for the exam. Exams were usually given only
> on weekdays, which meant taking at least a half day off from work for adults
> and waiting for vacation if you were still in school. The district offices
> usually required no appointment, but the quarterly exam points often required
> advance notice.
>
> All tests for a given license (code and written) had to be passed in the same
> session. If you failed any test, you got no partial credit and had to wait 30
> days or more to take the test again. If you passed, you could go on the air
> only when you received your new license in the mail, which was typically a six
> to eight week wait.
>
> If you lived more than 125 miles from an examining point, or had a permanent
> physical disability that prevented you from going to an exam session, or were
> on active military duty, the Class C exam could be taken by mail. First, you
> found a volunteer examiner to give you the test. This was usually another ham,
> but could be a person with a commercial telegraph license as well. You then

> sent away to the FCC for the proper forms, filled them out and had them
> notarized. The written exam was in a sealed envelope. The volunteer examiner
> gave you the code test, and if you passed, certified that you did so and gave
> you the written test. The volunteer examiner acted as a proctor only - he/she
> wasn't supposed to even look at the exam. The written exam was sent back to the
> FCC for marking, and if you passed, your new license came in the mail, and you
> could go on the air as soon as it arrived. If you failed, you had to do the
> whole thing all over again. The process typically took about six to eight weeks
> to complete.
>
> If you had a Class C license and moved to within 125 miles of a quarterly
> examining point, you had to appear for reexamination within a certain time, or
> lose your license. If you had a Class C license and wanted to upgrade to Class
> A, you not only had to travel to a quarterly examining point, but you would
> have to take the Class B exams as well as the Class A written exam. No credit
> was given for exam elements taken by mail.
>
> There were about 60,000 U.S. amateurs in 1946, and about 90,000 in 1950. The
> amateur allocations in 1949 looked like this: (Frequencies in MHz):
>
> 3.5-4 CW 3.85-4 Phone, Class A only
> 7-7.3 CW
> 14-14.4 CW
> 14.2-14.3 Phone, Class A only
> 26.96-27.23 CW/Phone
> 28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone
> 50-54 CW/Phone
> 144-148 CW/Phone
> 220-225 CW/Phone
> 420-450 CW/Phone (50 watt power limit)
> 1215-1295 CW/Phone
> 2300-2450 CW/Phone
> 5250-5650 CW/Phone
> 10000-10500 CW/Phone
> 21000-22200 CW/Phone
>
>
> Restructuring, Changes and More Changes (1951 - 1956)
>
> In the early '50s ham radio changed very quickly. A major influence was growing
> concern about television interference, or TVI. Transmitters had to be designed
> and built for to produce a much higher level of harmonic rejection than was
> needed with prewar designs. SSB was becoming common on the ham bands.
> Manufactured equipment was more common and less expensive. A few companies
> were offering equipment in kit form, which resulted in substantial savings for
> the builder. Coaxial cable and pi network output circuits, practically unused
> by amateurs only 10 years earlier, rapidly replaced parallel tuned tank
> circuits and open wire line.
>
> But the biggest changes came in the area of licensing and regulations. In 1951

> the FCC overhauled the venerable ABC system, and added three new licenses - the
> Novice, Technician, and Extra. The new license requirements and privileges
> were:
>
> Novice - 5 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Simplified written test on
> theory and regulations. No experience required or allowed - anyone who had
> previously held any class of amateur license was ineligible for a Novice.
> Extremely limited CW privileges in parts of the 80 and 11 meter bands, plus CW
> and phone privileges on part of 2 meters. 75 watts maximum power input, crystal
> control only. One year license term, nonrenewable. Exams given at FCC
> examination points or by mail if conditions for mail exams were met. The Novice
> was meant to be a sort of "learner's permit" to help new hams get started.
>
> Technician - 5 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written test on
> theory and regulations - same written test as General class. All amateur
> privileges above 220 MHz. Exams given at FCC examination points or by mail if
> conditions for mail exams were met. The Technician was meant for those who were
> more interested in VHF/UHF experimentation than HF operating. The proposed
> Class D license was implemented as the Technician.
>
> General (old Class B) - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic written
> test on theory and regulations. Exam given at FCC examination points only. All
> amateur privileges EXCEPT 75 and 20 meter phone were granted with a General
> license.
> Conditional (old Class C) - Same as General, except tests given by mail.
>
> Advanced (old Class A) - 13 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and
> advanced written tests on theory and regulations. At least one year of
> experience as a General or Conditional licensee. Exam given at FCC examination
> points only. All amateur privileges were granted with an Advanced license. This
> license was to be phased out and replaced by the Extra. To this end, no new
> Advanced class tests were given after 1952, but holders of Advanced class
> licenses could renew and modify them indefinitely.
>
> Extra - 20 wpm code test, sending and receiving. Basic and higher level written
> tests on theory and regulations. At least two years of experience as a General,
> Conditional or Advanced licensee. Exam given at FCC examination points only.
> All amateur privileges were granted with an Extra license.
>
> The new Novice license was an instant success, and thousands of new Novices got
> licenses and went on the air as soon as the license became available. The
> Technician got off to a slower start, but became more popular when first 6
> meter and later 2 meter privileges were added. These new licenses became so
> popular that in 1954 the FCC made them available by mail only.
>
> The announcement that there would be no more new Class A/Advanced licenses
> after the end of 1952 caused many hams to get one while they were still
> available, rather than face the more difficult requirements of the new
> Extra license. A few amateurs went after the Extra, though.
>

> But in early 1953 the FCC made a surprise about-face and announced that
> all amateur privileges would be granted to all holders of General,
> Conditional, Advanced and Extra class licenses.
>
> Callsigns were changed slightly. In some districts all of the W prefix
> callsigns were issued, so the prefix K began to be used. Novices got
> distinctive callsigns, in the following fashion: In the continental US, Novices
> got callsigns like KN5LZO and WV2ABC. The letter immediately preceding the
> numeral was either an N or a V, denoting Novice. When the Novice upgraded, this
> letter was dropped. In the possessions, the first letter of a Novice callsign
> was made a W instead of a K, as in WL7DEF. Upon upgrading, the W became a K.
>
> Several more changes also occurred in this time period. In 1953, 40 meters
> got a phone segment, and Novices got a subband on 40. In 1954, the 15 meter
> band was opened to amateur use and Novices got a subband there, but lost
> access to 11 meters. 50 kHz of 20 meters was lost to other services. The
> retest requirement for Conditionals was dropped in 1952, and the distance
> requirement for a Conditional license was reduced to 75 miles in 1954. The
> procedures for mail and in person exams remained the same.
>
> By 1956 there were over 140,000 US hams, and growth was exceeding 10,000 per
> year.
>
> 160 meters was returned to hams in a very limited fashion. Access was
> dependent on geographic location and time of day, ranging from 1000 watts
> to 25 watts to no access at all. It was confusing, but better than losing
> the band altogether. The amateur allocations in 1956 looked like this:
> Frequencies in MHz):
>
> 1.8-1.825 1.875-1.925 1.975-2 CW/Phone (Subject to geographic and power
> limitations)
> 3.5-4 CW 3.8-4 Phone Novices 3.7-3.75 CW
> 7-7.3 CW 7.2-7.3 Phone Novices 7.15-7.2 CW
> 14-14.35 CW 14.2-14.3 Phone
> 21-21.45 CW 21.25-21.45 Phone Novices 21.1-21.25 CW
> 26.96-27.23 CW/Phone
> 28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone
> (Technicians had all privileges above 30 MHz except 144-148)
> 50-54 CW/Phone
> 144-148 CW/Phone Novices 145-147 CW/Phone
> 220-225 CW/Phone
> 420-450 CW/Phone (50 watt power limit)
> 1215-1300 CW/Phone
> 2300-2450 CW/Phone
> 3300-3500 CW/Phone
> 5650-5925 CW/Phone
> 10000-10500 CW/Phone
> 21000-22000 CW/Phone
> All above 30000 CW/Phone
>

> End of Part 1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

6354. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:19:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA1E9.5E0D1005@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35865

CAM wrote:

>Do you think forcing a code exam upon Carl would turn

> him into a code lover?

NOTHING, not even the devil himself, could *ever* turn Carl into a code lover.

6355. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:23:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA2C2.7C16B954@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35866

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > We will not be able to "sell" all hams on the merits of CW/Morse,
> > but we don't have to "sell" everyone. Just a reasonable number.
>
> Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
> CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
> knuckledragger?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Carl and Brian Burke are newcomers? After 25 years of being licensed?
You know no one
called newcomers names, in fact I specifically stated that no newcomer
can be blamed for the fact that he can pick up an Extra class license
while knowing virtually nothing about ham radio, but you just like to
troll, troll, troll,.

6356. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:41:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA6F8.CCC1E3FA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35867

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7D02D8.A8C5FDE1@worldnet.att.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > The fact of the matter is that you don't have a clue what I'm
> > > doing, or where
> >
> > So, you lie about it, then?
> >
>
> Certainly not ... my point is just that you really don't know what
> I'm doing, or where

So you lie about all the microphonitis and no one has ever heard your
callsign on the
air working a digital mode.... Yup, another Cecilian liar trollski.

6357. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:45:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA7E0.2F409AC6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35868

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
> >"stagnating"
> >is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
> >witness.
>
> Carl, I am an old time ham and a supporter of CW use (by example and by
> believing that the mode has value).
>
> Do you think that I am stagnating in Amateur Radio?
>
>

Carl is making that accusation, not me.

6358. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:52:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DA97B.713FA337@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35869

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7D1E90.3C9A6CA8@worldnet.att.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > > We all know you hate high power.
> > >
> > > I don't "hate high power" ... I simply thing that it is misused A LOT,
> >
> > ....
> >
> > > according to the minimum power rule, which is probably the
> > > MOST violated rule in ham radio, the guys who are telling each other
> > > that they are all S9+40+ to everyone else in the group are MISusing
> > > their amps, IMHO.)
> > >
> >
> > The problem is YOU decide for them and you should know better. If a group
> > on a frequency runs high power, how do YOU know that one of them doesn't
> > need the rest to run that power level to overcome a bad local noise
> problem,
> > poor propagation conditions to his location, which may be in a distant
> area
> > from the others, or some other such variable? You DON'T. Just because
> > most of the stations in a group don't need to run high power to talk to
> > each other doesn't mean that a single station couldn't be the cause of
> > the need for the others to run it.
>
> Dick ... you really don't read well, do you? I said that ALL stations
> in the group were reporting ALL others as S9+40+ ... in other words
> ALL stations had WAY beyond "solid copy" of all others ..

I read it. You *ASS-UME* that all stations have bla bla bla. You assume a lot
of erroneous things, and this is no different. You make your version of how it
should
be for all hams, with no regard to facets about which you may not have full
information.
This is not new, you've done it all along.

>
> designing HF equipment and systems for military use, with
> several different, wellp-known companies ... one of which was
> Rockwell-Collins ... you HAVE heard of them, right?

>
> Have you ever designed a nation-wide HF voice and data
> system for an entire COUNTRY's government? I have.

Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though. Real shame, isn;'t it?
Toss those names around, maybe you'll impress someone yet.

>
> Don't try to preach your "superiority" to me ... it doesn't square
> with reality.

Oh - It doesn't square with your inferiority complex. I got it.

6359. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:56:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DAA73.24ED3DA3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35870

N2EY wrote:

> In article <a5jgbc022ks@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling.
>
> Well, selling, anyway. Aggression can turn people off.
>
> >I don't
> >see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as
> >FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate.
>
> Such a program already exists, and has for years. The ARRL Code Proficiency
> Program offers certificates and endorsements in 5 wpm intervals from 10 to
> at least 40 wpm.
>
> This program goes back many decades.

Well, this is a real demo of what is faced by spporters of CW. So much lack
of interest
he didn't even know of he ARRL code proficiency certificate program

6360. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 03:59:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DAB35.EFEABB9C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35871

CAM wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > ... my point is just that you really don't know what
> > I'm doing, or where ... I haven't seen you in my shack, peering
> > in my windows, at the same locations where I travel to, etc.
>
> Dick has this supernatural ability not only for remote viewing
> through space, but remote viewing through space-time. He was
> nine years old when I memorized the stuff for the Conditional
> exam. Yet he somehow knows and is certain that I didn't memorize
> the material.

You know as well as any of us that if Blowhard Carl was actually
doing anything with
digital modes on ham radio he'd regale us no end with *all* the
details.

6361. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231745.15503.00000108@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35872

In article <3ibp7usmlca54i2jcb6hb0hllfs7k1chqs@4ax.com>, Walt Davidson
<walt99@tiscali.co.uk> writes:

>
>>My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, she said to me, *either
>>the Cb goes or I do*
>
>Sensible girl!!!!!

Walt:

Especially when her boyfriend goes by the screen name "Toxic
Waste." It wouldn't take much for her to do a lot better than that
bloke!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6362. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231745.15503.00000109@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35873

In article <3C7C6C36.8AD5B928@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I'm not dictating a damn thing, Kim -- just holding your feet to the fire
>> for something you've already done.
>
>And for that today, she is thankful. The temperature in Dallas right now
>is 23 degrees F and falling fast.

Cecil:

Thank you for making that point. Who says I'm not a warm, caring
sort of guy?

73 de Larry, K3LT

6363. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231746.15503.00000110@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35876

In article <3c7d86fa_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> >If I were to have entered
>> >in this newsgroup, behaved as you would like, not had the callsign you
>> >dislike, and called you Sir with ever post, you'd have a far different
>> >attitude toward me.
>>
>> Of course I would -- I would think that you were a polite, intelligent
>> fellow ham, worthy of my respect and courtesy. You have not earned
>> that good opinion from me.
>>
>
>Oh good grief, Larry. The day I win respect and courtesy from the likes of
>you would be the day I'd hope I'd come to my senses.

Kim:

As it happens, that is correct!

>> >By the way, I live for me...no one else.
>>
>> Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with many
>> people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
>> the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of course,
>> here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
>> like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then, I
>give the devil it's due.

>If you are so concerned, Larry, about the affect you have on other people,
>you'd be a lot different kind of person. I suspect you are exactly the same
>in real life as you are on this newsgroup.

This newsgroup is only part of my real life, Kim -- not the whole thing,
as it may be with you. You have no way of knowing how I am in "real"
life because you simply don't know anything about me other than that
which I choose to expose in this forum.

>> >> It shows heinous disrespect
>> >> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
>> >> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
>> >> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>> >Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry, as

>you fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.

Any points made in this newsgroup which place you in a negative light, are gratuitously provided by your own self.

>> Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your
>opinion regarding the validity of my "points" made here.
>>
>
>Ditto from me to you, Larry.

Good, since you're the last person from whom I'm seeking any kind of validation -- unlike yourself.

(About a dozen lines of Kim's more severe inanity mercifully snipped)

73 de Larry, K3LT

6364. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231747.15503.00000111@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35875

In article <20020227053514.26494.00000722@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>However,
>>I realize that in your own ARRL HQ enforced worldview
>
>Um, Larry, how can a fellow of your claimed intelligence fail to grasp the
>simple, oft-repeated concpet that ARRL HQ doesn't give a rats butt about
>rrap?

Ed:

Oh, I grasp that concept, all right. In fact, I rather suspect that rrap is way down on their list of things they don't give a rat's butt about -- like the future of the ARS, among other things. If it were not so, perhaps they'd pay closer attention to the opinions being expressed here.

>Maybe you are the one that Dick feels rote-memorized his way to an Extra.

Ed, I'm here to tell you right now that I "rote-memorized" my way to virtually every academic achievement I've ever made in my life -- except the Morse code tests I took to become an Extra-class radio amateur! It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've learned it! Do you have something against learning? How does one learn the FCC Part 97 Rules and Regulations without "memorization" of same? If you have a problem with anyone who is against "rote memorization," don't look at me -- because you'll have the wrong man.

>As to the rest of your post, it degraded into near-meaningless buzzwords and
>gibberish,

Which only an ARRL HQ employee would so easily recognize...

>so it is not even possible to give a rational response.

...which is what people usually say when they cannot respond.

>Is this
>your "save the code" crusade, or your "let's see how many people we can honk
>off today" inner need?

Well, that posting was directed specifically at you -- so I guess it must be the former. Gee, what a surprise!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6365. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231748.15503.00000112@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35874

In article <3c7d8744$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Ain't he hilarious? Larry's the kind of man who still believes rape is a
>sexual crime, and that someone can *make* him do it.

Kim:

Kindly explain how anyone can "make" anyone else commit the crime
of rape. And if rape is not a sexually-based crime, what would it be
then? It is both a sex-based crime and a crime of violence; the two
are not separable if the definition of the crime is, in fact, rape --
unless you're referring to grape pomace or a mustard-like herb of
the Canola family.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6366. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:17:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020227231749.15503.00000113@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 35877

In article <3c7d8568_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Wow, I can't imagine a day when the CW guys predominantly were friendly.

Kim:

Don't look now, but that would be *any* given day of the year! I've never
heard anywhere near the number of discourteous Lids on CW as I have
on phone. Of course, you'd have no direct experience with how CW
operators really are, would you?

>Heh heh, actually that's a terrible generalization on my part, Ed.

Ehyupp.

>And,
>actually folks like Larry, Little Dick, Dave Heil...whomever, are in the
>minority.

I'd hope that 3 hams are in the minority -- but with the way things are
going, that may not be so in the future!

>At least around here. Most of the CW folks are very accepting of
>all hams, regardless of CW feelings. When the Restructuring debate *first*
>hit the air down here, we had few nidyuts who said, "we're dumbing down the
>bands."
>
>But, when those of us who are already 5wpm hams, retorted that *we* were not
>dumb,

You should have spoken strictly for yourself.

>the quick response was, "Well, I am not talking about you."

Actually, they most likely were, but were just trying to be polite.

>All we
>had to do was say, "Then who *are* you talking about?" and they pretty much
>re-surveyed what they had just said.

Naaahhh -- they were just probably dismissing you as a clueless, lazy, dumbed-
down no-coder.

(It's most of us Tech and Tech+ who,
>at the time, would spend our entire weekends helping out those older hams
>with antenna projects, retuning, etc.) We'd also ultimately fix problems
>with antenna connections into tuners, computer peripherals wrongly attached
>to TNCs, and on it goes.

Interesting. Prove it. Get one of the "older" hams for whom you've personally provided such technical assistance to get on this newsgroup and provide verification. Just one. If you cannot, or will not for any reason, you are a liar.

>In fact, for a while there we Tech/Tech+'s would
>jokingly gloat that all this stuff would roll down our way, yet it was us
>who was keeping things going...heh heh
>
>I have a feeling the folks like Little Dick and Larry and Dave would act the
>way they do without the ham radio forum.

Oh really? Find one person with whom Dick, Dave, or myself has had an on-the-air QSO and "acted" like we do in this newsgroup, and get them to provide verification -- if you cannot, or will not for any reason, then you have just gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself -- thus proving that you're no better than you claim we are.

> In fact, it is the ham radio forum
>that gives them the only soapbox they feel they can step up to, is my real
>suspicion.

Don't look now, Kim, but that's one of the things a Usenet forum is there for -- to serve as a "soapbox" for individual opinion. You use it in the exact same way.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6367. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:23:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DB0BE.CE59E0F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35878

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Is there such a silencing?
>
> A direct attempt was made on 25 January 1999. That is public
> record in FCC archives. It did not work.

Great, so you have no beef. The system works as it should. Why are you
then grousing?

> >You've certainly had more than your fifteen minutes of fame here.
>
> Oh, is this a "timed activity?" Is "authorization by credential"
> needed to engage in free speech? :-)

You are simply being obtuse once again.

> >I've said it before: Say what you want. Just
> >don't expect folks to fawn all over you in agreement with you.
>
> Nothing like that expected. :-)

Then why do you always sound so disappointed that no one follows you
banner?

> Interesting that those who make such comments hold up a
> mirror looking at themselves when writing such statements. :-)

I'm not the silly fellow standing on the soap box, wrapped in the flag
as well as the cloak of righteous indignation.

>
> >You've had your say. No one is obliged to give your views much credence
> >or to give a big "Hurrah for Leonard H. Anderson!" in response.
>
> :-) ...look into the mirror...look deep...you are becoming silly....

Reads like one of your experiments in self-hypnosis...

> >Getting into amateur radio has been largely made easier than ever.
>
> Has it? There's not much common agreement other than today's
> newcomers are demeaningly labeled with everything from "extra
> lite" to "CBplussers" to, in Heil's specialty, BEGINNERS!!!! :-)

That must come as a shock to you that beginners in amateur radio would be labelled "beginners". At least you won't have to suffer the horror of being called a "Novice".

> Yes, join the ranks, The Strong, The Proud, The Amateur Corps!
> Stand at attention while the long-timer Dill Instructor struts in
> front of "recruits" with swagger key tucked under arm extolling
> the Virtues of Rank, Obediance, Discipline, the TRADITION OF
> THE CORPS! The Morsemen are Your Leaders and all Shall
> enjoy as They enjoy...whether anyone likes it or not!
>
> ALL WILL DO AS THEY DO! :-)
>
> Of course that is an exaggeration, but it is not far from the
> implicit meaning of so many long-timers. It is not a pretty
> picture to others yet it is taken as a "masterpiece" to
> themselves.

Of course, as you say, it is an exaggeration. I might add that it is another product of Anderson Manufacturing.

> >... Your purpose isn't an amateur radio license.
>
> My purpose in this newsgroup is to argue for the elimination of
> the morse code test for an amateur radio license. Stated before,
> stated again.

To what end? We always come back to this one: Why would you be doing such a thing if you aren't setting out to obtain an amateur license? Stated before; stated again.

> That purpose has continually been clouded, obscured by artificial
> smoke from a certain group of long-time Morsemen who DEMAND
> that all DO AS THEY SAY!

Yeah, we have the power to cloud men's minds!

> Those long-time morsemen have NO authority and no special
> "right" to demean, belittle, or attempt humiliation of others who
> do not share their views. They still continue. They do not die
> for their ego gives them everlasting life.

Lenny, anyone has a right to demean, belittle, attempt humiliation of, or to simply laugh at you. In your case, you make it easy by providing ammunition in the form of your posts to this newsgroup.

> >Your hobby is haunting this newsgroup.
>
> Ghosts know about haunting. I am an optimist and perhaps too
> much the idealist to think that human beings can engage in
> rational discourse on subjects, looking at many sides rather than
> just one. My fault.

If someone asked me to describe you, the word "optimist" would be one of the last to come to mind. I'm afraid I'll never be able to think of you as, "Lenny the optimist".

Dave K8MN

6368. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:23:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB0DA.F2347E63@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35879

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> learned it!

But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6369. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:25:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB141.1AADC582@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35880

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Have you been sleeping close to Cecil or what?

Not unless his name is Bronco, the cat.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6370. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:28:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB203.425B841F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35882

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
> > CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
> > knuckledragger?
>
> Carl and Brian Burke are newcomers?

Carl and I are newcomers to the Extra license. You have NOT made
us feel welcome.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6371. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:31:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB29E.50785F6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35883

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.

You and I can expose them to CW's merits, Dick, but your attitude seems
to be that CW doesn't have enough merits to survive without a government
welfare subsidy program.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6372. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:32:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DB2EC.C74B5AF5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35881

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Gee, that isn't even close to correct, is it, Lenny? The thread (some
> >four or five years back was over whether the U.S. government was using
> >morse. I commented on that idea and explained that the Department of
> >State used CW as late as the late eighties/early nineties. It was a
> >fact. I was there. I used it.
>
> Incorrect. Heil first stated that the idea of using morse on a teleprinter
> circuit was his idea. He later changed that to "procedures for
> synchronizing" without specifying what was synchronized. Finally,
> in the last go-around of that he stated that it was "State Department
> Procedure."

It's "put up or shut up" time, Len. Produce the post where I made such
a statement about such being my own idea.

> >That you casually dismiss my statement as false is asinine.
>
> Nothing was "dismissed." My opinion, stated in the original
> thread, was that such a procedure was "dumb" based on existing
> procedures on radio-teleprinter circuits used by the US military
> and commercial services established decades before this
> innovation. There is no stated technical necessity for doing so
> and in this go-around Heil is shrouding the matter in "security"
> as a justification. Good smokescreen. Such cannot be
> proved or disproved for "reasons of security." :-)

I guess you'll go to your grave without the answer to this burning
question, huh?

> >... At no time did I mention my "importance" and if USG
> >security bothers you, take it up with your congressman.
>
> As I've tried to point out to Heil before, hundreds of thousands
> of us have done the "security" thing in regards to classified
> documents. That is commonplace, a fact of life, important to
> national security. It is not some "special activity" exclusive to
> the Department of State.

You are demanding information which I cannot provide you. It seems to
bother you. Take it up with your Congressman.

> >...as in, "I am interested in taking up oil painting but perhaps I'll
> >postpone it for forty years". If you aren't interested in what hams do,
> >you probably aren't interested in amateur radio at all.
>
> ? As an artist-illustrator with natural talent and professional
> experience in other media as well as oils, this is a puzzling
> analogue. Artists are not licensed by the federal government for
> either amateur or professional art activities. The only possible
> link can be the very tenuous fact that Samuel F. B. Morse was
> an itinerant portrait painter before getting involved in telegraphic
> communications. :-)

You are simply full of baffling revelations. Who among us knew that the
Feds didn't license artists??? Without getting too caught up in
semantics, Leonardo da Anderson, who would put off anything in which
they held an avowed interest for decades?

> >There are numerous areas of interest within amateur radio.
>
> Agreed.
>
> >You need to become a ham to become a participant.
>
> No, no, no. Authorization to TRANSMIT RF energy requires
> grant of an amateur radio license to be a lawful participant.
> Everything else can be done by unlicensed-in-amateur-radio
> individuals.

I seem to recall "within amateur radio". Them that ain't within is
without!

> >Those who are up on the latest technology can do the same things if they
> >like. Their ham tickets permit any number of activities.
>
> Be consistent and aware of federal regulations. Radio amateurs
> are NOT AUTHORIZED to engage in deliberate transmission of
> RF energy outside of amateur bands through their amateur license.

Stuff and nonsense! No such claim was intended nor would it be
understood as such by anyone in full command of his mental faculties.

> >You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.
>
> ...as I said before, calm rational discourse is not a quality of
> Heil's correspondence. :-)

...but you made no denial.

Dave K8MN

6373. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:34:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB365.5EDFD7F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35884

Dick Carroll wrote:
> From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own merits. It
> keeps being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".

If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer. What's the age of
the average ham?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6374. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:36:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB3BE.A478CABC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35885

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> Is the usefulness of CW changed by whether we have code testing or not?
> > >
> > > You don't think that it would be changed by the fact that newcomers are no
> > > longer required to learn it at all?
> > >
> > Are you saying, then, that the other modes are not useful because newcomers do
> > not have to learn them to pass their tests? They thrive in amateur radio just
> > fine without pass/fail mandatory testing.
>
> Aw, yes, the Cecil "Stupid" defense.

Don't blame it on me, Dick, I don't even understand it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6375. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:41:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7DB4DD.A42702E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35886

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >Do you think forcing a code exam upon Carl would turn
> > him into a code lover?
>
> NOTHING, not even the devil himself, could *ever* turn Carl into a code lover.

Well then, it doesn't make any sense to force Morse code exams upon
people like Carl, does it? The people who like CW will use it. The
people who don't like CW won't use it. Different strokes for different
folks. What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6376. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:54:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DB7AC.39E37EEB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35887

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7C728C.1208106@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.
>
> Heh heh heh...thus is demonstrated another calm, dispassionate
> discourse...
>
> >You can't operate on the ham bands sans license.
>
> Untrue. See which bands are primary or secondary in allocation
> in Part 2, Title 47 CFR. See also Parts 15 and 95, same CFR.

Oh, I'll look forward to hearing your Part 15 sigs on 20m.

> >You remember, that "interest" of yours which goes back decades.
>
> "Interest" in radio need not be confined to just amateur radio.
>
Excuse me, Len. I was under the impression that we were discussing
amateur radio. I recall your claim of interest in obtaining an amateur
radio license. I don't recall a similar claim about any other radio
service.

>> Is that "stupidity" or is Heil engaging in yet-another insult fest?
> >> I vote that he is a fest.
> >
> >> The word "interest" does not show Lust or Craven Desire or anything
> >> else. The word has no specific gradation.
> >
> >Decades, Len? Decades? You've farted around here long enough for even
> >the slowest of the slow to obtain an amateur ticket.
>
> My purpose in this newsgroup has always been stated simply
> as arguing for the removal of the morse code test in amateur
> radio licensing. Since the PCTA have never yet made but one
> reasonable case for the retention of that test, many seem to
> fall back on the false charge of personal vindictiveness on the
> basis of "never having passed, or been able to pass an amateur
> license." Such a charge is false, bogus, a smokescreen for
> not having a viable counterargument for retention of the morse
> code test.

I'll go you one better: "Never having even attempted to pass". It isn't a false or bogus claim. The claim is quite true. The question which begs a real answer is why a seventy-year-old man with no interest in obtaining an amateur radio license would concern himself even slightly in the regulation of amateur radio?

> The charge that one must be "credentialled" with an amateur
> radio license in order to discuss getting into amateur radio at
> all is absurd. Radio communication is not exclusive to
> amateur radio nor are the arts of radio communication solely
> determined by amateur experience, techniques, or
> accomplishments within a specific amateur activity.

You've discussed, lectured, preached and railed here for years. You've garnered few supporters but you have managed to honk off greater numbers. I maintain THAT is your real purpose. You enjoy generating controversy here as a means for filling your empty hours.

> >Okay, Walter Mitty, you're BRAVE. If you're brave, stifle that twitch
> >in your breast and go forth and obtain even a no-code ticket.
>
> That is an immature "challenge" based on the bogus "necessity"
> of "do as we did or shut up." It is the primal fraternal order
> emotionalism syndrome on the edge of going bananas.

Awwww, shucks, you've gone and snipped that part of your rant to which I responded. Tell us again about you being Brave in your stand against those who think you're a loon.

> Heil seems to need constant reminders that the FCC does not
> need credentialism of fraternal amateurism in order to set the
> regulations of US amateur radio hobbyists nor is it allowed to
> seek comment on those regulations solely from amateurs.

You've commented here and you've commented to the FCC. It is my understanding that you've generated snickers in both places. You've had your say; now what more do you want?

> The necessity for an amateur callsign to discuss primary policy
> of getting into amateur radio is just bogus, false, irrelevant.

> >Aaaaaah, let me show you how to fold your Nazi stuff before insertion,
> >Len. Your use of it makes you look small.
>
> Does it? How does Heil feel about his own image reflected right
> back to him when he uses the same tactics?

Yes, it does. I didn't use those tactics. Darn, you've gone an snipped that portion of your material too. Are you ashamed of your words?

> >I'm great on shrouding, Len. The Department of State makes us shroud.
> >I was told not to reveal things to just any inquisitive clod on the
> >street. I think they meant you. The remainder of your rant is evidence
> >of mental imbalance on your part.

>
> "Mental imbalance?" If so, there are hundreds of thousands of us in
> aerospace and government agencies who have ALL had to follow the
> same laws and precautions regarding classified material as State.
> The Department of State has no exclusivity on that matter.

Darn, you've done it again--snipped the portion to which my reply was directed. I didn't say hundreds of thousands of folks who safeguard classified material show mental unbalance. I suggested that your rant demonstrates mental unbalance.

> >I don't care if you call or write State, Len. They're quite used to
> >getting quizzed by fruitcakes. I know you "challenged" WHAT I WROTE IN
> >THIS NEWSGROUP. If it wasn't for this newsgroup, I'd have NO CONTACT AT
> >ALL WITH YOU. Ask yourself this, Leonardo: What reason would I have to
> >manufacture material stated in this newsgroup? Would it change the
> >outcome of the code debate? Would it gain me riches? Would it convert
> >numbers of "code test haters" to my way of thinking?
>
> Heil's primal reason seems to concern his ego. That is a common
> syndrome in computer-modem communications, to win "message
> points" however possible, make yourself look superior.

You'd certainly know about what you describe, Len. My telling you about government use of morse was not to stroke my ego or win some of those invisible message points you keep babbling about, it was to counter claims of others that government was not using morse.

> >Hell, Len. YOU belittle those who don't share YOUR viewpoint and you
> >aren't even a ham! You aren't a grain of sand in the hourglass of
> >amateur radio.
>
> I present opposing arguments to certain amateur radio regulations
> and their retentions, trying to stay on the subject. All too often
> those who "reply" do so on my person instead of the subject. In some
> cases I will "return fire" in a like manner to those who insist on
> attacking the messenger instead of the message. That invariably
> results in cries of "outrageous objections!"

Sort a a "Point/Counterpoint" thing then, is it? Maybe your grating manner gets in the way of your words.

> One of the extreme cases of this is a current subject thread
> supposedly identifying myself but is an exchange between two
> others in a heated fashion. The originator of that other subject
> thread feels "perfectly justified" in everything he says, does, or
> thinks and will not back down. He is an extra class licensee
> with a one-by-two callsign.
>
> Heil is an extra class licensee with a one-by-two callsign.
> Except for the names, there seems to be little distinction
> between the two.

There's obviously a conspiracy against you and the conspirators all hold
1 x2 amateur callsigns. Get some rest, Len.

Dave K8MN

6377. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:56:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DB85C.344B48A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35888

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7D09A4.DF803C38@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> > I know hams my age who learned Morse code for the purpose
> >> > of passing the exam and never used it again. They cannot remember more
> >> > than a handful of Morse characters and sure can't carry on a CW QSO.
> >>
> >> Yep, we all do, and I count several of them as close ham friends. It
> >> doesn't matter
> >> to me that they have no affinity for CW. What matters is that they went
> >> through the same process to learn that fact that we all did.
> >>
> >So whether it's useful to a ham or not, he should go through what you did?
>
> That seems to be the basic reason behind the beligerant PCTA
> group. Carroll is one of those. It shines brightly through nearly
> every "message." :-)
>
> What makes it all so ludicrous is that the beligerant PCTAs are
> not in agreement. They differ markedly in "reasons." They
> cannot understand that others see them differently from how
> they see themselves, therefore they have no cognizance of the
> clearly-stated difference in "reasons" for keeping the code test.
>
> The only near-common "reason" is "You have to do as I did!"
>
> Not a good reason.

You know, Leonardo, you are right. It isn't a good reason 'cuz it can
no longer happen. No one taking the Extra exam has to do as I did.
Sorry to ruin your rant.

Dave K8MN

6378. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 04:58:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7DB8FA.79BEF31E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 35889
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Graham Sharp wrote:
>
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> >news:apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com...
> >> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >> >over such and unimportant thing.
> >>
> >> Please re-post in English.
> >>
> >> --
> >> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> >Why is it that there always has to be some smart-arse Brit chime in and say
> >that Yanks really don't speak/write English? We communicate in the same
> >language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English. Canadian
> >French is different from that spoken in France, but it's still called
> >French. Ditto Mexico and Spain. However, English is supposed to have a
> >different set of rules, according to wankers like you.
> >
>
> Looser

I love it.

Dave K8MN

6379. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 05:22:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228002250.10578.00000184@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 35890

In article <9f4bfe89.0202271016.7d62e667@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3C7C8662.8EC42674@worldnet.att.net>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > In article <3c7787a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> >Bottom line, Jim, regardless of cars, is that CW may be the most
>reliable
>> > >> >mode. But, if there are few people who use it and understand it, its
>> > >> >reliability is a moot point.
>> > >>
>> > >> That is precisely the argument used for keeping the code tests.
>> > >>
>> > >> 73,
>> > >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>> > >
>> > >Oh, I wholeheartedly disagree on that. It should already be quite
>obvious
>> > >that CW testing does not a CW-lover/doer make.
>> >
>> > Not all the time. But at least some of the time, it does.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> In past times many CW ops came from the military and other
>> services and many of them went on to become hams. So few of
>> those operators come from that source these days that if
>> hams don't learn CW it will die out as a viable
>> communications mode because of that singular fact.
>
>Unfortunate but true. And it worked the other way, too - hams often
>became military or commercial radio operators, aided in large part
>by their CW/Morse and technical experience.

Not quite right. The above is PAST TENSE for "CW/Morse" by about three decades in the US military, at least two decades in the commercial radio field.

>But both the military and commercial communications folks have long
>been reducing/eliminating their dependence on radio operators. Not

>just Morse/CW ops, but the whole idea of a person whose job is specific to
>operating radio sets. The Navy, for instance, no longer has the
>"Radioman" classification at all.

This is NOT quite true for the US military. The synonymity of
"CW/Morse" and "radioman" disappeared/evaporated before 1970.

The sole exception in the US military is the MI, a very small group
service-wide, service-total, passive ELINT (ELectronic INTelligence)
specialists PART of whose task is interception of communications.
Training in that rare specialty is done at Fort Huachuca, not only for
all military branches but civilian government agency personnel.

That NAMES of Military Occupation Specialties have changed is
not the issue, the ACTUAL SPECIALTY has changed. Operation
is no longer of "radio sets" but rather radio/telecommunications
SYSTEMS.

AEGIS is a good example of a true SYSTEM, a weapons system
requiring dozens of specialties in radar, computers, misslery,
electronics, tracking and ordering, electronic warfare and
identification. It is not the motion picture symbolism of the old
rotating radar set and operators with grease pencils and chest
telephones. It is more modern, appearing more (to a civilian)
like a video game arcade in operation. The difference is that
this "game" is REAL and the player can LOSE by obliteration.
AEGIS first went to sea on trials in 1973, was operational with
the USN by 1980. That is 22 years ago.

You may obtain information on that and all the military
occupation specialties in the Army, Navy, USAF, and USMC
by simply linking to www.army.mil, www.navy.mil, etc. Just
follow the links for "careers." For army MOS, you may get
more detailed information via www.goarmy.com/jobs/index.htm.
The US Army has 212 MOSs but does include "radio" in a few
of their titles. The USAF prefers "avionics" or
"telecommunications" rather than "radio" and the USN seems
to like "electronics technician."

If you wish to SEE and read detailed technical specification on
radio-telecommunications, you are free to do so at
www.adtdl.army.mil/atdls.htm which is the Army Doctrine and
Training Digital Library. Click on "Library" and select "signal" to
see the available documents. Field Manual FM 24-24 is fully
open for viewing and/or downloading to see all the land force
manpack-through-vehicular-to-trailer systems. It is dated as
released four years after the end of the short Gulf War.

>It's pretty obvious that the FCC, for whatever reasons, wants to
>get rid of code testing ASAP. They've been pushing that agenda
>since 1975 - it's nothing new. Now the only thing keeping the
>one remaining test in place is S25.5, which will almost certainly

>not remain after WRC 2003.

That is supposition on "ASAP." The FCC's "reasons" have been very public since 1990, 12 years ago.

It is supposition on "[S25.5] almost certainly not remain" but it is likely. Note that the US preliminary proposal dated 30 November 2001 indicates a revision of S25.1 through S25.6. There is change everywhere. It is best to accept that some change will happen.

>Consider what has happened to AM voice. Back in the late 1950s and
>early 1960s the mode almost died out in amateur radio, pushed out
>by inexpensive SSB transceivers.

VOICE remained and VOICE quickly became the most popular mode used in HF amateur communications (verified by the famous or infamous ARRL "poll").

The TECHNOLOGY changed, but VOICE remained. Note that as well. The vacuum tube final was replaced by the transistor final in amateur HF transmitters under about 200 W.

I see nothing "inexpensive" about an all-mode HF transceiver that costs $1000 to $2500 for the basic box.

There is a distinct advantage to the combination of SSB and solid-state. It made ALL MODE modulation on HF more accessible to radio amateurs. This was difficult to do with the older double-sideband, unsuppressed-carrier "AM" transmitters.

Note: "SSB" is ALSO amplitude modulation or AM.

>How many prospective hams have ever even SEEN a real live CW station
>and operator in action, with a coherent explanation of what's going
>on? Too few, in my experience. That can be fixed, though.

There is nothing "broken" there. It does NOT need "fixing."

Museums are adequate for such tasks of "seeing." Such are good for displaying giant alternators, spark transmitters, and crystal sets as well...

6380. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 06:02:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228010217.03190.00000924@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35891

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 2/27/2002 4:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <pB2f8.36097$_N5.1372837044@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>That's a bold statement that KH2JU makes. The military drawdown in the
>early 90's must have taken a severe toll on the ham community there.

And everywhere else. Very few KA/7J's on the band from Okinawa or Japan,
and the numbr of /DU's is declining too, I think.

BUT...! Maybe some new "YA"s soon...?!?!

73

Steve

6381. Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 06:03:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228010341.03190.00000926@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35892

>Subject: Re: eQSL's NOW ACCEPTED by ARRL for DXCC
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 2/27/2002 4:35 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <UD2f8.36098$7P5.1372911763@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>Just as long as its not littered with a bunch of your ex-wives

And since when were YOU interested in WOMEN, Brian?

73

Steve, K4YZ

6382. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 06:08:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FPjf8.3452$gK2.296410@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35893

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227221006.17584.00000160@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <OIPe8.413$gK2.38492@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0202260722.454e592d@posting.google.com...
> >> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
> >news:<20020226051558.16980.00000538@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say
that
> >words that
> >> > taught me new things.
> >> >
> >> > 73,
> >> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >>
> >> Same here, Ed. In my case some of those words were spoken and others
> >were
> >> written.
> >>
> >> But in all cases, I'm pretty sure that we took the time and effort to
> >listen
> >> or read those words and consider their meaning.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Outside of Math, virtually all testing is reading and vocabulary far
more
> >than anything else. To go back when dinosaurs roamed the Earth in 1956
I
> >was a snot-nosed freshman who enrolled in a general sci class to pad
the
> >schedule taught by the department head who had been in charge of
testing
> >at Lackland in WW2.
> >
> >The senior physics book at the time was Modern Physics by Dull, Brooks,
> >and Metcalf. It was modern in that it had acetate overlays of a steam
> >shovel. As was usually the case, the publishers hired English and
> >Education majors to revise good-selling texts so Charles Dull was the
only

> >scientist among the group and he died in 1917. Such was the state of
> >American science education when Sputnik went up and this was a
well-rated
> >high school.
>
> Yup. In fact, some folks say that one of the FCC's driving forces in
pushing
> "incentive licensing"
> was Sputnik fever. The FCC first started asking questions about how to
get more
> hams to
> upgrade beyond General in 1958.
> >
> >So I got to be a tackling dummy in our dephead's efforts and part of it
> >was to take great piles of standardized tests in subjects in which I
had
> >no background mostly to show how little they meant. That is when I was
> >not being a blocking dummy as nose moose on a team that included Gale
> >Sayers whom I will tell you now was not the hardest tackle in that
> >backfield. I got 92 percentiles in subjects like Biology that I
despised
> >at the time. It worked, he got the PSSC science curriculum installed
and
> >I became a professional test taker.
>
> HAW!!
> >
> >Some are indeed better than others but they are largely a matter of
> >vocabulary and definition -- the latter being simply some realization
of
> >why the word was coined.
>
> True, 'specially at the high school level. I used to get in some odd
> arguments as early as the 5th grade because I "knew too much".
> >
> >In traffic control, which when you think about it is the FCCs biz,
there
> >are the famous 3 Es, Engineering, Education, and Enforcement. Charlie
has
> >done a crappy job of the latter but by and large in the Amateur Service
at
> >least, decent Engineering and actually almost outstanding Education.
> >Given that we are in the self-education biz the major function of the
> >testing program is to lead the rookie in righteous paths and this the
> >present structure does fairly well and in fact always did.
>
> All depends on who you ask. Some folks think we're in the radio "Dark
Ages"
> because we still do things like dedicated repeater pairs.
> >

> >I am much more interested in maintaining the integrity of the system
and
> >the removal of pressure on the newbie that he doesn't impose on himself
> >than I am on the difficulty level of the exams. By getting the words
and
> >ideas out there, the biggest piece of the job is done. It took a while
> >for some of the concepts to sink in to the point of doing a lot about
> >them: why the plus went to the rectifier cathode took a while to sink
in.
> >
> >The object is not exclusion but education.
>
> AMEN!
>
> And Education includes a whole bunch of things - not just the purely
technical.
> How to conduct oneself on the air without a lot of formal training,
procedures
> and Enforcement is part of Education.
>
> >Removal of the Morse
> >requirement is a sea change not because of the mode but because it is
the
> >only part of the exams that requires the testee to actually DO a damned
> >thing and for that reason alone will harm or at least change the
Amateur
> >Service.
>
> I suspect that you have hit upon the very reason the Morse/CW test is so
> hated in some circles. Except for a very few who have learned the code
> elsewhere, most prospective hams have to start at dead zero and learn
> it from the bottom up. Functions as a Great Equalizer - and some folks
> really hate that.

As I would tell my middle school footballers, there be players and there
be fans.

>
> >I suspect it will have the effect of making it far more a
> >talking shop than a think tank where fuzz like 'legacy modes' gets
kicked
> >around like it really meant something.
>
> Some folks predicted (not promised, predicted) big technological changes
> from the dropping of the code test for Techs back in '91. Yet we're
still
> running early 1980s-style packet and mid-1950s style FM as the two
> most popular modes on amateur radio above 50 MHz. "They gave a
> revolution and nobody came".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Packet always struck me as being too close to auto-eroticism for my taste and while I have harbored thoughts of firing up a DSB vestigial carrier system with sync detection just to see if it actually could be done on 2 kHz channels as GE claimed when they lost the SAC job to Art Collins there is an element of so the hell what involved. My occasional forays to VHF remind me of when the telegraph line was completed down the Boston Post Road (US 1) and the last surviving Transcendental Poet (Longfellow ??) was informed that Boston could now talk to Florida, he replied 'But does Boston have anything to SAY to Florida. About thirty years ago Wayne Green asked for reports of intelligent life on 2 meter repeaters and got little or no response. Wish I could disagree but I remember the flap caused by a few docs and the local Federal Venereal Disease Control Officer getting clinical on our repeater (flap was some local radio cops, our machine was known for off the wall activities). If there is intelligent life Scotty, stomp the shit out of it.

All this technological wonderment is far more fun to talk about than actually do; glorioski you might be held responsible.

Oh well, it is late and depression is setting in.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6383. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 06:12:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228011237.03190.00000929@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35894

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/27/2002 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020227154034.26927.00000206@mb-ma.aol.com>

>That seems to be the basic reason behind the beligerant PCTA
>group. Carroll is one of those. It shines brightly through nearly
>every "message."

And the light in YOUR messages, Lennie? The SAME message over and over
and over and.........

>What makes it all so ludicrous is that the beligerant PCTAs are
>not in agreement.

Oh..?!?! And every Democrat or Republican ALWAYS walks the exact same
line as everyone else in the "party"..?!?!

>The only near-common "reason" is "You have to do as I did!"

Not even close as a "reason", but you keep repeating it to yourself so I
am sure you believe it.

>Not a good reason.

Not a good reason >to you<.

Steve

6384. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 06:32:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228013240.03190.00000934@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 35895

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/27/2002 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020227154033.26927.00000205@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Untrue. See which bands are primary or secondary in allocation
>in Part 2, Title 47 CFR. See also Parts 15 and 95, same CFR.

OK, Lennie...Pick a Part 15/Part97 frequency and let's trade signal reports.

>Since the PCTA have never yet made but one
>reasonable case for the retention of that test, many seem to
>fall back on the false charge of personal vindictiveness on the
>basis of "never having passed, or been able to pass an amateur
>license." Such a charge is false, bogus, a smokescreen for
>not having a viable counterargument for retention of the morse
>code test.

What is "false, bogus, a smokescreen..." is your assertions of "vindictiveness". This and other such vile attempts at demeaning the entire service are why you cannot make any "headway" with your ranting, nor even get a membership in the ONE organization that would seemingly promote your views.

>The charge that one must be "credentialled" with an amateur
>radio license in order to discuss getting into amateur radio at
>all is absurd. Radio communication is not exclusive to
>amateur radio nor are the arts of radio communication solely
>determined by amateur experience, techniques, or
>accomplishments within a specific amateur activity.

What's absurd is that you continue to think that you can make knowledgeable, informed posts without having an experience base from which to make those comments.

As has been acknowledged by many, myself included, your apparent knowledge of what's "under the hood" is seemingly satisfactory. (I am still not convinced that it's not a lot of well researched plagarism)

What's absolutely rediculous is your frequent attempts to appear knowledgeable on matters in which you clearly have no EXPERIENCE.

>Heil's primal reason seems to concern his ego. That is a common
>syndrome in computer-modem communications, to win "message
>points" however possible, make yourself look superior.

ROTMFFLMMFAO! Jeez, Lennie! How in the Blue Balzes did you type that without choking on it...?!?!

Guess the Old Lady is pretty up-to-date on the Heimlich maneuver, huh...?!?!

>I present opposing arguments to certain amateur radio regulations
>and their retentions, trying to stay on the subject.

OOOOPPPSSSS! Call 9-1-1...! ! ! Lennie's choking again!

6385. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 07:23:35 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <timr7ugi4ppiu90sa1e5268kd14fo8hl40@4ax.com>
Source record: 35896
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>We communicate in the same
>language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English.

Oh really?

"Albiet" looks more like German to me.
;-)

73 de G3NYY

P.S. At least you got "smart-arse" right ... rather than "smart-ass",
which is American.

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6386. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 07:28:40 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <eomr7ugmlqaa3dbcmhr09c6m3fl3mu8njc@4ax.com>
Source record: 35897
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 00:19:34 +0000 (UTC), .
<noemailaaa111@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Anyway,when she first saw my erection she was gobsmakced and thought
>it most impressive. Even now she is rather in awe of it and it has
>given both of us a great deal of pleasure..

I assume you are referring to the erection in your back yard? The one
with the 8 ele yagi on the top.

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6387. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 10:07:56 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <BCA6F4FF07A93D85.07A6C40E138F99C5.12E9539A86F528B2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 35898
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic waste) wrote:

>My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either >the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously >though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any >other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over >what mine described as *a weird hobby*?

Well, you'd have to ask her next time she's on one of the IRLP nodes :)

Though she does occasionally get a bit annoyed when I look at any metal object as a potential antenna...I'm still trying to figure out dimensions for 2m/70cm patio furniture so I can get something going outside our apartment. I'm seriously considering tracking down a plastic lamp-looking thing so I can disguise a copper J-pole as an ugly bit of decoration.

FWIW, most of the hams I know who have this sort of problem find that getting rid of the woman is quite a bit more productive than getting rid of the radios. Women who feel that sort of competition from inanimate object generally have other issues that you don't want to have to deal with.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

6388. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:24:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228062455.17463.00000987@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35899

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Oh, I'll look forward to hearing your Part 15 sigs on 20m.

That is a bit more prophetic than you think it is, Dave. Part 15 permits devices that unintentionally or intentionally radiate signals on 20 meters. If your local utility company decides to offer ISP-access power-line communications, using overhead power lines as the conductors to offer internet service to its subscribers, you may indeed hear a Part 15 signal on 20 meters, at a pretty substantial level.

We had very close calls with Home Phone Networking and HomePlug compliant devices, but the industry chose to include notches in the HF ham bands to a level about 30 dB lower than FCC rules would permit. This still leaves some potential for harmful interference, but is a major step in the right direction. Unfortunately, the access-PLC companies are not developing an industry specification and they have not responded to my letters of inquiry. Time to ratchet up the pressure, because if access-PLC technology is deployed at the level permitted by the rules, there will be a problem at hand for HF users.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6389. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:27:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228062701.17463.00000988@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35900

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>You've discussed, lectured, preached and railed here for years. You've
>garnered few supporters but you have managed to honk off greater
>numbers.

Lecturing, preaching and railing is not known to gather supporters and
generally honks people off to the point where the message is lost.

I am amazed how those on both sides of this discussion keep using those
techniques. It does make your conclusion appear likely:

>You enjoy generating
>controversy here as a means for filling your empty hours.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6390. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:30:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228063040.17463.00000989@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35951

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>
> OK, Lennie...Pick a Part 15/Part97 frequency and let's trade signal
>reports.

All Part 97 frequencies are accessible to Part 15 devices, Steve.

On 3.5 MHz, a legal Part 15 device located at your neighbors house will create an S9+20 dB signal to your 80 meter dipole located 100 feet away from that legal source.

On 2.4 GHz, Part 15 devices can use 1 watt of power and a 6 dBi gain antenna, or can use a higher gain antenna, reducing power by 1 dB for every 3 dB increase in antenna gain. For 100 milliwatts, an antenna of 36 dBi gain can be used.

That gives an EIRP of 26 dBW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6391. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:34:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228063407.17463.00000990@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35952

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> What is "false, bogus, a smokescreen..." is your assertions of
>"vindictiveness".

I think we can all agree on the content of some of Len's posts. How about the content of your posts? Any "vindictiveness" there, Steve? Dick's posts? He claims he is "defending himself" when he responds to one poster by calling another names. Is the assertation that there is "vindictivenes" in those posts false?

> nor even get a
>membership in the ONE organization that would seemingly promote your views.

I think Carl explained that he can indeed get a membership in NCI. What you said was false.

> Guess the Old Lady is pretty up-to-date on the Heimlich maneuver,
>huh...?!?!

Is that statement vindictive?

> OOOOPPPSSSS! Call 9-1-1...! ! ! Lennie's choking again!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6392. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:37:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228063741.17463.00000991@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35953

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>All depends on who you ask. Some folks think we're in the radio "Dark Ages"
>because we still do things like dedicated repeater pairs.

And when those "some folks" include engineers at the FCC who bring the subject up in speeches in the context of spectrum allocation, we sure best not dismiss it out of hand.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6393. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:40:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228064048.17463.00000992@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35954

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl
>doesn't
>> use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since
>Carl
>> stopped using about 10 years ago?

> Are you kidding? Carl never got started using it on the air.

Sure he did. He used it for his first few years of hamming. He said that he
was up to over 15 wpm at some point.

Even so, let's try the question a third time. (Good dodge, but I am still
curious.)

If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl doesn't
use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since Carl
was first licensed?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6394. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:42:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228064214.17463.00000993@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35955

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> No, thetas what YOU are saying. I'm saying what I always have said-
>Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.

They will be exposed to its merits, or not, by the things you and I say, Dick.
You are trying to talk them out of using it if there is no code test. I am not.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6395. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:44:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228064420.17463.00000994@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35956

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Are you saying, then, that the other modes are not useful because newcomers
>>do not have to learn them to pass their tests? They thrive in amateur radio
>>just fine without pass/fail mandatory testing.

> Aw, yes, the Cecil "Stupid" defense.

Can I infer from this that you believe my statement to be untrue? Can you
really believe that the other modes do not thrive in amateur radio without
pass/fail mandatory testing? Or do you call it "stupid" because you wish the
statement weren't true so you could be right?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6396. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:47:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228064713.17463.00000995@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35957

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Have you been sleeping close to Cecil or what?
>
>Not unless his name is Bronco, the cat.

I think when his best response is "you are starting to sound like Cecil" we can safely assume that he didn't have a better response. I think I won the point. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6397. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:49:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228064925.17463.00000996@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35958

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick has this supernatural ability not only for remote viewing
>through space, but remote viewing through space-time. He was
>nine years old when I memorized the stuff for the Conditional
>exam. Yet he somehow knows and is certain that I didn't memorize
>the material.

And he is equally certain that vast hordes of hams today are memorizing 300
questions three times to get their licences.

And he is also certain that I didn't pass my General in 1964 with a combination
of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that the harder subjects
didn't appear on the exam I was given.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6398. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:51:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228065107.17463.00000997@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35959

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>One could interpret the preceding position this way: "Until
>today things weren't so bad. Now it's bad old internet, bad
>old 1st amendment rights. It sure makes manipulating the US
>ARS from behind closed doors difficult."

One could, if that one were truly convinced that "they" were out to get him.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6399. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:53:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228065343.17463.00000998@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35960

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.

Carl passed a code test.

73,
Ed Hare, WRFI

6400. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 11:54:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228065455.17463.00000999@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 35961

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
>> >"stagnating"
>> >is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
>> >witness.

>> Carl, I am an old time ham and a supporter of CW use (by example and by
>> believing that the mode has value).
>>
>> Do you think that I am stagnating in Amateur Radio?

> Carl is making that accusation, not me.

Uhm, that is why I asked Carl the question...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6401. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 12:14:00 UTC
From: A Different Nick <nicholas@commcen.co.uk>
Message-ID: <hk7s7u4g2lc7oofaojf1f7p0u23s0pl4f9@4ax.com>
Source record: 35962
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>. It was my
>turn to razz HER! LOL!
>
>73
>
>Jerry
>
Um... My imagination is probably running away, but when you say it was
your turn to "razz" her, what exactly was that... or shouldnt I ask.

I'm assuming your razz her everytime you return from a trip away :-)

Nick

6402. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 12:36:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7e2573_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35963

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227172501.17520.00001070@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > The day you stop equating an oldtimer CW supporter with
> >"stagnating"
> >is the day you may begin-at least have a chance- to be a credible
> >witness.
>
> Carl, I am an old time ham and a supporter of CW use (by example and
by
> believing that the mode has value).
>
> Do you think that I am stagnating in Amateur Radio?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hell no! You know better than that, Ed. But, you're not the typical
ham either. (I know, Dick will say something like "define the typical
ham," but I think reasonable people understand the concept I'm
getting at.)

I am saying that at the "typical" (or below) level, there are many,
many long-time hams who have not kept up with technology in
any reasonable degree ... those who couldn't even do something
as simple as interfacing their computer to the radio for the various
digital modes, wouldn't have a clue what they did wrong when it
didn't work right ... might not even realize that it wasn't working
right and splatter all over the place, etc. Then there are those who
need help to figure out how to trim a dipole to resonance. The list
could be nearly endless, but the point is there are a shocking
number of licensed hams who are "way behind."

I see that as a problem (in my personal view) and I would (personally)
support some reasonable requalification testing at renewal ...
(remember, this is my personal view, NOT an NCI position at all)

Yes, some will say, "You support 'jumping through the technical hoop'
but not 'jumping through the Morse hoop'." Correct .. I believe that
the "technical hoop" if one insists on calling it that, is a
REASONABLE
one, because it relates to safety, interference, etc., whereas the

Morse
hoop only relates to operator mode use preference and a desire on the
part of some to avoid having to do their own "recruiting" on the basis
that some percentage of those who are forced to learn Morse will
probably decide they like it and will use it.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPH4kOJe+N6+q84HiEQLvuwCdFOY8F6zUC2XdIOSQhPyVAB+pkKsAoJhl
9GRVyP0t8fBDXEg0vaRUbigi
=+ChX
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

6403. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:02:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7e2bab_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35964

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228064925.17463.00000996@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Dick has this supernatural ability not only for remote viewing
> >through space, but remote viewing through space-time. He was
> >nine years old when I memorized the stuff for the Conditional
> >exam. Yet he somehow knows and is certain that I didn't memorize
> >the material.
>
> And he is equally certain that vast hordes of hams today are memorizing
300
> questions three times to get their licences.
>
> And he is also certain that I didn't pass my General in 1964 with a
combination
> of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that the harder
subjects
> didn't appear on the exam I was given.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

But Ed, surely you realize that Dick really doesn't CARE if you
passed your General test in 1964 by throwing darts at the answer
sheet, backwards, over your shoulder, with both eyes closed.
You can do Morse fast enough, and in Dick's mind, that makes
you a "real ham," regardless of ANYTHING else ... :-)

(you know I respect your technical competence ... my point above
is not to question that in any way ... just to point out that Dick has
made it perfectly clear that he really doesn't care about anything
but Morse ability ...)

Car - wa6vse

6404. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:12:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228081230.20570.00000139@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35965

In article <20020227075441.26502.00000803@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>The first QSO I ever had was with an old-timer who did not
>>try to drive me off. Now I'm the old timer. Do you see me trying
>>to drive off newcomers? Do you see me calling anyone names
>>like "stupid", "idiot", "twit", "cranky olde fartz", "a$$hole", "fossil" or
>>some such?
>
>You have always been a gentleman, Jim, and even those that disagree with you
>respect you, and have some expectation that both will learn from reasonable
>discourse with you.

I have found that some of those who disagree respect me. Like Bill Sohl, K2UNK, who is a model of "debating without berating". But I've also found that many others get angry and insulting for the mere fact that I disagree with them and point out factual and logical errors.
>
>Unfortunately, there have been too many insults to go around on both sides of
>this debate. But for completeness, don't leave out "inferior," and
>"knuckledragger."

Let me clarify that the above list was not meant to indicate any particular individual or viewpoint on any issue. It is also incomplete - lots of other words and tactics used, like making fun of someone's name.
>
>The really sad thing is that often those who devolve to insult somehow think
>that cussing and calling names strenghtens their points. It is almost as if
>they envision that everyone will gasp and think that this MUST be a serious
>thing because it even made a great guy like <name> act in such a childish
>manner.
>
>In reality, I bet the opposite is true.

I know it's true. "He who angers me controls me". Nobody in rrap angers me, though it's obvious that some try.

tnx for the words of support

>If the only counter to the NCTA
>position were the insults, the PCTA position would lose in a heartbeat. And
>vice versa, of course.
>
What really loses is the ability of the ARS to progress.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6405. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:12:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228081231.20570.00000140@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 35966

In article <3c7aee6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> >
>> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
>> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
>worst.
>>
>> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
>
>Oh good grief, Jim. You are near impossible to even attempt to communicate
>with because everything must be black and white, just for you.

I don't seem to have any problem communicating with most others on this NG,
Kim.

> OK--TAKE ANY

(expletive deleted)

>DISASTER YOU WANT--BIG, LITTLE, MID-SIZED, WHATEVER!!!!!

Why the screaming and cussing, Kim?
>
>> I'm NOT minimizing the tragedy or impact of 9/11, or the losses suffered
>in
>> NYC, Washington or Pennsylvania on that day. But on what grounds do you
>> call the WTC disaster the WORST in USA history?
>>
>> >I don't think you'll find one.
>>
>> I don't have access to any of those messages. But I can pretty much
>guarantee
>> that any which were relayed on NTS went at least part of the way on CW.
>>
>> Did any emergency messages go by HF? If you can't provide one, will you
>say
>> that HF is not preferred in emergencies?
>
>OK, JIM, I CAN'T VERIFY *ANY* MESSAGES LEFT THE WTC AREA VIA HAM RADIO...SO
>I GUESS I SHOULD SAY THERE WERE NONE. GOOD F#$%&@ GRIEF.

What's the big problem? All I did was use YOUR logic on a similar area. Is
that wrong?

Obviously Morse/CW isn't going to be used much, if at all, when a
disaster/emergency calls for short-range tactical communications. Like
the WTC, Pentagon and Flight 93 attacks did. But all disaster/emergency
situations are not like those.

>> > I am not saying anything against the mode,
>> >its users, etc.
>>
>> Maybe not in this post.
>>
>> >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
>> >preferred mode in an emergency.
>>
>> Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
>different.
>> Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff KT4ST is
>> involved in.

There - two examples of CW/Morse used by hams in an emergency/disaster
situation. And they're not decades old. Why don't they "count" to you?

You could look them up on google, y'know.

>I wish there were a way to statistically show how often/much CW is used in
>emergencies--and *not* using H&W, because I do believe there are some people
>who still use CW nets on NTS---those are *not* directly from the scene, not
>operational messages.

Why don't H&W & NTS count? Seems to me you want to limit the definition
to only those messages that fit your preconceived notion of "emergency" and
exclude all others and all other possibilities.

>Anyway, I am certain you are confused by my above sentence.

Not at all. It's clear that you want to exclude anything that might disprove
your
ideas. You haven't explained why H&W and NTS messages don't count. I
think it's clearly because counting them would disprove your claims.

btw, I have never claimed that CW/Morse testing was absolutely necessary
because it might be needed in an emergency. The way I put it went something
like this:

Is the possibility that a ham might have to use Morse in an emergency
situation so high that ALL hams MUST be tested for Morse skill? The
answer is obviously no.

> I give up even trying with you, Jim.

Because I won't simply knuckle under and agree with you. That's really
what it comes down to, I think.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6406. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:39:41 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <xqqf8.5250$106.332396@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35967

Carl R. Stevenson, WA6VSE, wrote

> Yes, some will say, "You support 'jumping through the technical hoop'
> but not 'jumping through the Morse hoop'." Correct .. I believe that
> the "technical hoop" if one insists on calling it that, is a
> REASONABLE one, because it relates to safety, interference, etc.,
> whereas the Morse hoop only relates to operator mode use preference...

Sadly, most of the present "technical" questions have little
or no relevance to the interference or safety issues in station
operation.

Any operator licensing test MUST justify its existence as
being necessary to protect the rights of other spectrum
users. Anything else is just a hoop to jump through, placed
there by someone with a favorite cause (or mode).

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

6407. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:40:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7e34d2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35968

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7DB4DD.A42702E9@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >Do you think forcing a code exam upon Carl would turn
> > > him into a code lover?
> >
> > NOTHING, not even the devil himself, could *ever* turn Carl into a code
lover.
>
> Well then, it doesn't make any sense to force Morse code exams upon
> people like Carl, does it? The people who like CW will use it. The
> people who don't like CW won't use it. Different strokes for different
> folks. What is wrong with live and let live?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Seems to me that, by his reference to the "anti-Christ," Dick is
effectively admitting that, to him, the Morse test issue is a
"religious thing." :-)

Carl - wa6vse

6408. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 13:49:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c7e3701_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 35969

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020227231749.15503.00000113@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3c7d8568_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >And,
> >actually folks like Larry, Little Dick, Dave Heil...whomever, are in the
> >minority.
>
> I'd hope that 3 hams are in the minority -- but with the way things are
> going, that may not be so in the future!

Larry ... it's nice to see you admit what I've known for a long
time ... that you, Dick, and other fanatical Morse test "insisters"
ARE in the minority ... :-)

> Naaahhh -- they were just probably dismissing you as a clueless, lazy,
dumbed-
> down no-coder.

I love it, Larry ... the anti-anyone-who-doesn't-love-code-and-willingly-
bow-down-to-your-"superiority" rhetoric that you, Dick, and others
like you spew is arguably one of the most effective arguments in favor
of the NCTA.

Please don't stop ... we really appreciate your help! :-)

Carl - wa6vse

p.s. Please don't listen to Ed when he tries to tell you that you're
your own worst enemies, either :-)

6409. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 14:30:09 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <7gfs7uog00oh82hjm19ocdpvv0tdn75r7s@4ax.com>
Source record: 35970
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 12:14:00 +0000, A Different Nick
<nicholas@commcen.co.uk> wrote:

>Um... My imagination is probably running away, but when you say it was
>your turn to "razz" her, what exactly was that... or shouldnt I ask.
>
>I'm assuming your razz her everytime you return from a trip away :-)

No, no .... you're thinking of "roger".

;-)
73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6410. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 14:43:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <jmrf8.29$Gc.18981@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 35972

Well, that depends..... some men are breast men all the way! :)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7C487F.F2363E10@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I have no objection to any callsign with the "SEX" suffix.
>
> "SEX" is a lot dirtier than "TIT", Larry. Sex is primary.
> Tits are secondary.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6411. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 14:43:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <kmrf8.30$Gc.19235@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 35971

Hey Ed..... put my ugly mug on the cover sometime and watch the whole organization fold completely. I am definitely proof of the term of having a "radio face!" :)

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020226213613.03662.00000806@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >uh-oh. Good thing Ed's never seen a picture of me.
>
> Unfortunately, I don't have the luxury of saying the same, more'n'likely. My
> mug has been in QST and on the ARRL web site a few times. Membership took a
> drastic drop each time. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

6412. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 14:43:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <lmrf8.31$Gc.19381@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 35973

See.... maybe there is some merit to All-Code International eh?

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7C4668.66D02A87@IEEE.org...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > I say let's really take it to the hilt...what does Dick propose to do
with a
> > Rescuer who doesn't know CW?
>
> I shudder to think.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6413. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 14:57:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E456C.98E2D7B3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35974

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> > > FCC regulation.
> >
> > There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations. You don't
> > know that?
>
> How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?

No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be enforced??
Change your mind?

> Who does the enforcement for "investing whatever it takes"?

The issuance of the license obviously takes care of that. If you found it to be
"trivial" as you have said, well boolah - boolah for you. I know that the vast
majority of applicants do not.

6414. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:01:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4650.902ABD3E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35975

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > learned it!
>
> But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.

Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
essentially
meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
result.
For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.

6415. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:05:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E473D.3D6449EE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35976

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
> > > CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
> > > knuckledragger?
> >
> > Carl and Brian Burke are newcomers?
>
> Carl and I are newcomers to the Extra license. You have NOT made
> us feel welcome.

"Newcomers" and "newcomers to the Extra license" have entirely different meanings, as you
know. Welcome to a dumbed down Extra class, one that any REAL newcomer can just
as well easily achieve. It isns't anywhere near the accomplishment it once was, and you know that, too.

6416. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:06:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E47A2.F3E0417C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35977

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.
>
> You and I can expose them to CW's merits

And how do you propose to expose Carl to CW's merits? Gag and tie him, and "force" him to listen to Gorden West tapes?

6417. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:13:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4928.5A656ECE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35978

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own merits. It
> > keeps being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".
>
> If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
> like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer.

Ah, the code-free refrain, redux!

> What's the age of
> the average ham?

What is the increase in the life expectancy? Why shouldn't they offset? And if people who retire are attracted to ham radio, that fills the ranks just as much as recruiting kids (who by and large are totally disinterested in such a pastime). When we were kids most new hams came from our age group. That changed along the way for number of reasons, and I don't see it going back. There are just far too many interesting diversions today that we didn't have. They think they can contact anyone in the world on the Internet much more easily than radio, and no license is involved.

6418. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:17:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4A31.82D694E3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,mSo

CAM wrote:

> The people who like CW will use it. The
> people who don't like CW won't use it.

And the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not learn it.
So they will never learn to like it. And so they will never use it. End of story for
CW
Carl will be very happy, and one might hope that he finds himself stranded on a
desert island with only an ordinary HF SSB/CW transceiver with a defective
microphone.

6419. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:26:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4C49.B15BA5FB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35980

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020227221006.17584.00000160@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <OIPe8.413$gK2.38492@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>
> > Some folks predicted (not promised, predicted) big technological changes
> > from the dropping of the code test for Techs back in '91. Yet we're
> still
> > running early 1980s-style packet and mid-1950s style FM as the two
> > most popular modes on amateur radio above 50 MHz. "They gave a
> > revolution and nobody came".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Packet always struck me as being too close to auto-eroticism for my taste
> and while I have harbored thoughts of firing up a DSB vestigial carrier
> system with sync detection just to see if it actually could be done on 2
> kHz channels as GE claimed when they lost the SAC job to Art Collins there
> is an element of so the hell what involved. My occasional forays to VHF
> remind me of when the telegraph line was completed down the Boston Post
> Road (US 1) and the last surviving Transcendental Poet (Longfellow ??) was
> informed that Boston could now talk to Florida, he replied 'But does
> Boston have anything to SAY to Florida. About thirty years ago Wayne
> Green asked for reports of intelligent life on 2 meter repeaters and got
> little or no response. Wish I could disagree but I remember the flap
> caused by a few docs and the local Federal Venereal Disease Control
> Officer getting clinical on our repeater (flap was some local radio cops,
> our machine was known for off the wall activities). If there is
> intelligent life Scotty, stomp the shit out of it.
>
> All this technological wonderment is far more fun to talk about than
> actually do; glorioski you might be held responsible.
>
> Oh well, it is late and depression is setting in.

Amen Brothers! It finally got to the point (before I finally gave upon
2meters)
that even a banal conversation would have been eagerly engaged. Now there's
not much use in even turning the rig on.

6420. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:30:18 UTC
From: A Different Nick <nicholas@commcen.co.uk>
Message-ID: <b6js7uoein02ktd9ar55rg43qe47f4l0lo@4ax.com>
Source record: 35981
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote:

>
>No, no .... you're thinking of "roger".
>
>;-)
>73 de G3NYY

What ... you mean roger razzes her as well !!! blimey :-)
Always thought these amateurs were a funny old lot

Nick

6421. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:32:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4DA4.EAFEF82@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35982

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >
> > OK, Lennie...Pick a Part 15/Part97 frequency and let's trade signal
> >reports.
>
> All Part 97 frequencies are accessible to Part 15 devices, Steve.
>
> On 3.5 MHz, a legal Part 15 device located at your neighbors house will create
> an S9+20 dB signal to your 80 meter dipole located 100 feet away from that
> legal source.
>
> On 2.4 GHz, Part 15 devices can use 1 watt of power and a 6 dBi gain antenna,
> or can use a higher gain antenna, reducing power by 1 dB for every 3 dB
> increase in antenna gain. For 100 milliwatts, an antenna of 36 dBi gain can be
> used.
>
> That gives an EIRP of 26 dBW.

When this proposal was in the NPRM stage I wrote my congressman to protest
(the only time I ever did that.)
After a time he wrote back saying the FCC had assured him that there was no problem

with the proposal, that all valid concerns had been addressed. Right.

6422. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:34:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4E07.1622EAC0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35983

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > What is "false, bogus, a smokescreen..." is your assertions of
> >"vindictiveness".
>
> I think we can all agree on the content of some of Len's posts. How about the
> content of your posts? Any "vindictiveness" there, Steve? Dick's posts?

And how about Carl's posts? Cecil's posts? I see you're "fair and balanced",
as usual.

6423. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:37:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35984

W1RFI wrote:

> If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl doesn't
> use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since Carl
> was first licensed?

The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.

6424. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:37:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4EDB.12F06999@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35985

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > No, thetas what YOU are saying. I'm saying what I always have said-
> >Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.
>
> They will be exposed to its merits, or not, by the things you and I say, Dick.
> You are trying to talk them out of using it if there is no code test. I am not.

What you are doing is pretending.

6425. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:41:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E4FC8.89A04999@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35986

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Are you saying, then, that the other modes are not useful because newcomers
> >>do not have to learn them to pass their tests? They thrive in amateur radio
> >>just fine without pass/fail mandatory testing.
>
> > Aw, yes, the Cecil "Stupid" defense.
>
> Can I infer from this that you believe my statement to be untrue? Can you
> really believe that the other modes do not thrive in amateur radio without
> pass/fail mandatory testing? Or do you call it "stupid" because you wish the
> statement weren't true so you could be right?

Another answer too obvious to be needed. No mode except CW requires
the self training that requires the self-discipline to complete that training
before
it can be utilized. The others are essentially plug-and-play. EASY!
But of course you already knew that.

6426. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:43:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E502E.99BA5C45@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35987

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.
>
> Carl passed a code test.

But not THE code test. He knows.

6427. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 15:47:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7E5118.5CF48AAE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35988

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I am saying that at the "typical" (or below) level, there are many,
> many long-time hams who have not kept up with technology in
> any reasonable degree ... those who couldn't even do something
> as simple as interfacing their computer to the radio for the various
> digital modes, wouldn't have a clue what they did wrong when it
> didn't work right ... might not even realize that it wasn't working
> right and splatter all over the place, etc. Then there are those who
> need help to figure out how to trim a dipole to resonance. The list
> could be nearly endless, but the point is there are a shocking
> number of licensed hams who are "way behind."

Yeah, that's about your mentality. Clueless to a fault, when removed from
the
"reality" of your digigeek world. You might try getting out into the
sunlight once every
decade or so and see what the real world looks like, idiot.

6428. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:17:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E582F.73613F35@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35989

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > > learned it!
> >
> > But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> > that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
>
> Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
> essentially
> meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
> result.
> For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.

1000 Russian words would be meaningless to you but I haven't seen any
progress in your memorizing their definitions. Is that another example
of do as I say, not as I do?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6429. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:19:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E58A6.6B204594@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35990

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> > > > FCC regulation.
> > >
> > > There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations. You don't
> > > know that?
> >
> > How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?
>
> No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be enforced??
> Change your mind?

No, you were the one who brought it up. I'm asking you how you would enforce them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6430. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:28:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5ABC.3C844C1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35991

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
> > > > CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
> > > > knuckledragger?
> > >
> > > Carl and Brian Burke are newcomers?
> >
> > Carl and I are newcomers to the Extra license. You have NOT made
> > us feel welcome.
>
> "Newcomers" and "newcomers to the Extra license" have entirely different
> meanings, as you
> know. Welcome to a dumbed down Extra class, one that any REAL newcomer can
> just
> as well easily achieve. It isns't anywhere near the accomplishment it once
> was, and you know that, too.

It is a license, not a degree, Dick. All it does is grant
privileges. I, like you, met the requirements in order to
obtain the privileges. That's what all new hams are doing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6431. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:31:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5B69.6710C134@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35992

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > If then, you feel that Morse code is less useful to you because Carl doesn't
> > use it, can you tell us how much less you have used it on the air since Carl
> > was first licensed?
>
> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.

So are you going to use CW less because of future hams who will NOT be
learning it? Is this part of your plan for allocating your future time?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6432. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:34:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5C18.EFA0042D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35993

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.
> > >
> > You and I can expose them to CW's merits
>
> And how do you propose to expose Carl to CW's merits? Gag and tie him, and
> "force" him to listen to Gorden West tapes?

You, yourself, said Carl is a lost cause for CW, as are many new hams.
There were many older hams who hated CW - always has been - always
will be. What I am talking about is exposing new hams, who might like
CW, to CW's merits. Set up field day demonstrations - stuff like that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6433. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:36:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5CA9.AD53D9AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35994

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What's the age of the average ham?
>
> What is the increase in the life expectancy? Why shouldn't they offset? And if
> people who retire are attracted to ham radio, that fills the ranks just as much as
> recruiting kids (who by and large are totally disinterested in such a pastime).

Egads, I can just visualize the average age in the ARS being 90 and when
we lose frequencies, nobody will even remember it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6434. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:41:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5lmeu010as@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36000

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net...
> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.

Walking and bicycling are basic modes of transportation, yet skill in
neither is required for a driver's license. This just shows were some hams
are technologically, and where they're likely to stay.

6435. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:42:24 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlinkdot.net>
Message-ID: <u7snhbiegrdm92@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 35995
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
| P.S. At least you got "smart-arse" right ... rather than "smart-ass",
| which is American.

So where did fookin' come into use ? British or Irish ?

|
| --
| Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
```

6436. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:42:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5E0A.E7D612C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35996

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > The people who like CW will use it. The
> > people who don't like CW won't use it.
>
> And the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not learn it.

Not unless hams like you and me introduce them to the merits of CW.
I'll bet they respond to my honey better than to your vinegar. "It's
their day in the barrel" isn't going to attract a lot of folks, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6437. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:44:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5E52.D40E8253@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35997

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.
> >
> > Carl passed a code test.
>
> But not THE code test. He knows.

He passed THE only one that matters now.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6438. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:45:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E5EAD.799CF392@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35998

KC8PMX wrote:
> Well, that depends..... some men are breast men all the way! :)

ALL the way? They should see a psychologist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6439. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:49:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5lmst010vq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35901

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7E4FC8.89A04999@worldnet.att.net...

> Another answer too obvious to be needed. No mode except CW requires
> the self training that requires the self-discipline to complete that
training
> before
> it can be utilized. The others are essentially plug-and-play. EASY!
> But of course you already knew that.

Don't look now, but CW has also become "plug-and-play." With gadgets like
the MFJ-461, there's now nothing even to "plug."

6440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 16:53:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5ln5j011a1@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35902

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5k457$do0$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling. I
> don't
> > see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such as
> > FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate.
> Yes,
> > it would be worthless as far as the FCC is concerned, but they would
then
> > have their "real" hams to tout.
>
> To my knowledge, no one in NCI opposes any such
> "voluntary", private certification idea/concept.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I never implied otherwise. The point I'm trying to make is that is the
pro-coders want CW to endure, they have to do so without welfare support of
the mode via mandated testing at high speeds.

6441. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:01:17 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E6263.34FE8C70@amsat.org>
Source record: 35999
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sir Walter --- over here fookin means "I have four kin" as in "fook in A"

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:

> | P.S. At least you got "smart-arse" right ... rather than "smart-ass",
> | which is American.
>
> So where did fookin' come into use ? British or Irish ?
>
> |
> | --
> | Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

--
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
I doubt, therefore I might be!

AC6V Mega Ham Index at http://ac6v.com
AC6V Book For DXers at http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

6442. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:02:06 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5lnl3011se@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35904
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:timr7ugi4ppiu90sa1e5268kd14fo8hl40@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >We communicate in the same
> >language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English.
>
> Oh really?
>
> "Albiet" looks more like German to me.
> ;-)

...and just what language(s) do you think English evolved from? Look at an
Indo-European chart sometime, if you know what one of those are.

6443. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:13:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7E652C.7B9EA51C@uci.edu>
Source record: 35903

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > learned it!
>
> But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.

Doh !!
```

6444. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:22:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7E6751.D9DC361B@uci.edu>
Source record: 35906

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >Do you think forcing a code exam upon Carl would turn
> > > him into a code lover?

> > NOTHING, not even the devil himself, could *ever* turn Carl into a code lover.

> Well then, it doesn't make any sense to force Morse code exams upon
> people like Carl, does it?

People like Carl might not like it, so it's bad and we must do something
about that. Sounds like something that someone from the "land of fruits
and nuts" would say, Cecil.

> What is wrong with live and let live?

David Westerfield comes to mind.

6445. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:25:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7E680E.E4A26B16@uci.edu>
Source record: 35905

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Seems to me that, by his reference to the "anti-Christ," Dick is
> effectively admitting that, to him, the Morse test issue is a
> "religious thing." :-)

Val Kilmer as Doc Holliday in the movie Tombstone used the term in a
non-religous sense. ;-)

6446. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:28:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7E68D5.15A4E6F7@uci.edu>
Source record: 35907

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > > learned it!
> >
> > But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> > that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.

> Wrong, as usual.

You're saying that Larry is wrong then, Dick. Cecil agreed with Larry
about rote memorization. Why didn't you reply to Larry's post instead?

6447. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 17:48:45 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C7E6D7D.546A@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 35908
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:timr7ugi4ppiu90sa1e5268kd14fo8hl40@4ax.com...
> > On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >We communicate in the same
> > >language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English.
> >
> > Oh really?
> >
> > "Albiet" looks more like German to me.
> > ;-)
>
> ...and just what language(s) do you think English evolved from? Look at an
> Indo-European chart sometime, if you know what one of those are.

For all who do not recognize ENGLISH as the world's standard:

OVERHEARD AT THE FRANKFORT RADIO TOWER ON THE AIRCRAFT FREQ:

1. Plane trying to land asking for instructions in German was
given the reply, "You must use English to recieve instructions
from this control tower!

The plane's pilot asked why since he was in a German Plane, in
German airspace and coming from and land on German soil, why
must we use ENGLISH?

Before the control tower could answer, a decidely British and
American Accent both chimed in, "Because we won the war!"

RULE BRITANNIA, PAX AMERICANA and the highest standards of living
in world are to be found in ENGLISH speaking countries!

In America, we have a ROYAL SOCIETY CLUB, in Canada we have the
best hockey team and in the UK country music has a cult following,
why you ask, because of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE!

Martin N5PZJ

To stay on thread, yes my spouse tolerates my hobby and I tolerate her
hobby, ouch where did you find those knitting needles again?

6448. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 18:07:38 UTC
From: --Jeff Mayner-- <bk43@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <Kluf8.44061$rv2.2550686@bin2.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 35909
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"." <noemailaaa111@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3ptq7u05t088u352koaofjr89dvjda0jad@4ax.com...
> On 27 Feb 2002 01:12:56 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
> waste) wrote:
>
> >My ex-girlfriend hated my hobby so much, when she said to me, *either
> >the Cb goes or I do*, I gave her a hand to pack her bags. Seriously
> >though it did cause many huge arguments between us… Have any
> >other Ham/Cbers had problems with their wife/husband/partner, over
> >what mine described as *a weird hobby*?
> >
> >Regards
> >toxic_waste
> I think my present woman thinks its quite interesting. she likes to
> listen in on my receiver occasionally and does find the 2m
> conversations rather interesting though Im not sure its for the right
> reasons!!. I think she sees herself as a bit of an armchair amateur
> psychologist!!.
>
> Anyway,when she first saw my erection she was gobsmakced and thought
> it most impressive. Even now she is rather in awe of it and it has
> given both of us a great deal of pleasure..

Damn. I whish there was an emoticon that showed a massive doubletake. lol...
Whew... :-)

Jeff

>
> G0 Joe
>

6449. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 18:11:23 UTC
From: --Jeff Mayner-- <bk43@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <fpuf8.238622$Re2.17996558@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 35910
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:u7q7vh1opg2lce@corp.supernews.com...
> Gail absolutely DETESTS it when I'm on the HF rig, because it blows the
> front end of her six-meter rig off the bench. She likes that sunspot
cycle
> DX, don'cha know.

I would like to hear Gail's views on this subject. Please put her on. :-)

Jeff

>
> Jim WX6RST
> Gail KB9MII
>
>
>

6450. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 18:12:49 UTC
From: --Jeff Mayner-- <bk43@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <Bquf8.214483$Aw2.16748864@bin7.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 35911
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >over such and unimportant thing.
>
> Please re-post in English.

Perhaps his "Erector" was not properly extended and his signal was garbled?

Jeff

>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>

6451. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 18:14:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7E7376.E71E9E25@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35912

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7E4FC8.89A04999@worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Another answer too obvious to be needed. No mode except CW requires
> > the self training that requires the self-discipline to complete that
> training
> > before
> > it can be utilized. The others are essentially plug-and-play. EASY!
> > But of course you already knew that.
>
> Don't look now, but CW has also become "plug-and-play." With gadgets like
> the MFJ-461, there's now nothing even to "plug."

My SCS PTC2e treats CW just like any other digital mode. It generates an
audio tone in SSB mode and keys the PTT line. It decodes CW a lot better
than I do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6452. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 20:57:37 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7E99C1.B88FFA32@psu.edu>
Source record: 35913

Accch! I'm sorry I didn't trim the message. How Gauche of me! 8^(

- mike -

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Thank you very much, Jim! This one gets saved. A lot of very good
> information.
>
> - Mike -
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)

6453. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228161044.17627.00000228@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35917

In article <3C7DB2EC.C74B5AF5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >Those who are up on the latest technology can do the same things if they
>> >like. Their ham tickets permit any number of activities.
>>
>> Be consistent and aware of federal regulations. Radio amateurs
>> are NOT AUTHORIZED to engage in deliberate transmission of
>> RF energy outside of amateur bands through their amateur license.
>
>Stuff and nonsense! No such claim was intended nor would it be
>understood as such by anyone in full command of his mental faculties.

The technical regulations on spurious emissions of amateur radio
transmissions are clearly given in Part 97, Title 47 CFR. It is the
RESPONSIBILITY of the control operator to insure proper
compliance of their station equipment. Anyone (even in partial
command of mental faculties) can see that for themselves.

Except for the extreme emergency situations outlined in Part 1,
Title 47 CFR, no amateur radio licensee is AUTHORIZED to use
his or her station for amateur radio activities outside of allocated
amateur radio bands.

ANYONE in the USA, licensed in any radio service or not, may
deliberately transmit RF energy within the regulations set forth
in Parts 15 and 95, Title 47 CFR. For further definitions, see
Part 1, Title 47 CFR.

Has Heil read and understood US radio regulations as they have
been explained to him by the FCC?

>> >You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.
>>
>> ...as I said before, calm rational discourse is not a quality of
>> Heil's correspondence. :-)
>
>...but you made no denial.

Irrelevant. To state full details of a life experience falls into the
"CV" category which is NOT AUTHORIZED by another one-by-two
Dill Instructor in this newsgroup.

Having pulled as long a shift as 34 hours continuously, broken only
by meals, and been "on call" around the clock all days of the week
both as soldier and civilian, is not relevant to any discussion of
whether or not morse codes will live or die or the claimed superiority

of Department of State HF communications methods or equipment relative to the rest of the US government.

"Having an interest in radio" is not rigidly confined to marching in ranks solely to some martial music of morse or the religious fanaticsm exhibited in "my god-code is the only god" proselyte mantras.

RADIO, that generic word having come to mean all forms of wireless communications, embraces ALL of it, ALL techniques, ALL methods, ALL procedures. It is a huge field of activity, long ago become far bigger than all of amateur radio, including all licensed therein whether active or inactive in amateur pursuits.

To parade around extolling the "virtues" of amateurism or placing oneself high on a virtual pedastel of self-imposed "superiority" by certain achievements within amateurism is ludicrous as much as claiming that one must show interest in radio solely through entering amateur radio by acquisition of a federal license grant is pompous and arrogant. Such is also hypocritical to a perverse point, claims used solely to satisfy some imaginary "battle" of words that exists only in the imagination of the outraged claimant.

Some work in or use radio as just another tool in their work or activity. That is probably the majority of all who have access to any sort of radio. Some find a fascination in radio itself, its technology, its methods, all the various modes and its uses for all rather than a few. Some delve deeper to become interested in the design and theory of the electronics required to make a "radio" of most any kind. Academics and engineers are generally in that last category for nearly all of the new developments in "radio" over its 106-year existance have come from them. Their interest and fascination led to exploration of new ideas and trials to see if their ideas would work. Some ideas did not work, but some did. Some ideas that did work were supplanted by newer, better ideas. Such is evolution in the entire radio world, not just a part of it occupied by non-professionals.

Does "interest in radio" equate JUST to amateur radio? No, nor should it, in my opinion. Must "interest in radio" be "demonstrated" to a "community" by acquisition of a legal amateur license? No. Such is the self-imposed "requirement" of the fanatics, the ego-driven, the irrational credentialists who have confused a hobby activity done for recreation and enjoyment to some all-embracing lifestyle. The classes of US amateur radio licenses have changed from the time radio regulation first began in 1912. The whole purpose of a "license" is as a regulatory tool, one of many thought necessary by federal agencies. It is not an academic achievement certificate. It does not "qualify" anyone to transmit RF energy, it only authorizes them to do so.

Some discount all of the preceding even though it is established in the real world, the bigger world of all radio. Those who wish to say otherwise live in another world of fantasy contained in their imaginations and quasi-religious beliefs. They are gods. Mere mortals may not argue with gods. They are superior.

6454. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228161045.17627.00000230@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35914

In article <20020228065343.17463.00000998@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>> Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.
>
>Carl passed a code test.

It wasn't at the high rate that Carroll passed, therefore it is inferior.

Anything that Carroll did is the basis for judgement on "everyone."

6455. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228161045.17627.00000229@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35915

In article <xqqf8.5250$106.332396@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson, WA6VSE, wrote
>
>> Yes, some will say, "You support 'jumping through the technical hoop'
>> but not 'jumping through the Morse hoop'." Correct .. I believe that
>> the "technical hoop" if one insists on calling it that, is a
>> REASONABLE one, because it relates to safety, interference, etc.,
>> whereas the Morse hoop only relates to operator mode use preference...
>
>Sadly, most of the present "technical" questions have little
>or no relevance to the interference or safety issues in station
>operation.

I have to take some exception to that. According to the question
pools, interference and safety questions certainly appear to
follow regulations.

FCC regulations in regards to test question content have changed
throughout the past years such that the VEC now have the
responsibility for the ENTIRE content of each pool. The only
FCC requlation is pool approval or disproval, the number of
questions per class, and the MINIMUM number of questions in
the pool. The question pool content is left to the VEC Question
Pool Committee.

I am told that the VEC QPC will accept input on the pools from
all. I cannot verify this, but that would seem the proper direction
to argue for changes to make them better.

>Any operator licensing test MUST justify its existence as
>being necessary to protect the rights of other spectrum
>users. Anything else is just a hoop to jump through, placed
>there by someone with a favorite cause (or mode).

Total agreement there.

Any radio operator license ever issued in any radio service's
activity by any US radio regulatory agency was always just
an authorization. None of them were academic or skill-
achievement certificates of "qualification."

Too many have regarded the various license classes as
certificates of achievement...and that includes the ARRL's
statements and advertisements implicit statements. That
is an artificial construct.

6456. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:10:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228161047.17627.00000231@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35918

In article <20020228065107.17463.00000997@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
>>One could interpret the preceding position this way: "Until
>>today things weren't so bad. Now it's bad old internet, bad
>>old 1st amendment rights. It sure makes manipulating the US
>>ARS from behind closed doors difficult."
>
>One could, if that one were truly convinced that "they" were out to get him.

To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed, is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable to either the membership or non-members.

The ARRL is a private organization and does not have to follow the governmental rules and monitoring of elections or open records-keeping. While the ARRL has a quasi-governmental structure and claimed "representation" of the ARS and "democratic principle" elections and "openness in BoD meetings through publishing minutes," the only output comes from the ARRL itself. Are there independent, disinterested witnesses to all this "openness and honesty?" All I've seen over the years is what the ARRL says it does. There are NO independent checks or balances; the ARRL says it is honest and aboveboard and all must take them at their word..

The ARRL has achieved a monopoly on amateur radio interest publications in the USA. Not an absolute monopoly but one of being the major source of information, at least two-thirds of all all available English-language amateur publications in print. The periodicals are self-sustaining through advertising fees despite claims that QST is merely a membership service benefit.

Before the opening of the Internet a mere decade ago, the ARRL acted as an intermediary for its membership (then only about a quarter of all licensees as it is now) in relations with the US government and especially with the FCC. That was useful since government was very large and direct communications with the government was difficult. The ARRL had become a de facto Big Brother, a claimed ombudsman. It was very difficult for individual members to verify if the ARRL actually DID what it said it did. All were expected to believe that the ARRL was honest because the ARRL said they were honest. A Belief

existed and skeptics were scoffed at, ignored by Believers.

The Internet brought a true Revolution as well as Revelation to all who had access. Governments now had databases available on-line, including Comments and Replies on NPRMs. No one had to travel to DC and go to the Reading Room of the FCC in order to see documents nor did they have to be a lifetime subscriber to the Federal Register or GPO customer. Governments even accepted comments from individual citizens and did not need attorneys to represent them. The FCC made public over 2600 Comments on the 98-143 NPRM, all available on-line around the clock.

The ARRL has a large website, too. Many sources of amateur radio information are available for free, but nearly as many are also available ONLY to members. That same website has continual advertisements paid for by others and for ITSELF. It is an ideal self-promotional medium and the ARRL never fails in such self-promotion. Competitors in publications are featured only if the ARRL stands to profit by resale of such products. The implications of altruism have become tarnished.

While I cannot do a full search, the open part of the ARRL site and their publications seem to ignore other organizations. The Radio Club of America was formed in 1909 and continues today yet it is ignored even in casual mentions. That is just one small spot of oxidation, a tarnish that disturbs the gloss.

The ARRL membership is still not above a quarter of all US amateur radio licensees, yet the ARRL still implies that it "represents all amateurs." The ARRL has had a record of past opposition, strong opposition to change, yet has repeatedly reversed opposing stances after change had been enacted. Believers will selectively bring out such reversals as "proof" that the ARRL was "really all for change" prior to an occurance. Believers cannot see such tarnish but others do.

The ARRL has no indication of "support" for newcomers unless they are teen-agers or totally ignorant of radio or of miniscule experience in ANY radio communication. The (unfortunately) clear implication for many years has been that all who enter must be ignorant of radio and young acolytes of brainwashable aptitudes. The ARRL knows all and sees all, they will "lead the way" because they (and only they) "know what is best."

Of course, the ARRL tries to influence ENTRY regulations into US amateur radio...by the same manner as had so many in the membership under old regulations. The ARRL does not "represent" newcomers, it seems to try to encourage only those who did as the members did. The ARRL and its "leadership" know what is best...

Are these just one person's observations? No. Hardly. It is a sort of synopsis of what thousands of others have seen and felt over the years. There is no poll of that multitude, no proof, yet it has been heard, felt, and understood. It is almost tangible. The signs have just begun to appear, such as the Comments on 98-143.

Perhaps the ARRL leadership ought to start listening to more than its own propaganda, to be more ecumenical in its Belief System. It is free to hold its own Mass but that is only a ceremony...the masses aren't entering the secular enclave.

There are no "black helicopters" but rather fully identifiable ones. There is no paranoia about a "they." There is simply an observation of what has gone on in the past and a very great mass of younger skeptics not convinced. The "they" are seen for who they are, what they have stated.

6457. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:10:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228161048.17627.00000232@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 35916

In article <3C7E4928.5A656ECE@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>When we were kids most new hams came from our age group.

When Carroll and the rest of the "we" were kids I had already
entered adulthood and was active in HF communications.

Carroll's statement is just another variant of "all should do as I
did" which has no justifiable imprimateur of importance.

>That changed
>along the way for number of reasons, and I don't see it going back. There
>are just far too many interesting diversions today that we didn't have.

Oh? The "we" already had moveable type, paper, and electricity
that preceding generations did not?!?

Perhaps Carroll will list all of these lacks of "interesting diversions"
that were in MY generation that suddenly disappeared by HIS
generation?!?

>They think
>they can contact anyone in the world on the Internet much more easily than
>radio, and no license is involved.

They don't "think so," they DO so. Radio amateurs are only lawfully
authorized to contact other lawfully authorized radio amateurs. The
Internet does not require such authorization.

Roughly twenty percent of all US households NOW have some form
of Internet access. That percentage was ZERO eleven years ago.

"Radio" has become a generic, all-embracing term for wireless
communications. The public KNOWS it exists and has existed
for decades. Trying to maintain some aura of mystery about
radio and that authorized amateur radio licensees are somehow
wizards in an arcane activity is not prepostorous, it is simply
stupid and ludicrous today.

It is time to consider the hobby AS a hobby, an enjoyable
recreational technological activity. It has always been so.
Always despite the self-professed self-glorificating statements
of those wrapping themselves in emotional, quasi-patriotic
bunting to prove it higher, more noble and more glorious than
anything else.

6458. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:14:15 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <a5m5cd$6vq$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 35919

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
> news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
> > Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One
> is
> > supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> > advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> > KF6WXJ
>
> Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
> (2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
> code?
>
> The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
> "on the air".

I would have thought that using a call sign, that was not yours, to identify oneself even off the air is a form of identity theft, which is a crime. People may have the same exact name but the FCC only issues unique callsigns, no duplicates. So, for example, would a person identifying themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a bootlegged callsign as proof, a crime?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

6459. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:28:58 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <uixf8.4832$gK2.374025@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 35920

Interesting question. We had a knucklehead around here a few years back
that just loved to chase ambulances. He was impersonating EMT personnel.
He did not pass go ... he did not collect $200 ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - key here is not to mess with emergency organizations - police, fire,
medical ... etc.

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:a5m5cd$6vq$1@news.bignet.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
> > > Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams.
One
> > is
> > > supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> > > advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> > > KF6WXJ
> >
> > Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
> > (2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
> > code?
> >
> > The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
> > "on the air".
>
> I would have thought that using a call sign, that was not yours, to
identify
> oneself even off the air is a form of identity theft, which is a crime.
> People may have the same exact name but the FCC only issues unique
> callsigns, no duplicates. So, for example, would a person identifying
> themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a
bootlegged
> callsign as proof, a crime?
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>

> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
>
>
>

6460. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:35:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5m7mh01het@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35921

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7E5E52.D40E8253@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > > > Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.
> > >
> > > Carl passed a code test.
> >
> > But not THE code test. He knows.
>
> He passed THE only one that matters now.

This mentality is strikingly familiar to what has been dubbed "blue collar envy" by some. An example, of which, would be Bill Gates working with computers since high school and starting Microsoft when he was 19. Blue Collar Envy is saying, "Yeah, he has billions, but HE NEVER HAD A REAL JOB!"

6461. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 21:40:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5m7vr01htf@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 35922
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Martin" <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
news:3C7E6D7D.546A@mobiletel.com...
> OVERHEARD AT THE FRANKFORT RADIO TOWER ON THE AIRCRAFT FREQ:
>
> 1. Plane trying to land asking for instructions in German was
> given the reply, "You must use English to recieve instructions
> from this control tower!
>
> The plane's pilot asked why since he was in a German Plane, in
> German airspace and coming from and land on German soil, why
> must we use ENGLISH?
>
> Before the control tower could answer, a decidely British and
> American Accent both chimed in, "Because we won the war!"
>
> RULE BRITANNIA, PAX AMERICANA and the highest standards of living
> in world are to be found in ENGLISH speaking countries!
>
> In America, we have a ROYAL SOCIETY CLUB, in Canada we have the
> best hockey team and in the UK country music has a cult following,
> why you ask, because of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE!
>
> Martin N5PZJ
>
> To stay on thread, yes my spouse tolerates my hobby and I tolerate her
> hobby, ouch where did you find those knitting needles again?

I would also remind the Brits that seventy percent of English, according to
my high school French teacher, is actually mispronounced French, thanks to
William the Conqueror and the Normans. So all of you Brits had better quit
butchering the French language!

6462. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:16:47 UTC
From: Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com>
Message-ID: <fvat7u87piuuusm6lnum0n7j07lcf614m9@4ax.com>
Source record: 35923
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Martin wrote in message <3C7E6D7D.546A@mobiletel.com>:

>Krell wrote:

>OVERHEARD AT THE FRANKFORT RADIO TOWER ON THE AIRCRAFT FREQ:
--snip--

http://www.aviationhumour.co.uk/aviation/aviation.htm
Been to Frankfurt Before?

The German controllers at Frankfurt Airport were a short tempered lot, they not only expected you to know your parking location but how to get there without any assistance from them. So it was with some amusement that we (a Pan Am 747) listened to the following exchange between Frankfurt ground and a British Airways 747 (Speedbird)

Speedbird: "Good morning Frankfurt, Speedbird 206 clear of the active."

Ground: "Guten morgan, taxi to your gate.

The BA 747 pulls onto the main taxiway and stops.

Ground: "Speedbird, do you not know where you are going?!"

Speedbird: "Standby ground, I'm looking up the gate location now.

Ground (with typical German patience): "Speedbird, have you never been to Frankfurt before?!"

Speedbird (coolly): "Yes, in 1944, but I didn't stop."

6463. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:18:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EAC9B.2090509@ieee.org>
Source record: 35924

Krell wrote:

> This mentality is strikingly familiar to what has been dubbed "blue collar
> envy" by some. An example, of which, would be Bill Gates working with
> computers since high school and starting Microsoft when he was 19. Blue
> Collar Envy is saying, "Yeah, he has billions, but HE NEVER HAD A REAL JOB!"

I'm willing to trade my college degree for Bill Gates' bank account.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6464. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:18:48 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <52D03C1151B75759.E61856F915AF62B1.4DFD1CB2F96D99B1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 35926
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 11:48:45 -0600, Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
wrote:

>in Canada

One of the few countries without enough nerve to stand up to the
French.

>and in the UK country music has a cult following,

That's just disturbing...toothless people of the world, unite.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

6465. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:20:27 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <F2D4209C67A1BFE9.F55A02A447557637.FEE07915FEEA4289@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 35927
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 07:28:40 +0000, Walt Davidson
<walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote:

>On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 00:19:34 +0000 (UTC), .
><noemailaaa111@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>Anyway,when she first saw my erection she was gobsmakced and thought
>>it most impressive. Even now she is rather in awe of it and it has
>>given both of us a great deal of pleasure..
>
>I assume you are referring to the erection in your back yard?

Do they still have the foreign-made cranes around that have "SUPER
ERECTION SYSTEM" in giant block letters on the arm?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

6466. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:20:58 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <fjat7u8u9elbg9h2qklk2dtq63p2eejoqm@4ax.com>
Source record: 35925
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 17:01:17 GMT, AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org> wrote:

>Sir Walter --- over here fookin means "I have four kin" as in "fook in A"

ROTFL!

I can do no better than to refer you, once again, to the excellent
glossary of "English as she is spoke", which is to be found at
http://www.youngie.com/terms.htm

It is of especial value to Americans, as it highlights many important
differences between the two languages!

P.S. I had faggots and peas for lunch on Monday!
;-)

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

6467. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:25:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228172501.16934.00001110@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35928

From: "Leland C. Scott" no-spam@junk-mail.net

>People may have the same exact name but the FCC only issues unique
>callsigns, no duplicates.

Not necessarily so. I believe under the convention used for aircraft identification, some of the combinations can duplicate amateur assignments.

> So, for example, would a person identifying
>themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a bootlegged
>callsign as proof, a crime?

I will leave that for the lawyers to unravel -- or ravel! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6468. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:46:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35929

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
>is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
>a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
>to either the membership or non-members.

An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by the direct vote of that membership.

>The ARRL is a private organization and does not have to follow the
>governmental rules and monitoring of elections or open records-
>keeping. While the ARRL has a quasi-governmental structure and
>claimed "representation" of the ARS and "democratic principle"
>elections and "openness in BoD meetings through publishing
>minutes," the only output comes from the ARRL itself.

And a copious output it is. :-)

>Are there independent, disinterested witnesses to all this "openness and
>honesty?" All I've seen over the years is what the ARRL says it
>does. There are NO independent checks or balances; the ARRL
>says it is honest and aboveboard and all must take them at
>their word..

Yes, we must. :-) Why would those who set ARRL policy not want to be honest and above board?

>The ARRL has achieved a monopoly on amateur radio interest
>publications in the USA. Not an absolute monopoly but one of
>being the major source of information, at least two-thirds of all
>all available English-language amateur publications in print. The
>periodicals are self-sustaining through advertising fees despite
>claims that QST is merely a membership service benefit.

The presence of those advertising fees is not kept secret, Len. To the contrary, as an ARRL employee, I am quite pleased to tell you that the advertising revenues are part of what helps pay for other membership services.

>Before the opening of the Internet a mere decade ago, the ARRL
>acted as an intermediary for its membership (then only about a
>quarter of all licensees as it is now) in relations with the US
>government and especially with the FCC. That was useful since
>government was very large and direct communications with the
>government was difficult. The ARRL had become a de facto
>Big Brother, a claimed ombudsman. It was very difficult for
>individual members to verify if the ARRL actually DID what it

>said it did.

What ARRL says it does wrt the FCC is very much a matter of public record then, as it is now.

> All were expected to believe that the ARRL was
>honest because the ARRL said they were honest. A Belief
>existed and skeptics were scoffed at, ignored by Believers.

Uh, oh, here come the Black Helicopters and Capitilizations. Must be Pontification time!

>The Internet brought a true Revolution as well as Revelation to
>all who had access. Governments now had databases
>available on-line, including Comments and Replies on NPRMs.
>No one had to travel to DC and go to the Reading Room of the
>FCC in order to see documents nor did they have to be a
>lifetime subscriber to the Federal Register or GPO customer.
>Governments even accepted comments from individual
>citizens and did not need attorneys to represent them. The
>FCC made public over 2600 Comments on the 98-143 NPRM,
>all available on-line around the clock.

Yes, it does. How does the fact that now that all these tools are available, ARRL tells hams about them, tells them how to use them, tells hams what it has filed with the FCC and gives the URLs where they can read those filings fit with your "we had to believe they were honest because we had no way of proving they weren't" allegations?

>The ARRL has a large website, too. Many sources of amateur
>radio information are available for free, but nearly as many are
>also available ONLY to members.

And on what basis do you know what percentage of the website is available only to members, Len? From what I see, the members-only features are probably less than 20% of the whole. Most of that is related to what is printed in QST, and I think we can reasonably conclude that someone who chooses not to get QST will have to accept that about half of the reprinted articles from QST and QEX on the ARRL website are available only to members.

>That same website has continual advertisements paid for by others and for ITSELF. It
>is an ideal self-promotional medium and the ARRL never fails
>in such self-promotion.

Good for them. As a member, I appreciate that ARRL promotes the products that pay for the things that are important to me.

>Competitors in publications are featured
>only if the ARRL stands to profit by resale of such products.

Nonsense. The ARRL Tech Info pages refer to any and all good sources of info known to the Technical staff. The TISFIND database features companies selling products of interest to hams whether they are competitors or advertisers or

not. Your conspiracy theory sounds good, Len, but doesn't hold up to reality.

>The implications of altruism have become tarnished.

By whom? Your "they could be lying so they must be" allegations? I don't think so.

>The ARRL membership is still not above a quarter of all US
>amateur radio licensees, yet the ARRL still implies that it
>"represents all amateurs."

Maybe someday you will understand the meaning of representation, Len.

>The ARRL has had a record of
>past opposition, strong opposition to change, yet has repeatedly
>reversed opposing stances after change had been enacted.

In what way? ARRL didn't purge the record of its postion wrt restructuring after restructuring was enacted differently. It did accept the outcome after filing its Petition for Reconsideration. To hear you talk, one would think that you believe ARRL should have flouted the law. I think this is a case you would damn either way ARRL did it. As a member, I believe that ARRL should not flout the law.

>Believers will selectively bring out such reversals as "proof" that
>the ARRL was "really all for change" prior to an occurance.

Can you provide an example of this nonsense?

>Believers cannot see such tarnish but others do.

Ah, the Secret Seer phenomenon. :-) We understand, Len.

>The ARRL has no indication of "support" for newcomers unless
>they are teen-agers or totally ignorant of radio or of miniscule
>experience in ANY radio communication.
I can barely understand what this means? In your twisted view, what rational reason can you offer that ARRl would not want to support newcomers unless they didn't know anything? You can sure cook up some far-flung ideas, Len. :-)

> The (unfortunately)
>clear implication for many years has been that all who enter
>must be ignorant of radio and young acolytes of brainwashable
>aptitudes.

Well, if you have had to bring in allegations of brainwashing, you really are scratching pretty deep, Len. I think I will let that one speak for itself. You can Clay can both think "they" are out to get other people, but YOU are too smart to be caught by their lies. :-)

>The ARRL knows all and sees all, they will "lead the
>way" because they (and only they) "know what is best."

I disagree, Len. I do not believe that ARRL is either all knowing, or all seeing. You are free to believe they are, but it is pretty odd that you would

believe that and say all the things you said above.

>Of course, the ARRL tries to influence ENTRY regulations into
>US amateur radio...by the same manner as had so many in
>the membership under old regulations.
Can you explain what you mean by this?

>Are these just one person's observations? No. Hardly. It is a
>sort of synopsis of what thousands of others have seen and
>felt over the years.

I don't imagine that "thousands" have seen and felt the TRVTH as Len knows it,
Len.

>There is no poll of that multitude, no proof,
>yet it has been heard, felt, and understood. It is almost
>tangible. The signs have just begun to appear, such as the
>Comments on 98-143.

This reminds me of the guy in rags standing on the street corner preaching the
end is near. :-)

>Perhaps the ARRL leadership ought to start listening to more
>than its own propaganda, to be more ecumenical in its Belief
>System. It is free to hold its own Mass but that is only a
>ceremony...the masses aren't entering the secular enclave.

>There are no "black helicopters" but rather fully identifiable
>ones. There is no paranoia about a "they." There is simply
>an observation of what has gone on in the past and a very
>great mass of younger skeptics not convinced. The "they"
>are seen for who they are, what they have stated.

I hope you feel better soon, Len.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6469. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:47:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228174735.16934.00001115@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35930

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.

>> Carl passed a code test.

> But not THE code test. He knows.

No one can pass that code test ever again, Dick.

He knows.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6470. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:51:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228175142.16934.00001117@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35931

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
>As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
>who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.

That will only be true if you are successful in your attempts to convince them
that they will not be learning it.

That is the classic self-fulfilling prophecy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6471. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:54:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228175421.16934.00001118@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35932

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I think we can all agree on the content of some of Len's posts. How about
>the
>> content of your posts? Any "vindictiveness" there, Steve? Dick's posts?

> And how about Carl's posts? Cecil's posts? I see you're "fair and balanced",
>as usual.

Hmmm, what can we infer from your evasion of the question?

Okay, I will try again.

Do you think that your posts are vindicitive?

Or, if I discuss what I don't like about Cecil's posts, will that make you stop posting vindictive things about people? I never would have thought of that, but if that will help you learn more about yourself, I would be willing to give it a try.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6472. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:56:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228175611.16934.00001119@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35933

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> What is the increase in the life expectancy? Why shouldn't they offset?

That would only offset if the increase in life expectancy was 1 year a year.

Surely you can't think that possible.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6473. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 22:59:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228175958.16934.00001120@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35934

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
>essentially
>meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
>result.

I know that you are giving this advice to those who are studying for the exams, but I want to tell them that you are wrong and that it is easier to learn the underlying principles than to try to word-associate 300 sets of questions three separate times.

>For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.

Now you're talking, Dick. Such a turnaround.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6474. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:04:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228180418.16934.00001121@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35935

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>CAM wrote:

>> How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?

> No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be
>enforced??

What he said... what he heard.

No wonder this is so difficult sometimes.

>> Who does the enforcement for "investing whatever it takes"?

>The issuance of the license obviously takes care of that.

I am sure that Cecil will agree. I have a question, though, if you believe that the issuance of a license takes car of enforcement for "whatever it takes," why the diatribe?

>I know that the vast
>majority of applicants do not.

Then again, why the diatribe?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6475. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:07:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202281507.62b5fffb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35936

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<a5ln5j011a1@enews3.newsguy.com>...

> The point I'm trying to make is that is the
> pro-coders want CW to endure, they have to do so without welfare support of
> the mode via mandated testing at high speeds.

There has never been mandated testing at "high speeds", though. 20 wpm
isn't really fast CW at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6476. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:07:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228180731.16934.00001122@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35937

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>p.s. Please don't listen to Ed when he tries to tell you that you're
>your own worst enemies, either :-)

The problem, Carl, is that the things they are saying to "defend" morse code by trying to keep a code test are the very things I would NOT say to a ham to encourage him to actually try Morse code.

I am sure you don't care one way or the other about what hams choose to do with Morse code, but I sure would like to see more hams use and enjoy it. On one of the QRP lists, we are having a nice discussion about how to help the newly minted 5 wpm QRPers with QSOs and fun with CW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6477. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:10:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228181020.16934.00001123@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35938

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I'll bet they respond to my honey better than to your vinegar. "It's
>their day in the barrel" isn't going to attract a lot of folks, Dick.

We could try it on the FPQRP-L list. Dick could give them vinegar and I could give them honey and we could ask the slow-speed hams there which made them want to try CW.

You game to come up with a vinegar paragraph, Dick? Maybe we could put this to rest with a few impartial judges.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6478. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:15:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228181516.16934.00001124@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35939

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>I am told that the VEC QPC will accept input on the pools from
>all. I cannot verify this, but that would seem the proper direction
>to argue for changes to make them better.

You are correct, and such input would be valuable. You can email your comments
to any of the participating VECs or directly to the chairman.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6479. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:18:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202281518.2e02f069@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35940

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7DB365.5EDFD7F5@IEEE.org>...

> If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
> like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer.

"Dropping like flies"? How many is that?

> What's the age of the average ham?

No such thing as an "average" amateur.

The "average age" can be misleading, too. There's the mean, the median,
and a bunch of other "averages", of course.

People are living longer today. More important, they are staying active
longer. I know many locals who became hams as a retirement activity.
Some were "retreads" who had dropped out years ago, some were "always
wanted to but never got around to it" folks, and some had never heard
of ham radio before. All of them tend to raise the average age!

Some folks look at the attendance at hamfests and radio club meetings,
see the preponderance of older folks and conclude that ham radio is
"dying". In truth what's going on is that the younger and middle
aged folks are often too busy working or taking care of families
to spend an entire evening or weekend day away from home.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6480. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:22:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228182254.16930.00001083@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 35941

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Some folks look at the attendance at hamfests and radio club meetings,
>see the preponderance of older folks and conclude that ham radio is
>"dying".

I was off at a hamfest lately, and another ham expressed his concerns that "only old people are here." I looked around the room and, excepting teens, I saw hams of all ages. I told him to look again, and he did. He had a very surprised look as he realized that there were hams of all ages there. Maybe a few more old timers than 20s and 30s, but hams of all ages were represented.

FWIW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

6481. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:42:20 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a5mfke$8fbr0$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 35943
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5hp6o$em7$3@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:WWDe8.48860$2v1.1626491@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > I'm told by a local Radio Shack manager that it is a policy of Radio
Shack
> > (Tandy, Inc.) not
> > to sell amateur equipment to unlicensed persons.
>
> When did that policy go into effect?
>
> How is it checked?

>...snip

> I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham
> license. 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No
> questions asked.

I'm curious about this "policy" myself. My wife bought me a 10 m rig from
them in 2000 for Christmas (she's a nonham). Plus, I've never been asked for
my license when buying stuff there.

There's another sticky issue I haven't seen mentioned either, the secondary
market. If I resell a radio, do *I* now have to check for licenses? What a
pain that would be. Would put a crimp in many a hamfest.

Robert / N4IXT

6482. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:46:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EC141.5286A7C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35942

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
> >As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
> >who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
>
> That will only be true if you are successful in your attempts to convince them
> that they will not be learning it.
>
> That is the classic self-fulfilling prophecy.

Dick has no choice but to discourage as many new hams as possible from
learning Morse code and using CW. Otherwise, he will prove himself wrong.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6483. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:48:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EC1BD.899D6083@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35944

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > What is the increase in the life expectancy? Why shouldn't they offset?
>
> That would only offset if the increase in life expectancy was 1 year a year.
> Surely you can't think that possible.

Anything is possible on the planet that Dick lives on. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6484. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-28 23:56:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EC3BF.951586C9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 35945

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C7DB365.5EDFD7F5@IEEE.org>...
>
> > If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
> > like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer.
>
> "Dropping like flies"? How many is that?

Look at the SK list.

> People are living longer today.

But they are not living forever. The average age of all hams has been
increasing for some time. It cannot increase forever. I'm told by
someone who knows about such things, that the absolute maximum lifespan
for a present-day Homo sapien is approximately 120 years. That's when
the ability of human DNA to reproduce itself peters out.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----